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# Survey of Local Authority Music Services 2005 

Executive Summary

## Background

In 2001, the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) published the White Paper 'Schools: achieving success' within which the Government pledged to ensure that over time, every primary school child who wanted to would have the opportunity to learn to play a musical instrument. To deliver this commitment a robust, current, data base was required which could be used to provide a baseline for wider opportunities in primary music, prepare the way for changes in Music Standards Fund allocations, enable national benchmarks to be established and complement the Music Services' Guidance as a tool for self-evaluation, development and target-setting. To satisfy this need in 2002, the DfES conducted a National Survey of Local Authorities (LA) ${ }^{1}$ music provision to provide a comprehensive picture of music provision nationally by investigating the different types of provision being offered by LA Music Services and assessing variations in levels of provision across LAs. The current research is to enable the monitoring of progress since the 2002 survey.

## Methodology

A questionnaire was developed in consultation with representatives from Music Services and adapted from that used in 2002. A data base was established to include data from the questionnaires, nationally available Local Authority (LA) data, and relevant data from the 1999 and 2002 surveys of Music Services. To improve the quality and quantity of data relating to pupil characteristics including ethnicity, Special Educational Needs and free school meals, where LAs were able to provide pupil information including Unique Pupil Number (UPN), name, year group and school this was matched with that in the Common Basic Data Set. The success of the matching process was variable depending on the quality of the data in the Common Basic Data Set and that provided by the Music Services. Common problems included inaccurate UPNs, and mis-spelled names. Where matching was undertaken without UPNs a success rate of $80 \%$ was achieved.

Responses were received from all but one Music Service, a total of 149, although the quality and quantity of the data that they were able to provide varied considerably. Fifteen LAs made joint returns. In some cases, where independent Music Services were employed by LAs to provide services some information was provided by the LA and some by the Music Service. It was apparent from this process that in some cases the working relationships between the independent music service and the LA were less than optimal. Where joint returns were made, as it was not possible to disaggregate the data, in the analyses undertaken each joint return was counted as a single response.

[^0]
## Findings

## Types of Music Service

Most Music Services were an integral part of LAs (71\%) with a further seven percent sharing services with another LA. Only a small proportion of tuition ( $11 \%$ ) was provided by independent services. Nine percent was provided by LAs in conjunction with an independent provider and in the remaining two percent the service was devolved to schools. Unitary authorities were the least likely to have their own Music Service ( $47 \%$ ) and Counties ( $91 \%$ ) and Metropolitan boroughs ( $86 \%$ ) the most likely.

Twenty percent of Music Services were less than five years old. Eleven of these were in Unitary authorities. Six Music Services were established in 2004.

## Wider opportunities schemes

Eight percent of the Key Stage 2 (KS2) school population were engaged in KS2 wider opportunities work during 2003/04. Ten percent had been involved up to February $1^{\text {st }}$ (the census date) in 2004/05. Music Services were developing a range of strategies to continue widening opportunities.

On average, in each LA, over 10,000 children had access to taster musical experiences in 2003/04 and ongoing in 2004/05. On average in each LA, a further 1500 had access to a musical skills programme and over 900 to specialist instrumental tuition as part of wider opportunities schemes.

The main barriers identified to increasing access were lack of sufficient funding, lack of instruments, lack of musical expertise among primary school teachers, and lack of appropriate experience of instrumental teachers in teaching very large groups of children.

## Access

Overall, $8.4 \%$ of pupils Key Stage 1 (KS1) to Key Stage 4 (KS4) were learning to play an instrument. This is a small increase on the figures for 2002. Thirteen percent of KS2 pupils were learning to play an instrument. This was a significant improvement on 2002 where the figure was seven percent.

Seventy six percent of primary schools were receiving specialist instrumental tuition and $88 \%$ of secondary schools.

In all Key Stages more girls were learning to play instruments than boys, the greatest difference being in KS2 where $60 \%$ of girls were learning and $40 \%$ of boys. There was a small reduction in the difference through to KS4. In Special Schools the situation was reversed with more boys ( $72 \%$ ) learning than girls.

Overall, nine percent of pupils with Special Educational Needs were in receipt of specialist instrumental tuition. Because of the difficulties with the data matching process this may be an underestimate.

Seventeen percent of pupils learning to play an instrument were from minority ethnic or mixed ethnicity groups. Ethnicity data were unknown or refused for four percent. Seventy percent of pupils were White British with a further three [s 1]percent from other white groups. [s2]

Twelve percent of pupils receiving tuition were in receipt of free school meals.
Music Services reported waiting lists of $0.5 \%$ of the school population. $0.2 \% \mathrm{had}$ been waiting to learn for over six months. The average number of schools waiting for tuition was 2.5 .

Music Services reported that $24 \%$ of pupils were taught in individual lessons, $64 \%$ in groups of between two and four, seven percent in groups of between five and ten, and ten percent in groups of more than eleven. This distribution reflects limitations on current charging policy where charges can only be operated for groups of four or less.

## Breadth of opportunity

Eighty two percent of Music Services offered schools advice on resources, appointments and preparation for or follow up to inspections. Eighty two percent offered advice on developing the curriculum, $78 \%$ curriculum delivery, $80 \%$ inservice training (INSET) for school staff, and $77 \%$ support for individual staff in schools. Eighty four percent provided festivals and other school activities for pupils, $68 \%$ an instrument loan scheme, $60 \%$ Information Technology (IT) support, $83 \%$ live music concerts, $74 \%$ new musical taster experiences, $77 \%$ workshops and $35 \%$ other services.

Opportunities were offered to play a wide variety of instruments. Twenty percent of those receiving tuition attended ensembles, although there was considerable variation between Music Services from one percent to $73 \%$.

A wide range of ensembles was on offer. The most common were string ensembles ( $86 \%$ ), wind bands ( $86 \%$ ), choirs and vocal groups ( $83 \%$ ), orchestras ( $83 \%$ ), jazz groups ( $82 \%$ ) brass ensembles ( $73 \%$ ), and woodwind ensembles ( $72 \%$ ). The least common were Gamelan ( $33 \%$ ), Steel pans ( $23 \%$ ), Kindermusik ( $7 \%$ ), and other groups ( $31 \%$ ). The ages ranged from nought to ten for Kindermusik and early years groups through to 66 for mixed band ensembles, 35 for choirs and 24 for many other groups.

Fifty seven percent of Music Services offered master classes, $61 \%$ music schools or centralised activities, $57 \%$ residential courses, $62 \%$ theory, aural or general musicianship classes, $66 \%$ tours and $28 \%$ other activities.

## Quality issues

Fifty three percent of children learning to play an instrument were pre Level 1 in the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). Thirty two percent were at Level 1, six percent were at Level 2 and two percent at Level 3.

Fifty five percent of Music Services indicated that they had special provision for talented pupils.

Overall, $10 \%$ of pupils dropped out. The key reason given for dropping out was loss of interest ( $27 \%$ of pupils) followed by competing demands from other school work ( $14 \%$ ) and competing demands from other extra-curricular activities ( $8 \%$ ).

Twenty two percent of staff were full-time, $21 \%$ part-time and $57 \%$ paid hourly. The staff in a small number of Music Services were self-employed, while other staff were on 'other' contracts, the nature of which was not specified.

The percentage of full time staff with Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) was 74\%, $18 \%$ were graduates but did not have QTS, and $14 \%$ were not graduates and did not have QTS. Relatively high proportions of part time and hourly paid staff were graduates but did not have QTS ( $34 \%$ and $46 \%$ respectively).

Of lessons observed by school staff $66 \%$ were judged to be satisfactory or better (responses from nine Music Services) and $76 \%$ judged good or better (responses from 11 Music Services). Internal monitoring by Music Service staff of a higher number of lessons indicated $96 \%$ lessons judged as satisfactory or better and $67 \%$ as good or better.

Seventy percent of Music Services reported that they used surveys to seek evaluation by schools and head teachers, $40 \%$ indicated that their provision was evaluated by pupils. Eighty two percent reported that they were evaluated internally within the LA and $25 \%$ by another organisation internally. Levels of evaluation of services provided by other organisations were much lower. Ninety seven percent of schools were satisfied with the services offered by Music Services.

High levels of continuing professional development opportunities were reported for Music Service teachers and for other teachers within the LA.

## Financial issues

The average hourly charge to schools for services was $£ 27.10$. Fifty eight percent of Music Services made charges directly to parents for instrumental tuition, 54\% for instrument hire, $62 \%$ for membership of ensembles, $60 \%$ for residential courses and $27 \%$ for other services. Charges for tuition varied in relation to group size. The average charge for individual tuition was $£ 98$ per term, for tuition in a group of four, $£ 43$.

Bursaries for gifted and talented pupils were offered by $38 \%$ of Music Services. A range of ways of identifying gifted pupils was adopted. Sixty seven percent of Music Services had remissions policies for students eligible for free school meals.

The percentage average income from LAs was $13 \%$, from the Music Standards Fund $43 \%$, from schools $25 \%$ and families $16 \%$. There was wide variation between Music Services in their sources of funding. Two Unitary authorities reported that $100 \%$ of their funding came from the Music Standards Fund and a
further five Music Services indicated that over $80 \%$ of their income came from the Music Standards Fund.

## Change since previous surveys

The response rate from Heads of Music Services to the survey in 1999 was $52 \%$. In 2002 and 2005 it was $99 \%$. Music Services have recognised the need for monitoring the quality of their work.

The quality of data returned was considerably improved on 2002, although there continued to be variability between Music Services. The best services were able to provide detailed descriptions of the nature of the composition of their pupil population, the standards that they reached, staffing and financial data.

Since the last survey several new Music Services had been established, sixteen in total. Inevitably, they had less experience in collating data for the process of monitoring the quality of their provision.

It was not possible to make direct comparisons between much of the data from previous surveys and the current survey because the level of detail required in 2005 was much greater, reflecting the increased capacity of services to provide this level of information. Comparisons made are therefore of a general rather than a specific nature.

There was a small increase in the total number of pupils learning music from $8 \%$ to $8.4 \%$ between 2002 and 2005. Music Services were able to provide data by key stage indicating that the greatest proportion of children learning are in KS2. There were also a considerable number of pupils learning pre-school, and in the 16-19 age group.

The wider opportunities scheme was at the planning stage at the time of the 2002 survey. On average in 2003/04, eight percent of pupils in KS2 were accessing wider opportunities schemes. In 2004/05, prior to $1^{\text {st }}$ February, $10 \%$ of KS2 children were involved in wider opportunities schemes with a range from zero to $66 \%$. In the Counties, over $13 \%$ of KS2 pupils were accessing wider opportunities schemes in 2003/04 and in 2004/05.

Music Services had a wide range of plans for developing access in the future. Limitations to these plans included: finance, lack of instruments, and lack of appropriate skills in Music Service staff and primary teachers.

In 1999 and 2002, very few Music Services were able to provide data relating to the makeup of their student cohort in relation to gender, ethnicity, eligibility for free school meals and Special Educational Needs.

The available data revealed that $40 \%$ of children learning were boys in 1999, reducing to $32 \%$ in 2002. In 2005, the position had reverted to that of 1999 with $60 \%$ of girls and $40 \%$ of boys learning to play post KS2. Increasing availability of tuition in guitar and drumming seemed to have provided more opportunities of interest to boys than previously.

In 1999, most Music Services made no particular provision for pupils with Special Educational Needs. In 2002, thirty five Music Services were able to provide data on the percentage of pupils on the Special Educational Needs register at Stage 2 or above receiving tuition. The proportion (seven percent) was close to the average proportion of pupils in the school population receiving tuition. In 2005, over one hundred Music Services provided data relating to Special Educational Needs. Overall, nine percent of the children learning to play an instrument were in receipt of additional support in relation to their Special Educational Needs. Because the matching with the Common Basic Data Set was on average at an $80 \%$ level this figure is an underestimation. Caution also has to be exercised as the way that children with Special Educational Needs are categorised has changed since 2002.

The 2005 survey is the first able to provide reliable data on ethnicity. Seventy three percent of pupils learning were white, with substantial proportions of ethnic minority groups receiving tuition.

The 2005 survey was the first to provide reliable data on the proportion of pupils in receipt of free school meals receiving music tuition (12\%).

Overall, there was a significant improvement in the quality of the data available which enabled much more accurate assessment of the population of children accessing tuition. The figures contradict the view that Music Services only cater for white middle class pupils and indicate that substantial proportions of children from minority ethnic groups, eligible for free school meals and with Special Educational Needs do learn to play an instrument, even given the underestimation resulting from the weaknesses in the matching process with the Common Basic Data Set.

In 2002, $69 \%$ of schools were reported to have received instrumental tuition. In $2005,76 \%$ of primary schools and $88 \%$ percent of secondary schools were reported to be receiving specialist music tuition.

In 2002, $38 \%$ of schools were reported to be taking advice on resources, appointments and preparation for or follow up for inspections. In 2005, this had risen to $82 \%$. In $2002,30 \%$ were taking advantage of support for curriculum development. This had risen to $82 \%$ in 2005. Similar rises were reported in relation to curriculum delivery, from $25 \%$ to $78 \%$, and IT support, from $18 \%$ to $60 \%$. In the 2005 survey, the number of categories of support for schools was extended beyond that of 2002 and high proportions of Music Services were offering a wide range of services.

The range of instruments which children were playing in 2005 demonstrated an expansion in breadth of tuition opportunities with children being able to access a wider range of world musics, folk music, and more popular musical instruments (drums, guitar) in addition to the classical Western instruments. The range of ensemble provision reflected these changes.

The 2005 survey was the first where Music Services were able to provide reliable information about the standards attained by pupils and data relating to the reasons for children dropping out.

There was no change in the percentage of staff reported to be on full time contracts between 2002 and 2005 or the levels of staff qualifications.

Music Services continued to monitor the quality of teaching, and provide professional development opportunities for staff.

There has been a consistent improvement in the quality of the data collected by Music Services since 1999 and the best Music Services have a range of data bases and monitoring systems in place.

## Comments on the survey process

Music Services reported different time ranges for the collation of data to complete the questionnaire. This reflected the extent to which individual Music Services routinely collected monitoring data.

## Next steps

Although the information provided in the questionnaires was vastly improved from 2002 there were still serious omissions with some Music Services being unable to provide all the necessary information. In order to assure the quality of their work it is essential that Music Services monitor their activities and take seriously self-evaluation of their performance. The best Music Services have systems in place which enable this to be undertaken. Their expertise needs to be shared with other Music Services.

The Common Basic Data Set which is produced at LA level, provides a wide range of information at pupil level which would be of considerable use to Music Services when combined with a Music Service data base. Music Services should explore the possibilities of accessing this data base at local level.

More opportunities need to be provided for Music Services to continue to share good practice with a particular focus on new and developing services so that they can learn from well-established services. Considerable change is evident in relation to access and the breadth of services on offer but this could be further enhanced if opportunities for sharing ideas were available more frequently.

There is evidence that some Music Services have further developed their activities into other areas, for instance, early years and adult education. This provides alternative sources of income and an improved service to the wider community. The changes to more integrated services at LA level will provide more opportunities for Music Services to develop such activities.

While there was a small improvement in the overall number of pupils learning to play an instrument between 2002 and 2005 from $8 \%$ to $8.4 \%$ of the school population it is apparent that the only way to achieve a major increase is for group tuition sizes to be larger. There are two obstacles to this. The first is legislation which prevents charges for tuition being made to groups larger than four pupils. The second obstacle is that most instrumental teachers have no experience of teaching larger groups of children. A major in-service training programme is required to remedy this.

Some Music Services still have an over reliance on particular income streams. There continues to be a need for diversity in the way in which Music Services are funded to ensure their security in the longer term.

## Chapter 1: Background and aims

This chapter provides an overview of the role of music in our lives, gives an indication of the number of children learning to play an instrument, and outlines the possible impacts of learning to play an instrument beyond learning a musical skill. It provides a brief review of previous surveys of Music Services and sets out the objectives of the research.

### 1.1 The role of music in our lives

In our society music is evident in almost every aspect of our lives. We are constantly hearing music in restaurants, supermarkets, shopping precincts, churches, schools, on the radio and television and through the medium of recordings. With increased technology, many different types of music are instantly available to most of us at any time of day and night wherever we are (Hallam, 2001). In the United States of America (USA) and the United Kingdom (UK) music is amongst the top economic generators of income (Hodges and Haack, 1996; KMPG/National Music Council, 1999). In the UK, in 1998, the domestic music industry had a value of $£ 3.2$ billion with the equivalent of 130,000 full time jobs. In 1999, the UK was ranked third with only the USA and Japan higher in relation to world music sales. It has also been estimated that the sale of new instruments and live performance ticket sales makes nearly $£ 150$ million for the treasury annually (Westcombe, 1997). Music is of major importance to the UK's economic health and is likely to become so increasingly as the shift from old style manufacturing industries to culture as a commodity continues.

While there is a lack of accurate information about the extent of music listening among the general population, figures for radio listening alone indicate that in the order of 11.3 million people listen regularly to BBC Radio 1,10 million to BBC Radio 2, 6.2 million to Classic FM and 1.9 million to Radio 3. In addition there are over 300 commercial stations and almost 40 BBC local stations which spend a considerable amount of air time playing music. Teenagers, in particular, listen to a great deal of music, in the UK typically almost three hours a day (North et al., 2000). In addition, in the region of $70 \%$ of students report listening to music while studying (Kotsopoulou, 1997).

Music making also plays an important part in the leisure of many individuals (Everitt, 1997). In 1991, there were more than 5,400 amateur music-making groups with an individual membership of 258,000, 240 youth choirs and orchestras with a membership of 28,000 and more than 1,700 folk or traditional music and dance club societies with a membership of 57,000 (Hutchinson and Feist, 1991). Another survey estimated that $11 \%$ of the population took part in disco dancing, five percent played a musical instrument, four percent were involved in ballroom dancing, two percent engaged in choral singing, two percent in making pop music, and one percent in orchestral music (Research Surveys of Great Britain, 1991). A further report estimated that at least 600,000 people actively participated in amateur and voluntary music making (National Music Council, 1996).

Studies of instrumental tuition have shown that at any one time substantial proportions of children are receiving tuition, either at school or privately, for example, the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER, 1991) showed that in the region of 467,500 pupils were receiving instrumental tuition from local authorities, between six and seven percent of the total school population in England and Wales. Participation rates varied between LAs. They tended to be highest in the London area (around $11 \%$ ) and lowest in the Counties (5-6\%). Only one percent of special schools received tuition. In 1998, a survey undertaken by the Performing Rights Society (1999) indicated that Music Services were teaching more children in more schools and offering a wider range of instruments and ancillary services than ever before. The percentage of pupils taught had increased to $12.3 \%$ from $9.1 \%$ in 1993 and $7.5 \%$ in 1991. Research undertaken on behalf of the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (Hallam and Prince, 2000) showed great variability in the numbers of pupils receiving tuition in different LAs. Global figures for the percentage of the school population receiving tuition varied from $0.2 \%$ to $14 \%$ with the majority of Music Services reaching between four and ten percent. As in 1991, provision for pupils with Special Educational Needs was generally perceived as weak. In addition to instrumental tuition, many children attended LA music centres and participated in music-making in groups (Sharp, 1991; Hallam and Prince, 2000). Surveys undertaken by the Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music (ABRSM) consider all instrumental music tuition, not only that provided by LAs. These revealed a reduction in the number of children learning to play an instrument between 1993 and 1996 from $45 \%$ to $41 \%$. The largest reduction was in children between the ages of five and ten. The most recent survey (ABRSM, 2000) showed that the number taking private lessons had reduced from $23 \%$ to $18 \%$ between 1996 and 1999, while learning in schools had increased from $69 \%$ to $73 \%$.

Although the proportion of individuals learning to play an instrument is relatively small, demand for tuition is high. In 1990, $91 \%$ of parents reported wanting their children to have the opportunity to play an instrument (Addison, 1990), while a recent report for QCA (Lamont et al., 2003) indicated that approximately $40 \%$ of children not already playing an instrument wanted to learn.

### 1.2 The impact of instrumental music tuition

Instrumental music tuition has an important role in contributing towards society's needs in relation to the culture industries and the continued development of active and constructive participation in musical activities. Learning to play an instrument is the starting point for many of those who go on to pursue a career in music, even if that career is not a professional performing career. In addition to the direct effects on careers in music, the media and the arts, there are benefits to those who learn to play a musical instrument in relation to other generic skills that are increasingly demanded by employers.

One strand of research has explored the effects of music on intellectual skills. This has proved extremely controversial. Research which claimed that listening to Mozart could improve spatial reasoning (Rauscher et al., 1995) has proved difficult to replicate (Chabris, 1999; Hetland, 2000). Studies of the effects of using the Kodaly method on other skills have had mixed results (Hurwitz et al.,
1975), although music lessons designed to develop auditory, visual and motor skills have benefited reading skills (Douglas and Willatts, 1994). Early research showed that learning to play a musical instrument produced small temporary effects on spatial reasoning but not on other aspects of cognitive functioning (Rauscher et al., 1997; Costa-Giomi, 1999; Hetland, 2000). Schellenberg (2004) randomly assigned a large sample of children to four different groups, two of which received music lessons (standard keyboard, Kodaly voice) for a year. The other two were control groups that received instruction in a non-musical artistic activity (drama) or no lessons. All four groups exhibited increases in IQ as would be expected over the time period but the music groups had statistically larger increases in full scale IQ with an effect size of 0.35 .

Studies exploring the effects of increasing the amount of classroom music within the curriculum have found that children receiving extra music lessons kept up with their peers in language and reading skills despite having fewer lessons although there were differences between high and low ability groups (Spychiger, et al., 1993). Research using correlational techniques has investigated the effects of taking arts subjects on overall examination results. While taking music was positively related to better performance in other subjects this does not necessarily mean that it was the cause of it (Harland et al., 2000). Currently, it is not possible to draw firm conclusions about the effects of listening to or active involvement in music making on other intellectual skills (Overy, 1998; Staines, 1999; Hallam, 2001).

There are, however, demonstrable positive effects of involvement with music on children's personal and social development. Children receiving additional or regular classroom music lessons have shown increased social cohesion within class, greater self-reliance, better social adjustment and more positive attitudes. These effects were particularly marked in low ability, disaffected pupils (Spychiger, et al., 1993; Hanshumaker, 1980). Children of low economic status receiving individual piano lessons have also exhibited increases in self-esteem compared with controls (Costa-Giomi, 1999). There is also some evidence that involvement in music can help re-engage those who may have become alienated from society (Ings et al., 2000).

