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Abstract
Audience education is a growing area of practice in the arts and community services. While empirical research flourishes in relation to audience engagement and development through marketing and programming, when it comes to educational work there is a paucity of theoretical and empirical understanding. This is especially true of current understandings of audiences, their listening experiences and how they contribute to lifelong learning and arts engagement in the concert hall. Thus, the present study seeks to understand how education and learning are experienced by listeners in the orchestral concert hall and investigate the pedagogies of listening employed to facilitate learning and engagement as part of audience engagement, education and development.

By generating data through semi-structured interviews, focus groups and the observation of eighteen concerts, the lifeworlds and experiences of audience members and arts organisers were used to construct a phenomenology of listening experienced in three contrasting orchestral concert hall settings. The research includes data generated in professional and community orchestra contexts as well as perspectives from metropolitan and regional settings. The work undertaken here builds upon the theoretical frameworks offered by John Dewey (Experience as Education and Art as Experience), Christopher Small (Musicking: The meanings of performing and listening), Hans Georg Gadamer (Philosophical Hermeneutics) and Max van Manen (Phenomenology of Practice), and contributes to scholarship on education, pedagogy, experiential learning and orchestra audience development.

The findings theorise four essential qualities that are inherent to the practice of pedagogies of listening- the notion of relationality, the balance between various tensions, differentiation within both pedagogy and the act of listening itself, and the technologies utilised in pedagogies of listening. Each of the individual settings are also examined in detail to highlight the ways pedagogy is developed and how context and listener-audience-orchestra-musician relationships impact learning experiences through listening. In addition to these contributions to the scholarship of audience development and education, this thesis also offers a methodological innovation in the practice of phenomenological research using mindfulness and an exploration of the history of audience development. Both of these are published in peer reviewed journal articles and included as part of this thesis including published works.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Over my first decade of teaching, I wrestled with various questions about education and learning. None were more fascinating than questions relating to how experience contributes to learning, particularly the experience of listening to live orchestral music. I can trace my own fascination with orchestral music back to my childhood and adolescence (although it was not cool to be the kid excited by Bach cello suites; meanwhile your buddies were pre-occupied with the opposite gender, fashion and ‘popular’ music). Orchestral music remained a mainstay of my arts experiences, community involvement and musical life as a young adult. But my research interest was provoked by a Year 3 student who perplexed me during a classroom music lesson where I was guiding a class through listening to a work by Norwegian composer Edvard Grieg. The student simply asked, “what’s it like to go to a concert?”

At the time, I was teaching in a small regional town in Queensland, Australia. Having come from the city and grown up going regularly to the concert hall, I had never really considered the importance of this engagement in my own musical education. My focus as a teacher shifted and, by designing and developing concerts and programs for children and adults, I experimented with ways to help others to enjoy and understand orchestral music. This interest formed the basis of my first postgraduate research project which answered some of my initial questions, but left many others wanting.1 Although I continued my work as a school teacher and as a pedagogue and animateur for local orchestras, I found myself wanting to understand more about “what it is like to go to a concert” and what can be done to facilitate meaningful learning and listening experiences for audiences. The current study grew out of these questions.

Background to the Study

It is frequently lamented that the future of live, classical music performance is in peril due to diminishing and greying audiences, and is at risk of being lost to the instantaneous music cultures of personal portable devices, online music streaming, and on demand entertainment

1 See Nicholls (2014). Learning to Listen: Audience, listening and experience in the classical music concert hall. (Master of Education), Monash University.

2 Typically in musicology ‘classical music’ is music of a European tradition composed between 1750 to 1835 (Downs, 1992). It has since been more broadly defined to denote any music from the Western art music tradition encompassing the Baroque, Classical, Romantic and 20th Century repertoire. For the purposes of this study ‘classical music’ will be understood in this latter broad sense.
(Kramer, 2007; Lowe, 2007). In response, arts organisations have attempted to captivate new audiences. However, both the research literature and the current market-discourse dominated practices of arts organisations demonstrate that engaging and educating new audiences requires more than telling them why arts attendance is ‘good for you’, and that it takes more than cheap ticket sales to convert occasional listeners into well-seasoned concert goers (Pitts, 2005).

The vast field of audience development\(^3\) scholarship stretches across diverse disciplines including history, music psychology, philosophy, cultural studies, arts management and marketing. This means that terms such as 'listening', 'audience' and 'audience development' are complex and often poorly defined, convoluted and consequently misunderstood (Bashford, 2010). The historical and musicological literature perspective suggests that challenges in audience development are in part due to the long and evolving history of the concert hall, from which the current etiquette and traditions of classical music performance are inherited (Kolb, 2001; Pitts, 2005; Weber, 2014). The sociological and cultural studies literature perspective suggests that along with this inheritance, classical music performance is now viewed by society as an elitist activity and, accordingly, attracts one 'type' of audience while creating barriers for others to participate in arts activities (Kolb, 2001; Wolf, 2006). Meanwhile, current organisational practices, often driven by arts management and business models, tend to view audiences as a homogenous mass who listen in a passive way and are essentially ‘bums on seats’ (Roose, 2006; Sigurjósson, 2009).

**A Wealth of Practice Scarcely Documented or Theorised**

Audience engagement and development within concert halls are central concerns for orchestras and consequently education and learning are a significant part of arts management. In Australia alone, each professional orchestra located in a major capital city employs a dedicated team of professionals to design and manage a program of audience development activities. These include concert seasons designed to develop the listening and musical knowledge of audiences, and concert programs designed to introduce the art form to children, school students, young adults and other newcomers.

In contrast, empirical research has predominantly been focussed on understanding marketing and programming practices. Particularly there is an emphasis on researching and understanding the efficacy of practices employed to identify, recruit and retain audiences.

---

\(^3\) Audience development is understood in this thesis as the work of education, programming and marketing (Sigurjósson, 2009; Maitland, 2000; Rogers, 1998).
There exist but a handful of studies and reports that focus solely on contributions by education to audience engagement and learning within concert halls. Heather Maitland, a UK based consultant, developed *A Guide to Audience Development* (2000) and minor non-academic articles that outline the basic tenets of the practice and at least make some mention of the contribution of education. Rick Rogers gave a little more detail on how education functions in relation to audience development in his report prepared for the Arts Council of England, *Audience Development: Collaborations between education and marketing* (1998).

Though not directly concerned with listening pedagogy, two other research projects informed the formulation of the current project. Each will be further critiqued in part 2 of chapter 2 ‘Related and Recent Research’. First is Julie Winterson’s study of the community education work of orchestras and opera companies (1994, 1998, 2010). Second is Sidsel Karlsen’s research into informal learning pedagogy and experiences of musical learning at a music festival (2007, 2009, 2010, 2014). Winterson’s work provided a helpful way of framing the education and community engagement work of orchestras, albeit with a specific focus on school outreach and instrumental music programs. Karlsen’s work, while not situated within the context of the concert hall, offered a useful perspective on how musical learning happens in informal settings.

A third collection of studies into pedagogies of listening is also worth noting at this point, though the bulk of them relate to formal education settings such as schools and university courses. The only empirical study I located on pedagogies of listening outside classroom instruction was Adam Tinkle’s (2015) solitary article on experimental pedagogies of listening which draws on the work of composer John Cage (1971, 1995), Raymond Murray Schaeffer’s ideas on ear cleaning (1969), Max Neuhaus’s ‘sound walks’ pedagogy (1994) and Pauline Oliveros’ teaching on music appreciation (2005, 2011). Of course, there also exist various published guides to listening to classical music, including Aaron Copland’s *What to Listen for in Music* (1988), Tobias’ *Classical Music Without Fear* (2003), Forney and Machlis’ *The Enjoyment of Music* (2014) and many others.

In more recent times, the rise of social media has provided a platform for the development of new pedagogies for developing audience listening. Orchestras and animateurs from around the world continue to use the internet and social media to produce and distribute
short listening guide videos, blogs, vlogs, podcasts and interactive projects utilising virtual reality and animation to accompany specially designed concerts. To date, however, there remains a paucity of empirical research which documents and analyses these practices. Thus, addressing the disparity between professional practice, theory and research is a key interest of mine reflected in the focus of this research.

Guiding Questions and Central Aims of the Study
To guide the project, I formulated the following research question:

*How is learning experienced by listeners in the orchestral concert hall and what pedagogies of listening do orchestras employ to facilitate learning as a strategy for audience development?*

To support and further focus the research I also formulated the following auxiliary inquiry questions.

- How are listening pedagogies experienced by audiences within professional and community orchestra contexts?
- What understandings do professional and community orchestras have about audience development strategies and pedagogy that help audiences to listen to and understand music?
- How do pedagogies of listening improve audiences’ and individual listeners’ experiences of music?

Through this research I will contribute to the field of education and audience development and:

- add depth and complexity to understandings of audience development practices within Australian community orchestra contexts;

---

4 For example see Paul Rissmann’s animateur work and projects for adults and children with the London Philharmonic Orchestra (Philharmonia Orchestra London UK, 2009, 2010), Melbourne Symphony Orchestra (ABC Radio, 2015; Melbourne Symphony Orchestra, 2015), London Symphony Orchestra (Rissmann, 2016) and RTÉ National Symphony Orchestra (RTÉ National Symphony Orchestra, 2010).

5 For example see the listening guides and blogs published online by Burton-Hill (2018b); Giltburg (2018), Hoffman (2005) and Judd (2019).

6 For example see The “Inside the Score” YouTube channel InsideTheScore (2017).

7 For example see David Walliams Marvellous Musical Podcast (Townsend & The Dorsett Brothers, 2019).

8 For example see Roger and Miranda’s (n.d.; UniversalClassic, 2007) description of concerts and listening in the virtual reality platform ‘Second Life’; projects by Philharmonia Orchestra including digital take overs and apps incorporating virtual reality (see Berliner Philharmoniker, n.d.; Philharmonia Orchestra London UK, n.d.; Tilden, 2016); and animation work by Craven (2009b, 2019).
• contribute a theoretical framework for understanding audience development and education informed by empirical research;
• generate effective methodologies and methods for researching listening, pedagogy, education and audience development;
• provide recommendations for practitioners, arts organisations and researchers for developing and implementing effective listening pedagogies as part of audience development efforts.

Defining Key Concepts
It is imperative that the central concepts of ‘pedagogy’ and ‘listening’ are clearly defined and that the scope of what entails ‘the contemporary concert hall’ is limited for the purposes of this study. These are core concerns which I define in phenomenological terms.

Listening
In the literature review (see chapter 2), I provide a deep exploration of the nature of listening and how it has been theorised in relation to the concert hall. There, I draw on literature from musicology and music history, studies in perception and the psychology of listening, the typologies and many ways of listening theorised by various authors, studies in cognition, affect and somatic responses to listening, research into musical taste and preference, and literature relating to listening in the context of the concert hall.

For the purposes of this introduction, listening is understood as the act of giving one’s attention to, and making sense of, what is heard. I espouse a model of listening which incorporates Christopher Small’s (1998) idea of musicking where listening is valued as a part of the music making and conceived as a verb – to music.

Linked with the definition of listening is the position of individual listeners within the collective group of listeners called the audience. While this distinction is often overlooked, I have come to appreciate the nuance between this individual (listening) and corporate (being in the audience) experience. Understandings of the notion of audience are well populated with studies from the perspective of marketing and representing audience demographics. However, what I aspire to add to the field is a carefully constructed phenomenology of audiences in the context of the contemporary orchestral concert hall through the experiences of individual listeners.
**Pedagogy**

The term pedagogy denotes the theory and practice of education - the art of teaching. Therefore, to study pedagogy is to understand how knowledge and skills are exchanged and to question what mechanisms, interactions, relationships and understandings are essential for these exchanges to take place. Pedagogy (the art of teaching children) is made distinct from andragogy (the art of teaching adults), however, in this study, as in the wider use of the term I do not discriminate between the two. The phenomenologist Max van Manen (2014) (one of the central methodological theorists used for this study) explains that the term pedagogy also carries an ethical implication and should address the question of what is good for the student and in their best interest. He takes his definition of pedagogy from the work of Langeveld who stated:

> Pedagogy is a science of experience; it is a human science… that is conducted or studied with practical intent… It is a science of experience because it finds its object (the pedagogical situation) in the world of lived experience. It is a human science because the pedagogical situation rests on human science… it is practical because all this is brought to bear in the practical process of bringing up and educating children (Langeveld cited in van Manen, 2012, p. 13).

From Langeveld, we come to understand that pedagogy is a practical method rooted in lived experience. van Manen goes on to explain that this method and practice is “in the routine and reflective, habituated and deliberate, preconscious and conscious practices” (2012, p. 10). These are the spaces, places and relationships in which I focus my efforts in the current study. True to this definition, this study remains focussed on the practical working out of this philosophical construct - what orchestras actually do in their efforts to help audiences know and understand through experience.

**The contemporary concert hall and ‘classical music’**

the term ‘classical music’ is one which is loaded with both well-meaning intent and inaccurate application. Although commonly used to describe all orchestral music both from the western art music tradition and its various concerts (e.g. opera, symphonic music, sacred music, musicals) strictly ‘classical music’ refers to a select period from a certain context. Namely, the music from the canon of Western art music from circa 1750 to 1840. Thus, I must clarify how I have defined the terms ‘classical music’ and ‘concert hall’ for the sake of delimiting the scope of the current project.
The term ‘classical music’ is used in its broadest sense (if and when it is used at all) because this is how the participants explain it in their experiences. The term encompasses all Western art music (Baroque, classical, Romantic, 20th century, film, works from musicals, and contemporary orchestral music’s) but I only consider those performances which happen within the confines of the concert hall. I do not investigate audience experiences of listening or audience development activities of the opera, stage productions such as musicals, jazz performance, religious music use, or digital concert halls. However, included in the definition of ‘concert hall performances’ are concerts performed in spaces such as outdoor orchestral performances, performances in professional and amateur spaces (e.g. public halls and venues).

Thus ‘the contemporary concert hall’ encompasses spaces and places where orchestral performances are performed and where audiences assemble to listen. Although the performance practices and audience engagement look very different depending on the orchestra and audience, consequently also the context in which they perform.

**Dissertation Presentation**

This thesis submitted as the core work of my doctoral studies is presented in eight chapters in the style of a ‘thesis including published works’. Within the dissertation I have included two articles accepted and published by reputable academic journals which were completed during my candidature and one commentary currently under consideration for publication. The articles appear in chapters 2 and 3 and are presented in their finished published form as per my university’s guidelines.

In the current chapter (chapter 1), I introduced the study with a brief discussion of the background to my research interests, outline of the research questions, and indication as to the significance and importance of the research for theorising learning in informal contexts. I also provided an overview of the overall thesis structure. The remainder of the thesis is structured as follows.

The literature review (chapter 2) is presented in two parts. I begin by offering a historical survey of education and audience development practices, presented as a standalone article. Titled “Charting the Past to Understand the Cultural Inheritance of Concert Hall Listening and Audience Development Practices,” the manuscript was co-authored with my supervisors in the early stages of my candidature and eventually published in 2018 in *Paedagogica Historica: International Journal of the History of Education*. I assert in the article that understanding historical efforts to educate audiences set the scene for understanding
contemporary audiences. In the second half I present a more traditional literature review for the study as a foundation for the work ahead. Specifically, I review literature on listening in relation to cognition, perception and psychology, the sociology of preference and taste, listening as a social and cultural practice and philosophies of listening. I also explore pedagogies of listening in relation to public pedagogies, communities of practice, musical acquisition, types of knowing, and educational theory relating to informal learning and experiential learning. I also examine the fields of audience development and the context of the concert hall in Australia in relation to education and audience experience.

Chapter 3 explains the research design, methodology and methods with the inclusion of two further publications that elaborate how I innovated an approach to phenomenological research for this study. Consequently chapter 3 is a lengthier chapter which I have organised into five sections: research methodology; the research contexts and participants; methods for data generation; methods for data analysis; and research ethics. The section on methods for data generation incorporates an article published in the journal Methodological Innovations which wrestles with practical questions relating to undertaking phenomenological research. I use this article to illustrate how I applied skills from Dialectical Behaviour Therapy Mindfulness to lift the natural attitude, to work from a bracketed perspective, and to address the question of the researcher positionality within phenomenology. I provide some later reflections on this innovation in the section on methods for data analysis in the form of a linked commentary article titled A Methodological Coda.

In chapters 4, 5 and 6, I present and analyse the respective findings from each of three concert hall contexts and orchestras researched for this study. In order these chapters focus on each of the orchestras and respective research participants’ lifeworlds, highlighting the key themes which arose from the data analysis. Chapter 4 relates to the Metropolitan Community Orchestra (MCO), chapter 5 presents the data generated with the Professional Symphony Orchestra (PSO) and finally the Regional Community Orchestra (RCO) example is examined in chapter 6.

In chapter 7, I present a phenomenology of listening and pedagogy in the concert hall. It is a framework derived through the synthesised discussion of key themes drawn from all three research contexts. In this chapter, I also present recommendations for future research.

In chapter 8, I offer a provide a brief conclusion in which I revisit the key findings of the study in relation to the research questions.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

The literature review is presented in two parts. Part 1 takes the form of a journal article published in *Paedagogica Historica: The international journal of the history of education* which examines the history of orchestral concert hall performance. In this article I trace the development of efforts to educate audiences and listeners and seek to understand where the practices of the concert hall have originated. I argue for a view of the concert hall which positions the current attitude toward listeners and audience development as one which is part of an ongoing evolving history, rather than a museum preservation stance. The second part is presented in the style of a more traditional literature review chapter. In it, I review the many and varied theoretical and conceptual frameworks through which audience development and pedagogies of listening have been understood.
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Charting the past to understand the cultural inheritance of concert hall listening and audience development practices
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Faculty of Education, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

ABSTRACT
Although often thought of as a contemporary practice, audience development and pedagogies for listener education can be traced throughout the history of the public concert where their origins were forged. This paper unpacks how western listening and audience practices have developed over time, the changes in listening and behaviour norms, the emergence of early practitioners who developed ideas and pedagogies for listener education within the concert hall in Europe, and exposes the current paucity of research on the educational dimension of audience development and pedagogies of listening in the contemporary orchestral concert hall. It is argued that by understanding the past we can better understand the current concert hall and the ways we ourselves actively participate and create our own histories in the ongoing evolution of classical music performance. The paper concludes that this cultural inheritance has implications for arts organisations, educators, audiences, and listeners alike.

Introduction

As a field of interest, “audience development” in the orchestral concert context is generally understood as a contemporary practice of the past 50 years, with academic commentary established only in the past 30 years.¹ Of its three constituent components – marketing, programming, and education² – the first two are documented in volumes of books and reports that analyse audience demographics, cultural consumption, and models of how and why audiences interact with various art forms, including orchestral music performance. At the same time, heavy investment is made in the actual practice of audience development, particularly audience education, with most professional orchestras employing education and community outreach staff to design entire concert series and projects aiming to educate
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Despite this breadth of consideration, the educational dimension of audience development in the concert hall has received far less attention from researchers.

Intimately related to audience development and education are the contexts in which they are situated – the contemporary concert hall, the public concert, and the behaviours and etiquettes acted out and enforced, for better or worse, within them. These are not new phenomena but have been conditioned over the course of a long and evolving European history that has framed how audiences should listen, behave, and interact during live orchestral music events. As Roger Sessions reminds us, with regard to how listening is enacted in the modern concert hall, “listening to music, is a relatively late, relatively sophisticated act”.

This paper is concerned with unpacking how listening practices and western orchestral concerts for the common public have evolved over time. Our examination of this history which began in Europe highlights dramatic changes not only in listening and audience behaviour norms, but also how education and pedagogy became established as a vital means of developing audiences. In the context of the article’s discussion, listening is differentiated from hearing as being the concentrated and focused attention given to the act of attending to an aural stimulus. However, listening as related to the history of the public concert also must acknowledge the social element known as being the audience, a group of listeners, which has had an equally significant role in the evolution of listening practices in the concert hall.

Examining such an informal context requires a very open understanding of what constitutes pedagogy of listening and the ways it can manifest. Subsequently, in addition to the explicit elements of audience development – programming (repertoire selection), marketing (how concerts are advertised, where they are performed), and education (for example what is communicated to the audience – programme notes, said by conductors, etc.) – the art and music performance as an experience and the ways the arts organisation facilitates listener experiences is also considered as a possible pedagogic activity.

Charting this social and musical history from the public concerts of the mid-seventeenth century with their loud and rambunctious audiences to the silent and seemingly passive listeners of the end of the twentieth century, this article builds a case as to why people listen the way they do in the contemporary concert hall to aid audience developers, particularly

---

6There is a wide and varied range of scholarship defining listening, which though worth exploring, lies beyond the scope of this article. However, we recommend the following as a helpful starting point: Peter Szendy, Listen: A History of Our Ears (New York: Fordham University Press, 2008); Jeanne S. Bamberger and Howard Brofksy, The Art of Listening: Developing Musical Perception (New York: Harper and Row, 1979).
educators, to understand more deeply and enact pedagogies of listening. By understanding the past, we can better understand the current concert hall and, perhaps more compellingly, identify the implications of these cultural inheritances for arts organisations, educators, audiences, and listeners as we ourselves actively participate and create our own social histories in the ongoing evolution of classical music performance. As Gerald Phillips challenges us, in but a short time we ourselves will have played our small part in this ongoing history: “can we leave something behind that will increase the likelihood that a future we can never see will become a home for our musical decedents?”

Setting the scene for listening in the concert hall

Prior to the European Renaissance, records of purely instrumental music performance are few and far between, let alone records of listening, audiences, or music for the common person. In the Baroque era, musicologists suggest that “listener’s music” rose in prevalence; that is, music that was performed to address the audience rather than the performer and was composed as “art for art’s sake”. Nevertheless, for the most part, if music was publicly performed during these times, it was mostly as an accompaniment to other events such as processions, liturgical singing, pantomime, or dance, and was intended either for the very wealthy or the church. Specific to the emergence of the public concert hall, three significant movements changed these precedents and, taken together, contributed to the genesis of instrumental music concerts for the “common” people and of listening as a musical act.

First, as a result of King Henry VIII’s “great reformation” in 1549, organs were shifted from the abbeys to be housed in London’s public taverns. Here, audiences sat around tables, enacting the same unfocused listening etiquette practised by other audiences of the time. At the same time, they engaged in social distractions such as eating, drinking, playing cards, and socialising, all of which took priority over attending to the music. Second, in London a century later, the earliest models of music festivals were being held at St Paul’s Cathedral where a service of thanksgiving would be followed by a banquet and a concert. Third, occurring in Lübek, Germany around the same time were hour-long informal abend-musik performances based on the concert spirituel format with both instrumental and vocal music. There are also sporadic accounts in primary sources including letters and public announcements of public subscription programmes played by large gatherings of musicians

---

14John Dewey is one of many who have critiqued the notion of “art for art’s sake” discussed here. In relation to education and art works, his texts Art as Experience and Experience and Education are useful starting points for interested readers.
17Raynor, Social History of Music, 173.
18The concert spirituel was one of the first concert series of sacred vocal and instrumental pieces which ran during religious holidays when the opera and theatres were closed. However, these concerts were only attended primarily by the upper middle class, lower aristocracy, and foreigners visiting major cities. Young, Concert Tradition, 54; Oxford Music Online – Concert Spirituel, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com (accessed May 10, 2014)
based on a quintet model. These early developments were vital to making instrumental music experiences and audiences that were independent of the church, opera, and the court available to a wider range of social classes, particularly the middle classes.

Public concerts: creating and engaging a new audience

From 1672 the first public concerts of European art music were observed in London. John Bannister (c. 1625–79), a violinist and composer, advertised daily concerts in the local gazette. Initially performed at his house and later at Covent Garden, Lincoln’s Inn Field, and Essex at The Strand, these concerts were often performed by court musicians seeking additional employment. They played from a curtain protected dais with the audience seated around small tables, ale-house fashion. For a shilling, these audiences of shopkeepers and middle-class folk could call for as much ale and tobacco as they liked as the concert progressed. Accounts of Bannister’s concerts indicate that audiences went to listen and sing a variety of music, including contemporary music from the royal courts or music academies which audiences would request as the concert progressed. Concerts also sometimes included novelty entertainment such as demonstrations of rare instruments and other gimmicks; for example, marine trumpets were promised in the London Gazette at the concert on 4 February 1674. Shortly afterwards, similar concerts were being established in London by others, including Thomas Britton (1644–1714), a charcoal merchant, keen promoter of public concerts, and advocate for free admission. By 1700, the public concert movement was well underway across Britain and Europe.

Documentation of this new public concert movement in Europe is also significant for what it reveals about early approaches to audience development, particularly in relation to marketing and programming. From a marketing perspective, records and newspapers of the day offer insight into early approaches to advertising, demonstrating how a repertoire was promoted in order to spark public interest. The differentials in admission fees also reveal much about the intended audiences being targeted for particular public concerts. From a programming perspective, the repertoire choices themselves and the inclusion of gimmicks to intercept long works (such as jugglers, dancers, operatic arias, and opportunities for audience members to meet musicians and trial playing the instruments) suggest the assumptions made by concert organisers that audiences wanted variety and lacked the

19The string quartet and vocal arrangement of soprano, alto, tenor, and bass had been the basis for forming larger ensembles beginning with quintets which mixed string, brass, woodwind, and keyboard instruments, for example: flute, oboe, viola, cello, and harpsichord; or flute, oboe, violin, viola, and brass. These arrangements established the basis for larger ensembles and ultimately the orchestra as we know it today. Raynor, Social History of Music, 198; Oxford Music Online – Quintet, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com (accessed May 10, 2014); Colin Lawson, “The String Quartet as a Foundation for Larger Ensembles,” in The Cambridge Companion to the String Quartet, ed. Robin Stowell (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 310–27.
20Young, Concert Tradition, 6–11.
23Taruskin and Weiss, Music in the Western World, 303.
25Repertoire connotes a selection of music pieces played by a musician or ensemble. The selection of repertoire is particularly associated in this context to the element of programming in relation to audience development.
26Taruskin and Weiss, Music in the Western World, 255–312.
concentration required to sit and listen to an entire symphony uninterrupted or to a pro-
gramme comprised purely of instrumental orchestral music.27

In the concerts of Bannister and Britton, we see the earliest evidence of approaches to
audience development that could be termed pedagogical,28 since they were designed to
enhance the audience’s attention to the act of listening. Central to this appears to be a
changing relationship between listening and seeing. For example, Bannister proposed the
construction of a purpose-built concert hall – at public expense – with the musicians accom-
modated in a six-square-yard space and audiences in galleries which would be partitioned
off from the central music room, offering aural access only through specially bored holes
and conical windows.29 There is similar evidence suggesting the organisers also privileged
listening over seeing at Britton’s concerts. Though odd by today’s standards, Bannister’s
proposal nevertheless evinces a concern, even from the earliest days of the public concert,
to focus people’s listening. Indeed, it marks a move to prioritise the listening experience
over and above the social elements which had previously ruled public musical engagement.
Furthermore, the relationship between listening and seeing is an ongoing point of interest
throughout this history of listening as well in modern scholarship.

The developing nuance between listening and audience

As the public concert movement continued to grow between 1750 and 1850, the roles of both
the performer and the audience became more distinct. So too did the act of listening to live
orchestral music become more distinctive as both an individual and communal act with a
developing set of cultural expectations and social rituals.30 Nevertheless, as observed at the
time by writer Fanny Burney (1752–1840), listening did not yet assume a need for silence
in the public concert hall. She noted: “Indeed I am quite astonished to find how little music
is attended to in silence; for though everybody seems to admire, hardly anybody listens.”31

For cultural historian James Johnson, during the Classical era (1750–1820), rules around
listening and being part of the audience were becoming ever more nuanced. He explains:
“the transformation in behaviour was a sign of fundamental change in listening, one whose
elements [now] included everything from the physical features of the hall to the musical
qualities of the works.”32 The very purpose of listening at public concerts took on new
significance, with music understood to act “as a unifying fluid that flow[ed] through all
who could feel [it]”.33 The spatial arrangement of the concert hall was also changing, now
resembling a church more so than an ale house, as evident in audience seating arrangements
with rows facing forwards and the audience accommodated as if it were a congregation.
The orchestra is also further divided from the audience, often achieved by arranging the
orchestra on a raised dais which was also occasionally fenced off.34

Just as the nature of audiences and listening were changing during the Classical period,
so too was the purpose, composition, and functioning of the orchestra itself changing shape.