A UK study of the impact of the arts in education (Harland, 1998, 2000) also showed that the most frequent overall influences on pupils were reported in relation to personal and social development. In music there were perceived effects relating to awareness of others, social skills, well-being and transfer effects. There were differences in pupils' responses depending on the school they attended. These were related to the degree of musical knowledge and experience that pupils brought to the school curriculum from involvement in musical activities outside school. Some students perceived the benefits of music classes in being listening to music and the development of musical skills while others referred to the sheer fun and therapeutic nature of music, how it gave them confidence to perform in front of others, how it facilitated group work and how it enabled them to learn to express themselves. Those who played instruments mentioned an increase in selfesteem and sense of identity.

Research with instrumental music teachers supports these findings. They believe that the benefits of learning to play an instrument include the development of
social skills, gaining a love and enjoyment of music, developing team-work, developing a sense of achievement, confidence and self-discipline, and developing physical co-ordination (Hallam and Prince, 2000). Other major national reports on the arts have emphasised their importance in developing a range of transferable skills including those related to creativity and critical thinking (NACCCE, 1999). Playing an instrument also enables the pursuit of interesting and rewarding social and leisure activities. Given the perceived importance and range of these benefits it is important that as many children as possible are provided with the opportunity to learn music.

### 1.3 Instrumental music services

In the 1980s, there were many cut-backs in LA provision and legislation. Financial restraints forced many LAs to devolve the monies previously spent on instrumental tuition to schools (Rogers, 1995). By 1993 more than $75 \%$ of LAs had devolved or were in the process of devolving funding for their music services and parents were being required to contribute a much greater proportion of total tuition fees. At this time, overall productivity improved despite a decline in expenditure on staffing. This was achieved by reducing full time teaching posts by $35 \%$ in favour of part time posts. Teachers were working longer hours and teaching more pupils per group and per hour. Teacher recruitment was reported as becoming much more difficult (PRS, 1999). In response to the difficulties being experienced by some Instrumental Music Services (IMSs) and the Department for Education and Employment's (DfEE) consultation on 'Fair Funding' ministers decided that two Standards Fund grants should be set up to support IMSs. At the same time research was undertaken to provide a baseline against which to assess the effects of the impact of this funding (Hallam and Prince, 1999). The research revealed enormous variability between IMSs in the combinations of structures, funding mechanisms and the nature of provision which had evolved in response to local needs, size, geographical location and musical traditions. Provision depended on the nature of the local community and the size of the IMS, although most services provided tuition in the main orchestral and band instruments and a broad range of ensemble opportunities in Music Centres. In some LAs there was no IMS, London being particularly poorly served. Policies regarding remission of fees and actual charges levied varied between IMSs, nationally, so there was great inequality of opportunity to play an instrument. In some places, inability to pay denied opportunity to learn an instrument. The introduction of Standards Funding made it possible to provide remissions in some IMSs where this had previously not been the case. Crucially, the research revealed a lack of systematic data collection by most IMSs regarding the number of pupils receiving tuition by gender, age, key stage, ethnicity, eligibility for free school meals, Special Educational Needs and instrument played and the standards that they attained.

In response to the evidence that active engagement with music has positive effects on personal well-being and a range of transferable skills, in 2001, the DfES published the White Paper `Schools: achieving success' within which the Government pledged to ensure that over time, every primary school child who wanted to would have the opportunity to learn a musical instrument. To deliver this commitment, the DfES undertook a survey of Music Services to provide a baseline data base. The main aim of the survey was to provide a comprehensive picture of music provision nationally by investigating the different types of
provision being offered by LA music services and assessing variations in levels of provision across LAs (Hallam and Rogers, 2003).

There had been dramatic improvements in provision between 1999 and 2002 as a result of the Music Standards Fund. The most striking aspect of the comparison was the extent to which there had been improvement in the collection and collation of data by Music Services. Although not all services were able to provide relevant information on all aspects of their provision, there was a substantial increase in the information available. This was particularly marked for Music Services in London. The 2002 Survey showed that Music Services nationally offered a wide range of services to children, schools and their local communities including tuition, ensembles, residential courses, instrument hire, taster sessions, concerts, workshops and festivals. Although overwhelmingly pupils were taught within the Western classical tradition, other world musics and genres were on offer in most Music Services. A substantial proportion of services also offered support to schools, in terms of advice, curriculum development, Information Technology (IT) support and curriculum delivery. On average, eight percent of compulsory school aged pupils were receiving regular tuition and a substantial proportion of KS2 pupils had started tuition in the last 12 months (seven percent). However, the data regarding gender, ethnicity, Special Educational Needs, eligibility for free school meals and percentage of pupils on waiting lists was insufficient to enable reliable statistical analysis. Data relating to attainment were incomplete and much was estimated making it impossible to draw any conclusions about standards. It was difficult to assess the extent of change in the numbers of pupils learning because of the large amount of missing data in 1999. The data supplied by LAs for both years showed little change. However, the figures for beginners starting in KS2 in 2001 indicated an increase in pupil numbers in the future.

The proportions of funding received from LAs, the Music Standards Fund, schools and families all differed significantly in 1999 and 2002. The cost to the public purse varied between Music Services, families bearing more or less of the cost depending on where they lived. Well established services tended to receive a greater proportion of their income from schools and families. Most Music Services had a policy for determining when fees for lessons should be remitted. This was usually when pupils were eligible for free school meals. There had been substantial changes in the extent to which Music Services offered remission of fees. In 1999, few Music Services had clear remissions policies while in 2002, $76 \%$ of services had remissions policies and offered remissions for a wide range of activities. This responding a positive change in facilitating access across Music Services as a whole.

The evidence on staffing demonstrated a shift in the make up of Music Services with a considerable reduction in full time staff and an increase in hourly paid staff. The majority of staff employed by Music Services were hourly paid although the highest proportions of qualified staff were found amongst those who were either full or part time. The percentage of full time music teachers employed by Music Services between 1999 and 2002 had dropped from an average of 26\% to $20 \%$. The overall percentage of teachers with Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) had dropped from $53 \%$ to $46 \%$. There was no significant relationship between the percentage of teachers with QTS and unit costs. Exploration of the relationships
between levels of qualified staff and performance indicators showed a highly significant and substantial relationship between the overall percentage of teachers with QTS and the percentage of pupils attaining NQF Level 2.

In 1999, those LAs who responded to the questionnaire had in place some quality assurance systems relating to the observation and monitoring of teaching. In 2002, $81 \%$ of Music Services indicated that they had systems in place for the observation of teaching. Given the increase in the sample size this indicates considerable development. Many Music Services were able to classify the outcomes of their observations in relation to protocols used by Ofsted. There was a highly significant positive relationship between the percentage of lessons judged as satisfactory or better by Ofsted and those judged as satisfactory or better internally. There was a positive relationship between lessons judged as good or better by Ofsted and the percentage of head teachers expressing satisfaction with the provision. The data indicated that there had been an increase in the percentage of instrumental music teachers involved in professional development activities suggesting that part time and hourly paid staff now had access to at least some training.

The establishment of the Music Standards Fund had clearly enabled existing Music Services to stabilise and halted the decline in services which was in evidence prior to 1999. New services had developed as a result of the funding. In addition, the funding focused attention on the breadth of provision and the extent of access. This has increased inclusion and made it possible for LAs to adopt and implement systematic remissions policies which were generally not in place in 1999. The data reported in the questionnaires were vastly improved from those provided in 1999. However, there were still serious omissions. Services cannot assure the quality of their work unless they monitor their activities and take seriously self-evaluation of their performance.

The 2002 survey went a considerable way towards providing the data needed by the Department but some LAs did not have the systems in place to present a complete picture of their schools provision. To complete this picture the Department commissioned a second National Survey of LA Music Services.

### 1.4 Objectives: The current research

The main aim of the 2005 survey was to provide a comprehensive picture of music provision nationally by investigating the types of provision being offered by LA Music Services and assessing the variations in levels of provision across LAs. This aimed to:

- provide a baseline for wider opportunities in primary music;
- enable national benchmarks to be established; and
- complement the Music Services Website Guidance as a tool for selfevaluation, development and target setting.

The 2005 survey gathered information on key areas such as:

- the number of pupils and schools being reached by Music Services;
- which instruments are being taught;
- continuing development opportunities for teachers;
- the age, gender and ethnicity of those pupils receiving tuition;
- numbers of pupils with Special Educational Needs being offered instrumental tuition;
- judgements of the quality of teaching;
- details of remission policies; and
- details of other musical activities funded by the Music Standards Fund (e.g. festivals and visiting musicians) including how many pupils these reach.

These data were collected at both the individual pupil level and at the level of the local authority. The survey aimed to attempt a census of all pupils for whom services were provided by LA music services during the academic year to February 2005, together with a census of all LA Music Services in England.

## Chapter 2: Methodology

This chapter sets out the way that the questionnaire was developed, the methodological issues relating to the matching of Music Service data with that from the Common Basic Data Set, the setting up of the data base and the response rates to the questionnaire.

### 2.1 Development of the questionnaire

A questionnaire was devised for LAs to complete to provide the relevant information. The questions asked were devised to ensure comparability with the data collected in 2002 and any additional information required by the DfES. An extensive consultation process was undertaken with representatives of Music Services to ensure that the questionnaire was user friendly, easy to understand and addressed questions of relevance to them. The questionnaires were made available through commonly used word processing packages and offered over email or, if required, in paper form (the questionnaire is provided in Appendix 1). Where data was not available electronically LAs were asked only for raw data, and percentages were calculated using the national LA data by the researchers.

### 2.2 Pupil level data

Music Services were asked to supply pupil data which would be matched with that from the Common Basic Data Set to provide information about pupil gender, Special Educational Needs, ethnicity and free school meals. The Common Basic Data Set is compiled nationally from data provided by LAs. Each individual child has a Unique Pupil Number (UPN) which enables s/he to be tracked throughout their education. It includes information relating to gender, entitlement to free school meals, ethnicity and Special Educational Needs. Music Services were asked to provide pupil level data including UPN, instrument played and attainment level on that instrument. Where Music Services had devolved funding to schools and pupil lists with UPNs were not available, LAs were asked to provide a list of names of pupils learning which could then be tracked through the Common Basic Data Set.

Where LAs provided pupil data electronically, data were matched using either the Unique Pupil Number (UPN), or the pupil's name together with the school and key stage. Even where UPNs were available the matching process was not perfect. Where the first point of matching was the pupil's name there were difficulties because of inaccurate spelling. Using more means of identification only served to reduce the numbers matched as there were more variables where there was the possibility of inaccuracy. On average the matching process was $80 \%$ successful. This means that data based on this process are systematically an underestimate (for more details see Appendix 2).

### 2.3 Data bases

The data for the survey required the development of two data bases: the first at the individual pupil level for each LA, the second at the LA level. The pupil data base drew on the Common Basic Data Set and data from LA music services. The second data base was at LA level and contained:

- data from all LAs unavailable through the pupil data base, e.g. staffing, quality assurance, finance;
- data from LAs which did not have their own data base;
- global percentages derived from the pupil data base, e.g. percentages of pupils learning, those with Special Educational Needs, from different ethnic minorities, etc;
- national statistics relating to LAs for 2003/04; and
- data from the two previous DfES surveys in 1999 and 2002.


### 2.4 Consultative conference

A key issue for the research was the reliability and accuracy of the data supplied by those responsible for the monitoring of instrumental music tuition within each Music Service. Valid comparisons could only be made if the data supplied by each Music Service was comparable. A consultative conference was held to which all LAs were invited and which most attended to ensure that they understood the nature of the data that they were being asked to provide. The Institute of Education provided telephone contact lines to enable queries from LAs to be answered if difficulties arose.

### 2.5 Analysis of data

Coding of qualitative responses to the LA questionnaire was crucial in providing a valid description of the nature of the provision of instrumental tuition. As far as was possible, categories were the same as those derived from the 2002 survey to ensure comparability.

Data were analysed using SPSS. A range of analyses were undertaken.

### 2.6 Response rate

Of the 150 LAs in England, 149 provided some kind of response to the survey, although the quantity and quality of data varied considerably. Fifteen LAs made joint returns. In these cases it was not possible to disaggregate the data. In the analyses undertaken each joint return was treated as a single response making a total of 141 Music Services.

## Chapter 3: Types and operation of Music Services

This chapter provides information about the different types of Music Services, how long they have been in operation, and the range of services that they offer to schools. It considers issues of access to opportunities, the wider opportunities scheme, and possible barriers to every child in KS2 having the opportunity to learn to play an instrument. The numbers of children accessing tuition are set out, their gender, the percentage with Special Educational Needs, the percentage eligible for free school meals, and their ethnicity. The breadth of available opportunities in terms of tuition, ensembles and other activities are described. Where appropriate differences in relation to the above with regard to the different types of Music Services are discussed.

### 3.1 Types of Music Services

Seventy one percent of LAs had their own Music Service and seven percent shared their Music Service with another LA. Eleven percent of LAs contracted the provision out to an independent provider. In nine percent of LAs, the Music Service was split between an independent provider and LA provision. Two percent of Music Services had devolved the funding for provision to schools. In the Counties and Metropolitan boroughs the great majority of services were run by the LA ( $91 \%$ and $86 \%$ respectively). In London, $70 \%$ of authorities had their own Music Service. The lowest proportion of LA services was in the Unitary authorities ( $47 \%$ ). Twenty three percent of Unitary authorities shared their service with another LA Music Service. Overall, $70 \%$ of Unitary authority provision was provided through the LA. The highest proportions of LAs contracting their services out to an independent provider were in Unitary authorities (19\%) and London (18\%) (see Table 3.1 for details). A brief description of each of the main types of Music Service is provided in Appendix 3.

Table 3.1: Types of Music Services

| Type of service | Overall <br> percentage | County | Metropolitan <br> borough | Unitary <br> authority | London |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LA has its own service | $71 \%$ <br> $(107)$ | $91 \%$ <br> $(31)$ | $86 \%$ <br> $(31)$ | $47 \%$ <br> $(22)$ | $70 \%$ <br> $(23)$ |
| The LA shares its service with | $7 \%$ |  |  | $23 \%$ |  |
| another LA | $(11)$ |  |  | $(11)$ |  |
| The service is contracted out to | $11 \%$ |  | $3 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| an independent provider | $(16)$ |  | $(1)$ | $(9)$ | $(6)$ |
| The service is split between an <br> independent provider and LA <br> provision | $9 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| The service is devolved to | $(13)$ | $(3)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(3)$ |
| schools | $2 \%$ |  | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ |

* Percentages have been rounded up or down to the nearest whole number
* Figures in brackets are the number of Music Services responding

In some cases returns were submitted jointly from more than one LA. Where joint returns were made the data were treated as a single return. For this reason the maximum possible response throughout the report is reduced to 141. In two cases
independent providers and the LAs that they served both submitted information. To avoid double counting only the LA responses were included in the analysis with disaggregated data from the independent services being included where possible.

The LA Music Services typically offered instrumental/vocal tuition, a range of ensemble opportunities, residential courses, festivals, live music concerts, taster sessions, wider opportunities programmes, and curriculum support. In some cases the Music Service offered music workshops in collaboration with outside agencies. On the basis of the qualitative data which Music Services supplied describing the way that they operated an attempt was made to categorise different types of service. This process was problematic because the level of detail in the descriptions varied. However, it appeared that $75 \%$ of LAs with their own Music Services allocated schools a portion of time for instrumental and vocal tuition. In some LAs schools were able to buy in additional time. These LAs retained central control over ensemble provision, curriculum support, wider opportunities and special events. A further $24 \%$ of LAs with their own Music Services centrally retained control for all music provision. One LA Music Service differed in that all aspects of the music provision were offered to schools on a buy-back basis, and no services were sold directly to families. Music Services shared between LAs typically offered similar provision, with the difference being that one Music Service was responsible for music provision in two or more LAs.

Where a partnership had been established between the LA Music Service and Independent Providers it was typically instrumental/vocal tuition that was provided by Independent Trusts, Limited Companies, or individual self-employed teachers, and families contracted directly with independent providers for that service. Six of these LAs operated Licensed Teachers Registers, as a quality assurance measure.

Where music provision was delivered in full by independent providers ( $11 \%$ of LAs) principal differences from LA Music Services related to scope of provision which was typically more limited and more likely to be delivered by hourly paid peripatetic teachers.

Just two percent of LAs had delegated responsibility for music provision entirely to schools, and in these areas there was little information about the scope of provision.

## Age of Music Services

There was considerable variation in when Music Services were established. The earliest was 1935 . Twenty six music services reported that their service had been established in the last five years. Six were established in 2001, six in 2002, four in 2003 and six in 2004. This suggests that as the Music Standards Funding has continued more LAs have felt sufficiently confident to establish their own service. The greatest proportion of newly established Music Services was in the Unitary authorities (see Table 3.2).

Table 3.2: Provision less than 5 years old by type of LA

| Type and numbers of LAs | Number less <br> than 5 years <br> old | Percentage less <br> than 5 years <br> old |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| County (34) | 6 | $18 \%$ |
| Metropolitan authority (36) | 4 | $11 \%$ |
| Unitary authority (47) | 11 | $23 \%$ |
| London (33) | 5 | $15 \%$ |

* Figures in brackets indicated the number of LAs in each group
* Percentages have been rounded up or down to the nearest whole number


### 3.2 Access

## Contribution To Wider Opportunities

In the White Paper, 'Schools: Achieving Success', the Government restated its election manifesto pledge, over time, to offer all primary pupils who wanted to do so the opportunity to learn a musical instrument. In September 2002, thirteen Wider Opportunities pilots were set up to explore models of delivering this pledge. Twelve of the thirteen pilots were involved in a year-long evaluation, culminating in the publication of the DVD and report, 'Tuning in' (Ofsted, 2004) and the release of a new set of Units for the Music Schemes of Work by the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA).

While all the pilots developed their own unique blend of activities, three core elements were present throughout the programme: a taster stage, foundation or general musicianship activities and finally, a period of sustained and progressive instrumental tuition. Tuition generally included opportunities for ensemble playing, composition, improvisation and performance and in most cases involved up to two term's free tuition in small and in larger groups. Lessons were very often team taught, with classroom teachers working alongside music service and community musicians. In almost all cases, the Wider Opportunities programme was taught during curriculum time with the involvement of whole classes or year groups. At the end of the pilot in March 2004, all LA Music Services received an additional $£ 10 \mathrm{k}$ to enable them to set up their own primary music pilots.

The contribution to access made by Music Services through the wider opportunities scheme was assessed in the current research in three ways: the average number of children involved in KS2 wide opportunities work during 2003/04; the average number of children involved in 2004/05 prior to the $1^{\text {st }}$ February 2005 census date; and the number of children involved on $1^{\text {st }}$ February 2005 (the census date).

During 2003/04, on average 1503 children in each LA were involved in KS2 widening opportunities work. This represented on average eight percent of the children in KS2. However, there was a wide range from zero to $89 \%$. In 2004/05 prior to $1^{\text {st }}$ February, $10 \%$ of KS2 children had been engaged in wider
opportunities. The range was from zero to $66 \%$. On $1^{\text {st }}$ February 2005, the census date, five percent of the KS2 population were involved in wider opportunities activities (see Table 3.3).

Table 3.3: Average number and percentage of children involved in KS2 wider opportunities work

|  | Number of LAs Responding | Average number children | Total number of children | Percentage as proportion of KS2 population | Percentage range |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children involved in Key Stage 2 wider opportunities work during 2003/2004 | 119 | 1503 | 178,965 | 8\% | 0-89\% |
| Children involved in Key Stage 2 wider opportunities prior to $1^{\text {st }}$ February in 2004/2005 | 127 | 1844 | 234,255 | 10\% | 0-66\% |
| Children involved in Key Stage 2 wider opportunities on the census date February $1^{\text {st }} 2005$ | 121 | 890 | 29,675 | 5\% | 0-59\% |

* Percentages have been rounded up or down to the nearest whole number

Table 3.4 sets out the differences between Music Services in different types of LAs and the percentage of students engaged with wider opportunities. In relation to 2003-04 and up to $1^{\text {st }}$ February 2005 the Counties reached the largest proportion of pupils (over 13\%).

Table 3.4: Participation in wider opportunities schemes in different types of LA

|  |  | Number of LAs responding | Mean percentage | Minimum | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of children involved in KS2 wider opportunities schemes in 200304 | County | 26 | 13\% | 0\% | 65\% |
|  | Metropolitan | 33 | 6\% | 0\% | 41\% |
|  | Unitary authorities | 27 | 6\% | 0\% | 51\% |
|  | London | 27 | 8\% | 0\% | 89\% |
|  | Joint provision | 6 | 8\% | 0\% | 46\% |
| Percentage of KS2 children involved in wider opportunities so far in 2004-05 | County | 29 | 14\% | 0.1\% | 63\% |
|  | Metropolitan | 33 | 8\% | 0\% | 53\% |
|  | Unitary authorities | 31 | 9\% | 0\% | 48\% |
|  | London | 28 | 8\% | 0.3\% | 66\% |
|  | Joint provision | 6 | 10\% | 0.2\% | 56\% |
| Percentage of KS2 children engaged in wider opportunities on the census date February 1st 2005 | County | 26 | 6\% | 0\% | 59\% |
|  | Metropolitan | 33 | 5\% | 0\% | 48\% |
|  | Unitary authorities | 30 | 4\% | 0\% | 15\% |
|  | London | 26 | 4\% | 0\% | 23\% |
|  | Joint provision | 6 | 6\% | 0.2\% | 31\% |
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## Strategies to develop wider opportunities

On average Music Services had implemented 2.7 strategies to enhance opportunities for children to learn to play an instrument or experience voice tuition. The average number planned for the future was 3.3. Some examples are given below.

One Music Service particularly emphasised vocal work. The service had employed a vocal and choral development manager. Vocal workshops were operating in primary schools to demonstrate good practice, develop teachers' awareness of good vocal modeling and provide them with new repertoire. A choral and vocal network newsletter was being set up which would provide a termly update of events and activities across the LA. There were plans to commission an opera for primary schools, to create new vocal ensembles for primary schools and to provide choral direction training for teachers. A training choir to prepare pupils for membership of the youth choir was also to be created. In addition to the choral work, taster instrumental tuition for rural areas was planned to include opportunities to experience a range of world musics.

Another LA had focused on developing string programmes in Years 3 and 4 in some primary schools and recorder, percussion or keyboard opportunities in others. There were plans to introduce brass, woodwind, guitar, djembe, samba, tuned percussion and steel pans in other primary schools in 2005/06 with a continuing programme over the next three or four years. Singing was to be introduced as an essential element in all Wider Opportunities programmes. There were plans to provide the necessary training to instrumental and class teachers. Taster singing sessions were to be offered and live music opportunities in schools. An endangered species instrumental programme was to be introduced with opportunities for everyone to engage in world music.