---

27 Johnson, Listening in Paris, 199.
29 Young, Concert Tradition, 36.
31 Chanan, Musica Practica, 142; Fanny Burney, Evelina: Or the History of a Young Lady’s Entrance into the World (Oxford:
32 Johnson, Listening in Paris, 1.
33 Ibid., 86.
34 Blanning, Triumph of Music, 135.
Orchestras grew in size and social importance and there was growing impetus for municipal authorities and organisations to support music concerts as a public service and as something of value to the public.35 Perhaps this elevation in stature accounts in part for the developing professionalisation of orchestras. This can be seen, in particular, in the introduction of the conductor as a specialised position whereas previously it had been a role taken in turns by members of the orchestra.36

The growth of the public concert during this time also saw changes to repertoire, with the playing of so-called “ancient music” a particularly noteworthy innovation. Certainly reviving music from the Baroque and beyond by certain music societies and in early concert spirituels pre-existed as an erratic practice, but from 1800 the programming of music by past composers became more popular and commonplace.37 This glorification of the selected works of past composers and audiences’ desire to return again and again to familiar works impacted listening, the individual’s listening experience, and has a significant lasting legacy in public concerts today. Indeed, one might argue that this new practice ushered in a completely new way of listening; one that aims to build familiarity, to appreciate the motivations and intentions of the composer, and to analyse the more suggestive themes represented by music which come to characterise the Romantic era – emotion, storytelling, and so on.38 As Szendy observes, this focused approach to listening marks a radical shift from “pleasure listening” to serious “academic listening”.39 It demanded more of audiences, resulting in a growing trend among some towards silent listening.

In considering the development of public concerts during the Classical era, it is important to acknowledge the contributions of several key individuals from across Britain and Europe who championed these new ways of listening and advocated for audience education. First is music critic François-Joseph Fétis (1784–1871), who attempted through his public essays to offer audiences insights into the music being performed, especially by exploring the intentions of the composers.40 Another key figure is Johann Adam Hiller (1728–1804), a modernist, composer, and first conductor of the popular Gewandhaus Concerts in Leipzig. Arguably, Hiller’s most significant contribution was to establish a format for presenting symphony concerts (overture, symphony, concerto) which has been more or less maintained to the current day. As a scholar, Hiller developed listening appreciation in the concert hall through audience education.41 Finally, in 1810 there is evidence of a kapellmeister named Peter Wiemer who petitioned King Maximillion I for permission to use the court orchestra to give public concerts of entirely contemporary music by Bavarian composers in order to “benefit the artistic education of the general public”.42

36Taruskin and Weiss, Music in the Western World, 345–50; Chanan, Musica Practica, 139.
37Johnson, Listening in Paris, 71–6; Blanning, Triumph of Music, 166.
39Szendy, Listen, 117.
41Young, Concert Tradition, 158.
42Raynor, Social History of Music, 318.
The increasing value of listening as an educated musical act

The next significant surge of development in public concerts occurred from 1850 to 1920 when many elements central to the present-day concert hall emerged. This period was also marked by a series of divisions. There was a divide in orchestra type, with the early beginnings of community orchestras distinct from the formation of professional orchestras such as the Berliner Philharmoniker (1882), Czech Philharmonic (1896), and London Symphony (1904). There was also a growing social divide which saw concert-going become an activity of the middle and upper classes. Unable to afford the price of admission, the lower classes instead attended less prestigious public performances such as promenade and music hall events. Finally, there was growing disunion in audience behaviours, and even at this stage the public concert was still not a place of silent reverential listening with performances still routinely interrupted by spontaneous applause and audience conversation. Nevertheless, it is clear that the work of audience development continued during the Romantic era (1820–1910), with shifts made in public music literacy due to the audience education work of a number of individuals. Of particular note are Louis Antoine Jullien, Richard Wagner, and George Grove, all of whom contributed to the development of attentive and educated listening.

Louis Antoine Jullien (1812–60) was a conductor and animateur who, with his mix of novelties and showmanship, blurred the line between entertainment and education becoming an early popular educationalist. His concerts included a range of gimmicks including being shot out of a trap door baton in hand, or else conducting in white gloves with a jewel-encrusted baton presented on a velvet cushion, and even using rifle shots and fireworks to accentuate moments in the orchestral works being performed. Directed at lower- and middle-class Londoners, his concerts were enormously commercially successful, attracting audiences of up to 10,000 people at a time. At his promenade concerts and concert festivals, he both introduced audiences to “works from the great masters” and featured prominent contemporary composers. Albeit eccentric, Jullien’s concerts thus succeeded in presenting a range of repertoire, from easy listening to more musically demanding items, educating audiences by first connecting with them, using entertainment to peak and maintain their interest.

---


44Blanning, Triumph of Music, 156–64.

45Blanning, Triumph of Music, 156–64.


48Young, Concert Tradition, 187–8; Chanen, Musica Practica, 140. Again, the relationship between listening and seeing shifts; arts organisers recognise the importance of being able to see in order to aid the listening experience to become a means of educating. Jonathan Sterne, in The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of sound reproduction (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), presents an interesting discussion of this relationship which, although useful, polarised seeing in relation to listening. I argue, and this history demonstrates, that the pedagogical relationship between listening and seeing in the context of the public concert is far more nuanced and is rather a tool which can be intentionally managed to achieve different pedagogical and audience development aims.

49Like other commentaries of the day, “great masters” refers to the works of male composers of the western orchestral music tradition. Indeed, Jullien and the other practitioners discussed in this article are also exclusively male which demonstrates the under-representation of women in records of the day and a need to investigate the roles of women in the development of listening and audience practices in concert halls. See: J.A. Sadie and R. Samuel, The New Grove Dictionary of Women Composers (London: Macmillan, 1994) as a starting point.

50Blanning, Triumph of Music, 156–60.
interest. As explored by Balloffet, Courvoisier and Lagier, the enduring value of mixing entertainment and education as an approach to audience development is an ongoing area of research interest which presents both opportunities and risks.

Another unlikely champion of audience development and education was composer Richard Wagner (1813–83). Wagner instructed the architects to “get rid of the ornaments” at his Bayreuth opera hall after identifying the distracting impact of visuals on listener attention in the original performance space design. In a similar effort, he also introduced the practice of dimming the concert hall lights during performances in order to direct the audience’s attention squarely on the stage-lit orchestra. This is another important convention which has been maintained in contemporary concert practice. Sources also reveal that Wagner also originally intended to offer free admission to his performances at Bayreuth in an effort to provide access to high-quality music performances to the lower and middle classes who would normally be excluded from premium or elite performances because of ticket prices. In this way Wagner perpetuated a music and culture for all social ethos.

Another significant innovation of the late Romantic era, and one which continues to the present day, is the introduction of programme notes. It is unclear when Reichart, the originator of programme note writing, first started the practice, however, it is clear that by 1850, they were widely used at public concerts, a fact that suggests a growing zeal for listener education. In a speech by George Grove (1820–1900, also the originator of the Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians and an early writer of programme notes), explains the beginning of programme note writing:

The analytical programme originated entirely from the suggestion of a friend. We were going to celebrate the birthday of Mozart in 1856 when the Crystal Palace music was just beginning to struggle into existence, and Mr Manns said to me how much he wished that I would write a few words about Mozart himself, and about the works to be performed. I tried it, and that gave me the initiation; and after that as the Saturday Concerts progressed, I went on week after week. I wrote about the symphonies and the concertos because I wished to make them clear to myself, and to discover the secret of the things that charmed me so; and then from that sprang a wish to make other amateurs see it in the same way.

53 Blanning, *Triumph of Music*, 147. The Bayreuth Festspielhaus is a performance space in Bavaria which was built under the patronage of Ludwig II of Bavaria and according to the design of Richard Wagner himself who envisioned it as the ideal opera house. Bayreuth’s design was radical for its time and set the precedent for many design features of contemporary concert halls. The seats are arranged in a single-tiered wedge absent of boxes and galleries allowing equal viewing by all audience members, unlike the traditional opera house design of several tiers of boxes in a horseshoe configuration. The orchestra pit is recessed beneath the stage and invisible to the audience whereas the orchestra had previously been arranged in front of the stage or even in different boxes on the stage. Wagner’s design choices and consideration of creating excellent acoustics emphasise the importance of the music and the need to focus the listener’s attention on the drama created by the music. Oxford Companion to Music Online – Wagner, (Wilhelm) Richard, [http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com](http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com) (accessed May 10, 2014); Simon Williams, “Bayreuth Festspielhaus: Enchanting the Audience,” *Theatre Survey* 33 (1992): 65–73.
57 Young, *Concert Tradition*, 121.
Programme notes become so important to the listener experience that large professional orchestras begin employing music critics and commentators to produce notes for each concert. Soon other educative resources were published for listeners, such as guidebooks to the repertoire, self-help treatises about the elements and theory of music, and pocket scores designed to be brought into the concert hall. These publications influenced people’s listening habits and gave them insights with which to argue and decide for themselves the meaning and aesthetics behind the music.58 Clubs and societies were formed where people attended a performance then discussed the event in detail with fellow audience members. Growing accessibility to recordings allowed greater familiarity with repertoire, further altering the listening experience both inside and outside the concert hall.59 These approaches are broadly described by Herman and Roberts as using interruption to bring about cultural learning.60

By now a new cultural phenomenon called “amateur listener” was born. Listening attentively and being able to articulate one’s ideas about music was now a cultural pastime as serious as playing, reading, or writing music.61 As Leon Botstein comments of the period, “the public realm of music became one in which one talked about music, imagined music through reading about it, and developed a language of response and evaluation”.62 But achieving the aims of the amateur listener required a serious approach to listening, as evident in the further adjustments to audience listening behaviours. Now silent for the most part and seemingly passive, audiences of public concerts were a mass of educated and discerning listeners.63 Listening, by the end of the Romantic era, was finally a culturally and socially valued musical activity.

Twentieth-century concerts and audience education efforts

In the remainder of the twentieth century, the cultural and social practices of public concert going continued as they had during the late Romantic era (c. 1880–1920). The importance of listening underwent further refinement as did educative audience development practices which began to target the teaching of listening specifically.64 During this time there were key individuals whose pedagogies and philosophies of listening would in turn shape general public music education and performance practices.

Significant among these was “The Society for Private Musical Performances”, founded in Vienna in November 1918 by Arnold Schoenberg (1874–1951).65 The society’s strict rules

62 Botstein, “Listening Through Reading,” 139.
65 Original documents published by this society do exist, however from our research they have not been compiled into a volume in English. Two particular works which do provide English translation and commentary on Schoenberg and his society’s approaches to developing listening pedagogies are Judith Meibach, “Schoenberg’s Society for Musical Private Performances; Vienna 1918–1922: A Documentary Study” (PhD diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1984) and Bryan R. Simms, “The Society for Private Musical Performances: Resources and Documents in Schoenberg’s Legacy,” Journal of the Arnold Schoenberg Institute 3, no. 2 (1979): 126–49.
of conduct for concert performance reflect its serious pedagogical commitments in terms of developing their audience’s appreciation of modern music, their listening skills, and their understanding of newly composed music. To achieve these pedagogical purposes, the society followed three overarching guidelines: first, to perform clear and well-rehearsed performances to present the finest possible interpretation of the composer’s music; second, to build familiarity and develop listening by presenting frequent repetitions of performances and repertoire, as Schoenberg understood that these repetitions would build familiarity which aids the development of understanding in listening; and third, that “performances must be removed from the corrupting influence of publicity … [and] be unaccompanied by applause or demonstrations of disapproval.” Though Schoenberg’s society was not the only one of its kind, it certainly offers an exceptional early example of intentional audience education and development.

Other prominent twentieth-century composers are also notable for their various efforts to encourage educated listening in the concert hall. Claude Debussy (1862–1918) often wrestled philosophically with his students about the dialectic of listening education resting between music being taught versus the ideal of merely having to listen and the experience of listening as being educative within itself. Aaron Copland (1900–90) encouraged the development of listening by broadening the programmes of orchestral performances to include contemporary compositions. Stravinsky (1882–1971) and Schoenberg also promoted the value of “new music”, identifying the crucial need for listeners to not only be exposed to new music other than the established canonical great composers, but also to be supported to understand it. These composers’ concerns highlight the critical relationship between programming and education to facilitate audience development, especially with regard to creating positive experiences of new repertoire in a spirit of curiosity and enquiry.

Arguably one of the most significant listening pedagogues of the twentieth century was American composer and music theorist John Cage (1912–92). Through his avant-garde compositions, Cage rebelled against institutionalised music learning, advocated for a new pedagogic approach to exploring listening in the concert hall, and pushed the limits of the relationships between audience, performer, and listener. His work 4’3” exemplifies these new ideas during which the performer presents the work by doing nothing aside from being on stage at the piano for the amount of time named in the title. The “music” is instead the environmental sounds heard and made by the audience.