Some LAs had plans to work with professional orchestral groups to deliver opportunities for participation with specially composed pieces to be performed. In one LA an Advanced Skills Teacher was appointed with responsibility with the Music Advisor for co-ordinating activities, visiting schools, giving demonstrations and conducting appraisals. Whole class tuition was being offered on the recorder and schools were being encouraged to purchase instruments to enable a band programme to be developed. The aim was for every child to be able to play at least one instrument. Another LA planned different projects in different schools. One project ensured that all participating children in Year 4 would learn to play the violin, cello or African drums. In another project, violin, viola, cello and bass would be taught as a string ensemble. Other projects included teaching musical skills and musical notation through learning different instruments, e.g. the recorder, the glockenspiel, steel pans, wind/brass instruments, guitar, djembe, clarinet.

## Different types of wider opportunities experiences

It was not possible to calculate the percentages of children accessing different types of opportunities as it was clear from the data that some Music Services had not restricted these opportunities to children in KS2. Table 3.5 sets out the details.

The range of schools and pupils accessing the wider opportunities scheme was very wide and varied between different Music Services. The type of activity introduced clearly influenced the extent to which all pupils could access it.

Table 3.5: Average number of children and schools accessing different aspects of the wider opportunities programme

| Type of opportunity | Average number <br> of children <br> participating in <br> academic Year <br> 2003-2004 | Average <br> number of <br> schools <br> participating <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0 3 - 2 0 0 4}$ | Average <br> number of <br> children <br> participating <br> to date in <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0 4 - 2 0 0 5}$ | Average <br> number of <br> schools <br> participating <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0 4 - 2 0 0 5}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New musical <br> experiences / 'tasters' | 10,783 <br> $(89)$ | 54 | 10,363 | 52.4 |
| Range | $0-44,363$ | $0-360$ | $12-43,568$ | $1-330$ |
| Musical skills <br> programme / <br> foundation or general <br> musicianship stage | 1372 | 23.45 | 1541 | 26 |
| Range | $(72)$ | $(60)$ | $(87)$ | $(79)$ |
| Specialist instrumental <br> tuition | $0-20,000$ | $0-260$ | $0-24,930$ | $1-277$ |
| Range | 801 | 31 | 990 | 32 |

* Figures in bracket indicate number of Music Services responding

Some Music Services provided information about the types of opportunities available and the lengths of different types of those opportunities (see Table 3.6). However, relatively few Music Services provided this information.

Table 3.6: Lengths of different types of activities

|  | 2003-2004 |  |  |  | 2004-2005 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type of opportunity | Average length of experiences | Range | Average number of terms | Average number of sessions | Average length of experiences | Range | Average number of terms | Average number of sessions |
| New musical experiences / 'tasters' |  | 33-90 minutes (14) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2.2 \\ \text { terms } \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | 4.7 <br> sessions <br> $(21)$ <br> 16 |  | 0.5-4 hours (17) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2.2 \\ \text { terms } \\ (16) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Musical skills programme / foundation or general musicianship stage | $\begin{gathered} 3.1 \\ \text { hours } \\ (25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1-3.5 \\ \text { hours } \\ (25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.7 \\ \text { terms } \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | 16 sessions <br> (8) | $\begin{gathered} 2.7 \\ \text { hours } \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | 0.5-3 hours <br> (1) | $\begin{gathered} 2.2 \\ \text { terms } \\ (16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ \text { sessions } \\ (13) \end{gathered}$ |
| Specialist instrumental tuition | 45 minutes $(19)$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.3- \\ 1.5 \\ \text { hours } \end{gathered}$ <br> (3) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2.7 \\ \text { terms } \\ (33) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22.5 \\ \text { sessions } \\ (15) \end{gathered}$ | 52 minutes (22) | 0.2-1 hours (5) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2.7 \\ \text { terms } \\ (54) \end{gathered}$ | 22 sessions <br> (17) |

[^2]
## Barriers to extending wider opportunities to all pupils in KS2

Music Services were asked to indicate the main barriers to all KS2 pupils having the opportunity to learn a musical instrument over the next few years. They were also asked to rank these barriers in order of importance. Table 3.7 provides the percentages responding in each category and the rankings. While insufficient funding was the most frequently cited reason and was ranked the highest by most Music Services there were other important barriers. Lack of instruments was cited by $74 \%$ of Music Services and lack of expertise among primary schools teachers by $63 \%$. Conflicts with other priorities, inadequate accommodation and lack of appropriate experience or skills in Music Service staff were also cited.

Table 3.7: Perceived barriers to all KS2 pupils having the opportunity to learn a musical instrument

|  | \% and number of <br> Music Services <br> agreeing |  | \% and number of <br> Music Services <br> disagreeing |  | Mean rank of <br> perceived barrier |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\%$ | Number | $\%$ | Number | $\%$ | Number of <br> responding <br> Music |
| Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |$|$

## Pupils receiving tuition

Music Services provided information about the number of pupils learning preschool, in each school Key Stage, post 16, and post 19. Overall $8.4 \%$ of the school population (KS1-KS4) were learning to play an instrument. It was not possible to calculate percentages for pre-school or post-16 pupils. In KS2, on average, $13 \%$ of pupils were learning to play an instrument, $8 \%$ in KS3 and 5\% in KS4 (see Table 3.8). Although these figures suggest high drop out rates, pupils in KS3 and KS4 may still be having lessons on an instrument but may have chosen to have lessons privately to avoid having to take time out of school lessons. Alternatively, they may have lost interest and given up playing.

Table 3.8: Number and percentage of pupils receiving instrumental tuition in each Key Stage

|  | Average <br> number of <br> pupils | Range | Total <br> number <br> of pupils <br> playing | \% of KS <br> population | Number of <br> responding <br> Music |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Services |  |  |  |  |  |$|$| Pre-school | 25 | $0-600$ | 2,375 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KS1 | 144 | $0-1,400$ | 17,950 | $2 \%$ |
| KS2 | 1,971 | $26-$ <br> 8,548 | 252,335 | $13 \%$ |
| KS3 | 906 | $0-4,859$ | 115,138 | $8 \%$ |
| KS4 | 356 | $0-2,584$ | 45,227 | $5 \%$ |
| Special schools <br> (KS1-KS4) | 21 | $0-264$ | 1,229 |  |
| 16-19 pupils in <br> school 6 $6^{\text {th }}$ form | 84 | $0-775$ | 9,547 |  |
| 16-19 pupils in <br> colleges | 108 | $0-3,917$ | 5,282 |  |
| Lifelong <br> learning for <br> adults | 18 | $0-130$ | 824 |  |
| Total pupils <br> KS1-KS4 | 3,428 | $85-$ | 438,772 | $8.4 \%$ |

* Percentages have only been calculated where national data were available

Table 3.9 sets out the percentages of children learning to play an instrument in each Key Stage by type of authority. The Unitary authorities had the greatest percentage of children learning in KS1. At KS2, London had the greatest proportion, while in KS3 and KS4 the Unitary authorities had the highest proportions. Despite the higher proportion of staff time spent in traveling in the Counties in comparison to urban areas the percentages of children accessing provision compared favourably. The only statistically significant differences occurred at KS2 where the much greater proportion in London was substantially greater than that in other places. At every Key Stage joint provision reached a smaller percentage of children.

Table 3.9: Average number and percentage of children receiving tuition by Key Stage and type of Music Service


## Provision of instrumental tuition for schools

Table 3.10 sets out the number of schools receiving regular specialist instrumental/vocal tuition provided by the LA/Music Service in the academic year 2003-2004. Only schools where Music Service staff were teaching in the school as opposed to tuition being offered through centres or other joint provision are included.

Table 3.10: Number of schools receiving specialist instrumental/vocal tuition in academic year 2003-04

|  | Average number of schools | Range | Total number of schools receiving tuition | Number of Music Services responding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of infant schools | 4.6 | 0-53 | 445 | 96 |
| Number of primary schools | 78.3 | 1-329 | 9234 | 118 |
| Number of junior schools | 13.8 | 0-99 | 1312 | 95 |
| Number of middle schools | 7.8 | 0-45 | 320 | 41 |
| Number of secondary schools without $6^{\text {th }}$ forms | 11.4 | 0-67 | 1157 | 101 |
| Number of secondary schools with $6^{\text {th }}$ forms | 11.8 | 0-69 | 1295 | 109 |
| Number of special schools | 2.5 | 0-13 | 249 | 100 |
| Number of post 16 institutions | 1.0 | 0-6 | 71 | 72 |

National data were not available for infant, primary and junior schools separately so the percentage of schools receiving tuition was based on a total 'primary' school figure. Using this approach $76 \%$ of primary schools overall were receiving specialist instrumental tuition based on data from the 89 Music Services where it was possible to merge the data. The percentage of middle schools receiving specialist instrumental tuition was $40 \%$ based on a sample of 41 Music Services. National data were not available for secondary schools with and without sixth forms so calculations were based on summed data. Using this approach $88 \%$ of secondary schools were receiving specialist instrumentalist tuition based on data from 92 Music Services where it was possible to merge the data.

## Gender differences in those in receipt of tuition

Where Music Services were unable to provide information about gender, lists of pupils learning to play instruments were merged with the Common Basic Data Set. As it was not possible to match every pupil, the figures below are an underestimation. Overall, at every Key Stage more girls played instruments than boys. However, the differences were relatively small. At pre-school level 51\% of girls and $49 \%$ of boys were learning, by KS1 the gap had widened to $57 \%$ $43 \%$ with a further increase to $60 \%-40 \%$ at KS2. After this point the ratio remained remarkably similar. Interestingly, the percentages for Special Schools were reversed with $72 \%$ of boys learning as opposed to $28 \%$ of girls perhaps reflecting the greater number of boys in the special school population (see Table 3.11).

Table 3.11: Average number and range of boys and girls receiving specialist tuition

|  | Preschool | KS1 | KS2 | KS3 | KS4 | Special schools | Post 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Girls |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average percentage | 51\% | 57\% | 60\% | 59\% | 58\% | 28\% | 62\% |
| Average number receiving specialist tuition | 7 | 81 | 1165 | 536 | 210 | 6 | 56 |
| Range | 0-149 | 0-772 | 22-5219 | 0-2657 | 0-1437 | 0-66 | 0-464 |
| Number of LA responses | 98 | 120 | 124 | 124 | 124 | 46 | 117 |
|  | Boys |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average percentage | 49\% | 43\% | 40\% | 41\% | 42\% | 72\% | 38\% |
| Average number receiving specialist tuition | 7 | 62 | 790 | 377 | 152 | 15 | 34 |
| Range | 0-170 | 0-628 | 4-3633 | 0-2202 | 0-1147 | 0-198 | 0-311 |
| Number of LA responses | 98 | 120 | 124 | 124 | 124 | 47 | 116 |

* Data are an underestimation as up to $20 \%$ of pupils learning to play an instrument were unable to be matched with the Common Basic Data Set


## Pupils with Special Education Needs

Music Services were asked to provide data regarding the number of pupils in receipt of additional support in relation to their Special Educational Needs including children who were classified in the categories 'School Action', 'School Action Plus', 'School Action Plus and Statutory Assessment' and 'Statemented' in the 2004 system of categorisation. Most Music Services provided data which was matched with that in the Common Basic Data Set. While this enabled the inclusion of data from a considerable number of Music Services the level of matching was only on average $80 \%$ so the figures are an underestimation. Table 3.12 sets out the details. Overall, nine percent of the children learning to play an instrument were in receipt of additional support in relation to their Special Educational Needs. The range was $0.1 \%-28 \%$. Data were available for over 100 LAs in KS1-KS4. This is an increase on the figures for 2002. These data have to interpreted with caution as the way that the children have been categorised in relation to Special Educational Needs has changed since the previous research.

Table 3.12: Number and range of pupils receiving tuition who are in receipt of additional support in relation to their Special Educational Needs

|  | KS1 | KS2 | KS3 | KS4 | Special <br> schools | Post <br> $\mathbf{1 6}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of pupils with Special <br> Educational Needs receiving tuition <br> as the percentage of all pupils <br> receiving tuition | $9.2 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |  |
| Average number of pupils with <br> Special Educational Needs receiving <br> tuition in each Music Service | 13 | 10 | 76 | 27 | 24 | 2.7 |
| Range of pupils with Special <br> Educational Needs receiving tuition <br> in each Music Service | $0-110$ | $0-1155$ | $0-467$ | $0-224$ | $0-272$ | $0-20$ |
| Number of Music Services <br> contributing data | 100 | 107 | 105 | 101 | 30 | 87 |

* Data are an underestimation as up to $20 \%$ of pupils learning to play an instrument were unable to be matched with the Common Basic Data Set


## Pupils from minority ethnic groups

Music Services were asked to provide information regarding the ethnicity of their pupils. Most Music Services provided data which was matched with that in the Common Basic Data Set. While this enabled the inclusion of data from a considerable number of Music Services the level of matching was only on average $80 \%$ so the figures are an underestimation. Table 3.13 sets out the details. Overall, approximately $73 \%$ of pupils learning to play an instrument were white. But there were substantial proportions of all other minority ethnic groups learning to play instruments. Four percent were of mixed heritage, five percent were of Asian heritage, six percent were Black or Black British and six percent were Chinese or from another ethnic group.

Table 3.13: Pupils from minority ethnic groups receiving tuition

|  | Average number receiving instrumental / vocal tuition | Range | Percentage of population receiving tuition | Number of LAs included |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White |  |  |  |  |
| British | 2424 | 95-14,577 | 70.3\% | 115 |
| Irish | 17 | 0-130 | 0.5\% | 100 |
| Traveller of Irish heritage | 2 | 0-10 | 0.1\% | 24 |
| Gypsy/Roma | 2 | 0-20 | 0.1\% | 28 |
| Any Other White background | 73 | 1-557 | 2.6\% | 107 |
| Mixed |  |  |  |  |
| White and Black Caribbean | 34 | 0-251 | 1.2\% | 105 |
| White and Black African | 15 | 0-201 | 0.5\% | 97 |
| White and Asian | 24 | 1-185 | 0.8\% | 103 |
| Any Other Mixed background | 40 | 0-265 | 1.4\% | 107 |
| Asian or Asian British |  |  |  |  |
| Indian | 66 | 0-745 | 2.3\% | 107 |
| Pakistani | 31 | 0-356 | 1.1\% | 104 |
| Bangladeshi | 16 | 0-317 | 1.0\% | 85 |
| Any Other Asian background | 23 | 0-289 | 0.7\% | 97 |
| Black or Black British |  |  |  |  |
| Caribbean | 73 | 0-2052 | 2.4\% | 98 |
| African | 83 | 0-3377 | 2.7\% | 107 |
| Any Other Black background | 17 | 0-129 | 0.7\% | 85 |
| Chinese or other ethnic group |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese | 16 | 1-110 | 0.5\% | 109 |
| Any Other ethnic group | 32 | 0-328 | 1.3\% | 95 |
| Ethnicity not known or information refused | 100 | 1-646 | 3.8\% | 89 |

* Figures are an underestimate because the matching process was only on average 80\% successful


## Children eligible for free school meals

Music Services were asked to indicate the number of pupils receiving tuition who were eligible for free school meals on $1^{\text {st }}$ February 2005. On the basis of the available data, $12 \%$ of pupils learning to play an instrument were eligible for free school meals. Where Music Services provided raw data to be matched with the Common Basic Data Set the matching process itself led to an underestimation (see Table 3.14 for details).

Table 3.14: Average number and range of pupils receiving tuition eligible for free school meals by Key Stage

|  | Pre <br> school | KS1 | KS2 | KS3 | KS4 | Post <br> $\mathbf{1 6}$ | Special <br> school |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average number receiving <br> tuition who were eligible for <br> free school meals | 1 | 13 | 209 | 82 | 30 | 3 | 10 |
| Range | $0-30$ | $0-84$ | $4-2414$ | $0-585$ | $0-408$ | $0-24$ | $0-114$ |
| Number of Music Services <br> responding | 71 | 106 | 113 | 111 | 108 | 59 | 32 |

* Data are an underestimation as up to $20 \%$ of pupils learning to play an instrument were unable to be matched with the Common Basic Data Set


## Pupils waiting to learn and schools waiting for tuition

Music Services provided information on the number of pupils waiting for instrumental or vocal tuition on $1^{\text {st }}$ February 2005 and how many had been waiting for longer than six months. The average percentage of pupils waiting to learn was $0.5 \%$ of the LA school population aged 5-15. Those waiting for more than six months constituted $0.2 \%$ (see Table 3.15). The average number of schools waiting for tuition was 2.5 with a range from zero to 78 .

Table 3.15: Average number and range of pupils waiting to learn to play an instrument

|  | Girls | Boys | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average number of pupils in a waiting list <br> for instrumental/vocal tuition | 87 <br> $(72)$ | 70 | 156 |
| Range | $0-730$ | $0-496$ | $0-1214$ |
| Number of pupils who have been waiting | 32 | 28 | 61 |
| to learn for longer than 6 months | $(72)$ | $(72)$ | $(72)$ |
| Range | $0-350$ | $0-320$ | $0-670$ |

* Figures in brackets indicate the number of Music Services responding


## Children taught in different size groups

The average percentage of children reported to be taught in individual lessons was $24 \%$. Sixty four percent of children were reported to be taught in groups of two to four children with approximately $17 \%$ of children being taught in larger groups (see Table 3.16).

Table 3.16: Percentage of children taught in different sized groups

|  | Percentage | Range | Number of <br> responses |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Individual lessons | $24 \%$ | $0-100$ | 113 |
| Groups of between 2-4 children | $64 \%$ | $0-98$ | 112 |
| Groups with between 5-10 <br> children | $7 \%$ | $0-60$ | 98 |
| Groups with more than 11 <br> children | $10 \%$ | $0-85$ | 94 |

[^3]There were considerable differences in the percentage of children having individual and group tuition in different types of Music Services. The greatest proportion of children having individual lessons was in joint provision (31\%). The least was in the Metropolitan boroughs. The greatest proportion of children having lessons in groups of two to four was in the Metropolitan boroughs, the least was in London (see Table 3.17). These differences were statistically significant ( $\mathrm{p}=0.036$ ). The highest proportion of pupils taught in groups of five to ten was in London (8.8\%) and in groups over 11 in London and the Unitary authorities. There are cost implications of teaching larger groups as no charge can be made to parents if the group is larger than four.

Table 3.17: Differences between types of services in individual and group tuition

|  |  | Number of Music Services responding | Average percentage | Minimum percentage | Maximum percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of children taught in individual lessons | County | 26 | 28.8 | 4\% | 98\% |
|  | Metropolitan | 30 | 13.5 | 2\% | 32\% |
|  | Unitary | 28 | 25.0 | 0\% | 100\% |
|  | London | 24 | 27.5 | 0\% | 80\% |
|  | Joint provision | 5 | 30.9 | 9\% | 43\% |
| Percentage of children taught in groups of between 2-4 | County | 26 | 63.1 | 1\% | 95\% |
|  | Metropolitan | 30 | 72.9 | 18\% | 98\% |
|  | Unitary | 26 | 65.4 | 0\% | 96\% |
|  | London | 25 | 52.3 | 0\% | 98\% |
|  | Joint provision | 5 | 64.0 | 52\% | 86\% |
| Percentage of <br> children taught in <br> groups of <br> between <br> $5-10$ | County | 26 | 4.9 | 0\% | 23\% |
|  | Metropolitan | 26 | 8.3 | 0\% | 48\% |
|  | Unitary | 21 | 8.0 | 0\% | 60\% |
|  | London | 21 | 8.8 | 0\% | 35\% |
|  | Joint provision | 4 | 4.8 | 0.5\% | 8\% |
| Percentage of child taught in groups of more than 11 | County | 25 | 2.7 | 0\% | 27\% |
|  | Metropolitan | 22 | 9.0 | 0\% | 34\% |
|  | Unitary | 21 | 13.2 | 0\% | 72\% |
|  | London | 22 | 16.7 | 0\% | 85\% |
|  | Joint provision | 4 | 1.47 | 0\% | 4\% |

## Services to schools

Most Music Services offered a wide range of services to schools, although these were not always taken up. Eighty two percent of Music Services indicated that they offered advice to schools on resources, appointments, and preparation for or follow up for inspections. Eighty two percent offered advice on developing the curriculum and 78\% curriculum delivery services. Eighty percent provided in service training (INSET) for school staff and $77 \%$ individual support for staff in school. Eighty four percent ran festivals and other inter-school activities for pupils. Sixty eight percent offered instrument loan schemes, $60 \%$ IT support for schools, $83 \%$ live music concerts, $74 \%$ new musical experiences, and $77 \%$ workshops (see Table 3.18 for breakdown by school phase).

Table 3.18: Average and percentage of schools accessing a variety of services

| Type of activity | \% of services offering the activity | Primary schools |  | Middle schools |  | Secondary schools |  | Special schools |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | \% | Mean | \% | Mean | \% | Mean | \% |
| Advice on resources, appointments and preparation for or follow up for inspections | $\begin{gathered} 82 \% \\ (116) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 22 \\ (99) \end{gathered}$ | 24\% | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (18) \end{gathered}$ | 39\% | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (96) \end{gathered}$ | 38\% | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (77) \end{gathered}$ | 36\% |
| Advice on developing the curriculum, e.g. schemes of work | $\begin{gathered} 82 \% \\ (116) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (106) \end{gathered}$ | 27\% | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (15) \end{gathered}$ | 16\% | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (90) \end{gathered}$ | 34\% | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (71) \end{gathered}$ | 11\% |
| Curriculum delivery | $\begin{gathered} 78 \% \\ (110) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 24 \\ (99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 23\% | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 16\% | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (72) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 31\% | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (65) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 35\% |
| Provision of music INSET for school staff | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \% \\ & (113) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 43 \\ (103) \end{gathered}$ | 36\% | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 36\% | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (77) \end{gathered}$ | 45\% | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (61) \end{gathered}$ | 36\% |
| Provision of support for individual staff in school | $\begin{gathered} 77 \% \\ (108) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (93) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 17\% | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (12) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 21\% | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (79) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 29\% | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 31\% |
| Festivals and other interschool activities for pupils | $\begin{gathered} 84 \% \\ (119) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44 \\ (109) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 46\% | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 38\% | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (92) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 41\% | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (76) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 40\% |
| Instrument loan scheme | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 68 \% \\ (96) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ (77) \end{gathered}$ | 49\% | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (12) \end{gathered}$ | 50\% | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (68) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 80\% | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 22\% |
| IT support for schools | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 60 \% \\ & (82) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 20 \\ (61) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 18\% | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 24\% | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (62) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 32\% | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (44) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 29\% |
| Live Music Concerts | $\begin{aligned} & 83 \% \\ & (117) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ (107) \end{gathered}$ | 51\% | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (16) \end{gathered}$ | 46\% | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | 33\% | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (69) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 44\% |
| New musical experiences/ 'tasters' | $\begin{array}{r} 74 \% \\ (105) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 61 \\ (92) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 51\% | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (12) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 30\% | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (69) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 40\% | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 39\% |
| Workshops | $\begin{gathered} 77 \% \\ (109) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ (101) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 32\% | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 59\% | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (80) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 37\% | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 34\% |
| Other | $\begin{aligned} & 35 \% \\ & (49) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 39 \\ (46) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 31\% | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (6) \end{aligned}$ | 35\% | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (33) \end{gathered}$ | 50\% | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (22) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 28\% |
| Total number of schools receiving support |  | $\begin{array}{r} 133 \\ (94) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 100\% | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ (13) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 86\% | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (91) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 100\% | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (80) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 90\% |

[^4]Secondary, middle and special schools were more likely than primary schools to take advantage of advice on resources, appointments and preparation for or follow up for inspections. The greatest proportion of schools seeking advice on the curriculum were also secondary schools (34\%). A higher proportion of special schools than other schools took advantage of curriculum delivery services, although on average $31 \%$ of secondary schools were reported to take advantage of this service. A higher percentage of secondary schools as opposed to other schools also took advantage of INSET for school staff (45\%), proportions of other schools were $36 \%$. A similar pattern emerged in relation to individual support for school staff. In contrast festivals and other inter-school activities were accessed by a higher proportion of primary schools ( $46 \%$ ), although on average $41 \%$ of secondary schools also took advantage of such opportunities. A considerably higher proportion of secondary schools were reported to take advantage of instrument hire schemes ( $80 \%$ ), the smallest proportion being special schools. A higher proportion of secondary schools also took advantage of support for IT (32\%).

Primary (51\%), middle (46\%), and special schools (44\%) were more likely to access live music concerts. New musical experiences were most likely to be accessed by primary schools (51\%), although relatively high proportions of secondary ( $40 \%$ ) and special schools ( $39 \%$ ) also accessed these opportunities. In contrast a higher proportion of middle schools were reported to take advantage of opportunities to engage pupils with workshops (59\%), followed by secondary schools ( $37 \%$ ). Other unspecified services were accessed by higher proportions of secondary schools ( $50 \%$ ) than other schools (see Table 3.18).

A breakdown of what was on offer to schools by different types of Music Services showed that the highest percentage of county services offered advice to schools on a range of issues, and were also the greatest providers of curriculum delivery and INSET for school staff. They were also the group of Music Services which offered the most opportunities for live music concerts, new musical experiences and workshops. The Metropolitan boroughs were the group with the highest percentage offering IT support to schools. The Unitary authorities were the group where the lowest percentage offered most of these services (see Table 3.19 for details).

Table 3.19: Average percentage of Music Services types offering different services

| Type of activity | Counties | Metropolitan <br> boroughs | Unitary <br> authorities | London <br> boroughs | Joint <br> provision |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advice on resources, <br> appointments and <br> preparation for or follow <br> up for inspections | $97 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| Advice on developing <br> the curriculum, e.g. <br> schemes of work | $97 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| Curriculum delivery | $90 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| Provision of music <br> INSET for school staff | $93 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| Provision of support for <br> individual staff in school | $90 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| Festivals and other inter- <br> school activities for <br> pupils | $86 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Instrument loan scheme | $76 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| IT support for schools | $66 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| Live Music Concerts | $93 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| New musical <br> experiences/ 'tasters' | $86 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| Workshops | $90 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| Other | $55 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $33 \%$ |

### 3.3 Breadth of provision

Table 3.20 sets out the number and percentage of Music Services offering tuition on different instruments. These data are based on figures for the number of pupils learning to play each of these instruments so they may be an underestimation. The most commonly taught instruments are the violin ( $88 \%$ ), trumpet ( $87 \%$ ), flute ( $87 \%$ ), cello ( $86 \%$ ), clarinet ( $86 \%$ ) and saxophone ( $85 \%$ ). While this suggests that the traditional instruments are still most taught, this may be misleading. Data for guitar tuition was differentiated by type which may disguise the overall levels. $50 \%$ of services reported offering acoustic guitar, $41 \%$ electric guitar, $45 \%$ bass guitar and $40 \%$ reported guitar as an undifferentiated category. Kit drumming was taught by $67 \%$ of Music Services, the same percentage as teaching the oboe.
Seventy four percent reported teaching keyboard instruments, more than the piano (62\%). Voice training was offered by $74 \%$ Music Services.

Table 3.20: Number and percentage of Music Services offering tuition on different instruments

| Instrument | Number | Percentage | Rank <br> order |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African drumming | 22 | $16 \%$ | 31 |
| Bassoon | 70 | $50 \%$ | 23 |
| Baritone | 79 | $56 \%$ | 20 |
| Cello | 121 | $86 \%$ | 4 |
| Clarinet | 121 | $86 \%$ | 4 |
| Cornet | 109 | $77 \%$ | 8 |
| Double bass | 76 | $54 \%$ | 22 |
| Euphonium | 93 | $66 \%$ | 15 |
| Flute | 123 | $87 \%$ | 2 |
| French horn | 82 | $58 \%$ | 18 |
| Gamelan | 5 | $4 \%$ | 37 |
| Guitar (acoustic) | 70 | $50 \%$ | 23 |
| Guitar (electric) | 58 | $41 \%$ | 26 |
| Guitar (electric bass) | 64 | $45 \%$ | 25 |
| Guitar (not separated) | 56 | $40 \%$ | 27 |
| Harp | 11 | $8 \%$ | 35 |
| Keyboard | 105 | $74 \%$ | 9 |
| Kit drums | 95 | $67 \%$ | 13 |
| Music Technology | 13 | $9 \%$ | 34 |
| Oboe | 95 | $67 \%$ | 13 |
| Percussion (orchestral) | 80 | $57 \%$ | 19 |
| Piano | 88 | $62 \%$ | 16 |
| Recorder | 104 | $74 \%$ | 9 |
| Saxophone | 120 | $85 \%$ | 6 |
| Sitar | 7 | $5 \%$ | 36 |
| Steel Pans | 38 | $27 \%$ | 29 |
| Tabla | 21 | $15 \%$ | 32 |
| Tenor Horn | 97 | $69 \%$ | 12 |
| Trombone | 114 | $81 \%$ | 7 |
| Trumpet | 122 | $87 \%$ | 2 |
| Tuba | 79 | $56 \%$ | 20 |
| Voice | 124 | $74 \%$ | 9 |
| Viola | 26 | $62 \%$ | 16 |
| Violin | 56 | $88 \%$ | 1 |
| Other Piccolo/fife |  | $18 \%$ | 30 |
| Other Flugel horn | $11 \%$ | 33 |  |
| Other unspecified | $40 \%$ | 27 |  |
|  | 78 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2 |

Table 3.21 provides the details of the average number of children playing each instrument in each key stage. A sizeable proportion of these data were obtained through merging Music Service data with the Common Basic Data Set so figures are an underestimation.

Music services, in contrast to the historical position, now offer a very wide range of musical instruments for pupils to learn. There has been a considerable increase in world musics of all types. In addition to the instruments listed the 'other' category included a range of Indian instruments, West Indian, South American, Eastern European and African. In addition, there were examples of the provision of tuition of early music (viols, harpsichord, lute) alongside rock music
instruments, D-J-ing, music technology and a variety of folk musics, and other less common instruments (fife, harmonium, harmonica, ocarina, tin whistle, mandolin, hand-bells, banjo). One Music Service taught Braille music and several included Music Therapy services. This provides evidence of the richness and variety of musical opportunities in the UK and demonstrates clearly that Music Services have moved away from their early focus on Western Classical music.

There was evidence of provision for pre-school children, although relatively few Music Services were engaged with this, with tuition increasing through KS1 with the largest proportion of tuition taking place in KS2. On average in each Music Service the instrument most commonly learnt in KS2 was the violin with on average 314 girls learning and 115 boys. Guitar, acoustic and undifferentiated, were also extremely popular with on average 189 boys reported to be learning acoustic guitar and 166 undifferentiated guitar with 113 and 112 girls on average learning respectively. Clarinet was more popular with girls (117) than boys (50) as was flute, 156 girls as opposed to 25 boys on average learning. Trumpet and cornet were more favoured by boys (trumpet on average 55 boys, 34 girls; cornet 28 girls, 31 boys). Steel pans were more favoured by girls ( 57 girls, 47 boys) although there were no differences in relation to African Drumming (57, 56). Girls predominated in relation to learning the piano (70 to 39) and recorder (114 to 75 ). Cello was also most favoured by girls ( 43 to 24). Trombone was heavily favoured by boys, on average 21 boys to 10 girls, and at KS3, when more tuition seemed to be on offer, 32 boys learned the electric guitar as opposed to 9 girls. The pattern was similar for kit drumming at KS2 on average 11 girls to 34 boys and at KS3 23 girls to 67 boys.

Once the gender pattern was established it tended to continue in relation to tuition through KS3 and KS4. However, there were some instruments where the pattern changed. In music technology at KS2 and KS3 boys predominated ( $41 / 35$ and 16/11) but at KS4 the balance changed with more girls on average learning: 16 as opposed to 13 boys. The pattern for playing the saxophone was variable across key stage. The most striking change over time was in relation to the voice. In pre-school and at KS1 there were only small gender differences. In KS2 on average 36 girls received voice tuition as opposed to 28 boys. At KS3 this changed to 51 girls as opposed to 7 boys with a similar pattern at KS4 (42 girls, 6 boys). These differences may be related to boys' voices breaking in adolescence.

Table 3.21: Average number of pupils learning each instrument at each key stage

|  | Pre school provision |  | Key Stage 1 |  | Key Stage 2 |  | Key Stage 3 |  | Key Stage 4 |  | Post 16 |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Post } \\ 19 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Instrument | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys |  |
| African drumming |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ (9) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 57 \\ (22) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 56 \\ (22) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 19 \\ (13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 19 \\ (15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Bassoon | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \\ & (6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (49) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (64) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (67) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (49) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (44) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (27) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \\ & (4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Baritone |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \\ & (8) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (66) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (79) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (42) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (67) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (39) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (12) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (19) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Cello | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (46) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (42) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 43 \\ (121) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (119) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (112) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (104) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (96) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (82) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (73) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (55) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Clarinet | $\begin{aligned} & 0.6 \\ & (5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (32) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 117 \\ (120) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (121) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 73 \\ (121) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (120) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (118) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (105) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \\ (91) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (71( \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Cornet | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \\ & (4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (27) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (107) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ (109) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (89) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (94) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (78) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (80) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (39) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (44) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Double bass |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.4 \\ & (7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & (7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (63) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (66) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (76) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (64) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (42) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Euphonium |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & (7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \\ & (7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (74) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (93) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (68) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (84) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (45) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (65) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (26) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (35) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \hline \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Flute | $\begin{gathered} 0.6 \\ \hline(6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \\ & (4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (54) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (21) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 156 \\ (123) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (118) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 94 \\ (121) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (114) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ (116) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (93) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 14 \\ (96) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (61) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| French horn |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.4 \\ & (8) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.4 \\ & (8) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (79) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (82) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (81) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (82) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (62) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (42) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (36) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Gamelan |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92 \\ & (4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71 \\ & \text { (4) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Guitar (acoustic) | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (37) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 113 \\ (69) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 189 \\ (70) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 42 \\ (69) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 79 \\ (67) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18 \\ (59) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (37) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Guitar (electric) |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.4 \\ & (7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (16) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (37) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \\ (46) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 32 \\ (56) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (47) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 17 \\ (58) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (18) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (35) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Guitar (electric base) |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (62) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (49) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (64) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (34) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4) \end{gathered}$ |
| Guitar (not separated) | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \\ (37) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 112 \\ & (53) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 166 \\ (53) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 49 \\ (55) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 81 \\ (56) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 16 \\ (53) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ (55) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (27) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Harp |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline .3 \\ (6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.3 \\ & (8) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \\ & \text { (5) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Keyboard | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (12) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (67) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ (105) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 64 \\ (102) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 43 \\ (104) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (105) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 15 \\ (93) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (94) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (37) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (36) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Kit drums |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \\ & (4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (31) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11 \\ (73) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 34 \\ (86) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 23 \\ (88) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 67 \\ (95) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 12 \\ (84) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (95) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (50) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (58) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \\ & (4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

* Data are an underestimation as up to $20 \%$ of pupils learning to play an instrument were unable to be matched with the Common Basic Data Set
* Figures in brackets indicate the number of Music Services responding

Table 3.21 (continued)

|  | Pre school provision |  | Key Stage 1 |  | Key Stage 2 |  | Key Stage 3 |  | Key Stage 4 |  | Post 16 |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Post } \\ 19 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys |  |
| Music Technology |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 35 \\ (8) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41 \\ & (8) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11 \\ (13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 16 \\ (13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 16 \\ (11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 13 \\ (17) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Oboe |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.3 \\ & (6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline .4 \\ (7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (83) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (67) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (95) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (81) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (79) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (48) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (61) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Percussion (orchestral) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.5 \\ & (4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (16) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (80) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 13 \\ (74) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (76) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 15 \\ (77) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (43) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (54) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Piano | 2 (9) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (49) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11 \\ (42) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 70 \\ (80) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 39 \\ (72) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 40 \\ (88) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 19 \\ (84) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 20 \\ (86) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (83) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (58) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (49) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Recorder | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.6 \\ & (5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 29 \\ (68) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 21 \\ (67) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 114 \\ (104) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 75 \\ (101) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (62) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (43) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (19) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.6 \\ (12) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Saxophone | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (101) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (112) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (120) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (110) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (109) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (79) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (75) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Sitar |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Steel Pans | 0.7 <br> (4) | $\begin{aligned} & 0.6 \\ & (5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 57 \\ (39) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 47 \\ (38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (37) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (35) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (26) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (3) \end{gathered}$ |
| Tabla | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (16) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (21) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ \text { (6) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Tenor Horn |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (12) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 13 \\ (88) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11 \\ (97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (69) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (79) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (54) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (47) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (27) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.5 \\ & (4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Trombone |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.5 \\ & (8) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (16) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (104) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (114) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (92) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (113) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (71) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (96) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (36) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (65) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Trumpet | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.6 \\ & (5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ (120) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 55 \\ (122) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (116) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (115) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (104) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (64) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (72) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (9) \end{gathered}$ |
| Tuba |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.3 \\ & (7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (32) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (61) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (79) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (58) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (19) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Voice | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ (6) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 13 \\ (6) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 15 \\ (25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (21) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 36 \\ (64) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 28 \\ (52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51 \\ (104) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (96) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 42 \\ (107) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (95) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11 \\ (77) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (56) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Viola | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (19) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 19 \\ (81) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \\ (81) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (88) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (68) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (69) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (55) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (28) . \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Violin | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (23) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (19) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 32 \\ (99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (94) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 314 \\ (124) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 115 \\ (124) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 85 \\ (120) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (117) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (113) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (107) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \\ (94) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (71) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Other <br> Piccolo/fife |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (12) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.6 \\ & (6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (26) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (17) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.4 \\ & (5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \\ & (4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Other Flugel horn |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8 \\ & (5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8 \\ & \text { (5) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \\ & (4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \\ & (4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (1) \end{gathered}$ |
| Other unspecified | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 23 \\ (24) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 17 \\ (28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ (53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 24 \\ (56) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11 \\ (45) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11 \\ (43) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (32) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.5 \\ & (2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

* Data are an underestimation as up to $20 \%$ of pupils learning to play an instrument were unable to be matched with the Common Basic Data Set
* Figures in brackets indicate the number of Music Services responding

Table 3.22 sets out the overall gender differences in playing instruments. It also provides an overview of the relative numbers learning each instrument. The instrument most commonly played was the violin (19\%) probably because it is relatively cheap to buy and is available in a range of sizes for young children. The percentage of pupils playing guitar overall, including acoustic, electric, bass and undifferentiated was $16 \%$, the next highest group. Clarinet (nine percent) and flute $(10 \%)$ remained popular. Seven percent of children played keyboard, five percent the trumpet, four percent kit drum, four percent the piano, and four percent had voice training. More children had lessons in African drumming and steel pans than the bassoon, baritone, euphonium, French horn, saxophone, oboe, tuba and recorder indicating the tremendous change which has occurred in tuition offered in Music Services since 1999.

The most gendered instruments were the harp ( $90 \%$ girls) flute ( $89 \%$ girls), voice ( $80 \%$ girls), fife/piccolo ( $79 \%$ girls), oboe ( $78 \%$ girls), clarinet ( $73 \%$ girls), electric guitar ( $81 \%$ boys), bass guitar ( $81 \%$ boys), tuba ( $77 \%$ boys), kit drum ( $75 \%$ boys), tabla ( $74 \%$ boys), and trombone ( $71 \%$ boys). The least gendered
instruments were African drumming, cornet, French horn, saxophone and tenor horn. A break down of gender data by key stage is provided in Appendix 4.

Table 3.22 Percentage of girls and boys learning each instrument

| Instrument | Girls | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { girls } \end{gathered}$ | Boys | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { boys } \end{gathered}$ | Gender not <br> known | Total | Total \% learning each instrument |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African drumming | 1680 | 50\% | 1683 | 50\% | 105 | 3468 | 0.8\% |
| Bassoon | 676 | 62\% | 417 | 38\% | 51 | 1144 | 0.3\% |
| Baritone | 574 | 41\% | 868 | 49\% | 34 | 1476 | 0.4\% |
| Cello | 8351 | 66\% | 4301 | 34\% | 490 | 13142 | 3\% |
| Clarinet | 26696 | 73\% | 9680 | 27\% | 1958 | 38334 | 9\% |
| Cornet | 4597 | 48\% | 4888 | 52\% | 705 | 10190 | 2\% |
| Double bass | 697 | 47\% | 782 | 53\% | 124 | 1603 | 0.4\% |
| Euphonium | 596 | 33\% | 1222 | 67\% | 100 | 1918 | 0.5\% |
| Flute | 35823 | 89\% | 4472 | 11\% | 2189 | 42484 | 10\% |
| French horn | 868 | 49\% | 888 | 51\% | 95 | 1851 | 0.4\% |
| Gamelan | 467 | 58\% | 331 | 42\% |  | 798 | 0.2\% |
| Guitar (acoustic) | 12315 | 36\% | 21483 | 64\% | 12 | 33810 | 8\% |
| Guitar (electric) | 725 | 19\% | 3126 | 81\% | 2 | 3853 | 0.9\% |
| Guitar (electric bass) | 313 | 19\% | 1306 | 81\% | 3 | 1619 | 0.4\% |
| Guitar (not separated) | 9745 | 38\% | 15869 | 62\% | 2285 | 27899 | 7\% |
| Harp | 52 | 90\% | 6 | 10\% | 6 | 64 | 0.02\% |
| Keyboard | 18352 | 62\% | 11306 | 38\% | 618 | 30276 | 7\% |
| Kit drums | 3982 | 25\% | 12247 | 75\% | 1419 | 17648 | 4.3\% |
| Music <br> Technology | 615 | 43\% | 829 | 57\% |  | 1444 | 0.4\% |
| Oboe | 1787 | 78\% | 605 | 22\% | 121 | 2513 | 0.6\% |
| Percussion (orchestral) | 2827 | 30\% | 6666 | 70\% | 91 | 9584 | 2\% |
| Piano | 11982 | 66\% | 6044 | 34\% | 547 | 18573 | 4.5\% |
| Recorder | 292 | 55\% | 243 | 45\% | 516 | 1051 | 0.3\% |
| Saxophone | 414 | 50\% | 421 | 50\% | 705 | 1540 | 0.4\% |
| Sitar | 72 | 63\% | 43 | 37\% |  | 115 | 0.03\% |
| Steel Pans | 3687 | 58\% | 2687 | 42\% | 13 | 6387 | 1.6\% |
| Tabla | 118 | 26\% | 334 | 74\% | 1 | 453 | 0.1\% |
| Tenor Horn | 1723 | 52\% | 1585 | 48\% | 139 | 3447 | 0.8\% |
| Trombone | 1734 | 29\% | 4175 | 71\% | 278 | 6187 | 1.5\% |
| Trumpet | 6615 | 37\% | 11143 | 63\% | 870 | 18688 | 4.6\% |
| Tuba | 168 | 23\% | 562 | 77\% | 46 | 776 | 0.2\% |
| Voice | 13479 | 80\% | 3312 | 20\% | 444 | 17235 | 4\% |
| Viola | 2489 | 69\% | 1117 | 31\% | 108 | 3714 | 0.9\% |
| Violin | 56000 | 74\% | 19763 | 26\% | 3015 | 78778 | 19\% |
| Other Piccolo/fife | 412 | 79\% | 111 | 21\% | 13 | 536 | 0.1\% |
| Other Flugel horn | 54 | 61\% | 34 | 39\% | 1 | 89 | 0.02\% |
| Other unspecified | 3038 | 54\% | 2558 | 46\% | 517 | 6113 | 1.5\% |

* Data are an underestimation as up to $20 \%$ of pupils learning to play an instrument were unable to be matched with the Common Basic Data Set


## Range of ensembles available

Eighty six percent of Music Services provided string ensembles and wind bands, and $83 \%$ provided choirs and orchestras. Brass ensembles were provided by $73 \%$. The greatest number of ensembles provided were on average string ensembles (7.6), theory groups (7), pop/rock groups (6.3 groups), vocal groups (6.1), mixed bands (6), Kindermusik (6), wind bands (5.7), woodwind ensembles (5.5), orchestras (4.6), and brass ensembles (4.5) (see Table 3.23).

Ensembles were available in many Music Services for a wide age range of players from age five through to adulthood and retirement age, although there were many opportunities for beginners to participate (see Table 3.23). The largest average number of ensembles for beginners were pop/rock groups perhaps because of their relatively small size ( 3.9 groups). There were also on average 3.4 string ensembles, perhaps reflecting the large number of children who play the violin. The average number of children participating in the range of ensembles varied widely. On average 187 in each LA participated in orchestras, 201 in vocal or choral groups, 210 in wind bands and 162 in string groups. The smallest number of participants were in Asian instrumental ensembles (19) and folk groups (21).