Cage’s emphasis on experimental pedagogy and on the importance of creating shared learning experiences represented a new epistemology, radically different from the largely

---

67 Taruskin and Weiss, *Music in the Western World*, 431. Evidence of Schoenberg’s commitment to educating listeners can also be found in his own writing and letters. The text *Style and Idea: Selected Writings of Arnold Schoenberg*, ed. Leonard Stein (New York: St Martin’s Press, 1975) is particularly useful as it was compiled during Schoenberg’s lifetime and most likely with his assistance. Also see Arnold Schoenberg, *The Musical Idea and the Logic, Technique, and Art of its Presentation*, ed. and trans. Patricia Carpenter and Severine Neff (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006). The archives held by the Arnold Schoenberg Centre in Vienna are also a helpful place to access primary source documents, [http://www.schoenberg.at/index.php/en/texte-2](http://www.schoenberg.at/index.php/en/texte-2) (accessed April 18, 2017).
69 Ibid., 418–19.
didactic, instructional approaches of listening pedagogues who came before him. His listening pedagogies are the subject of interest of music scholars including Adam Tinkle, Julia Winterson, and Otto Muller and have also influenced a number of sound collectives who apply them as part of their artistic practice. Cage's work inspired the development of a number of experimental and creative listening pedagogies as antidotes to the music appreciation and silent listening approaches to music education such as such as Murray Schafer’s “ear cleaning”, Max Neuhaus’ “soundwalks”, and Pauline Oliveros’ “sonic meditations”, as well as acoustic ecology practices which further advanced the necessity of explicitly teaching new ways of listening.

The improvement of audience listening and understanding also continued outside the concert hall through printed texts. The early twentieth century saw the publication of a number of concert guides and educational materials designed to assist audiences in understanding “how to listen”. These include Bernard Shore’s *The Orchestra Speaks* (1938), Hugo Ulrich’s *The Enjoyment of a Concert* (1951), numerous music appreciation publications by Sir Walford Davies and Percy Scholes, and Lionel Salter’s *Going to a Concert* which was published especially for children.

Other media were also exploited to enhance the listener’s experience of orchestral repertoire and to educate audiences for the concert hall. Weekly radio programmes such as the BBC’s long-running music appreciation and education programme “Foundations of Music” (established in 1923) and the ABC’s “Listen to the Music” series became popular, as did educational recordings of annotated performances of established concert repertoire. Another particularly noteworthy use of new media for audience development was the collaboration between conductor Leopold Stokowski and Walt Disney on the 1940 animated feature film *Fantasia* which uniquely offered narrative and accessibility for the musically uninitiated to some of the most complicated orchestral repertoire including Stravinsky’s “Rite of Spring”, Bach’s “Toccata and Fugue”, and Beethoven’s “Symphony No. 6 – The Pastoral”. In 2000 Disney Studios brought new life to this significant pedagogical innovation with feature film
Fantasia 2000. The influence of these many guides and programmes is still evident in both school music education and concert hall audience education efforts today.82

**Audience development and listener education in the twenty-first century**

In many ways, the conventions of the contemporary public concert are a reflection of its western historical roots and European cultural inheritances.83 Meanwhile, “audience development” has grown into a discrete and essential aspect of the work of twenty-first-century orchestras, combining programming, marketing, and education in order to target specific audience types and to present concerts which are both accessible and relevant to individual listeners.84 To this end, most professional orchestras offer audiences a spectrum of concert series from which to choose, from the traditional symphony concert to free, mass public concerts featuring popular repertoire such as movie scores and popular classics to performance collaborations with popular music artists. Now an official role in its own right, the task of the audience educator or developer frequently involves designing events with the explicit aim of introducing audiences to “classical music”. From established practices such as concerts for children and families to the development of entirely new concert formats, these events are designed to teach repertoire, skills, and knowledge in the concert setting with a view to supporting audiences to create meaning from the listening experience.85

Contemporary orchestral concert-going across the world and the practices of listener education through audience development has drawn on the evolving history of public concerts begun in Europe and maintains many of the developments of that history in order to enhance the listening experience of audiences. Concerts generally continue to be performed in dimmed concert halls which, while architecturally grand, utilise every element of the room to enhance the acoustic and listening experience.86 There is even an argument to be made that the architectural design of the concert hall is, in itself, pedagogic in that it provides spaces for audiences to discuss, debate, and reflect on their experiences before and after concerts.87 Indeed, in the case of community orchestra concerts where audiences mingle with the musicians, the conversations that take place in these spaces can be vital to the development of the audience’s listening capabilities.88

Both professional and community orchestras continue to distribute programme notes and continue the tradition of listener education in the concert hall through pre-concert talks, formalised post-concert activities, and opportunities to engage and learn via a range of new platforms.
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technologies, including social media, email subscription, and YouTube. Worldwide, professional orchestras often partner with visiting schools, producing pedagogical materials to support school visits to public concerts or musician visits to schools by the orchestra. These strategies tend to focus on providing age-appropriate information about the instruments or the composers rather than developing skills or understanding of listening in particular.

One contemporary pedagogue of note is Paul Rissmann, a Scottish composer, presenter, and animateur whose work with professional orchestras focuses explicitly on teaching listening at public concerts. In interviews, Rissmann describes some of his innovative pedagogies which include digitally projected images, narrated orchestral stories, and inviting audiences to perform as equals with the orchestra. While much of his work is focused on developing young audiences, Rissmann has also applied his ethos of high impact, music-for-all, and active engagement to develop adult audiences for some of the UK’s leading professional orchestras. He has also created digital educational resources for the broader public, such as listening guides which are freely available via YouTube. The influence of Rissmann’s pedagogies on the Australian professional orchestras with whom he works is reflected in the development of innovative programmes and practices which explicitly teach audiences to listen attentively.

Contemporary practice of audience development has also extended beyond the traditional orchestral concert; a few examples are given here as a starting point. “DeepBlue” is a Queensland orchestra affiliated with the Queensland University of Technology. Their contemporary performance style engages the audience through music, amplification, choreography, lights, and an ambitious repertoire that combines classical and popular music and is often created in collaboration with the audience, as seen in their “Heartstrings” project. A second project of note is the online community “Second Life” which webcasts a live concert into a virtual world where real-time audiences sit and listen in a virtual concert hall environment via their avatar. Academic works by Nicholas Cook and Linda Rogers have reported the success of these online concerts, particularly in reaching audiences which have no prior experience of classical music. As a tool for audience development, Rogers explains that these concerts reach new audiences, diminish geographic barriers to attendance, increase accessibility to quality artists (such as the pianist Lang Lang who performed in 2007 at a Second Life virtual concert), and encourage conversation about the concert experience through texted comments and questions that other people in the virtual concert hall can answer in real time with the performance. Finally, there are numerous other orchestras, such as the Berliner Philharmoniker who also use technology to create digital concert halls.
which aim to achieve similar objectives,94 and the Philharmonia Orchestra in London who created a digital takeover of their concert hall in 2016. Audience members could experience a concert moving within virtual reality anywhere within the concert venue with 360° aural and visual stimulation using headphones and a virtual reality headset. Presented simultaneously was a performance of Holt’s “Planets” suite where audience members could watch the performance on 37 screens and conduct or play along with the orchestra.95

**Issues for research and practice**

Despite the obvious importance of developing aware and educated listeners for the sustainability of the public concert tradition and the wealth of history and practice of audience development through education, the academic literature has been slow to research the efficacy of listening pedagogies. Listening itself has been explored academically in terms of typologies and ways of listening,96 listening philosophies,97 the sociology of preference and taste in listening,98 cognition, psychology, and perception of listening,99 and listening as a social and cultural practice.100 Despite all of this, and the obvious importance of educating listeners for the sustainability of the public concert tradition, there is a paucity of academic literature exploring specifically the nature and efficacy of listening pedagogies.

A handful of texts exist focusing on the educational element of audience development, but none at all on pedagogies of listening. Heather Maitland’s book *A Guide to Audience Development*, published in 2000, and Rick Roger’s 1998 report titled *Audience Development: Collaborations between Education and Marketing* remain the leading texts defining audience development and outlining its relationship to education.101 And while there is a kaleidoscope of theoretical lenses through which to view how pedagogies of listening work within public concerts, Julia Winterson’s 1998 doctoral thesis “The Community Education Work of Orchestras and Opera Companies: Principles, Practice and Problems” and a minor report by Christopher Wainwright are the only existing empirical reports on the educative practices of professional orchestras, both of which make recommendations relating to the match between arts organisations’ programmes and school curriculum priorities, and a need for high-quality educational outreach work.102 While both are relevant to listening pedagogies
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and audience development, there is still no explicit study on the educational work within concert halls.

As this article demonstrates, the time is ripe both historically and in practice to investigate and report the roles and impacts of pedagogies of listening within audience development practices. There is a necessity to theorise the ways in which arts organisations understand and employ pedagogies of listening and audience members’ experiences of these and other audience development activities. Doing so will provide data-driven recommendations for practitioners, arts organisations, and researchers seeking to implement listening pedagogies as part of audience development efforts. This will serve to document the innovations of contemporary practice as part of the living history still being made in the concert hall tradition, not only for current audiences but our musical descendants to come.
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Literature Review
Having explored the origins and historical practices of listening and audience education in concert halls, I now go on to examine contemporary conceptual frameworks and theory. The studies cited here are also critiqued for their methodological contribution which will aid the ongoing exploration of the research topic. As I raised in chapter 1, the literature addressing the topic of listening pedagogies in concert halls rests across, rather than within individual research fields. Thus, it is essential to understand and synthesise the concepts and arguments made by the many authors within their own fields and making links between fields to create theoretical support while also identifying the gaps and questions which remain unanswered by the literature.

Broadly, there are six key fields vital to this study that will be explored in this section of the literature review: listening, music education, experience, audience and concert halls, and listening pedagogies. What follows is an overview of these central themes and concepts which rest within each of these fields guided by a number of highlighted authors whose work has strongly resonated and provide direction in moving ahead with this study. The final section of this literature review will briefly outline the current situation of listening pedagogies, education and audience development as practiced by professional orchestras in Australia, describe the position of regional arts in Australia, and review the most recent academic research carried out on the topic of listening pedagogies.

Listening
The literature on listening is vast and reported within a diverse range of research disciplines and contexts such as: typologies and ways of listening; listening philosophies; preference and taste in listening; cognition, psychology and perception of listening; and, listening as a social and cultural practice. These perspectives on listening are important to review not only as contributions to the work on listening, but also the methodologies and ontologies they advocate for. The work of two key authors, Njóróur Sigurjónsson (2005, 2009; 2010b- arts experiences in concert halls) and John Sloboda (1985- cognition and psychology of listening), has resonated strongly with this research project and provided a useful framework for understanding listening and preparing the research questions.

One of the most populated areas in the field of listening is the work on typologies and ways that separate the act of listening from hearing. In the literature surveyed, over forty
different conceptualisations were found including frameworks by Adorno (2006; 2002), Behne (1997), Deliège and Sloboda (1997), Trehub, Schellenberg, and Hill (1997), and Umemoto (1997). As a general observation, these typologies distinguish listening from hearing on the basis that listening is a focused, engaged and intellectual act requiring the intention to derive some meaning or value. As interesting as typologies are for defining the types of listening and listeners observed in the concert hall, the work of Njöróur Sigurjónsson (2005, 2009, 2010b) proved most useful because he advocates for an understanding that listneing is differentiated rather than typed. Through a pragmatist aesthetic reading of John Dewey and observation of twenty-one audience development events in concert halls, he theorised individual listening experiences as a ‘variation’ on the act of listening, rather than typing and categorising listening practices into a constructed ideal. Drawing from Sigurjónsson, it can be asserted that listening is an act carried out in a multiplicity of ways, and therefore there can be no one correct or truthful way of listening (Lowe, 2007; Sigurjónsson, 2009). All ways in which people listen within the concert hall are valid for the individual.

Another area of listening literature which often overlaps with listening typologies is the range of paradigms for understanding the cognition and psychology involved when one perceives and listens to music. In this area, a definite tension arises in views on the effects of culture, biology and psychology (Sloboda, 1985) on listening, and therefore what meaning and learning happens as a result of listening experiences (DeNora, 2000; J. H. Johnson, 1995; Small, 1998). All this debate is made more difficult to understand given that there is no quantifiable product which results from listening, as opposed to other areas of music participation. The work of John Sloboda (1997; 2010; 1985, 2010) has been particularly influential in the development of a way of finding the connections between music psychology, cognition and perception in relation to listening. Particularly relevant for considering the learning of listening are: Sloboda’s demonstration of the active internal processes which occur when one listens despite a seemingly passive exterior (Deliège & Sloboda, 1997; Dobson & Sloboda, 2014; Juslin & Sloboda, 2010); that learning to perceive music requires the development of memory and ‘habits’ which allow understanding to occur (Sloboda, 1985); and finally, understanding that emotion and affect play a vital role which must not be excluded when forming an understanding of how listening, perception and cognition are linked and work together (Lehmann, Sloboda, & Woody, 2007; Sloboda, 2010).

Philosophies of listening and music ask questions around ‘why’ and ‘how’ we should listen and are useful for conceptualising an underpinning understanding about why listening is
important (Doddington, 2010, 2014). When considering these listening philosophies within the context of the concert hall, Christopher Small (1996, 1998, 1999; 2011) is one of the few authors who has considered this area explicitly, describing listening in relation to live classical music. Small adamantly asserts that listening, like music, is not a thing or object but rather an action, “to music” (Small, 1998, p. 9) which ultimately presents a clearer view of the processes at play. Other authors who have also contributed to the philosophies on listening include: Peter Szendy (2008) who theorises the value of creating ‘good listeners’ over expert listeners and questions the often black and white conceptualisations of what constitutes effective listening; American composer John Cage (1973) whose works deliberately challenged conventional notions of what music and listening constitute; and, Theodore Adorno (2006; 2002; DeNora, 2003; Thomson, 2006) whose typologies of listening and theorising of a dialectical approach to thinking about music assert the need for balancing and seeing the ‘grey’ between seemingly opposite theoretical positions.

Given that listening to and having a taste for classical music traditionally connote elitism and class status, the concept of preference or taste in relation to classical music is another vital area to understand in relation to listening. Key voices in this area include Pierre Bourdieu (1984; 1990), Antoine Hennion (2001, 2012), Nick Prior (2005, 2011, 2013), David Hargreaves and Adrian North (1997) who consider issues of taste and preference in relation to: personal and social identity; preference as a learned competency; aesthetic preference and the enjoyment of listening; and, how preference relates to environments and the accumulation and use of cultural capital. It is interesting to note that existing studies on taste and preference (particularly in relation to classical music) reveal that consumers of ‘legitimate’ or ‘high’ music are more omnivorous in their preferences, consumption patterns and listening than those who do not have a taste for classical music (T. Bennett, Emmison, & Frow, 1999; Eijck, 2001; Peterson, 1992; Roose & Vander Stichele, 2010; M. Savage & Gayo, 2011). This observation suggests the value of viewing listening as a learned skill which can be useful to the listener across various genres of music beyond classical music, but also presents an anomaly asking whether class and sociological perspectives are the most effective for understanding learning and engagement with orchestral music.

A final significant area within the literature on listening comprises the various theories of listening as a social and cultural practice. This literature is closely tied with the literature on the experience of listening which makes a clear case for understanding listening as a series of relationships created both within the individual listener and the community of listeners around
them. It is argued by various authors including Stephanie Pitts (2014), Julian Johnson (2002) and Kurt Blaukopf (1992) that these relationships are what create meaning and understanding of listening while also contributing significantly to the wider collectives and societies in which listening operates, especially in the context of the concert hall and orchestral classical music. The various historical accounts of listening and audiences within the concert halls of the past similarly support an argument for viewing listening as a social and communal practice. These will be discussed in greater detail later in the next section.

**Music Education**

Because the concert hall represents a public context for music education, the notions of learning and pedagogy needs to be considered in a broader sense. Works on public pedagogies, communities of practice, musical acquisition, types of knowing, and theories explaining the link between learning and experience provide theoretical insight into how learning works in public spaces such as the concert hall. Influential in the literature on music education in relation to the concert hall is the work of Christopher Small (1996, 1998, 1999; 2011) whose work has already been given some attention in this literature review. Particularly useful in Small’s work is his notion of ‘musicking’ (1998) which not only reinforces the assertion that listening is an active process, but also provides some theoretical traction when trying to understand how learning takes place in the contemporary concert hall specifically.

Works on public pedagogies find their origin in the theorising of Henry Giroux (2000, 2004) who conceptualised public pedagogies as a form of activism to demonstrate the public and political nature of teaching and learning. Having been developed from this early work, public pedagogies are understood as a pedagogy of and for the public (Biesta, 2012; Sabeti, 2015; G. C. Savage, 2010; G. C. Savage, Hickey-Moody, & Windle, 2010) as well as asserting that learning takes place in a wide variety of sites or public contexts beyond the school environment (Sandlin, Schultz, & Burdick, 2010). For looking at learning in the concert hall and how listening pedagogies are conceptualised, the theory of public pedagogy brings an awareness of the power imbalances that arise between listener and organisation, and listener and audience, as well as broadening the assumptions made about pedagogy and how it functions within an informal learning environment.

Communities of practice was a framework adopted in my Master’s thesis research to explain how learning arises from participation in wider social networks and interpersonal relationships as part of social and cultural activities however ultimately it is a limiting theory for explaining learning in public spaces (Adu, 2016; Andrew, Tolson, & Ferguson, 2008).
Research reveals that connectivity and social relationships aid in the development of individuals’ knowledge and listening capabilities by offering exposure to, and fostering familiarity with classical music which makes a lasting difference to the listener (Partti & Karlsen, 2010; Schuermans, Vandenabeele, & Loopmans, 2012; Wenger, 1996). The learning that transpires within a community of practice is also facilitated by organisations such as orchestras, both community and professional, in that the organisation situates the learning and provides the informal space and resources which enable learning to occur by being in relation to others (Nicholls, 2014).

Considering the interrelationships between public pedagogies, informal learning and communities of practice theory, the scope for musical knowledge acquisition is dramatically broadened. A space which this current study will work with to reflect the numerous theories for explaining the development of understanding and types of knowing available in the research field of music education. Some of the most interesting and relevant theories useful to this research project centre on developmental theories (Deliège & Sloboda, 1997; Stubley, 1992) investigating the relationship between skill, enjoyment and knowledge in supportive environments (Pitts, 2005b) and the relationship between music appreciation and other forms of knowing including the praxial (Elliott, 1995), the aesthetic (Capponi-Savolainen & Kiviärvi, 2007; Forney & Machlis, 2014; Gershon, 2010; Leinhardt, Crowley, & Knutson, 2002) and educational habituses (Prior, 2013; Sloboda, 1985).

Interestingly, despite these theories of how education occurs within informal contexts such as the concert hall, education and pedagogy themes within the field of literature on audience development in the arts are really yet to be explored by researchers in the arts in general and will become a focus for this research. It is commonly accepted that education forms one of the three key areas along with marketing and programming which constitute audience development activity (Kawashima, 2006a; Sigurjónsson, 2009). However, only a handful of works make explicit links between education and audience development. First is the twenty-two-page report by Rick Rogers (1998) published by the Arts Council of England which deals explicitly with education within audience development, however, Rogers provides no discussion on pedagogy or learning. Second is a Ph.D. thesis (1998) and two journal articles (1998, 2010) by Julia Winterson investigating the educational policies and practice of selected London orchestra and opera companies. Winterson’s work, while useful for understanding the policies and audience development practices, tends to focus on engagement and impact with schools and curriculum rather than pedagogy occurring within the concert hall itself. Clearly,
further research is greatly needed to understand education’s place within audience development especially the use and efficacy of the very tools of teaching and learning pedagogy.

**Experience**
Closely related to the fields of education and listening is the area of research on experience in learning. A range of explanations of the significance of experience emerges from the literature which all hold in common the role of experience in facilitating learning, although experience does not necessarily constitute learning (Kronenburg, 2014; Merleau-Ponty, 1989; Radbourne, Johanson, Glow, & White, 2009). John Dewey (1963, 1966, 1980) who is a leading voice in the field of learning and experience asserts that to be educative, the experience must be differentiated, outward orientated, connective, enjoyable, have continuity, and be interrelated with prior experiences. Certainly, these requirements present definite challenges to organisations wishing to create listening pedagogies to engage listeners and audiences on the basis of experience. Stephanie Pitts (2005a, 2005b) who has also researched audience’s experiences of live chamber music at music festivals in the light of educational theory and offers some insight into how arts organisations approach and integrate ideas from this field of research.

**Audience and Concert Halls**
Two other closely related fields of research in the literature are the numerous and diverse works on ‘audience’ and ‘concert halls’. Though both stand alone, there are many overlapping authors and theories that inform both fields. Of note are the works on audience development, arts marketing and arts management, research which elaborates the communal dimension of audiences, and other areas which overlap into fields previously discussed including experience, education, and listening. Of particular note are the works by Njöróur Sigurjónsson (2005, 2009, 2010b), Howard Becker (1984), Bonita Kolb (2000, 2001b, 2005), and the various reports published by state and national arts councils and organisations.

Njöróur Sigurjónsson’s (2005, 2009, 2010b) work has already been discussed in relation to the important understanding it offers of listening existing in variations and being experienced in a multiplicity of ways. For this research project, Sigurjónsson’s work also offers a more dynamic approach to understanding audience development than that which is traditionally offered by the dominant paradigms of arts management and marketing.
Sigurjónsson suggests that John Dewey’s metaphor of ‘art as experience’ can underpin a new understanding of audience development, one which sees activities of arts organisation as serving multiple functions including the facilitation of learning through arts events (Sigurjónsson, 2009). For the current study, this approach to audience development also makes way for education to serve a vital role and creates a space in which listening pedagogies in the concert hall can be explored (R. Rogers, 1998).

Howard Becker’s seminal work *Art Worlds* (1984) is another text which strongly resonates with many of the key themes of this research project and the field of literature on audience and concert halls. Becker’s writing focusses on audiences- what they do, how they find belonging, what they need to know, and how they operate within different art worlds. Art worlds is also a collective and collaborative framework for thinking about audiences because Becker’s approach is inclusive and asserts that everyone has a role in creating the art world. Additionally, Becker’s sociological approach intersects productively with other theoretical frameworks such as those pioneered by Bourdieu (1984; 1990) which offer terminology to explain phenomena in the art worlds observed such as habitus, field, doxa, cultural capital and hysteresis (Grenfell, 2014; Hardy, 2014; Peterson, 1983). Furthermore, this combination of frameworks lends itself to exploring art worlds and the place of education, including listening pedagogies, in the contemporary concert hall.


There is also a range of works in the field of arts marketing and management which will be helpful when considering education within audience development, although ultimately these works are more concerned with issues of concert hall patronage and financial sustainability. Two of the major sources in the field of arts management and marketing are Bonita Kolb (2000, 2001b, 2005) and the various audience demographics and participation
reports often published by state and national arts councils (Australian Council for the Arts, 2010; 2015; Costantoura, 2001). Kolb’s works are ultimately more useful, not only because they are some of the few textbooks on marketing and management of cultural organisations, but because they demonstrate the history of management in cultural organisations and the application of sociological and cultural theory to current practices. In this way Kolb’s interests in audience engagement attest to the importance of audiences, their active and participatory role in concert halls, and the fact that contemporary audiences are distinctly different in their consumption, relationship and attitudes towards cultural organisations (B. M. Kolb, 2005). Held in a dialectic the ideas and attitudes towards listening and audience facilitated by arts organisations will be useful for the study ahead.

Research on arts participation, marketing and audience demographics like the works by Bonita Kolb generally focus on increasing the success of marketing to promote the arts (A. Brown, 2004; A. Brown et al., 2002; Hazelwood, Lawson, & Aitken, 2009; Maitland, 2006a; McDonald, 1999). On the whole, these documents promote a ‘culture for all’ attitude towards developing a musically or artistically engaged public. Key themes often encountered in such reports include: removing barriers to arts attendance (Baker, 2000; Dobson, 2010; Dobson & Pitts, 2011); targeting specific audience member types such as youth, families, or culturally aware non-attenders (Kawashima, 2006b; B. M. Kolb, 2001a; Winzenried, 2004); investigating the perceived relationships between arts organisation and the public (O’Sullivan, 2009; Roose, 2008); audience member preferences (Clopton, Stoddard, & Dave, 2006; Prieto-Rodríguez & Fernández-Blanco, 2000); aims to increase customer comfort (Kronenburg, 2014; Sigurjónsson, 2009, 2010b); and building in-depth profiles of audience demographics in relation to class, status, occupation and patterns of consumption to focus marketing efforts to capture various desirable audience factions (these are known as segmentation studies) (A. Brown et al., 2002; Clopton et al., 2006; B. M. Kolb, 2005; Peterson, 1992; Roose, 2008). These reports offer valuable insight into specific geographic contexts however, the usefulness
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9 The breadth of this area involving the various facets of audience development, arts development and arts marketing is extensive with each of these sub-areas covering vast amounts of literature. Such literature is often published by national art councils or government bodies through statistical research often focussing on quantitative terms of measuring each of these areas (e.g. participation, demographics) which coming from the marketing perspective they often serve is well justified. There are a number of Australian reports and documents which help to illustrate the unique position of arts and audiences in Australia which have been helpful in creating a context for the research at hand. Reports of particular note is the Saatchi and Saatchi report on ‘Australians and the Arts’ (Costantoura, 2001) and reports by the Australian Council for the Arts such as “More than Bums on Seats: Australian participation in the arts” (2010) and “Arts Nation: An overview of the Australian arts” (2015). Recently there has been a number of Australian authors are also involved in researching the unique place that the arts hold for Australians and the nature of Australian audiences including Lucy Bennett (2014), Ruth
of such research is limited by its recency and bias towards targeting audiences to attend arts events rather than providing opportunities to educate them.

**Listening Pedagogies**

In current educational theory, the term pedagogy denotes the theory and practice of education—the art of teaching. Therefore, to study pedagogy (though this is a complex term with many definitions influenced by context, discipline and ontology) is to understand how knowledge and skills are exchanged and to question what mechanisms, interactions, relationships and understandings are essential for these exchanges to take place. Frequently in European traditions of theory a distinction is made between pedagogy (the art of teaching children) and andragogy (the art of teaching adults), however, in this study, as in the wider use of the term in English speaking countries I do not discriminate between the two. The phenomenologist Max van Manen (2014) (one of the central methodological theorists used for this study) explains that the term pedagogy also carries an ethical implication and should address the question of what is good for the student and in their best interest. He takes his definition of pedagogy from the work of Langeveld who stated:

> Pedagogy is a science of experience; it is a human science… that is conducted or studied with practical intent… It is a science of experience because it finds its object (the pedagogical situation) in the world of lived experience. It is a human science because the pedagogical situation rests on human science… it is practical because all this is brought to bear in the practical process of bringing up and educating children (Langeveld cited in van Manen, 2012, p. 13).

From Langeveld, we come to understand that pedagogy is a practical method rooted in lived experience. Van Manen goes on to explain that this method and practice is “in the routine and reflective, habituated and deliberate, preconscious and conscious practices” (2012, p. 10). These are the spaces, places and relationships in which I focus my efforts in the current study. True to this definition, this study remains focussed on the practical working out of this philosophical construct—what orchestras actually do in their efforts to help audiences know and understand through experience.

Rentschler (1999), Heath McDonald (1999), and Tony Bennett, Michael Emmison and John Frow (1999) whose work is also of note.
In publication there are a range of pedagogies specific to listening to music, some of which have already been covered in the historical review in part 1 of this literature review. It is important to differentiate between those pedagogies which simply develop declarative knowledge about composers, historical context, the orchestra in general or music styles or genres and those pedagogies which instead use listening to develop other musical skills and procedural knowledge. There is a range of programs and courses in publication designed to specifically develop skills and knowledge for listening attentively such as Murry Schafer’s (1969) *Ear Cleaning*, Judy Johnson’s (2001) *Listening to Art Music* and a host of others belonging to various music education philosophies (see Ceraso, 2018; Conlon, 2009; Forney & Machlis, 2014; Gillan, 2015). Similarly, there is also a need to differentiate between those pedagogies which are designed to be used in formal learning contexts such as school and those able to be utilised in informal contexts such as the concert hall. Although neither is currently well researched, there is more literature in the former context, and there remains contention as to how these pedagogies can be organised, whether they should be sequential, developmental or integrative.