Table 3.23: Range and number of ensembles available

|  | Average <br> number of <br> ensembles | Number of <br> Music <br> Services <br> responding | Age range <br> of <br> ensembles | Average <br> number of <br> ensembles <br> for <br> beginners | Average <br> number of <br> pupils <br> taking <br> part in <br> regular <br> ensemble <br> activities |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African <br> instrumental <br> ensembles | 1.5 | 61 | $5-19$ | 1.8 | 43.4 |
| Asian instrumental <br> ensembles | 0.9 | 54 | $5-19$ | 1.6 | 19 |
| Brass ensembles | 4.5 | 103 | $5-47$ | 2.6 | 1.8 |
| Gamelan ensembles | 0.9 | 47 | $5-21$ | 1.8 | 78.3 |
| Guitar ensembles | 3.6 | 92 | $4-21$ | 1.9 | 48 |
| Jazz groups/Big <br> bands | 2.6 | 115 | $5-21$ | 0.6 | 53 |
| Keyboard groups | 1.9 | 68 | $5-19$ | 2.2 | 35.1 |
| Orchestras | 4.6 | 117 | $4-22$ | 1.6 | 187 |
| Percussion <br> ensembles | 2.8 | 94 | $2-21$ | 1.5 | 41.5 |
| Pop/rock groups | 6.3 | 82 | $5-21$ | 3.9 | 66 |
| Recorder ensembles | 4.2 | 93 | $4-21$ | 2.7 | 79 |
| Samba bands | 1.2 | 74 | $5-21$ | 1.6 | 43 |
| Steel pan ensembles | 4 | 33 | $4-21$ | 3 | 63 |
| String ensembles | 7.6 | 122 | $4-24$ | 3.4 | 162 |
| Wind bands | 5.7 | 121 | $5-24$ | 2 | 210 |
| Vocal groups/choirs | 6.1 | 117 | $4-35$ | 3.3 | 201 |
| Woodwind <br> ensembles | 5.5 | 102 | $5-21$ | 2.4 | 62 |
| Folk groups | 0.6 | 47 | $7-19$ | 0.2 | 21 |
| Early music groups | 3 | 39 | $5-18$ | 1.4 | 55 |
| Mixed band <br> ensembles | 6 | 8 | $5-66$ | .3 | 60 |
| Young <br> music/kindermusik | 6 | 10 | $0-10$ | 5 | 51 |
| Theory groups | 7 | 9 | $6-19$ | 4 | 79 |
| Other ensembles | 5 | 44 | $3-23$ | 3 | 72 |

The average number of pupils reported to regularly attend ensembles was 754 with a range from 2 to 6003 . This constituted $20 \%$ of those receiving tuition. There was considerable variability between Music Services in the percentage attending ensembles from one percent to $73 \%$.

In addition to the ensembles outlined above Music Services offered a range of other activities. Sixty six percent of Music Services offered tours, $62 \%$ offered theory, aural or general musicianship classes, $61 \%$ offered a range of centralised activities, $57 \%$ offered masters classes and $57 \%$ offered residential courses (see Table 3.24).

Table 3.24: Out of school hours activities organised by Music Services

| Activities | Average <br> number <br> of <br> courses | Number of <br> Music <br> Services <br> responding | Average <br> number of <br> pupils | Number of <br> Music <br> Services <br> responding |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Master classes | 3 | 81 | 106 | 72 |
| Music schools or <br> centralised activities | 16 | 86 | 709 | 99 |
| Residential courses | 2 | 80 | 135 | 71 |
| Theory, aural or general <br> musicianship classes | 6 | 88 | 74 | 92 |
| Tours | 1 | 93 | 71 | 88 |
| Other | 8 | 40 | 456 | 43 |

## Differences in ensemble provision between types of Music Services.

There were some highly statistically significant differences between the different types of Music Service and the ensemble activities that were on offer. London had the greatest average number of African instrumental groups (2.1), whereas the metropolitan authorities had the greatest average number of Asian instrumental groups. Brass groups were more numerous in the Counties (7.1) and least numerous in London. Gamelan groups were the most common in the Unitary authorities, while guitar groups were the most numerous in the Counties as were jazz/big band ensembles. Keyboard groups were also on average the most numerous in the Counties, as were orchestras, percussion ensembles, pop and rock groups, and string ensembles. Where there was joint provision, there were high numbers of brass groups, orchestras, recorder ensembles, string ensembles, wind bands, woodwind ensembles and vocal groups/choirs. Young musician / Kindermusik groups were most numerous in the Unitary authorities and London while Steel pan ensembles were least well responding in the Unitary authorities. London Music Services had the highest number of 'other' types of groups (8.8), the joint provision the least (0.5). Overall, Music Services offered young people a wide range of musical activities which seemed to be tailored to satisfy local needs (see Table 3.25).

Table 3.25: Average number of different types of ensembles by type of Music Service

| Type of ensemble | Counties | Metropolitan <br> authorities | Unitary <br> authorities | London | Joint <br> provision | Statistical <br> significance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African instrumental | $1.6(14)$ | $0.7(11)$ | $1.3(14)$ | $2.1(17)$ | $1.4(5)$ | NS |
| Asian instrumental |  | $2.1(12)$ | $0.6(13)$ | $0.7(18)$ | $0.4(5)$ | .04 |
| Brass | $7.1(24)$ | $3.8(26)$ | $4.4(22)$ | $2.7(25)$ | $5.5(6)$ | .0001 |
| Gamelan | $0.6(5)$ | $0.5(10)$ | $2.4(11)$ | $0.3(16)$ | $0.2(5)$ | NS |
| Guitar | $7.1(22)$ | $2.9(24)$ | $3.0(16)$ | $1.9(24)$ | $1.5(6)$ | .004 |
| Jazz/big band | $4.5(28)$ | $1.8(29)$ | $1.9(27)$ | $1.8(25)$ | $3.3(6)$ | .0001 |
| Keyboard groups | $3.7(15)$ | $1.0(16)$ | $2.5(15)$ | $1.1(17)$ |  | NS |
| Orchestras | $7.6(28)$ | $2.9(30)$ | $4.2(26)$ | $3.4(28)$ | $7.2(5)$ | .0001 |
| Percussion ensembles | $4.4(25)$ | $1.9(23)$ | $2.5(22)$ | $2.6(19)$ | $1.6(5)$ | NS |
| Pop/rock group | $12.5(20)$ | $5.2(21)$ | $4.2(19)$ | $3.3(18)$ | $3.8(4)$ | NS |
| Recorder ensembles | $7.0(22)$ | $2.0(20)$ | $3.1(22)$ | $3.7(24)$ | $8.4(5)$ | NS |
| Samba | $1.3(15)$ | $1.1(14)$ | $1.7(18)$ | $1.0(22)$ | $0.4(5)$ | NS |
| String ensembles | $15.9(27)$ | $4.5(32)$ | $5.1(28)$ | $4.2(29)$ | $14.0(6)$ | NS |
| Wind bands | $10.4(28)$ | $4.8(32)$ | $3.5(28)$ | $2.6(27)$ | $13.3(6)$ | .0001 |
| Vocal groups/choirs | $9.2(28)$ | $3.8(28)$ | $5.1(28)$ | $6.0(27)$ | $7.5(6)$ | NS |
| Woodwind <br> ensembles | $8.6(25)$ | $3.7(26)$ | $6.7(21)$ | $2.5(25)$ | $9.2(5)$ | .002 |
| Folk groups | $1.5(11)$ | $0.6(10)$ | $0.5(8)$ | $0.2(14)$ | $0.3(4)$ | NS |
| Early music groups | $8.4(11)$ | $0.6(8)$ | $1.1(8)$ | $0.2(10)$ | $0.5(2)$ | NS |
| Mixed band <br> ensembles | $7.5(2)$ |  | $3.5(2)$ | $5.5(4)$ |  | NS |
| Young <br> musician/kindermusik | $4.3(4)$ | $4.0(1)$ | $6.5(2)$ | $6.0(3)$ |  | NS |
| Steel pan ensembles | $4.7(6)$ | $4.1(8)$ | $2.8(9)$ | $4.0(10)$ |  | NS |
| Theory groups | $9.6(5)$ | $4.5(2)$ | $5.1(9)$ | $1.0(2)$ |  | NS |
| Other groups | $5.4(12)$ | $2.9(12)$ | $5.8(9)$ | $0.5(2)$ | NS |  |

* Numbers in brackets indicate number of Music Services responding
* NS = Not statistically significant

There was variability in the range and average number of activities on offer in different types of LA. Counties offered the most master classes (4.6), music schools and other central activities (23), residential courses (3.4), theory, aural and general musicianship classes (9.8), tours (1.9), and other courses (13.8) (see Table 3.26).

Table 3.26: Average number of different types of activities by type of Music Service

| Type of ensemble | Counties | Metropolitan <br> authorities | Unitary <br> authorities | London | Joint <br> provision | Statistical <br> significance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Master classes | $4.6(22)$ | $1.6(20)$ | $1.8(18)$ | $1.9(17)$ | $4.5(4)$ | NS |
| Music schools or <br> other central <br> activities | $23(22)$ | $10.7(22)$ | $13.8(19)$ | 15.4 | $21.5(4)$ | NS |
| Residential courses | $3.4(25)$ | $2.0(20)$ | $0.9(17)$ | $0.4(14)$ | $2.0(4)$ | .003 |
| Theory, aural or <br> general musicianship <br> classes | $9.8(20)$ | $3.2(23)$ | $4.3(19)$ | $6.7(21)$ | $3.2(5)$ | NS |
| Tours |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other courses | $1.9(23)$ | $1.2(25)$ | $0.9(22)$ | $0.9(17)$ | $1.5(6)$ | .021 |
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### 3.5 Summary

The widening opportunities scheme enabled Music Services to extend the number of children offered opportunities to play an instrument considerably. Music Services had a wide range of strategies planned for continuing this work in the future, although there were some genuine barriers to its continuation. Overall, access to tuition was broad with substantial proportions of children from different minority ethnic groups, with Special Educational Needs, and eligible for free schools meals learning to play instruments. There were gender differences in the number of children learning to play but these were less than might have been expected from the previous survey in 2002. Boys seemed to have been encouraged to learn to play through the increased provision of guitar and drumming tuition. The breadth of activities available was very wide with opportunities to play traditional Western instruments balanced with world music instruments and those pertaining to commercial and popular music. The ensemble activity available reflected this. Music Services based in different environments seemed to have responded to the needs of their communities by offering activities relevant to them.

## Chapter 4: Quality issues

This chapter considers issues relating to the quality of provision including standards attained, provision made for talented pupils, the number of dropouts and the reasons for their dropping out. The number of staff, full, part time or hourly paid and their qualifications are considered, and the quality of teaching and arrangements for professional development. The way that Music Services evaluate their provision is also reported.

### 4.1 Standards attained

In this section the number of regular instrumental/vocal pupils achieving National Qualifications Framework (NQF), Levels one, two and three are considered. This refers to the number of pupils regularly attending instrumental or vocal lessons considered to have reached the level of attainment specified in the National Qualifications Framework and exemplified through 'A Common Approach' (2002) and/or graded music examinations. Overall, $53 \%$ of those learning to play an instrument were pre Level 1 in the National Qualifications Framework, 32\% were at Level 1, $6 \%$ were at Level 2 and $2 \%$ were at Level 3. These percentages, in part, are based on responses from 59 Music Services where data were matched in relation to the Common Basic Data Set. They are therefore an underestimation (see Table 4.1). On average 855 girls and 72 boys in KS3 and KS4 attained Level 2 in the NQF (equivalent to GCSE grades A* - C) and a further 49 ( 30 girls, 19 boys) attained levels at NQF Level 3 (equivalent to 'A' level). On average 566 pupils at KS1 and KS2 attained Level 1 NQF, while a further 35 pupils attained Level 2 (the equivalent of GCSE grade A*-C). On average 4 pupils in KS1/KS2 attained Level 3 (the equivalent of A level) (see Table 4.1).

Table 4.1: Average number of pupils in each key stage attaining NQF levels

|  | Pre school |  | KS1 and KS2 |  | KS3 and KS4 |  | 16-19 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys |
| Average number of pupils pre NQF Level 1 (pre grade 1) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (64) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (62) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 860 \\ (101) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 583 \\ (101) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 227 \\ & (97) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 187 \\ & (97) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (82) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (81) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average number of pupils achieving NQF Level 1 (Grades 1,2 and 3 ) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \\ (61) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 341 \\ (109) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 225 \\ (109) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 360 \\ (106) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 235 \\ (106) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (96) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (94) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average number of pupils achieving NQF Level 2 (Grades 4 and 5) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 24 \\ (91) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11 \\ (94) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 855 \\ (106) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 72 \\ (105) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 19 \\ (98) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11 \\ (98) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average number of pupils achieving NQF Level 3 (Grades 6,7 and 8) | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (59) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (59) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (76) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (77) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (103) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (101) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (98) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (99) \end{gathered}$ |
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## Special provision for pupils identified as talented.

Seventy seven Music Services (55\%) indicated that they had special provision for talented pupils. Forty ( $28 \%$ ) indicated that they did not.

### 4.2 Drop outs

Overall $10 \%$ of pupils discontinued tuition during the academic year 2004/05 prior to February $1^{\text {st }} 2005$. This is based on data from 61 Music Services. On average 11.5 pupils dropped out in KS1, 153 in KS2, 129 in KS3 and 39 in KS4. Table 4.2 sets out the data on drop outs in relation to the different types of service. These figures must be interpreted with caution as in some cases they are based on relatively small numbers of Music Services. They suggest that the County Music Services have a drop out rate of $10 \%$ or less across key stages. Unitary authorities have low rates of drop out in KS1 and KS2 but higher rates in KS3 and KS4. Rates in London are also low, although they rise in KS3, perhaps as a result of increasing academic pressure. The data for joint provision are based on a very small sample and may have occurred as a result of the particular groupings included in the analysis.

Table 4.2: Average percentage and number of pupils discontinuing tuition in 2004/05

|  | Average number | County |  | Metropolitan |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Unitary } \\ \text { authorities } \end{gathered}$ |  | London |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Joint } \\ \text { provision } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N |
| Number of pupils dropping out in KS1 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.5 \\ & (62) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \% \\ & (14) \end{aligned}$ | 23.5 | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \% \\ & (16) \end{aligned}$ | 9.5 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \% \\ (18) \end{gathered}$ | 6.2 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \% \\ (12) \end{gathered}$ | 9.5 | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \% \\ & (2) \end{aligned}$ | 3.0 |
| Number of pupils dropping out in KS2 | $\begin{aligned} & 153 \\ & (80) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \% \\ (16) \end{gathered}$ | 252 | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% \\ & (22) \end{aligned}$ | 146.7 | $\begin{gathered} 7 \% \\ (23) \end{gathered}$ | 75.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \% \\ & (16) \end{aligned}$ | 101.6 | $\begin{gathered} 18 \% \\ (3) \end{gathered}$ | 530 |
| Number of pupils dropping out in KS3 | $\begin{aligned} & 129 \\ & (78) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% \\ & (15) \end{aligned}$ | 191 | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \% \\ & (22) \end{aligned}$ | 126.4 | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \% \\ & (22) \end{aligned}$ | 65.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \% \\ & (16) \end{aligned}$ | 61.4 | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \\ & (3) \end{aligned}$ | 653 |
| Number of pupils dropping out in KS4 | $\begin{gathered} 39 \\ (77) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% \\ & (15) \end{aligned}$ | 72.5 | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \% \\ & (22) \end{aligned}$ | 27.9 | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% \\ & (22) \end{aligned}$ | 20.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \% \\ & (15) \end{aligned}$ | 22.4 | $35 \%$ <br> (3) | 171 |

* Figures in brackets indicate the number of Music Services responding


## Reasons given for drop out

Music Services were asked to provide information on the reasons given by pupils for dropping out of tuition. Twenty seven percent of students gave no reason for giving up. The main reason given was loss of interest ( $27 \%$ of pupils), followed by competing demands for other school work (14\%) and the cost of tuition (10\%) (see Table 4.3).

Table 4.3: Reasons for giving up playing

| Possible reason | Percentage of <br> pupils giving <br> each reason | Number of Music <br> Services <br> responding |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Loss of interest | $27 \%$ | 47 |
| Competing demands from other school work | $14 \%$ | 47 |
| Competing demands from extra-curricular activities | $8 \%$ | 44 |
| Cost of tuition | $10 \%$ | 44 |
| Lack of space or time to practice | $6 \%$ | 33 |
| Lack of progress | $6 \%$ | 39 |
| Peer group pressure | $3 \%$ | 32 |
| Lack of support from family | $6 \%$ | 37 |
| Lack of opportunity to perform with others | $1 \%$ | 22 |
| Dislike of the instrument/voice taught | $2 \%$ | 34 |
| Lack of interest in the type of music taught | $1 \%$ | 31 |
| Dislike of examinations | $3 \%$ | 24 |
| Relationships | $17 \%$ | 31 |
| Other reason given |  | 36 |

### 4.3 Staffing

Based on responses from 83 Music Services, the percentage of teachers employed full time as a percentage of those employed was $22 \%$. The percentage of part time teachers was $21 \%$ and the percentage of hourly paid teachers $57 \%$. However, there was wide variability between Music Services. Table 4.4 sets out the details.

On average $74 \%$ of full time teachers had Qualified Teacher Status (QTS). Eighteen percent were graduates but did not have QTS, while on average $14 \%$ were not graduates and did not have QTS. Fifty one percent of part-time staff on average had QTS, $34 \%$ were not QTS graduates and $22 \%$ were non-graduates and did not have QTS. Of hourly paid staff $27 \%$ had QTS, $46 \%$ were graduates without QTS and $31 \%$ were not graduates and did not have QTS. The full time staff were overall the best qualified, followed by part-time staff with hourly paid staff frequently having graduate status but not QTS (see Table 4.4 for details).

Table 4.4: Average number and range of numbers of staff

|  | Average number of teachers | Average percent | Average total full time equivalent or hours for hourly paid teachers per annum | Average number of teachers with QTS | Average percent | Average number of nonQTS teachers who are graduates | Average percent | Average number of teachers who do not have QTS and are not graduates | Average percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Full time teachers | $\begin{gathered} 14.2 \\ (116) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \% \\ & (83) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.46 \\ & (111) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.6 \\ (105) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 74 \% \\ & (104) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.2 \\ (81) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \% \\ & (80) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.7 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \% \\ & (79) \end{aligned}$ |
| Range | 0-60 | 0-67\% | 0-60 | 0-41 | 0-100\% | 0-25 | 0-100\% | 0-16 | 0-50\% |
| Part time teachers | $\begin{gathered} 20.3 \\ (110) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \% \\ & (82) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.21 \mathrm{fte} \\ (92) \\ 1747 \mathrm{hrs} \\ (8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.0 \\ & (96) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51 \% \\ & \text { (93) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.6 \\ (85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34 \% \\ & \text { (83) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.3 \\ (75) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \% \\ & (73) \end{aligned}$ |
| Range | 0-131 | 0-71\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { 680-3510 } \\ \text { hours } \end{gathered}$ | 0-77 | 0-100\% | 0-80 | 0-100\% | 0-54 | 0-61\% |
| Hourly paid teachers | $\begin{gathered} 53.6 \\ (101) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57 \% \\ & (82) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30198 \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.6 \\ & (88) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27 \% \\ & \text { (88) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22.6 \\ & (81) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46 \% \\ & (81) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.4 \\ & (76) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31 \% \\ & (76) \end{aligned}$ |
| Range | 1-469 | 3-100\% | $\begin{gathered} 13.5- \\ 965682 \end{gathered}$ | 0-152 | 0-100\% | 0-179 | 0-100\% | 0-180 | 0-100\% |

* Percentages may not sum to $100 \%$ as they are based on different sample sizes

The average greatest proportion of full time teachers was to be found in joint provision ( $41 \%$ ) and the Metropolitan boroughs ( $32 \%$ ). The greatest percentage of part time teachers was to be found in joint provision with the least in London. The greatest percentage of hourly paid teachers was to be found in London (73\%) and the Unitary authorities ( $67 \%$ ). The smallest percentage was in the joint provision (see Table 4.5 for details).

Table 4.5: Percentage of full, part time or hourly paid teachers

|  | County <br> $(\mathbf{2 0})$ | Metropolitan <br> $(\mathbf{2 1})$ | Unitary <br> $(\mathbf{1 7 )}$ | London <br> $(\mathbf{2 0})$ | Joint <br> provision <br> $\mathbf{( 4 )}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of full time <br> teachers | $19 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $41 \%$ |
| Percentage of part time <br> teachers | $25 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| Percentage of hourly <br> paid teachers | $56 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $24 \%$ |

* Figures in brackets indicated number of Music Services responding

A small number of Music Services were staffed by self-employed teachers and staff who were employed on other types of contract. Table 4.6 sets out the details.

Table 4.6: Self-employed and other staff

|  | Average <br> number of <br> teachers | Average total <br> full time <br> equivalent or <br> hours for <br> hourly paid <br> teachers per <br> annum | Teachers <br> with QTS | Non-QTS <br> who are <br> graduates | Not QTS <br> and not <br> graduates |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Self- <br> employed | 85.5 | 42.4 fte (2) | 15.1 | 15.1 | 20.3 |
| Range | (8) | 22064 hrs (5) | $(8)$ | $(8)$ | $(8)$ |
| Others | $4-183$ |  | $1-48$ | $1-48$ | $2-61$ |
| Range | 6.0 | $2.4(22)$ | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.8 |

* Figures in brackets indicate the number of Music Services contributing data


## Proportions of male and female staff

There were slightly more male full time staff than female but the difference was very small. There were more female part time teachers than male teachers. The female teachers were also more likely to have QTS. There were slightly more hourly paid female teachers, who also tended to have QTS, in comparison with male teachers. There was little difference in the average number of male and female self-employed staff but the female staff tended to be better qualified. This also applied to those employed in other ways (see Table 4.7 for details).

Table 4.7: Average numbers and range of staff by gender

|  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Average } \\ \text { number of } \\ \text { teachers }\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Average total full } \\ \text { time equivalent or } \\ \text { total hours for hourly } \\ \text { paid teachers per } \\ \text { annum }\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Average } \\ \text { numbers of } \\ \text { teachers with } \\ \text { QTS }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Average } \\ \text { numbers } \\ \text { of non- } \\ \text { QTS } \\ \text { teachers } \\ \text { who are } \\ \text { graduates }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Average } \\ \text { numbers } \\ \text { of }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| teachers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| who do |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| not have |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| QTS and |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| are not |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |$]$
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## Travel arrangements

Twenty six Music Services indicated that their teachers were paid for their travel time, 81 , indicated that this was not the case, 23 indicated that this did not apply in their service.

## Contract hours

The average hours which constituted a full time contract were 30.8 with a range between 20 and 40 hours (based on 105 Music Service responses). The average number of weeks for which this applied was 37.9 with a range from 30 to 52 (based on 111 responses). On average 23.7 teachers were paid on teachers pay and conditions with a range from zero to 232 (based on 105 Music Service responses).

### 4.4 Teaching quality

## Monitoring of teaching quality

Music Services presented data relating to the number of instrumental/vocal lessons observed during the academic year 2004-2005 and the percentage judged to be satisfactory or better, and good or better using Ofsted criteria. Relatively few lessons were observed internally by schools. Of those observed by school staff $66 \%$ of lessons were judged satisfactory or better, and $76 \%$ good or better. Of the lessons monitored by the Music Service $96 \%$ were judged to be satisfactory or better and $67 \%$ judged good or better (see Table 4.8).