In practice, as evidenced in concert descriptions and press releases by various orchestras, there are efforts to explicitly teach attentive listening in concert halls. As already discussed in part 1 of the literature review, Paul Rissmann is a leading pedagogue working with professional orchestras to design educational programs for both children and adults using digitally projected images, narration, orchestral excerpts and inviting audiences to perform as equals with the orchestra (Melbourne Symphony Orchestra, 2015; RTÉ National Symphony Orchestra, 2010; Thwaites, 2015). One example of his listening pedagogies at work in the concert hall with adults is in his *Naked Classics* concerts featuring a single large-scale symphonic work. The first half of the concert is presented as an analysis and guide through the work with musical extracts played by the orchestra and interviews with the musicians. The second half the concert is an uninterrupted performance of the full work (Rissmann, n.d.; Royal Scottish National Orchestra). Rissmann has also lead mass concerts such as the yearly ‘BMW LSO at Trafalgar Square’ concert where audiences have learnt and performed complex rhythms to clap in time with the orchestra (Rissmann, 2016), as well as publishing a variety of listening guides which are available on YouTube (for example see Philharmonia Orchestra UK London, 2009, 2010, 2013). Similar projects have been undertaken locally including the *Ears Wide Open, A Voyage of Musical Discovery* and *Meet the Music* concert series directed by Richard Gill (Centre:, 2019; Quinn, 2016; Westlake, 2018). However because empirical
research has yet to be conducted on these models and they remain firmly in the domain of practice only, concerts and practices such as these remain stand alone occurrences.

Similarly, in recent years, social media has become another platform which augments the work of audience developers in concert halls. Mediums including YouTube videos, vlogs, podcasts, blogs and multimedia have been used creatively to help introduce listeners to the canon of Western art music. A notable example is the work of Victor Craven (2009a, 2009b, 2019) who regularly collaborates with orchestras around the world to present accompanying animations parallel in concert. Outside the concert hall the YouTube channels InsideTheScore (2017) and The Listeners’ Guide (2018); The Listener’s Club blog by Timothy Judd (2019); and the recent series of David Walliams Marvellous Musical Podcast (Townsend & The Dorsett Brothers, 2019) are all creators continually generating content in the field of listening pedagogies, but like the concert models mentioned above remain isolated incidents. The current study will seek to understand these types of models for education and theorise how learning works as part of listening experiences.

**Orchestras in Australia**

Though briefly covered towards the conclusion of part 1 of the literature review, it is vital to gain a wider perspective on Australian and global trends in orchestra organisation and practice. Broadly, the contemporary practice of Australian orchestras appears to be aligned with the practices of other orchestras around the world (Wainwright, 2013). The most updated authority on Australian music-making organisations, The Music Trust (2016) cites that there are a range of orchestras operating in full-time and part-time capacities such as professional, ‘pro-am’ (professional-amateur), community, youth, school and specialist orchestras (such as orchestras for opera, ballet or specialising in new and world musics).

A survey of the websites of all of Australia’s professional orchestras, based in each of Australia’s six states, suggests significant similarities in their approaches to audience development and education. On a par with similar international orchestras, there has been a steady increase in the number of self-professed educational activities which take place each year since 2001 (Department of Communications Information Technology and the Arts, 2005). Every organisation organises these events through a dedicated administration team of education and/or community outreach part-time and full-time staff. Every professional orchestra also offers a range of education concert series often catering for families, early childhood and school
aged children, and publishes a range of teaching resources including teachers’ notes, apps, and digital media.

In addition to these children’s education concerts and resources, orchestras also perform a range of concerts following, for the most part, the traditional programming of famous dead composers which are portrayed as being serious or traditional symphonic music performed in the formal concert hall setting. It has been observed that due to diminishing and graying audiences that the programming of these concerts is becoming increasingly conservative though some orchestras are choosing to mix familiar with new repertoire in carefully selected proportions (Department of Communications Information Technology and the Arts, 2005). These concerts are predominantly aimed at adults and sometimes include educational information such as programs and pre-concert talks. A minority of orchestras are also making these listening aids available online before concerts. From my survey of publicly available material (as no empirical research was located), though these projects seem to work at enhancing the listening experience, it is unclear from the literature and promotion by these orchestras whether these events and resources are intended to be pedagogical or if they were designed with listening in mind.

According to their websites, most orchestras demonstrate that the organisations cater to a variety of audiences and music interests. In addition to concerts for children, schools, families and traditional concerts, these include: selections of popular ‘classical’ music presented in more relaxed atmospheres (e.g. Sunday afternoon, outdoor concerts, picnic concerts); audiences interested in film music (movie concerts where the film is projected onto a screen above the orchestra who plays the music live); performances of the orchestra with popular music artists; and specialist interests such as themed concert series on ‘world’ music or ‘modern’ music. Many of Australia’s professional orchestras also access a wider variety of audiences through tours to regional towns in their respective states and occasionally tour internationally to parts of Asia.

However, contemporary orchestral music for the concert hall in Australia extends beyond professional orchestras, casual or even professional-amateur collaborations (The Music Trust, 2016). The most current survey conducted by the Music in Communities Network estimated conservatively that there are 130 to 170 community orchestras\(^\text{10}\) in Australia based in metropolitan, suburban, regional and remote areas, most of which have been serving their

\(^{10}\) Excluding youth symphony orchestras and subsidiary ensembles part of larger organisations.
communities for over 20 years with an average of 40 participants playing an average of seven concerts per year (Masso, 2012; The Music Trust, 2016). These orchestras, while traditionally focussing on Classical music, perform a wide range of genres and over half of Australia’s community orchestras commission new music or play arrangements by members. Community orchestras are also vital to rural and regional communities who are more likely to access culture via community arts organisations, according to a 2015 report published by the Australian Council for the Arts (Australia Council for the Arts, 2015) and other sources (see Brann-Barrett, 2014; Hardcastle, 2015; Terracini, 2007).

The reports mentioned above and a handful of academic commentaries (see Kay, 2000; McHenry, 2009; Radbourne, 2003; Scollen, 2008) that comment on the management or connection between community arts organisations and their community are the only information currently documented about Australian community orchestras. Even less information contained within these reports comment on community orchestras in regional or remote areas (see Hardcastle, 2015). Consequently there is no information on the use of audience development or education in community orchestras except for one study which investigated the perceptions and experiences of listening and being an audience at concerts given by a community orchestra in regional Queensland (Nicholls, 2014). The study also investigated the ways that audience members were participatory and the competencies they employ as listeners.

**Related and Recent Research**

There are four authors who represent the most directly relevant commentaries and research on orchestra educative practices and listening pedagogies. The first two - Julia Winterson and Christopher Wainwright - examine the educative practices of professional symphony orchestras, which while useful to the present study, both seem to focus more on the school outreach or musician-based programs. Winterson’s Ph.D. thesis (1994) and two subsequent journal articles (1998, 2010) focussed on the impact of symphony orchestra education projects on learning participants. Though the research explicitly looks more at in-school education programs facilitated by orchestra instrumentalists and orchestra education policy (which is not the focus of the current study), Winterson’s research certainly provides some inspiration and direction for thinking about education within professional orchestras and arts organisations.
Churchill Fellow and general manager of the Adelaide Youth Orchestra, Christopher Wainwright (2013), completed a report outlining a survey of participatory music education facilitated by orchestras in the UK, Germany, and the USA. Wainwright observed that music education by orchestras in Australia tends to be passive, and as I have also, underresearched, and sought to find examples of participatory education delivered by musicians which gave students more time to think through planning and design processes, precise feedback, extending questioning strategies rather than cued responses, and aimed to extend rather than change students’ initial ideas (Galton, 2008; Mantie, 2012; Wainwright, 2013). The study usefully concludes by recommending that orchestra-presented learning needs to be seen as a part of lifelong learning and that orchestra administrators need to maintain curiosity and awareness of what is occurring in Australia and around the world (Wainwright, 2013). Unfortunately, however, the study is very vague and tends to focus on school-based learning and making music, and does not acknowledge the role of audience development, pedagogy or the presence of learners in concert halls.

The other two authors providing relevant research and guidance are Sidsel Karlsen (2009, 2014; 2008) and Adam Tinkle (2015). While Karlsen’s work is not situated in the concert hall but rather at music festivals, her study provides useful methods for the present study that seeks to understand music learning experiences, theories of how musical knowledge is acquired in informal learning settings and the importance of experience in creating learning. Finally, Adam Tinkle’s (2015) article is the only research located so far that explicitly focuses on pedagogies of listening, although again this is not in the concert hall setting. Tinkle investigated how post-Cagean experimental music and sound art can be used to explicitly teach listeners how to listen by transforming auditory perception in everyday life. Although Tinkle’s research context lies well outside the realms of the contemporary concert hall, his work demonstrates that pedagogy and education can facilitate change and enhance the audience-listener experience. The work is also helpful to the present study in that the research is situated within community arts contexts which is an area of interest for this study.

Further afield in academic writing on audience development are other key works and authors which are potentially very useful when transferred to thinking about the contemporary concert hall, listening pedagogies and audiences. One area of research and practice which surpasses efforts in cultural organisations is the field of informal learning and pedagogy within museums. Karen Knutson and Gaea Leinhardt (2002; 2002; 2004) have written particularly about the use and place of ‘learning conversations’ in museums and the ways in which the
museum organisations can achieve a balance between the priorities of education, enjoyment, and experience for patrons. Learning conversations may well be a useful framework for understanding interpersonal relationships in the concert hall, particularly conversations between audience members.

**Summary**

In this chapter I have surveyed the literature to provide a background to the research and key ideas relating to listening pedagogies, audience development, education and the contemporary concert hall. In part 1 of the chapter I presented a historical overview which traced the origins of contemporary audience development practices. In this article I made an argument for considering the concert hall as a space where practices have and continue to evolve, rather than a space which preserves and conserves tradition. In part 2 I examined the conceptual frameworks and theory related to listening, music education, experience, audience and concert halls, and listening pedagogies. I synthesised these arguments to identify the gaps and questions that remain unanswered by the current literature and highlighted the complexity of the topic which rests across rather than within individual fields of research. To conclude the literature review I briefly outlined current trends in the practice of listening pedagogies, education and audience development with a particular focus on the practices of Australian orchestras in professional, metropolitan and regional contexts.
CHAPTER 3
Research Design

Introduction
This chapter explains the research design for this research project with the inclusion of an published article and a commentary article that provide elaborations on the practice of the chosen research methodology and methods. As a result, this is a longer chapter which not only explains the research methodology and methods, but also makes an innovative contribution to knowledge relating to the praxis of phenomenological research and bracketing using mindfulness. By means of orientation, I have organised this chapter into five sections:

- Research Methodology
- The Research Contexts and Participants
- Methods for Data Generation
  - Includes the article: Innovating the Craft of Phenomenological Research Methods Through Mindfulness
- Methods for Data Analysis
  - Includes the commentary article: A Methodological Coda
- Research Ethics

The research methodology section explicates the underpinning philosophy of phenomenology, details the hermeneutic approach taken for this study and offers supporting theoretical frameworks for the specific research of experience and listening within the concert hall. The research contexts and participants section outline the three orchestras selected for this study and the participant groups identified as research participants.

The methods for data generation section explains the tools and protocols developed for generating the data and includes an article published in the journal Methodological Innovations which problematises aspects of undertaking phenomenological research with which I wrestled theoretically: the practices of bracketing, reflexivity in research and the eidetic reduction. This article gives further detail into my specific use of phenomenology as a methodology for research and illustrates a minor innovation I have developed using mindfulness practices
borrowed from Dialectical Behaviour Therapy (DBT). In this article I also address the explicit development of these specific phenomenological practices for social research and the position of the phenomenologist as both researcher and participant. To illustrate my use of this innovation, I draw on examples from the current study.

Next, I outline the research methods for data analysis employed and how phenomenology was practiced in the later stages of the research process. This section includes a commentary which is under review which offers some later reflections on bracketing and the researcher’s positionality within phenomenological research practice. The final section addresses the matter of research ethics and researcher footprint.

**Research Methodology**

Underpinning all research are assertions about the nature of knowledge, how it exists, what exists and how it should be best observed and measured (Babbie, 2005; Creswell, 2009, p. 360; Swedberg & Dodd, 2015; Wellington, 2000). The present study was framed primarily by a constructivist research paradigm that asserts knowledge is socially constructed (epistemology) and situated within both historical and cultural contexts (ontology). Consequently, the research carried out inductively (that is bottom-up), aimed to describe, understand and empathise, and positioned the researcher as both participant and interpreter (Boden, Kenway, & Epstein, 2005; Carter & Little, 2007; Thomas, 2003; Veresov, 2010). This point is of significance in relation to the central research interest which was to qualitatively understand the experiences of audience members and their learning in the concert hall.

Because of the focus and interest on learning through listening as experienced by audience members, I situated this research within the tradition of phenomenology and applied philosophy. Phenomenology was first and foremost selected because of its focus on individual human experience or lifeworlds as the primary source of understanding and meaning (Giorgi, 2012; van Manen, 1997). Phenomenology was also selected for its humanistic inquiry and orientation to phenomena which is achieved through rich description and a bracketed interpretative approach (Heidegger, 2005; Husserl, 2012). I also selected phenomenology specifically for this pioneering study out of a fundamental need to remain anchored in the immediacy of the human experience of listening and learning, yet open theoretically to how best explain the essential structure and qualities that are present in effective pedagogies of listening (Finlay, 1999; Randles, 2012; Vagle, 2014). I will, therefore, be able to draw on the
many fields of literature reviewed so far and move towards theorising a pragmatic philosophy of education as audience development within the contemporary concert hall.

In respect to phenomenology, I acknowledge that it is first and foremost a philosophic tradition stemming from the works of Kant and Hegel. However, it is the work of Edmund Husserl and his expansions of his teacher Franz Brentano that launched phenomenology as a significant intellectual movement (M. Russell, 2006; B. Smith & Woodruff Smith, 1995). In the texts *Logical Investigations* (published in 1901), *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology* (published in 1913) and *Cartesian Meditations* (published in 1931) Husserl asserts a philosophy distinguished from previous thinkers whose works had focussed on logic, ethics or questions of metaphysical meaning.

From this philosophic tradition, the underlying assertions about the *lebenswelt* (lifeworld) as “the absolute here” (Husserl, 1999, p. 360) and the value of making observations through the natural attitude, or what can be understood as a person’s consciousness, were adapted to form a methodology for qualitative research (Bernet, Kern, & Marbach, 1993; Dowling, 2007). Therefore, from the perspective of the researcher, there are many methodological options to select from which stem from Husserl’s transcendental phenomenology.11 One of the most distinctive and accessible extensions of phenomenology is offered in the work of Hans-Georg Gadamer, understood as philosophical hermeneutics.

**Phenomenology and Philosophical Hermeneutics**

Gadamer’s work was the first to apply phenomenology to understanding the meanings of the arts, including music, modelled on what he called “practical philosophy” (Gadamer, 2001, pp. 78-81). Gadamer’s approach to phenomenology moves beyond framing meaning as opposites, as was reflected in previous formulations of phenomenology by Husserl, and works with a more Heideggerian and dialogical formulation to form a complex interpretive method (Malpas, 2018; Todres & Wheeler, 2001; van Manen, 2014). Gadamer’s use of dialectics and creating hermeneutic understandings was also useful for developing a highly pluralistic interpretive

---

11 Beginning with Max Scheler’s 1970 text *The Nature of Sympathy* then in works by Husserl’s students Edith Stein who developed a phenomenology of empathy and faith, and Martin Heidegger who introduced ontological phenomenology. Other foundational thinkers who furthered phenomenology as a philosophy and explored the various types of experience and how meaning is made through them included Emanuel Levinas (ethical phenomenology), Maurice Merleau-Ponty (embodied phenomenology), Jean-Paul Sartre (existential phenomenology), Paul Ricoeur (critical phenomenology), Alfred Schutz (sociological phenomenology) and Jacques Derrida (deconstruction phenomenology) (Cerbone, 2006; Dowling, 2007; Randles, 2012; van Manen, 2014).
analysis of the phenomenon of pedagogies of listening in the contemporary concert hall (Gadamer, 1976).

Gadamer is also an appropriate methodological basis for this study because of the explicit and praxial way the observer (philosopher or researcher) is positioned within the question of experience and the phenomena. Zimmermann (2015) explains that in applying a philosophical hermeneutic approach to research “our perception of the world is not primarily theoretical or practical. We don’t assess objects neutrally from a distance, but [rather] they disclose themselves to us as we move around [and work in relation to them]” (p. 40). For this study, Gadamer’s hermeneutic philosophy guided my understanding of how theory and practice should come together and specifically at which points my own understanding and viewpoints could be integrated with those of the research participants. Gadamer’s work helped me to theoretically understand how these points of reference worked relationally with the meanings disclosed by the phenomena under study (pedagogies of listening, audience development and the contemporary concert hall). Such an understanding also gave a means of adding my own lived experience (as a teacher, musician, pedagogue etc.) while I interacted with the data as they were generated and analysed which brought an additional nuance to the study of the phenomena alongside the lived experience of the research participants. This distinctive applied and practical grounding was appealing to me as it also served as an interpretive methodology with the integration of philosophic hermeneutics which also aimed to produce an inherently pragmatic theoretical contribution (Gadamer, 1976; Matua & Van Der Wal, 2015).

Another phenomenological and methodological reference utilised in this study was van Manen’s *Phenomenology of Practice* (2014). Van Manen’s work is useful as a practical guide to researching and writing within the phenomenological research tradition, as well as clearly articulating how key elements adopted from the philosophy of phenomenology can be applied to pedagogical inquiries. These elements include a well-developed theory of phenomenology and empirically observed pedagogical practice (1979), theory on pedagogy and the lived experience (1997), and phenomenological insight into questions relating to what roles pedagogy does or should play. Van Manen’s work espouses the primacy of pedagogy in lived experience which is also evident in the nature of pedagogies of listening. Van Manen refers to this primacy and complexity as “pedagogical tact” or as he explains, “how one [the educator, learner, parent, participant] knows what to do when not really knowing what to do” (van Manen, 2015, p. 13).
Phenomenological researchers, including van Manen and others who established phenomenology as a research method/ology, assert that for a study to qualify as phenomenological, the researcher must employ three linked elements drawn from the philosophical tradition. First, description. Second, that the description be completed with the attitude of the phenomenological reduction. Third, that in doing this, the most invariant meanings be found within the set context (van Manen, 1997, 2014). Essentially these linked elements relate to how we relate to the lifeworld or lived experience of the research participants, how the researcher directs and understands the nature of consciousness or intentionality toward the phenomenon, and finally when and how bracketing is applied throughout the research (Vagle, 2014; van Manen, 2014). The details of how phenomenological research was undertaken and innovated for this study is explored in far greater detail in the article Innovating the Craft of Phenomenology Research Methods Through Mindfulness and A Methodological Coda included as part of this chapter.

Developing a Specific Framework for Understanding the Phenomenology of Listening and Education
Writers of the phenomenological tradition highlight that terms such as ‘experience’ and ‘the phenomenon’ require more precise definition within specific research contexts. In the current study, I draw on two theorists from outside the phenomenological tradition whose work relates to specific areas of this study and the question of experience. Namely education and experience, art experiences, meanings of listening, and how these specifically relate to the orchestral concert hall. By adding these theoretical perspectives from outside phenomenology and hermeneutic philosophy, I am shaping my specific methodology for this research study and forming a complementary theoretical frame for the particular phenomenon under investigation.

John Dewey- Art as Experience, Experience and Education
The first theorist I have added to shape a specific methodology for studying the phenomenology of learning and listening is the American educational philosopher, psychologist and education reformist, John Dewey. His works have been variously applied to research in the arts and his specific philosophy of experience and education acts as a solid foundation for understanding the nature of listening and experiences which are educative. This is important because, as in Dewey’s own words, “[a] philosophy of experience is needed otherwise [we] are at the mercy of every intellectual breeze that happens to blow” (Dewey, 1963, p. 113). There is, also for me, a very satisfying harmony between adopting Dewey’s pragmatic philosophy of experiential
education and phenomenology (the study of experience/the lifeworld) as an approach to research.

For this study, I have drawn on Dewey’s key texts included *Art as Experience* (published in 1934) and *Experience and Education* (published in 1938; both indexed in Sharpe, Simon, & Levine, 1991). These works theorise the pioneering, pragmatic and progressive notion that aesthetic experience is a key to learning. They also provide the groundwork for the post-Deweyan theories of experiential learning of Kolb (2015), Moon (2004) and Beard (2013) which are occasionally referenced in this study. While Dewey’s work specifically targets education in formalised institutions such as schools, his work is equally applicable to places where learning is not formalised such as in the concert hall. Other studies that have also successfully adopted Dewey’s works in similar learning contexts include Sigurjónsson (2005, 2009), Karlsen and Väkevä (2012), and Winterson (1994, 1998).

Central to Dewey’s theory of experience and his move toward a progressive approach to education were the use of dialectics (avoiding the dangers of either/or philosophy, particularly when moving from principles in abstract to their concrete application) and the intimate and necessary relationship between the process of education and actual experience. Dewey’s work also emphasises the consideration of social factors that operate in the making of individual experience and place equality between the ends and means of education, which creates meaning within experience (Dewey, 1963, 1966, 1998). Dewey’s ideas are also useful in clarifying what it means to enact the phenomenological notion of intentionality towards listening as an experience which is complementary with the specific hermeneutic philosophy explained above. This is reflected in Dewey’s *Art as Experience* (2005) where he described the essential way that experience, the process of living and intentionality are interconnected in the process of making meaning. Dewey wrote:

> Experience occurs continuously because the interaction of live creature and environing conditions is involved in the very process of living... Things are experienced but not in such a way that they are composed into an experience. There is distraction and dispersion; what we observe and what we think, what we desire and what we get, are at odds with each other (p. 36).

Dewey’s specific formulation of a practical theory of experience is pertinent to this research because he was very specific about the nature of and necessary qualities of educative experiences that are meaningful. These are theoretical aspects not addressed explicitly in the
phenomenological literature. In utilising Dewey’s work, I was able to be specific about the nature of meaningful educative experiences and use his language and criteria of ‘continuity’ and ‘interaction’ in my analysis. This was important, because as Dewey identified, “all genuine education comes about through experience… [however this] does not mean that all experiences are genuine or equally educative” (1998, p. 13).

**Christopher Small- *Musicking: The meanings of performing and listening***

I chose to tie phenomenology, philosophical hermeneutics and Dewey’s work more concretely to the context of the contemporary concert hall, listening and the experience of being an audience using the work of Christopher Small (1996, 1998, 1999). Stylistically, Small’s work offers a useful model for developing thick descriptions and deriving meaning from the phenomenon being described. Also, conceptually, Small’s theory of musicking supports the constructivist research paradigm adopted for this study and echoes the themes of Dewey’s philosophy of experience in a specific musical context — the orchestral concert hall. Some of the key definitions and assumptions I hold about the nature of listening in the orchestral concert hall for this research are exhibited in the following excerpts from Small’s seminal book, *Musicking: The meanings of performing and listening* (1998).

The fundamental nature and meaning of music lie not in objects… but in action, in what people do. It is only by understanding what people do as they take part in a musical act that we can hope to understand its nature and function (p. 8)

[I] propose a framework for understanding all musicking as a human activity, to understand not just how but why taking part in a musical performance acts in such complex ways on our existence as individual, social and political beings. What I am proposing is a way of interpreting… human musicking (p. 12)

If everyone is born musical, then everyone’s musical experience is valid. That being so, a theory of musicking, if it is to have any basis in real life, must stand up to being tested against the musical experience of every human being, no matter who he or she may be or how the experience was acquired (p. 13)

These quotes highlight some of the central tenets about the nature of music and listening in the concert hall that I adopted for this study. That music is a verb, an action in which people participate, and that musicking offers a theoretical concept for interpreting the social and
musical relationships at play. However more than this, Small’s concept of musicking is especially useful in this study as it places primacy on the experience of all listeners in the context of the concert hall, rather than those of composers, performers or limiting the study to only musical individuals. Small asserts that listening is active. As such, he positions the audience as vital participants with agency within the concert hall setting. One way that Small explains this is through the metaphor of ritual as action which can be observed in the “making, the wearing, the exhibiting, the advancing, the musicking” (1998, p. 16). Particularly this framework for explaining the significance of ritual and social relationships became a highly useful construct for guiding the analysis phase of the research.

Having adopted phenomenology and the specific hermeneutic philosophy of Gadamer as the overarching methodology, Dewey and Small complement this research orientation and work together in a symbiotic relationship. Small’s notion of musicking is of vital importance because it establishes the audience and the listener as vital parts of creating meaning rather than the art form or performer as the holder of meaning. Likewise, Dewey’s philosophy includes the nature of experience on the part of the individual listener and the ways in which the audience contributes to art through their engagement. Dewey and Small also theorise some of the questions of role and status, which are fundamental to the experience of the concert hall. While Dewey is not explicit in the role and status the audience has, Small highlights the ways in which meaning is created by ‘anyone’ who contributes to the nature of the event and illustrates how this is witnessed in the concert hall.

To summarise, in the methodology formulated for this research project is a pragmatically orientated approach to theorising the phenomenology of listening and learning in the orchestral concert hall. Beginning with the philosophic work of phenomenology, I adopted the works of Gadamer (hermeneutic philosophy) and van Manen (phenomenology of practice) to construct a foundation for understanding the experiences and lifeworlds of the research participants. To complement and tailor this phenomenological methodology to this particular study and research context I introduced the works of Dewey (art as experience, experience and education) and Small (musicking and the orchestral concert hall). In the next section I present the research methods which were employed as part of the design for this project.
The Research Contexts and Participants
Having situated my research within a phenomenological philosophical tradition, in this section I turn more specific attention to the research methods used in this phenomenological study of listening pedagogies in the concert hall. Here I provide an overview of the processes for selecting research sites and recruiting individual research participants. A thorough descriptive overview of each research site and detailed profiles of the individual research participants can be found in the three respective findings and discussion chapters.

Selecting Research Sites
The audience experience of listening to a community orchestra can be very different from the experience of listening to a professional orchestra (Nicholls, 2014). Likewise, different types of orchestras take different approaches to developing their audiences and creating learning experiences for them. In selecting sites for the present study, I hoped to include both professional and community orchestras, and orchestras operating in both metropolitan and regional settings. At the same time, the number of research sites had to be contained in order to fit within the scope of the project.

Including the community orchestra context is especially important given the paucity of studies that work with the community orchestra context from the perspective of audience development through education. Because of this understanding, I drew on reports on Australian orchestras (Australia Council for the Arts, 2015; Masso, 2012; The Music Trust, 2016) and web-based research to identify a short list of regional community, metropolitan community and professional orchestras. Each of these orchestras was then further explored using publicly available information on their website, social media, YouTube and news reports which included past programs, season planning, education brochures, ‘about us’ information, online programs, online videos and annual reports. Ultimately, the orchestras that I approached demonstrated through publicly available material a commitment to education, community development and involvement, and a variety of concerts which could target various audiences to represent the current diversity of the contemporary concert hall in Australia. I limited the study to Australian orchestras in order to give a similar overall context as well as being a way to generate data and analysis in a space which is generally under-represented or not represented at all in the literature. Australian orchestras were also selected to provide rich data because I could access the sites personally several times. Eventually, I settled on three orchestras to
include in the study: one metropolitan professional orchestra (PSO), one metropolitan community orchestra (MCO), and one regional community orchestra (RCO).

**Participant Groups**
Within each research context, I identified two groups of stakeholders whose firsthand experiences of listening and learning would give the most relevant and contrasting perspectives on the phenomenon in the contemporary concert hall. The first group were audience members and listeners who attend concerts by each orchestra. The second group of participants were the arts organisers; that is, staff and managers of each orchestra, particularly those directly involved in coordinating education for listeners. My experiences as the researcher added a third perspective to research, which I recorded via field notes made during concert observations and other contact with each of the orchestras. Figure 3.1 details the number of each type of participant group at each research site. The number of participants recruited are within parameters for qualitative and phenomenological research espoused by van Manen (1997), Vagle (2014) and Finlay (1999).