Table 4.8: Average and percentage of lessons observed and judged satisfactory, good or better

|  | Average <br> number of <br> lessons <br> observed (some <br> teachers may <br> have been <br> observed more <br> than once) | Average <br> percentage of <br> lessons judged <br> satisfactory or <br> better | Average <br> percentage of <br> lessons judged <br> good or better |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Internal monitoring by <br> school | 12 | $66 \%$ | $76 \%$ |
| Internal monitoring by LA <br> Music Service | 77 | $(9)$ | $(11)$ |

* Figures in brackets represent the number of Music Services responding


## Professional Development

Music Services offered continuing professional development (CPD) opportunities to school staff, instrumental teaching staff and other teachers. Table 4.9 sets out the average number of teachers in a range of categories receiving CDP opportunities or individual support in 2004/05. Most professional development
was offered through CPD rather than individual support. On average, the largest group of teachers receiving individual support and attending CPD sessions was primary school teachers. The second largest group was Music Service teachers (see Table 4.9).

Table 4.9: Continuing Professional Development in 2004/05

|  | Individual <br> support | CPD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Average number of LA Music Service teachers receiving CPD | $27(91)$ | $58(113)$ |
| Average number of private music teachers receiving CPD <br> through the LA Music Service or related services | $3(53)$ | $4.6(66)$ |
| Average number of special school teachers receiving CPD <br> relating to music through the Music Service or related services | $4(70)$ | $9(90)$ |
| Average number of early years teachers receiving CPD relating to <br> music through the Music Service or related services | $11(67)$ | $40(95)$ |
| Average number of primary School teachers receiving CPD <br> relating to music through the Music Service or related services | $35(85)$ | $110(108)$ |
| Average number of middle school teachers receiving CPD <br> relating to music through the Music Service or related services | $4(21)$ | $6(25)$ |
| Average number of specialist secondary music teachers receiving <br> CPD relating to music through the Music Service or related <br> services | $8(85)$ | $14(98)$ |

* Numbers in brackets indicate the number of Music Services responding


### 4.5 Evaluation of provision

More Music Services had systems in place for monitoring their own performance than that provided by other organisations ( $70 \%$ as opposed to $17 \%$ ). Forty percent of those services responding reported that their provision was evaluated by pupils and $51 \%$ by parents. Most services undertook internal evaluation ( $82 \%$ ), although $25 \%$ reported that they were evaluated by another organisation internally. External provision was most frequently reported to be evaluated by the LA or Music Service internally (25\%) (see Table 4.10).

Table 4.10: Evaluation of Music Services

|  | LA / <br> Music <br> Service <br> Provision | Evaluation of <br> external services <br> provided by other <br> organisations |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Evaluated by surveys of schools/ head teachers | $70 \%(99)$ | $17 \%(24)$ |
| Evaluated by pupils | $40 \%(57)$ | $11 \%(16)$ |
| Evaluated by parents | $51 \%(72)$ | $5 \%(7)$ |
| Evaluated by the LA/Music Service internally | $82 \%(115)$ | $25 \%(35)$ |
| Evaluated by other organisation internally | $25 \%(35)$ | $8 \%(11)$ |

* Figures in brackets indicated the number of Music Services responding

Some LAs surveyed head teachers or schools as part of their evaluation procedures. Of those so doing, on average 136 schools were surveyed with a range from zero to 539 . On average 63 schools responded to the survey with a
range from 1 to 310 . Of those responding, on average, 60 head teachers ( $97 \%$ ) were satisfied with the service with a range from zero to 304 .

## Summary

The data relating to standards were more robust than in previous surveys and more Music Services were able to provide data. They indicated that some children were attaining very high standards of performance at an early age. The proportion of children dropping out varied across different types of service and different key stages. The reasons given for drop out were also varied, although loss of interest and competing demands of school work and other interests featured strongly. The proportion of hourly paid staff was substantial across the sector and on average greater than the number of full or part time staff. Full time staff generally had qualified teacher status, with the proportion of qualified staff reducing through part time and hourly paid staff. Female staff tended to be slightly over represented in part time and hourly paid staff. They also tended to be better qualified than their male counterparts. Assessed teaching quality was on the whole at least satisfactory and Music Services provided extensive opportunities for continuing professional development for staff. Evaluation of Music Service activities was mainly carried out within services, although in some cases parents and pupils were surveyed. Evaluation of provision made outside the service was still patchy.

## Chapter 5: Financial issues

This chapter outlines the charging policies adopted by Music Services, and bursary and remissions policies. Descriptions are provided of income and expenditure and comparisons are made between different types of services in relation to income.

### 5.1 Charging policies

## Charges to schools

Sixteen Music Services indicated that no charge was made to schools (11\%). Of those that made charges to schools ( $67 \%$ ) the average charge per hour was $£ 27.10$. There was a wide range with some Music Services charging up to $£ 40$. Some Music Services had an hourly fee remission rate. The average for this was $£ 24.30$ with a range from $£ 1.75$ to $£ 40$ (see Table 5.1). Information was not available about whether schools had remissions policies in those cases when they received devolved funding to provide tuition.

Table 5.1: Hourly charges to schools

|  | Average <br> charge | Range | Number of <br> Music <br> Services |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hourly charge to schools for tuition or other <br> services | $£ 27.10$ | $£ 0-£ 40$ | 95 |
| Rate per hour on which fee remission is <br> based if this is relevant | $£ 24.30$ | $£ 1.75-$ | 25 |
| $£ 40$ |  |  |  |

## Charges to parents

Most Music Services (58\%) made charges directly to families. Five Music Services indicated that a charge was made to families by schools. Fifty four percent of Music Services indicated that they made a charge directly to families for instrument hire, $62 \%$ for membership of ensembles, $60 \%$ for residential trips and $27 \%$ for other services. A substantial proportion of Music Services had remission schemes in place, $51 \%$ for instrumental tuition, $38 \%$ for instrument hire, $55 \%$ for membership of ensembles, $50 \%$ for residential courses and $20 \%$ for other services (see Table 5.2).

Table 5.2: Extent of charges made to families

|  | Charge made directly <br> by the LA/Music <br> Service |  | Remission <br> scheme in place |  | Activities not <br> offered |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | $\%$ | Number | $\%$ | Number | $\%$ |
| Instrumental <br> tuition | 82 | $58 \%$ | 72 | $51 \%$ | 9 | $6 \%$ |
| Instrument hire | 76 | $54 \%$ | 54 | $38 \%$ | 15 | $11 \%$ |
| Membership of <br> ensembles | 88 | $62 \%$ | 78 | $55 \%$ | 2 | $1 \%$ |
| Residential <br> courses, trips | 84 | $60 \%$ | 71 | $50 \%$ | 16 | $11 \%$ |
| Other | 38 | $27 \%$ | 28 | $20 \%$ |  |  |

Music Services reported different charges for tuition taking place in groups differing in size. The average charge for pupils in groups of three or four each term was $£ 43$, and for tuition in a group of two, $£ 53$. The average charge for individual tuition was $£ 98$ and that for extra-curricular activities $£ 28$.

Group lessons ranged in length from 20 minutes to 60 minutes with averages of around 30 minutes. The average length of individual tuition was 27 minutes with a range from 15 minutes to 30 . The range of numbers of lessons was from 1-12 for groups and 8-14 for individual tuition (see Table 5.3).
Table 5.3: Charges for different size of groups and contact time 2004/05

|  | Average charge <br> per pupil per <br> term | Length of lesson <br> or activity in <br> minutes | Number of <br> sessions | \% where <br> tuition is not <br> offered |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuition in a group <br> of four | $£ 43$ | 31.2 | 10.4 | $23 \%$ |
| Range | $(65)$ | $(65)$ | $(65)$ | $(32)$ |
| Tuition in a group <br> of three | $£ 0-£ 88$ | $20-60$ | $1-12$ |  |
| Range | $(63)$ | 28.6 | 10.3 | $23 \%$ |
| Tuition in a group | $£ 0-£ 88$ | $(63)$ | $(62)$ | $(32)$ |
| of two | $£ 53$ | $20-60$ | $1-12$ |  |
| Range | $(67)$ | 27.5 | 10.4 | $18 \%$ |
| Individual tuition | $£ 0-£ 112.50$ | $20-60$ | $1-12$ | $(26)$ |
| Range | $(74)$ | 27 | 10.5 | $16 \%$ |
| Extra-curricular | $£ 0-£ 280$ | $£ 28$ | $15-30$ | $8-14$ |
| activities, e.g. | $(35)$ | $(35)$ | 10.2 | $(22)$ |
| Music Centres |  |  | $(86)$ | $4 \%$ |
| Range | $£ 0-£ 150$ | $10-240$ | $1-13$ |  |

* Figures in brackets indicate number of Music Services responding


### 5.2 Bursaries and remissions policies

## Gifted and Talented Bursaries

Fifty six Music Services (38\%) reported that they offered Gifted and Talented Bursaries, 62 indicated that they did not ( $44 \%$ ), while 12 services indicated that this was not applicable ( $9 \%$ ). Table 5.4 sets out the ways in which Music Services indicated that they identified gifted and talented pupils in relation to the provision of bursaries. Of the $38 \%$ of Music Services offering bursaries, most were offered for achievement ( $31 \%$ ), although in some cases a competitive or audition process was adopted (19\%). In some cases bursaries were offered for children who were eligible for free school meals (see Table 5.4). Music Services were unable to provide information about the passing on of remission arrangements by schools to families.

Table 5.4: Ways in which gifted and talented pupils are supported and identified

|  | Number <br> indicating <br> yes | Percentage <br> indicating <br> yes | Number <br> indicating <br> no | Percentage <br> indicating <br> no | Number <br> indicating <br> not <br> applicable | Percentage <br> indicating <br> not <br> applicable |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gifted and <br> Talented <br> Bursaries <br> offered | 56 | $38 \%$ | 62 | $44 \%$ | 12 | $9 \%$ |
| For pupils <br> identified <br> through a <br> competitive <br> process <br> where there <br> are a limited <br> number of <br> places | 27 | $19 \%$ | 33 | $23 \%$ | 61 | $43 \%$ |
| For pupils <br> identified <br> through <br> audition <br> where a <br> particular <br> standard is <br> required | 27 | $19 \%$ | 31 | $22 \%$ | 62 | $44 \%$ |
| For pupils <br> identified <br> through <br> achievement | 44 | $31 \%$ | 26 | $18 \%$ | 55 | $39 \%$ |
| For parents <br> of children <br> eligible for <br> free school <br> meals | 39 | $28 \%$ | 24 | $17 \%$ | 54 | $38 \%$ |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Remissions policies

Seventy two Music Services indicated that they had a remissions scheme in place in 2005. Thirteen indicated that this was not the case. Nine indicated that instrumental tuition was not offered. Most remissions policies were for families whose children were eligible for free school meals ( $67 \%$ ). In some cases full remission of tuition fees was given ( $25 \%$ ), in others part remission ( $25 \%$ ). In other cases remission was given for ensembles at a reduced (27\%) or full rate (35\%). Some Music Services offered differentiated rates for families with two or more children were learning (26\%) (see Table 5.5).

Table 5.5: Remissions policies

|  | Yes | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { yes } \end{gathered}$ | No | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { no } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Not applicable | \% not applicable |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Where charges are made to families by schools the LA / Music Service makes provision for remission e.g. by adjusting charges to schools. | 30 | 21\% | 54 | 38\% | 44 | 31\% |
| The LA/Music Service has a remissions policy for music activities for families whose children are eligible for free school meals | 95 | 67\% | 19 | 13\% | 16 | 11\% |
| All children eligible for free school meals have full remission of tuition fees | 36 | 25\% | 44 | 31\% | 43 | 30\% |
| All children eligible for free school meals have part remission of fees | 36 | 25\% | 33 | 23\% | 52 | 37\% |
| All children eligible for free school meals have access to ensembles/other activities at a reduced rate | 38 | 27\% | 27 | 19\% | 57 | 40\% |
| All children eligible for free school meals have free access to ensembles/other activities | 49 | 35\% | 40 | 28\% | 35 | 25\% |
| Differentiated rates are available for families with two or more children learning | 37 | 26\% | 54 | 38\% | 30 | 21\% |
| Other | 45 | 32\% |  |  |  |  |

### 5.3 Income

Music Services received income from a variety of sources. On average $13 \%$ of income came from LAs, $43 \%$ from the Music Standards Fund, $25 \%$ from schools and $16 \%$ from families. Table 5.6 gives the details. There was wide variability between LAs in the proportion of income derived from each source. The LA contribution varied from zero to $56 \%$. The Music Standard Fund proportion varied from $4 \%$ to $100 \%$. Income from schools varied between zero and $72 \%$ while income from families varied from zero to $59 \%$. Up to $10 \%$ of funding was received in relation to grants for teacher's upper pay spine and up to $16 \%$ for wider opportunities (see Table 5.6 for details).

Table 5.6: Breakdown of income for 2004/05

| Income Source | Average <br> percentage <br> of income | Number of <br> Music <br> Services <br> responding | Range |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LA contribution | $13 \%$ | 104 | $0 \%-56 \%$ |
| MSF contribution | $43 \%$ | 99 | $4 \%-100 \%$ |
| Income from schools | $25 \%$ | 96 | $0 \%-72 \%$ |
| Income from families | $16 \%$ | 95 | $0 \%-59 \%$ |
| Grants for teachers' upper pay spine | $2 \%$ | 90 | $0 \%-10 \%$ |
| Wider opportunities | $2 \%$ | 31 | $0.27 \%-16 \%$ |
| Concerts and sponsorship | $2 \%$ | 15 | $0.04 \%-11 \%$ |
| Grants and funding from other external <br> organisations | $3 \%$ | 40 | $0.02 \%-27 \%$ |
| Other income | $3 \%$ | 69 | $0 \%-14 \%$ |

* Figures may not add up to $100 \%$ because of different size samples for each item

Table 5.7 sets out the breakdown of finances in relation to particular types of Music Service. The Metropolitan authorities and those in London received the highest percentage of income from their LAs $16 \%$ and $18 \%$ respectively. The authorities working together received the least funding (7\%) followed by the Unitary authorities ( $9 \%$ ) with the Counties in between ( $11 \%$ ). In contrast the shared provision Music Services received the greatest average percentage from the Music Standards Fund (74\%) followed by the Unitary authorities (50\%), the Metropolitan authorities (48\%) and London authorities (43\%). The Counties received the least income from the Music Standards Fund (29\%). Some of these differences were statistically significant (see Table 5.7).

Table 5.7: Breakdown of percentage income by type of LA or joint provision

|  |  | Number of responses | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Average } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minimum } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Maximum } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage income from LA$\mathrm{p}=.039$ | County | 26 | 11 | 0 | 35 |
|  | Metropolitan | 30 | 16 | 0 | 43 |
|  | Unitary | 25 | 9 | 0 | 31 |
|  | London | 19 | 18 | 0 | 56 |
|  | Joint provision | 4 | 7 | 0 | 23 |
| Percentage of income from the Music Standards Fund$\mathrm{p}=.001$ | County | 26 | 29 | 4 | 72 |
|  | Metropolitan | 30 | 48 | 21 | 86 |
|  | Unitary | 22 | 50 | 23 | 100 |
|  | London | 19 | 43 | 7 | 96 |
|  | Joint provision | 2 | 74 | 62 | 85 |
| Percentage income from Wider Opportunities fund | County | 4 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.8 |
|  | Metropolitan | 10 | 2 | 0.6 | 4 |
|  | Unitary | 11 | 3 | 0.9 | 16 |
|  | London | 5 | 2 | 0.4 | 4 |
|  | Joint provision | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Percentage income from schools$\mathrm{p}=.003$ | County | 24 | 36 | 1 | 64 |
|  | Metropolitan | 30 | 20 | 0 | 59 |
|  | Unitary | 20 | 31 | 0 | 72 |
|  | London | 19 | 14 | 0 | 42 |
|  | Joint provision | 3 | 26 | 0 | 69 |
| Percentage income from families | County | 26 | 21 | 0 | 57 |
|  | Metropolitan | 27 | 12 | 0 | 59 |
|  | Unitary | 20 | 10 | 0 | 39 |
|  | London | 19 | 20 | 0 | 58 |
|  | Joint provision | 3 | 12 | 5 | 17 |
| Percentage income from teachers grants for salaries$\mathrm{p}=.008$ | County | 23 | 3 | 0.5 | 10 |
|  | Metropolitan | 31 | 3 | 0 | 7 |
|  | Unitary | 18 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
|  | London | 15 | 0.6 | 0 | 3 |
|  | Joint provision | 3 | 3 | 0.3 | 5 |
| Percentage income from concerts and sponsorship | County | 6 | 0.4 | 0.04 | 0.6 |
|  | Metropolitan | 2 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.6 |
|  | Unitary | 5 | 4 | 0.5 | 11 |
|  | London | 2 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 1 |
|  | Joint provision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percentage income from grants and other external organisations | County | 16 | 2 | 0.02 | 16 |
|  | Metropolitan | 8 | 2 | 0.4 | 4 |
|  | Unitary | 6 | 7 | 1.0 | 27 |
|  | London | 10 | 3 | 0.5 | 8 |
|  | Joint provision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percentage of income from other sources | County | 18 | 3 | 0.2 | 10 |
|  | Metropolitan | 20 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
|  | Unitary | 12 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
|  | London | 17 | 4 | 0 | 14 |
|  | Joint provision | 2 | 2 | 0.1 | 3 |

### 5.4 Expenditure

By far the greatest proportion of expenditure was on staffing (74\%), although there was a wide range from $16 \%$ to $93 \%$. On average Music Services spent four percent on general office expenditure and five percent on purchase of equipment. On average $12 \%$ was spent on remissions and seven percent on other unspecified costs (see Table 5.8).

Table 5.8: Average expenditure

| Expenditure | Average <br> amount | Percentage | Percentage <br> range | Number of <br> Music <br> Services <br> responding |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Staffing (teaching, management of <br> service, etc.) | $£ 977,788$ | $74 \%$ | $16 \%-93 \%$ | 100 |
| Administrative and clerical support | $£ 74,943$ | $6 \%$ | $0.5 \%-34 \%$ | 99 |
| Other employee costs (non- <br> teaching) e.g. caretakers | $£ 12,973$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%-8 \%$ | 76 |
| Staff development | $£ 7,257$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%-5 \%$ | 92 |
| Travel and transport | $£ 43,280$ | $3 \%$ | $0 \%-12 \%$ | 97 |
| General office expenditure (phone, <br> consumables, premises costs, <br> photocopying, etc.) | $£ 52,406$ | $4 \%$ | $0 \%-16 \%$ | 97 |
| Purchase of equipment <br> (instruments, music, etc.) | $£ 46,817$ | $5 \%$ | $0 \%-21 \%$ | 84 |
| Repair and maintenance of <br> equipment | $£ 7,624$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%-3 \%$ | 79 |
| Percentage spent on remissions | $£ 89,283$ | $12 \%$ | $0.5 \%-36 \%$ | 8 |
| Other | $£ 78,846$ | $7 \%$ | $0 \%-70 \%$ | 83 |

* Percentages may not add to 100 as a different number of LAs are included in each percentage


### 5.5 Summary

Music Services varied in the extent to which they charge for tuition and the charges made. Many offer bursaries for gifted children and have in place remissions policies for those who are in receipt of free school meals. Music Services varied in the extent to which they relied on different sources of income. While many received income from the LA, the Music Standards Fund, schools, and families, some relied heavily on Music Standards Funding. The highest proportion of expenditure, except where funding was devolved to schools, was in relation to staffing.

## Chapter 6: Overview and conclusions

This chapter provides a comparison of the findings of the current Music Services survey with previous surveys, describes the length of time taken to complete the survey by Music Services and considers where Music Services need to target their efforts in the future.

### 6.1 Comparison with surveys from previous years

In 1999, a survey of all Instrumental Services was undertaken on behalf of the DfES to establish a baseline against which the impact of Music Standards Funding could be measured. The research explored:

- the nature and extent of music provision on offer from Music Services;
- the proportion of funding obtained from different sources of and the effect that this had on the operation of Music Services;
- the different ways that Music Services were structured, operated and the strengths and weaknesses of each;
- the extent and adequacy of existing systems of accountability;
- the factors which affected teaching and learning;
- the perceived benefits of music services; and
- the characteristics of successful Music Services.

A follow up survey in 2002 aimed to establish a robust, current data base which could be used to provide a baseline for wider opportunities in primary music, prepare the way for changes in Music Standards Fund allocations, enable national benchmarks to be established and complement the Music Services Guidance as a tool for self-evaluation, development and target setting.

The response rate from Heads of Music Services to the survey in 1999 was $52 \%$, in 2002 it was $99 \%$. In 2005 all Music Services were contacted and some level of response obtained. One LA, because of a change of Music Service director indicated that it would not be possible to complete a questionnaire although some information was provided on the telephone. One LA employed a consultant to collate the data because of maternity leave, but the return was made too late to be included. The quality of data returned was considerably improved on 2002, although there continued to be variability between Music Services. The best services were able to provide detailed descriptions of the nature of the composition of their pupil population, the standards that they reached, staffing and finance data. Overall, there was an improvement in the quality of the data supplied. Opportunities need to be provided for the best services to share examples of their good practice in relation to data collection with other services. Since the last survey several new Music Services had been established, 16 in total. Inevitably, they have less experience in collating data for the process of monitoring the quality of their provision.

It was not possible to make direct comparisons between much of the data from previous surveys and the current survey because the level of detail required in 2005 was much greater reflecting the increased capacity of services to provide this
level of information. Comparisons made are therefore of a general rather than a specific nature.

## Pupils receiving tuition

In 1999, the lowest percentage of pupils taught by any Music Service was $0.2 \%$ the highest $14 \%$. Most services provided tuition for between $4 \%$ and $10 \%$ of their school population. The nature of the data provided in 1999 was such that it was not possible to provide any meaningful average. Comparable data for 2002 indicated that $8 \%$ of pupils of compulsory school age were receiving regular tuition with a range from $0.6 \%$ to $17.8 \%$ demonstrating an increase in access. In $2005,8.4 \%$ of the school population was receiving tuition, $13 \%$ in KS2, $8 \%$ in KS3 and 5\% in KS4. On average 3,428 were learning in each Music Service with a range from 85 pupils to 16,741 .

The wider opportunities scheme was in its infancy at the time of the last survey. On average in 2003/04, 8.15\% of pupils in KS2 were accessing wider opportunities schemes. In 2004/05 prior to $1^{\text {st }}$ February $9.68 \%$ of KS2 children were involved in wider opportunities schemes with a range from zero to $66 \%$. In the Counties over $13 \%$ of KS2 pupils were accessing wider opportunities schemes in 2003/04 and in 2004/05. Music Services also demonstrated that they had a wide range of plans for developing access in the future. Limitations to this included finance, lack of instruments, and lack of appropriate skills in Music Service staff and primary teachers.

In 1999 and 2002 very few Music Services were able to provide data relating to the makeup of their student cohort in relation to gender, ethnicity, eligibility for free school meals and Special Educational Needs. In 2005, the well established Music Services were able to provide this information directly. These data were enhanced through the merging of the Common Basic Data Set and Music Service data bases. Although this process provided matches in only approximately $80 \%$ of cases it, alongside data provided by some Music Services, provided a much more accurate assessment of the make up of the population of children learning to play an instrument, albeit an underestimation. It also enabled a breakdown by Key Stage. There was also a considerable number of pupils learning pre-school, and in the 16-19 age group. These are not included in the percentage figures but indicate the extent to which Music Services are attempting to provide services to the whole community.

In previous surveys very few LAs were able to provide any data regarding the makeup of their student cohort in relation to gender. The available data revealed that $40 \%$ of children learning were boys in 1999 , reducing to $32 \%$ in 2002. In 2005, the position had reverted to that of 1999 with $60 \%$ of girls and $40 \%$ of boys learning to play post KS2. Increasing availability of tuition in guitar and drumming seemed to have provided more opportunities of interest to boys than previously. The 2005 data also enabled comparison to be made of the instruments which most appealed to girls and boys, facilitating future planning to increase the number of boys engaging with music.

In 1999 most Music Services made no particular provision for pupils with Special Educational Needs. In 2002, 35 LAs were able to provide data on the percentage
of pupils on the Special Educational Needs register at Stage 2 or above receiving tuition. The proportion (7\%) was close to the average proportion of pupils in the school population receiving tuition. In 2005 over 100 Music Services were included in the analysis relating to Special Educational Needs. Overall, $9.1 \%$ of the children learning to play an instrument were in receipt of additional support in relation to their Special Educational Needs. Because the matching with the Common Basic Data Set was on average at an $80 \%$ level this figure is an underestimation. Caution also has to exercised as the way that children with Special Educational Needs are categorised has changed since 2002.

In previous surveys data relating to ethnicity were available from only a few Music Services. In 2002, 57 Music Services were able to provide data regarding ethnicity. This revealed that while white children predominated in receiving tuition the levels of provision for other minority ethnic groups were being monitored. The 2005 survey based on data from on average 100 Music Services, revealed that while $73 \%$ of pupils were white, substantial proportions of minority ethnic groups were receiving tuition. Similarly, the proportion of children in receipt of free school meals receiving tuition was able to be established based on the data from 100 Music Services. This indicated that $12 \%$ of pupils were in receipt of free schools meals. This figure may be an underestimate given the 20\% of data unmatched.

Overall, there was a significant improvement in the quality of the data available which enabled much more accurate assessment of the population of children accessing tuition. The figures contradict the view that Music Services only cater for white middle class pupils and indicate that substantial proportions of children from ethnic minorities, eligible for free school meals and with Special Educational Needs do learn to play an instrument, even given the underestimation resulting from the weaknesses in the matching process.

## Breadth of provision

The more detailed statements required of Music Services relating to provision for schools makes comparison with previous surveys difficult. In previous surveys schools were not differentiated by phase. In 2005, $76 \%$ of primary schools and $88 \%$ of secondary schools were reported to be receiving specialist music tuition based on responses from approximately 90 Music Services. In 2002, 69\% of schools overall were reported to have received instrumental tuition.

In 2002, $38 \%$ of schools were reported to be taking advice on resources, appointments and preparation for or follow up for inspections. In 2005 this had risen to $82 \%$. In $200230 \%$ were taking advantage of support for curriculum development. This had risen to $82 \%$ in 2005. Similar rises were reported in relation to curriculum delivery, from $25 \%$ to $78 \%$, and IT support, from $18 \%$ to $60 \%$. In the 2005 survey, the number of categories of support for schools was extended beyond that of 2002 and high proportions of Music Services were offering a wide range of services.

The data collected in 2005 focused on the number of children learning each instrument rather than whether tuition was offered on that instrument. This makes direct comparison with previous surveys difficult. However, the range of
instruments which children were playing in 2005 demonstrates an expansion in breadth of tuition opportunities with children being able to access a wider range of world musics, folk music, and more popular music instruments (drums, guitar) in addition to the classical Western instruments. The range of ensemble provision reflects these changes.

## Quality issues

2005 was the first survey where Music Services were able to provide reliable information about the standards attained by pupils. This demonstrated that a small number of pupils were attaining very high standards. More accurate data were available in relation to drop outs indicating considerable variation between different types of Music Service. Music Services were also able to supply data relating to the reasons for children dropping out.

There was no change in the percentage of staff reported to be on full time contracts between 2002 and 2005. Twenty two percent of staff were reported to be on full time contracts. The percentage of part time and hourly paid staff had also changed little between 2002 and 2005. There were no significant differences in the level of staff qualifications. Music Services continued to monitor the quality of teaching, and provide professional development opportunities for staff.

There has been a consistent improvement in the quality of the data collected by Music Services since 1999 and the best Music Services have a range of data bases and monitoring systems in place.

### 6.2 Comments on the survey process

Music Services reported different time ranges for collection of the data to complete the questionnaire. Those who reported the time in hours indicated that on average it took them 66 hours to complete the questionnaire with responses ranging from two to 290 hours. Those reporting in days indicated that it took on average 12 days to assemble the data to complete the survey with a range from one to 60 . Those Music Services which reported in weeks indicated that it took them on average seven weeks to assemble the data to complete the questionnaire. The range was between 0.5 to 28 weeks. The time taken to complete the questionnaire was reported as on average 11 hours (range 1-50), three days (range $0.5-18$ ) or 2.7 weeks (range 1-9). This huge variability reflects the extent to which the Music Services routinely collect this information.

### 6.3 Next Steps

Although the data provided in the questionnaires were vastly improved from 2002 there were still serious omissions with some Music Services being unable to provide all the necessary information. In order to assure the quality of their work it is essential that Music Services monitor their activities and take seriously selfevaluation of their performance. The best Music Services have systems in place which enable this to be undertaken and their expertise needs to be shared with other Music Services.

The Common Basic Data Set which is produced at LA level, provides a wide range of information at pupil level which would be of considerable use to Music Services when combined with a Music Service data base. Local Authority Music Services should explore the possibilities of accessing this data base at local level.

More opportunities need to be provided for Music Services to continue to share good practice with a particular focus on new and developing services so that they can learn from well-established services. Considerable change is evident in relation to access and the breadth of services on offer but this could be further enhanced if opportunities for sharing ideas were available more frequently.

There is evidence that some Music Services have further developed their activities into other areas, for instance, early years and adult education. This provides alternative sources of income and an improved service to the wider community. The changes to more integrated services at LA level will provide more opportunities for Music Services to develop such activities.

While there was a small improvement in the overall number of pupils learning to play an instrument between 2002 and 2005 from $8 \%$ to $8.4 \%$ of the school population it is apparent that the only way to achieve a major increase is for group tuition sizes to be larger. There are two obstacles to this. The first is legislation which limits charges for tuition to be made to groups no larger than four pupils. In practice this means that as children drop out group sizes decrease until they are financially unviable. To allow for drop out children need to start playing in much larger groups. The second obstacle is that most instrumental teachers have no experience of teaching larger groups of children. A major in-service training programme is required to remedy this. Those teachers participating in the wider opportunities programmes have gained this experience and will provide a valuable resource to support their colleagues.

Some Music Services still have an over reliance on particular income streams. There continues to be a need for diversity in the way in which Music Services are funded to ensure their security in the longer term.
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## Appendices

## Appendix 1: National Survey of LEA Music Services

Since 1999 the DfES has periodically commissioned a survey of LEA Music Services. The survey for 2005 is being undertaken on behalf of the DfES by the Institute of Education, University of London. The team is led by Professor Susan Hallam and includes Lynne Rogers (Senior Research Officer) and Andrea Creech (Research Officer). While there is no compulsion to take part in the survey, the information which it provides will inform policy. We therefore hope that you agree that it is important to provide the most comprehensive picture possible by ensuring a high completion rate. This questionnaire, which will provide the data for the survey of 2005, is being sent, in the first instance, to you as Chief Education Officer in your LEA. We expect that you will pass it on to the appropriate person in the LEA to complete. However, we would be grateful if you would sign it before returning it to us so that we can be assured that you are aware of its contents. If you have any queries about this questionnaire or would like an electronic copy for word processing please contact l.rogers@ioe.ac.uk

The information to be included in the questionnaire is restricted to schools in the maintained sector. Please do not include information relating to independent schools. If provision is made by the same Music Service or provider to more than one LEA, where possible the data should be separated out for each LEA. This may mean completing two questionnaires. If this is not possible, one return should be made with a clear indication that the data is for two or more LEAs. Where provision is offered by an independent organisation or charitable trust the questionnaire should be completed by their representative in conjunction with the relevant LEA officer.

The purpose of the survey is to establish the nature of provision which is funded through all public sector funding for music in the LEA. Information should therefore be included relating to the Music Standards Fund allocation and any LEA contribution.

The research team has already made contact with the DfES contact person for music in the LEA, in most cases the Head of Music Service, to explore if some of the pupil information required could be made available to the research team through the data base held by the Music Service. If this is the case, the data will be merged with that from the Common Basic Data Set to provide a detailed and accurate profile of the pupils learning to play instruments in the LEA. This part of the survey will be based on a snapshot of pupil learning on the $1^{\text {st }}$ February 2005. Where this is the case it will not be necessary to complete some of the sections in the questionnaire because these sections will have been pre-populated for you.

In some cases you may be unable to provide the information required or it may not be applicable. If this is the case please indicate that by marking N/A for not applicable, U for unavailable or data followed by (E) for informed estimate. A glossary of terms is available at the end of the document and reference will be made to this glossary throughout the questionnaire.

## 1. Background information

a) Please give the contact details of the representative in your LEA who is responsible for overseeing the operation of the monies provided by the DfES through the Music Standards Fund.

|  | Local Education Service | Music Service |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Contact person |  |  |
| Title |  |  |
| Position |  |  |
| Address |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| E-mail |  |  |
| Telephone |  |  |

b) In the space below please provide a brief description of how instrumental/voice tuition and other musical services to schools are provided in the LEA.
c) Please indicate which organisation is the prime Music Service provider in your authority or how the Music Standards Funding is distributed and its use
monitored. Please include provision funded through the Music Standards Fund or through other sources.

|  | Yes | No |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Your own Music Service |  |  |
| The Music Service of another LEA |  |  |
| An Independent Music Service |  |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |  |
|  |  |  |

d) When was the current provision established? $\square$

### 1.1 Staffing

a) Please indicate the number of full, part-time (as a proportion of fte) and hourly paid Music Service teachers working in your LEA on February 1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ 2005. You should include teachers directly employed by the LEA/Music Service, other staff employed by the LEA who support music in the LEA, e.g. music advisers, advisory teachers, other teachers who contribute to music support and continuing professional development, e.g. advanced skills teachers, and teachers who are 'overseen' by the LEA in some other way (see glossary for further information). Please indicate their status and qualification level as indicated in the table below. Where teachers are on part of full time contracts indicate totals as fte, where teachers are hourly paid indicate the total number of hours that are worked in each year. You should include teachers who offer curriculum support to schools. For hourly paid teachers do not include time they may be paid for traveling.

|  | Number of <br> teachers | Total full <br> time <br> equivalent or <br> total hours <br> for hourly <br> paid teachers <br> per annum | Numbers of <br> teachers <br> with QTS | Numbers of <br> non-QTS <br> teachers <br> who are <br> graduates |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | F | M | F | Numbers of <br> teachers who do <br> not have QTS <br> and are not <br> graduates |

b)

|  | Yes | No | Not <br> applicable |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Are hourly paid teachers paid <br> for their traveling time? |  |  |  |

c)

| How many hours on average each week constitute a full time <br> contract? |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| For how many weeks of the year does this apply? |  |
| How many teachers are paid on teachers' pay and conditions? <br> Please provide the information as the number of full time <br> equivalents. |  |

### 1.2 Charging

a) In the next section please indicate the hourly charge made to schools and the rate on which fee remission was based in the academic year 2004-2005.

| Please tick here if no charge is made |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Hourly charge to schools for tuition or other services |  |
| Please include rate per hour on which fee remission is based if <br> this is relevant |  |

b) Please indicate what arrangements were in place on February $1^{\text {st }} 2005$ where charges were made directly to families by the LEA / Music Service. Please indicated Yes or No in each box or where activities are not offered in your LEA please indicate not applicable (N/A).

|  | If a charge is made <br> directly by the <br> LEA/Music <br> Service | If a charge is <br> made is a <br> remission scheme <br> in place? | If these activities <br> and services are <br> not offered please <br> indicate here |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Instrumental <br> tuition |  |  |  |
| Instrument hire |  |  |  |
| Membership of <br> ensembles |  |  |  |
| Residential <br> courses, trips |  |  |  |
| Other (please <br> specify) |  |  |  |

c)

|  | Yes | No | Not <br> applicable |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Does your LEA have gifted and talented bursaries? |  |  |  |

d) Please indicate with yes, no or not applicable the circumstances when bursaries are given:

|  | Yes | No | Not <br> Applicable |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| For pupils identified through a competitive process where <br> there are a limited number of places |  |  |  |
| For pupils identified through audition where a particular <br> standard is required |  |  |  |
| For pupils identified through achievement |  |  |  |
| For parents of children eligible for free school meals |  |  |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |  |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |  |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |  |  |

e) Please complete the box below relating to remissions policies.

|  | Yes | No | Not Applicable |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Where charges are made to families by schools, <br> does the LEA / Music Service make provision for <br> remission e.g. by adjusting charges to schools? |  |  |  |
| Does the LEA/Music Service have a remissions <br> policy for music activities for families whose <br> children are eligible for free school meals? |  |  |  |

f) How does the policy work? Please indicate yes, no or not applicable in the box below.

|  | Yes, | No | Not <br> applicable |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| All children eligible for free school meals have full <br> remission of tuition fees |  |  |  |
| All children eligible for free school meals have part <br> remission of fees |  |  |  |
| All children eligible for free school meals have access <br> to ensembles/other activities at a reduced rate |  |  |  |
| All children eligible for free school meals have free <br> access to ensembles/other activities |  |  |  |
| Differentiated rates are available for families with two <br> or more children learning |  |  |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |  |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |  |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |  |  |

g) What charges were in operation on February $1^{\text {st }} 2005$ for instrumental tuition or other extra-curricular music activities where the Music Service charged parents directly? Please state the length of lesson or activity and the number of sessions. Do not include tours.

|  | Charge per <br> pupil per term | Length of <br> lesson or <br> activity | Number of <br> sessions | Tick box if <br> not offered |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tuition in a <br> group of four |  |  |  |  |
| Tuition in a <br> group of three |  |  |  |  |
| Tuition in a <br> group of two |  |  |  |  |
| Individual <br> tuition |  |  |  |  |
| Extra- <br> curricular <br> activities, e.g. <br> Music Centre |  |  |  |  |

### 1.3 Finance

a) Please provide a breakdown of your total Music Service income for the financial year 2004-2005.

| Income Source | Amount |
| :--- | :--- |
| LEA contribution |  |
| MSF contribution |  |
| Income from schools |  |
| Income from families |  |
| Grants for teachers' upper pay spine |  |
| Other income (please specify) |  |

b) Please complete the box below indicating the breakdown of your expenditure for the financial year 2004-2005.

| Expenditure | Amount |
| :--- | :--- |
| Staffing (teaching, management of service, <br> etc) |  |
| Administrative and clerical support |  |
| Other employee costs (non-teaching) e.g. <br> caretakers |  |
| Staff development |  |
| Travel and transport |  |
| General office expenditure (phone, <br> consumables, premises costs, <br> photocopying, etc) |  |
| Purchase of equipment (instruments, <br> music, etc) |  |
| Repair and maintenance of equipment |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |

## 2. Contribution To Wider Opportunities

a) Please indicate in the box below the numbers of children involved in Key Stage 2 wider opportunities.

| How many children were involved in Key Stage 2 wider <br> opportunities work during 2003/2004? |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| How many children have been involved in Key Stage 2 wider <br> opportunities so far in 2004/2005? |  |
| How many children were involved in Key Stage 2 wider <br> opportunities on February 1 ${ }^{\text {st }} 2005$ ? |  |

b) What new ideas do you have in place for your Music Service to extend and improve opportunities for instrumental / vocal tuition at Key Stage 2 in 2004/5 and beyond? Please indicate if you have any other strategies planned.

| Title of strategy or planned <br> strategy (please indicate <br> whether planned (P) or <br> implemented (I)) | Brief description |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

c) In the table below please indicate the number of children accessing different types of wider opportunities in the academic years 2003/04 and 2004-2005. (See Glossary for explanations of the terms).

| Type of <br> opportunity | Number of <br> children in <br> academic <br> Year <br> 2003-2004 | Number <br> of schools | Length of <br> experience | Number of <br> children to <br> date in <br> 2004-2005 | Number <br> of <br> schools | Length of <br> experience |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| New musical <br> experiences / <br> 'tasters' |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Musical skills <br> programme / <br> foundation or <br> general <br> musicianship <br> stage |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specialist <br> instrumental <br> tuition |  |  |  |  |  |  |

d) Please indicate in the box below the main barriers in your LEA to all KS2 pupils having the opportunity to learn a musical instrument.

|  | Yes | No | Indicate order of <br> importance with 1 <br> being the most <br> important |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Insufficient funding |  |  |  |
| Lack of instruments |  |  |  |
| Inadequate accommodation |  |  |  |
| Lack of demand in schools |  |  |  |
| Lack of support from head and/or other teachers |  |  |  |
| Lack of demand from pupils |  |  |  |
| Lack of appropriate skills or experience in Music <br> Service staff |  |  |  |
| Lack of expertise among primary teachers |  |  |  |
| Lack of appropriate skills or experience in other <br> local musicians |  |  |  |
| Conflicts with other priorities |  |  |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |  |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |  |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |  |  |

## 3. Access

a) Please complete the following table indicating the numbers of pupils who received regular specialist instrumental tuition/vocal lessons in each category (at least one session a week). Please only count each child once. Please use the figures for $1^{\text {st }}$ February 2005. For those LEAs providing pupil level data to be merged with the Common Basic Data Set this table need not be completed.

|  | Number of pupils receiving tuition |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pre-school |  |
| KS1 |  |
| KS2 |  |
| KS3 |  |
| KS4 |  |
| Special schools (KS1-KS4) |  |
| 16-19 pupils in schools (6 |  |
| th form) |  |
| 16-19 pupils in colleges |  |
| Lifelong learning for adults |  |
| Total pupils KS1-KS4 |  |

b) Please indicate in the box provided the total number of schools receiving regular specialist instrumental/vocal tuition provided by the LEA/Music Service in the academic year 2003-2004. Only include schools which were visited not those offered opportunities through centres or other joint provision.

| Number of infant schools |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of primary schools |  |
| Number of junior schools |  |
| Number of middle schools |  |
| Number of secondary schools without <br> $6^{\text {th }}$ forms |  |
| Number of secondary schools with $6^{\text {th }}$ <br> forms |  |
| Number of special schools |  |
| Number of post 16 institutions |  |

c) Please indicate in the table below the number of boys and girls receiving specialist instrumental/vocal tuition at each key stage on February $1^{\text {st }}$ 2005. For those LEAs providing pupil level data to be merged with the Common Basic Data Set this table need not be completed.

|  | Pre- school | KS1 | KS2 | KS3 | KS4 | Special <br> schools | Post 16 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Girls |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Boys |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

d) Please give the number of pupils receiving specialist instrumental/vocal tuition who were in receipt of additional support in relation to their Special Educational Needs in the academic year 2003-2004 (see Glossary for details).
For those LEAs providing pupil level data to be merged with the Common Basic Data Set this table need not be completed.

|  | Pre- <br> school | KS1 | KS2 | KS3 | KS4 | Special <br> schools | Post 16 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of pupils who <br> are receiving tuition <br> who are in receipt of <br> additional support in <br> relation to their Special <br> Educational Needs (see <br> Glossary for details) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

e) Please indicate in the table below the number of school aged pupils from minority ethnic groups who were receiving specialist instrumental / vocal tuition within your Music Service on February 1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ 2005. For those LEAs providing pupil level data to be merged with the Common Basic Data Set this table need not be completed.

|  | Number receiving <br> instrumental / vocal <br> tuition |
| :--- | :--- |
| White |  |
| British |  |
| Irish |  |
| Any Other White background (please specify) |  |
| Mixed |  |
| White and Black Caribbean |  |
| White and Black African |  |
| White and Asian |  |
| Any Other Mixed background (please specify) |  |
| Asian or Asian British |  |
| Indian |  |
| Pakistani |  |
| Bangladeshi |  |
| Any Other Asian background (please specify) |  |
| Black or Black British |  |
| Caribbean |  |
| African |  |
| Any Other Black background (please specify) |  |
| Chinese or other ethnic group |  |
| Chinese |  |
| Any Other (please specify) |  |

f) Please indicate the number of pupils receiving tuition who were eligible for free school meals on $1^{\text {st }}$ February 2005. For those LEAs providing pupil level data to be merged with the Common Basic Data Set this table need not be completed.

|  | Pre school | KS1 | KS2 | KS3 | KS4 | Special <br> school |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number <br> receiving <br> tuition who <br> are eligible <br> for free school <br> meals |  |  |  |  |  |  |

g) Please indicate how many pupils in the authority have expressed an interest in instrumental / vocal tuition and on February $1^{\text {st }} 2005$ were on a waiting list. How many have been waiting for longer than six months.

| Number of pupils on a waiting list for <br> instrumental / vocal tuition |  | Number of pupils who have been waiting <br> to learn for longer than 6 months |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

h)

Please indicate how many schools were on a waiting list for tuition on February $1^{\text {st }} 2005$
i) Please indicate the percentage of children currently taught in different sizes of groups. Please include only instrumental lessons not ensemble work.

|  | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- |
| Individual lessons |  |
| Groups of between 2-4 children |  |
| Groups with between 5-10 children |  |
| Groups with more than 11 children |  |

j) Please indicate in the table below the number of schools who took up opportunities to access the services outlined below in the academic year 20042005.

| Type of activity | Activity <br> available <br> (please <br> indicated <br> Yes or No | Number <br> of <br> primary <br> schools | Number <br> of <br> middle <br> schools | Number <br> of <br> secondary <br> schools | Number <br> of <br> special <br> schools |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Advice on resources, <br> appointments and <br> preparation for or follow <br> up for inspections |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advice on developing the <br> curriculum, e.g. schemes <br> of work |  |  |  |  |  |
| Curriculum delivery |  |  |  |  |  |
| Provision of music INSET <br> for school staff |  |  |  |  |  |
| Provision of support for <br> individual staff in school |  |  |  |  |  |
| Festivals and other inter- <br> school activities for pupils |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instrument loan scheme |  |  |  |  |  |
| IT support for schools |  |  |  |  |  |
| Live Music Concerts |  |  |  |  |  |
| New musical experiences/ <br> 'tasters' |  |  |  |  |  |
| Workshops |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total number of schools <br> receiving support |  |  |  |  |  |

## 4. Breadth of provision

a) Please indicate the numbers of pupils learning each instrument through the Music Service provision by key stage and gender. If children are learning more than one instrument they can be counted more than once. Please use data from $1^{\text {st }}$ February 2005. For those LEAs providing pupil level data to be merged with the Common Basic Data Set this table need not be completed.

|  | Pre school provision |  | Key Stage 1 |  | Key Stage 2 |  | Key Stage 3 |  | Key Stage 4 |  | Post 16 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Post } \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Instrument | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys |  |
| African drumming |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bassoon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baritone |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cello |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clarinet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cornet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Double bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Euphonium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flute |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| French horn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gamelan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Guitar (acoustic) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Guitar (electric) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Guitar (electric base) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Keyboard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kit drums |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Music Technology |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oboe |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percussion (orchestral) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Piano |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recorder |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Saxophone |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sitar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Steel Pans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Pre school provision |  | Key Stage 1 |  | Key Stage 2 |  | Key Stage 3 |  | Key Stage 4 |  | Post 16 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Post } \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Instrument | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys |  |
| Tabla |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenor Horn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trombone |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trumpet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tuba |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Voice |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Viola |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Violin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

b) How many pupils who were receiving regular instrumental/vocal lessons through the LEA/Music Service on $1^{\text {st }}$ February 2005 also regularly attended ensembles provided by the LEA / Music Service?

| Number of pupils receiving regular <br> weekly instrumental/vocal tuition | Number who also regularly attended <br> ensembles |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
|  |  |

c) Please indicate the range of ensembles provided by the LEA/Music Service in the academic year 2004-2005 and the total number of participants.

| Ensemble | Number of <br> ensembles | Age ranges <br> of ensembles | Number of <br> ensembles <br> for beginners | Number of <br> pupils taking <br> part <br> regularly |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| African <br> instrumental <br> ensembles |  |  |  |  |
| Asian instrumental <br> ensembles |  |  |  |  |
| Brass ensembles |  |  |  |  |
| Gamelan <br> ensembles |  |  |  |  |
| Guitar ensembles |  |  |  |  |
| Jazz groups/Big <br> bands |  |  |  |  |
| Keyboard groups |  |  |  |  |
| Orchestras |  |  |  |  |
| Percussion <br> ensembles |  |  |  |  |
| Pop/rock groups |  |  |  |  |
| Recorder <br> ensembles |  |  |  |  |
| Samba bands |  |  |  |  |
| String ensembles |  |  |  |  |
| Wind bands |  |  |  |  |
| Vocal <br> groups/choirs |  |  |  |  |
| Woodwind <br> ensembles |  |  |  |  |
| Folk groups |  |  |  |  |
| Early music <br> groups |  |  |  |  |
| Other (please <br> specify) |  |  |  |  |
| Other (please <br> specify) |  |  |  |  |
| Other (please <br> specify) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

d) Please indicate how many pupils benefited from the following out-of-school hours activities organised by the LEA / Music Service in the academic year 20042005.

| Activities | Number of <br> courses | Number of <br> pupils |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Master classes |  |  |
| Music schools or centralized <br> activities |  |  |
| Residential courses |  |  |
| Theory, aural or general <br> musicianship classes |  |  |
| Tours |  |  |
| Other (please specify) |  |  |

## 5. Quality issues

a) Please indicate the number of regular instrumental / vocal pupils achieving National Qualifications Framework, Levels 1, 2 and 3 (e.g. the number of pupils regularly attending instrumental 1 vocal lessons considered to have reached the level of attainment specified in the National Qualifications Framework and exemplified through 'A Common Approach' (2002) and/or graded music examinations) on February $1^{\text {st }} 2005$. For those LEAs providing pupil level data which includes attainment data to be merged with the Common Basic Data Set this table need not be completed.

|  | Pre school |  | KS1 and KS2 |  | KS3 and KS4 |  | $16-19$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys |
| Number of <br> pupils pre NQF <br> Level 1 <br> (pre grade 1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of <br> pupils <br> achieving NQF <br> Level 1 <br> (Grades 1, 2 <br> and 3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of <br> pupils <br> achieving NQF <br> Level 2 <br> (Grades 4 and <br> 5) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of <br> pupils <br> achieving NQF <br> Level 3 <br> (Grades 6, 7 <br> and 8) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

b)

|  | Yes | No | Not applicable |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Do you have any special provision for pupils <br> that you have identified as 'talented'? |  |  |  |

c) Please indicate how many pupils discontinued regular tuition in the academic year 2004-2005 prior to $1^{\text {st }}$ February 2005.

| Number of pupils dropping out in KS1 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of pupils dropping out in KS2 |  |
| Number of pupils dropping out in KS3 |  |
| Number of pupils dropping out in KS4 |  |

d) Please indicate the percentage of pupils giving particular reasons for dropping out

| Possible reason | Percentage of pupils giving each <br> reason |
| :--- | :--- |
| Loss of interest |  |
| Competing demands from other school <br> work |  |
| Competing demands from extra- <br> curricular activities |  |
| Cost of tuition |  |
| Lack of space or time to practice |  |
| Lack of progress |  |
| Peer group pressure |  |
| Lack of support from family |  |
| Lack of opportunity to perform with <br> others |  |
| Dislike of the instrument/voice taught |  |
| Lack of interest in the type of music <br> taught |  |
| Dislike of examinations |  |
| Relationships |  |
| Other, please specify |  |
| Other, please specify |  |
| Other, please specify |  |

e) Please indicate the number of instrumental/vocal lessons observed during the academic year 2004-2005 and the percentage judged to be satisfactory or better, and good or better using OFSTED criteria.

|  | Number of lessons <br> observed (some <br> teachers may have <br> been observed <br> more than once) | Percentage of lessons <br> judged satisfactory <br> or better | Percentage of <br> lessons judged good <br> or better |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Internal <br> monitoring by <br> school |  |  |  |
| Internal <br> monitoring by <br> LEA Music <br> Service |  |  |  |

### 5.1 Professional Development

a) The following section asks for information about continuing professional development. Please indicate how many Music Service teachers and teachers in schools (primary, secondary and special) received Continuing Professional Development (CPD) through the Music Service, selected LEA services, or others who contribute to music support and CPD in the academic year 2004-2005. Please include both individual support and attendance at training sessions and courses (see Glossary for details).

|  | Individual <br> support | CPD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of LEA Music Service teachers receiving CPD in <br> 2004/05 |  |  |
| Number of private music teachers receiving CPD through the <br> LEA Music Service or related services in 2004/05 |  |  |
| Number of special school teachers receiving CPD relating to <br> music through the Music Service or related services in 2004/05 |  |  |
| Number of early years teachers receiving CPD relating to music <br> through the Music Service or related services in 2004/05 |  |  |
| Number of primary School teachers receiving CPD relating to <br> music through the Music Service or related services in 2004/05 |  |  |
| Number of middle school teachers receiving CPD relating to <br> music through the Music Service or related services in 2004/05 |  |  |
| Number of specialist secondary music teachers receiving CPD <br> relating to music through the Music Service or related services <br> in 2004/05 |  |  |

### 5.2 Evaluation of provision

a) Please indicate how you evaluate your provision and that provided by other organisations. Please tick all types used.

|  | LEA / Music <br> Service <br> Provision | Services provided by <br> other organisations |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Evaluated by surveys of schools/ head <br> teachers |  |  |
| Evaluated by pupils |  |  |
| Evaluated by parents |  |  |
| Evaluated by the LEA/Music Service <br> internally |  |  |
| Evaluated by other organisation <br> internally |  |  |
| Evaluated by more than one of these <br> methods (please indicate which above) |  |  |

b) If you undertake surveys of head teachers' satisfaction with the Music Service, please indicate the number and percentage of head teachers who were satisfied with their Music Service provision in the academic year 2004-2005.

| Number of head <br> teachers/ schools <br> surveyed | Number of head <br> teachers/ schools <br> responding | Number who were <br> satisfied with the <br> service |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |

## 6. General comments on the survey

| How long did it take you to assemble the data that you <br> needed to complete the survey? |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| How long did it take to complete the questionnaire? |  |
| Please use the space below to make any further comments on the <br> structure/content of the survey. |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Authorised by $\qquad$ (Senior LEA Officer)

Role $\qquad$
Thank you for completing this survey. Please return the completed form by e-mail to l.rogers@ioe.ac.uk or by mail to Lynne Rogers, Institute of Education, University of London, 20 Bedford Way, London, WC1H OAL by June $30^{\text {th }} 2005$.

## Glossary of terms

Teachers 'overseen' by the authority refers to those teachers employed in full or in part from Music Standards Fund, local authority funding. You may also include staff employed within an advisory or school improvement service who support music, for instance, music advisors, advisory teachers, and advanced skills teachers who play a role in the authority in supporting music.

Children in receipt of additional support in relation to their Special Educational Needs should include children who were classified in the categories 'School Action', 'School Action Plus', 'School Action Plus and Statutory Assessment' and 'Statemented' in the 2004 system of categorisation.

New musical experiences / 'tasters' refers to sessions where pupils are introduced to new instruments or types of music

Musical skills programmes/ foundation or general musicianship stage refers to general musicianship programmes where pupils are given opportunities to participate in musical activities additional to the national curriculum which do not involve specific tuition on an instrument

Specialist instrumental tuition refers to tuition on one particular musical instrument

Continuing Professional Development - individual support refers to those situations where teachers have received support at an individual level (this may include funding at an individual level to participate in external courses) as opposed to situations where teachers have attended sessions arranged for groups of staff.

## Appendix 2: Issues arising from matching the Music Service data with the LA Plasc data

Data were supplied by the Music Services in excel spreadsheets, and presented in one of two formats:

1. Pupil UPN, instrument and level
2. Pupil surname, forename, instrument and level

The excel files were imported into SPSS and then matched with the LA Plasc data which includes information about gender, ethnicity, year groups, Special Educational Needs, and free school meals.

Where the UPN numbers were supplied the matching process was successful. In each case a small percentage (less than $10 \%$ ) did not match, and this was attributed to either human error in entering the UPNs or pupil mobility (pupils moving from one LA to another).

Matching with pupil name was more problematic. Difficulties in achieving a good match arose from spelling errors, abbreviated forenames, double barrelled names, names duplicated within the same LA, and case sensitive issues. Some of these issues were easily overcome. For example, all of the data could be transformed into lower or upper case, and abbreviated names could be changed. However, in order to uniquely identify the pupils with the same degree of accuracy as with the UPNs it would have been necessary to match on LA number, school number, year group and name. Factoring in human error in data entry on each of those variables inevitably resulted in difficulties with matching without the UPNs. Nevertheless, with perseverance in resolving the problems that could be overcome (i.e. case sensitive, abbreviations, spelling errors) it was possible to achieve a reasonable match for the data from the majority of LAs.

If this procedure were to be repeated, without UPNs, it would be helpful to ask the Music Services, where possible, to provide (all in lower case):

- Surname
- Double Barrelled names with hyphen
- Forename in full - no abbreviations
- Gender
- Year Group
- School number
- Instrument
- NQF level


## Appendix 3: Types of Music Service

## Type 1a <br> LA Music Service with time allocated to schools for instrumental and vocal tuition ( 80 (53\%) music services)

The Music Service employs full-time, part-time, and hourly paid teachers. Principal funding streams include Music Standards Fund, LA grant, Wider Opportunities funding, fees from schools and families. Schools are allocated time for instrumental and vocal provision, whilst central control is held for ensemble provision, curriculum support and extra events.

All primary, junior, special and secondary schools have a free entitlement for instrumental tuition according to the number on roll. Additional instrumental lesson time to schools over and above the free entitlement is sold to schools via service level agreements. Schools buy in instrumental and vocal tuition on an hourly rate (varying), and this charge may be passed on to families by the schools (Music Service does not charge families directly). Lessons are typically in groups of up to four, and last 20-30 minutes. Some instrumental/vocal tuition, taking place during twilight hours or at Saturday Music Centres, may be charged for directly by the Music Service.

A range of ensemble opportunities are offered by the Music Service in Saturday Music Centres and during twilight hours sessions, and families are charged directly by the Music Service for membership of these ensembles. In some LAs ensemble provision is free. Residential courses are offered during school holidays (families are charged directly). Schools are able to buy in additional support for school-based ensembles.

Festivals, live music concerts, and taster sessions may be offered. A variety of special music projects may be offered to schools in collaboration with outside agencies.

LAs often have their own scheme of work (linked to the National Curriculum) and some have developed in-house assessment schemes for instrumental/vocal pupils.

Curriculum support, including advice on curriculum delivery, INSET for classroom teachers, and support for individual teachers, are offered. Remissions policy for children on free school meals is in place, and additional financial help for pupils in the form of bursaries for Gifted and Talented may be available. Assisted purchase schemes, instrument loan schemes and subsidy for tuition on "endangered species" instruments may be available.

## Type 1b

## LA Music Service with central control for all music provision (26 (17\%) music services)

The service offered is as for 1a (above), with the difference being that all provision is controlled centrally. The Music Service charges families directly for instrumental/vocal provision, ensembles, and residential courses. Schools may buy in curriculum support, additional instrumental tuition and additional support for school-based ensembles.

Type 1c
LA Music Service with budget for music provision delegated to schools (1
$(\mathbf{1 \%})$ music service)
The provision is as for type 1 a and 1 b (above), with the difference being that all aspects of the music provision are offered on a buy-back basis. No services are sold directly to families. Schools purchase all of their instrumental/vocal, ensemble direction, curriculum and live music requirements via annual Service Level Agreements.

## Type 2

LA Shared Music Service ( $\mathbf{1 1}$ (7\%) music services)
One Music Service provides service for two or more LAs.
Provision is as above for Type 1a and 1 b (above).
Type 3
Partnership between LA and Independent Provider(s) ( $\mathbf{1 3}$ (9\%) music services)
In these cases some or all of the instrumental/vocal service is provided by one or more independent providers, while the LA retains responsibility for ensemble provision, curriculum development, wider opportunities, and special events.

Typically the instrumental/vocal teachers are recruited by the independent provider, and may be employed or self-employed, while a small central team employed by the LA are responsible for ensemble provision, special events, and curriculum support. In six cases the LAs operate an 'Approved Tutors Scheme' as a quality assurance measure.

Principal funding streams include Music Standards Fund, LA grant, schools and families.

Typically, contractual agreement for instrumental tuition is made between parents/guardians and the independent provider. Families are charged directly by the independent provider. In some cases an option is in place for direct purchase of the service by schools. Schools are currently allocated free time based on roll number, and may purchase extra time over and above their free allocation.

A range of ensembles are offered through Music Centres or during twilight hours sessions. The ensembles are typically administered centrally, and families are charged directly by the LA.

Festivals, live music concerts, workshops and taster experiences are offered by the LA and administered centrally. Likewise, curriculum development, curriculum delivery and advice are offered. Wider Opportunities programmes may be being developed.

Type 4
Private Company limited by guarantee or Independent Charity (independent provider) ( $\mathbf{1 6}$ ( $\mathbf{1 1 \%}$ ) music services)
The services of a "Music Service" are delivered by one or more independent providers.

Funding streams include Music Standards Fund, LA grant, and tuition fees from families and schools.

Instrumental/vocal tuition is typically provided by a team of self-employed peripatetic teachers. Schools may buy in coaching for in-house ensembles, and area ensembles are provided through music centres. Families are charged directly by the independent provider for tuition and ensembles. Residential courses during school holidays are offered, for which families are charged directly.

Festivals, workshops, live music concerts and taster experiences are offered to schools. Curriculum development, curriculum delivery, advice and IT support are available to schools.

Financial help for pupils may be available via remission schemes for tuition, ensembles, instrument hire and residential courses. In addition Gifted and Talented bursaries and instrument loan schemes are sometimes available.

The independent provider may be monitored by the County Council, who specifies annual targets and reviews performance.

## Type 5

Responsibility for music provision devolved entirely to schools ( $\mathbf{3}$ (2\%) music services)
The Music Standards Fund budget is devolved entirely to schools, who take individual responsibility for music provision. The LA does not offer any music provision, and there is no formal recognised alternative independent provider.

## Appendix 4: Total number of pupils learning each instrument at each key stage differentiated by gender

|  | Pre school provision |  | Key Stage 1 |  | Key Stage 2 |  | Key Stage 3 |  | Key Stage 4 |  | Post 16 |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Post } \\ 19 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Instrument | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls | Boys |  |
| African drumming |  |  | 125 | 126 | 1270 | 1221 | 249 | 280 | 36 | 54 |  | 2 | 25 |
| Bassoon |  |  | 6 | 1 | 171 | 133 | 294 | 162 | 133 | 86 | 72 | 35 | 1 |
| Baritone |  |  | 4 | 4 | 401 | 580 | 117 | 211 | 44 | 57 | 8 | 16 |  |
| Cello | 1 |  | 211 | 136 | 5206 | 2901 | 1922 | 829 | 721 | 313 | 290 | 122 | 13 |
| Clarinet | 3 | 1 | 118 | 86 | 14047 | 6049 | 8816 | 2482 | 2856 | 797 | 856 | 265 | 35 |
| Cornet | 2 | 1 | 60 | 65 | 2988 | 3372 | 1186 | 1103 | 286 | 286 | 75 | 61 | 1 |
| Double bass |  |  | 3 | 2 | 312 | 346 | 223 | 226 | 105 | 145 | 54 | 63 | 4 |
| Euphonium |  |  | 2 | 4 | 313 | 690 | 192 | 323 | 59 | 160 | 30 | 45 |  |
| Flute | 4 | 2 | 319 | 40 | 19147 | 2920 | 11301 | 1057 | 3739 | 334 | 1313 | 119 | 19 |
| French horn |  |  | 3 | 3 | 460 | 452 | 248 | 286 | 101 | 91 | 56 | 56 | 7 |
| Gamelan |  |  | 31 | 25 | 368 | 282 | 37 | 8 | 23 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |
| Guitar (acoustic) | 9 | 21 | 421 | 814 | 7790 | 13245 | 2885 | 5290 | 1038 | 1817 | 172 | 296 | 12 |
| Guitar (electric) |  |  |  | 3 | 27 | 162 | 405 | 1803 | 246 | 993 | 47 | 165 | 2 |
| Guitar (electric bass) |  |  |  | 6 | 29 | 52 | 143 | 642 | 122 | 531 | 19 | 75 | 3 |
| Guitar (not separated) | 7 | 7 | 178 | 342 | 5950 | 8782 | 2669 | 4581 | 851 | 1876 | 90 | 281 | 11 |
| Harp |  |  |  |  | 11 | 2 | 24 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 7 |  | 6 |
| Keyboard | 17 | 14 | 694 | 499 | 10523 | 6563 | 4508 | 3007 | 1387 | 1133 | 90 | 90 | 12 |
| Kit drums |  | 2 | 20 | 96 | 818 | 2963 | 1982 | 6325 | 984 | 2579 | 178 | 282 | 2 |
| Music Technology |  |  |  | 1 | 278 | 326 | 138 | 204 | 173 | 221 | 26 | 77 |  |
| Oboe |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 546 | 273 | 761 | 210 | 295 | 82 | 183 | 36 | 6 |
| Percussion (orchestral) | 2 | 1 | 64 | 84 | 1178 | 2428 | 932 | 2767 | 534 | 1162 | 117 | 224 | 6 |
| Piano | 15 | 12 | 705 | 472 | 5593 | 2777 | 3542 | 1593 | 1751 | 963 | 376 | 227 | 48 |
| Recorder | 10 | 5 | 68 | 67 | 104 | 101 | 62 | 43 | 29 | 15 | 19 | 12 | 2 |
| Saxophone | 3 | 2 | 9 | 15 | 101 | 100 | 112 | 120 | 110 | 109 | 79 | 75 | 10 |
| Sitar |  |  |  |  | 42 | 38 | 27 | 4 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Steel Pans | 3 | 3 | 30 | 19 | 2219 | 1794 | 1033 | 671 | 365 | 186 | 37 | 14 | 13 |
| Tabla | 1 |  | 6 | 22 | 72 | 208 | 29 | 87 | 5 | 12 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| Tenor Horn |  |  | 17 | 26 | 1135 | 1097 | 397 | 342 | 126 | 85 | 48 | 35 | 2 |
| Trombone |  | 1 | 4 | 20 | 1043 | 2339 | 468 | 1217 | 172 | 402 | 47 | 196 | 1 |
| Trumpet | 1 | 3 | 39 | 357 | 4090 | 6702 | 1743 | 2904 | 487 | 876 | 155 | 301 | 11 |
| Tuba |  |  |  | 2 | 48 | 185 | 64 | 211 | 36 | 112 | 20 | 52 | 3 |
| Voice | 72 | 79 | 373 | 357 | 2303 | 1466 | 5346 | 626 | 4501 | 606 | 884 | 178 | 61 |
| Viola | 1 |  | 30 | 17 | 1502 | 767 | 611 | 215 | 231 | 82 | 114 | 36 | 1 |
| Violin | 44 | 50 | 3167 | 1620 | 38885 | 14219 | 10233 | 2678 | 2797 | 908 | 874 | 288 | 24 |
| Other <br> Piccolo/fife |  |  | 16 | 4 | 374 | 104 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 2 |  |  |
| Other Flugel horn |  |  | 13 |  | 25 | 15 | 10 | 13 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Other unspecified | 40 | 35 | 554 | 474 | 1662 | 1324 | 504 | 460 | 210 | 218 | 68 | 47 | 1 |

* Data are an underestimation as up to $20 \%$ of pupils learning to play an instrument were unable to be matched with the Common Basic Data Set
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Throughout this report use is made of the term Local Authorities (LAs). This indicates the recent change in the renaming of Local Education Authorities (LEAs) to reflect their wider role. It is acknowledged that at the time of the previous research the current LAs would have been referred to as LEAs.

[^1]:    * Percentages have been rounded up or down to the nearest whole number

[^2]:    * Figures in brackets represent number of Music Services responding

[^3]:    * Percentages do not total to $100 \%$ as the number of LAs responding to each statement differed.

[^4]:    * Figures in brackets indicated the number of Music Services responding

[^5]:    * Numbers in brackets indicate number of Music Services responding
    * NS = Not statistically significant

[^6]:    * These figures are an underestimate as $20 \%$ of pupils could not be matched through the data base
    * Numbers in brackets indicated the number of Music Services responding

[^7]:    * Figures in brackets indicate the number of Music Services contributing data

[^8]:    * Percentages are calculated in relation to the 141 possible responses