*Figure 3.1 - Summary of the research sites and participants*
Methods for Data Generation
I developed three strategies to generate data at three research sites:

1. I used semi-structured interviews (Bickman & Rog, 2009; Qu & Dumay, 2011; Rowley, 2012) to generate data from the perspectives of the arts institution.
2. I used focus groups (Bloor, Frankland, Thomas, & Robson, 2001; Edmunds, 1999; Ho, 2006; Morgan, 1996) to generate data from the perspectives of audience participants.
3. I used field observations to generate and record additional data from my own perspective as the researcher.

Interviews and Focus Groups
I developed a protocol for conducting the semi-structured interviews and focus groups with questions and a process sequence for the researcher to use before and after data generation. Each of these protocols was refined during a piloting process where I trialled the questions (which I had developed as sub questions of the research questions provided on page 12) with individuals and groups of volunteer research participants. This pilot process helped identify gaps in the data generation process and was also an opportunity for me to practise setting up and using recording devices, to trial reflective processes, to develop the mindfulness to support bracketing, and to refine my skills as a reflective and reflexive researcher. See Appendix B (p. 232) and C (p. 234) for the interview and focus group protocols that I finalised through the pilot study trials which were then utilised with research participants and at each research site. Tables 3.1 and 3.2 outline a summary of the recruitment, data generation strategy and analysis method used for interviews and focus groups at each research site.

Observations and Field Journal
The third data generation strategy (see table 3.3) involved observations and field journal of reflections which I completed during concerts given by each orchestra. This approach was very much inspired by Sigurjónsson’s (2009) observations of orchestral events in that the observations provided a firsthand experience of each orchestra’s practice, use of pedagogy and audience development strategies. However, this study extends this practice by using additional data generation strategies and applies a phenomenological research methodology. I also sought out other qualitative research where concert observations had been used as part of the data generation to understand the successes, limitations and how observations had been utilised as
data in classical and orchestral concert halls,\textsuperscript{12} learning at music festivals\textsuperscript{13} and engagement with the arts.\textsuperscript{14} General explanations of observation as part of research methods\textsuperscript{15} and phenomenological research\textsuperscript{16} also aided the development of using observations as part of a research strategy. Once the protocol had been developed it was trialled at two concerts as a pilot before being used at the research sites.

Table 3.1 - A summary of research strategy 1: Interviews with arts organisers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Participants</th>
<th>Participant Recruitment Methods</th>
<th>Data Generation Method</th>
<th>Data Analysis Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Regional Orchestra Organisation** – 3 members of the organising committee (actual recruitment = 3 participants)  
Pseudonyms: Regional Community Orchestra (RCO) arts organisers have pseudonyms starting with letters “Ro”  
**Metropolitan Community Orchestra** – 3 members of the organising committee (actual recruitment = 3 participants)  
Pseudonyms: Metropolitan Community Orchestra (MCO) Arts organisers have pseudonyms starting with letters “Mo”  
**Professional Orchestra** – 3 members of staff (preferably education/ community outreach staff) (actual recruitment = 4 participants)  
Pseudonyms: Professional Symphony Orchestra (PSO) Arts organisers have pseudonyms starting with letters “P” | Letter addressed to the arts organisers including an invitation to arts organisers to participate in the research project; and request for permission to attend concerts and recruit audience member participants  
30 to 60-minute semi-structured interview at a time convenient to the participant (maybe via telephone) and a follow-up interview as needed | Total interviews:  
RCO= 3  
MCO= 5  
PSO= 6 | 1. Transcription  
2. ‘Back brain’ intuitive note taking  
3. Inductive coding  
4. Thematic coding and analysis  
5. Mapping themes and connections (these methods were used in an iterative and cooperative process in the light of van Manen’s (2014) six key activities for undertaking phenomenological research) |

\textsuperscript{12} Crawford, Bagnall and Light’s 2014 case study which focussed on the use of mobile devices to network and engage audiences with a UK based professional symphony orchestra and Wainwright’s 2014 Churchill Foundation report on observing educational practices of several professional orchestras based in the UK, Europe and US.

\textsuperscript{13} See Karlsen’s 2009 and 2007 descriptions of using observation in a case study to capture understandings of musical learning at a Swedish music festival.

\textsuperscript{14} See Maitland’s 2008 guide to measuring engagement in the context of audience development, and Radbourne, Johansen, White and Glow’s 2010 guide to measuring quality and audience experience in concert halls.


\textsuperscript{16} Excellent examples and clear explanations are given in Finlay’s 2009 text \textit{Applying Phenomenology in Research: Problems, principles and practice} and van Manen’s 1979 text \textit{The Phenomenology of Pedagogic Observation}. 
### Table 3.2 - A summary of research strategy 2: Focus groups with audience members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Participants</th>
<th>Participant Recruitment Methods</th>
<th>Data Generation Method</th>
<th>Data Analysis Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Audience members (ideally 5-8 members) Pseudonyms starting with letters &quot;Ra&quot;</td>
<td>Invitation for participants offered at the pre-concert talk (given by researcher). Invitation via orchestra’s social media and email subscribers</td>
<td>30 to 60-minute focus group after concert attended by audience members Focus group participants also fill out a ‘profile’ for themselves providing background and useful demographic information</td>
<td>1. Transcription 2. ‘Back brain’ intuitive note taking 3. Inductive coding 4. Thematic coding and analysis 5. Mapping themes and connections (these methods were used in an iterative and cooperative process in the light of van Manen’s (2014) six key activities for undertaking phenomenological research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan audience members at a community orchestra concert (ideally 5-8 members) Pseudonyms starting with letters “Ma”</td>
<td>Invitation via pre-concert talk, program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience members at a professional orchestra concert (ideally 5-8) Pseudonyms starting with letters “Pa”</td>
<td>Invitation via orchestra’s social media and email subscribers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total participants and focus groups: RCO= 6 (1 focus groups) MCO= 7 (1 focus group) PSO= 5 (2 focus groups) |

### Table 3.3 - Summary of research strategy 3: Researcher observations and field journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Participant</th>
<th>Data Generation Method</th>
<th>Proposed Data Generation Contexts</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myself as researcher With an awareness that I also bring my experiences of being pedagogue, subjective culture consumer, subjective ‘member’ of the cultural context, and in a community orchestra context possibly as ‘insider’ (depending on the organisation selected)</td>
<td>Observations of orchestra concerts/events- recorded on template and checklist Field notes recording impressions and any informal conversations had as a result of attending the concert as an ‘audience member.’ Collection of concert artefacts – e.g. ticket stubs, emails from orchestra regarding the concert, advertisements of the concert, information about the concert published on the orchestras website, social media posts regarding the concert, program notes or handouts to the audience</td>
<td>GOAL: to observe professional and community orchestras in a variety of contexts and concert formats, with a diversity of target audience members and environments broadly representational of the ‘contemporary concert hall’. Professional orchestra performances including ‘mainstage’ (‘classical’ music), children’s concerts, concerts outside the home venue of the orchestra, popular classical music concerts, movies in concert shows… Regional community orchestra concert/event- at least 2 (total RCO concerts observed = 3) Metropolitan community orchestra concert/event- at least 2 (total MCO concerts observed = 3)</td>
<td>Writing post observation thick descriptions Summarising key practices of concerts and noting similarities and differences across the three cases and within each case Using data to construct objective description of the orchestra’s audience development practices Analysis across data sources (e.g. observations, artefacts, field notes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data generated through concert observations and field notes provided an invaluable overview and appreciation of orchestra and concert practices to bring together the perspectives of the arts organisations as organiser-pedagogues and the experiences of audience-listeners as learners in each context. The observations included collecting and analysing artefacts gathered at each concert (e.g. ticket stubs, programs, screenshots of online advertising and notification.
material) and field observations recorded before, during and after the concert event on a paper-based concert observation protocol which was developed specifically for the project (Rapley, 2007).

In preparing this protocol, I analysed specific examples from the literature including the ‘Musical Event and its Conditions’ by DeNora (2000, p. 49), Sigurjónsson’s own ‘Event Review’ schema (2009, p. 108), and Karlsen’s pro-forma for event observation (2007, p. 60) because I had identified them as useful guides during the literature review. Having reviewed each example and my research goals, I selected elements that were relevant and could be adapted for this project. I also included other basic ideas and elements from these examples such as noting the repertoire, program, time, setting and using a mixed format of tick boxes and extended note-taking space. By applying my understanding of mindfulness and phenomenology, I then expanded the examples to include pre, during and post-observation activities, and other DBT mindfulness practices. In the appendices I have included both a blank version of the finished concert observation protocol (see Appendix D – p. 238) and a scanned completed version (see Appendix E – p. 243) to demonstrate how the protocol was practically used. Following the advice given by Vagle (2014), Harvey (2013) and van Manen (1979, 1997), I very intentionally implemented their guidelines and some of their writing exercises for developing phenomenological reflexivity. Ultimately the completed concert observation protocols, field notes and research diary served their purpose in not only being a good space for reflective writing but also vital memory aids during the analysis process (Burgess, 1981).

Chan, Fung, and Chien (2013) and Drummond (2007) explain along with other authors on research methods that researchers must make every effort from the outset of the research project to the conclusion of the data analysis to mitigate the biases they bring. In my case, these biases stem from my position as a pedagogue, classical musician, community orchestra member, and subjective culture consumer. In the next section of this chapter I address how I theorised and practiced this notion of bracketing in further detail in the form of an article published in the journal Methodological Innovations. This article comes out of my wrestle with the intersection between theory and practice as a phenomenological researcher and how I addressed the often elusive and slippery issues of the phenomenological reduction and bracketing. In the article I present my elaborations on phenomenology as a method for qualitative data generation and an innovation I developed and applied in this research using mindfulness.
Innovating the Craft of Phenomenological Research Methods Through Mindfulness
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Abstract
To conduct qualitative social research requires not only a declarative knowledge of the research methods and methodology, but also a set of honed practical, applied skills. For beginning researchers, particularly those undertaking phenomenological research, the skills of bracketing, the phenomenological reductions and having an awareness of one’s positionality or relationship to their chosen research methods, participants and contexts is of significant importance. More generally, these skills are also required in other qualitative research disciplines under the guise of reflexivity or critical reflective practice. Regardless, these are notoriously slippery and require more than prior reading to translate from theory and philosophy into practice. There is literature which also identifies and highlights the disparity between theory, skill development and practice; however, these practicalities of how one can bracket or bridle and undertake reductions require further elaboration and guidance for how researchers can develop these applied skills of research. In this article, I propose and demonstrate that the therapeutic tradition of mindfulness as specifically practised in dialectical behaviour therapy can be used to de-mystify the practices of reflexivity and work specifically within the tradition of phenomenological reduction and bracketing. I also assert that this innovation can provide a practical tool to craft qualitative and phenomenological research and make achievable the original philosophical ideas which underpin phenomenological research. I begin by focusing on the theory of bracketing and reduction from the philosophic tradition of phenomenology as a framework for research methodology and methods, and then introduce the practical skill of mindfulness as prescribed in dialectical behaviour therapy as an innovation which can assist the researcher in developing these skills. I finish by illustrating the usefulness of mindfulness in undertaking phenomenological research drawing on examples from a current research project.
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Introduction
As a beginning researcher, the notion of researcher reflexivity and critical reflection in qualitative research seems theoretically simple during preparatory reading. However, in the field and when going about generating data, the actual practice of being reflexive and reflective while undertaking research becomes something far more elusive and slippery (Bloor and Wood, 2006; Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2011). Harvey (2013), Pillow (2003) and other voices in the qualitative methodological literature have described the difficulty of practising reflexivity as a lived aspect of undertaking qualitative research; particularly, the disparity which is often encountered between knowing that and knowing how. As Berger (2015) alludes, this aspect of doing research has the quality of being ‘here and there, now and then becoming… [an issue of]… now I see it, now I don’t’ (pp. 219, 226).

Indeed, there is a significant body of literature and many fine textbooks which describe and outline skills and theory relating to crafting successful qualitative research (e.g. see Bickman and Rog, 2009; Denzin and Lincoln, 2009; O’Toole and Beckett, 2010). Likewise, there are guides aimed at describing how critical thinking and reflection in research can be developed (Babbie, 2005; Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2014). Regardless, these practicalities of how one can bracket or bridle and undertake reductions require further elaboration and guidance for how researchers can develop these applied skills of research. In this article, I propose and demonstrate that the therapeutic tradition of mindfulness as specifically practised in dialectical behaviour therapy can be used to de-mystify the practices of reflexivity and work specifically within the tradition of phenomenological reduction and bracketing. I also assert that this innovation can provide a practical tool to craft qualitative and phenomenological research and make achievable the original philosophical ideas which underpin phenomenological research. I begin by focusing on the theory of bracketing and reduction from the philosophic tradition of phenomenology as a framework for research methodology and methods, and then introduce the practical skill of mindfulness as prescribed in dialectical behaviour therapy as an innovation which can assist the researcher in developing these skills. I finish by illustrating the usefulness of mindfulness in undertaking phenomenological research drawing on examples from a current research project.
However, while the knowledge about these issues can be learnt, the skills and ‘knowing how’ take work and ongoing development to master – if this is even possible (van Manen, 2015).

These things are part of the craft and ongoing development we as researchers undergo in undertaking social research. Furthermore, and more importantly, the effectiveness and rigour of any research method employed ultimately relies on the learning and crafting of these knowledge and skills, because the researcher is both the tool which implements both the data generation with participants, and the analyser-interpreter of the data (Wiles et al., 2013).

While the examples and theory explored in this article are drawn from the tradition of phenomenology as a methodology and method for research, there are similarities to be found between the phenomenological practice of bracketing and reduction, and the broader qualitative practices of reflexivity and critical self-reflection. Sometimes, these terms are used interchangeably in the methodological literature and at other times they are defined separately (Berger, 2015; May, 2010). However, for clarity and the discussion ahead, I will delineate them. Otherwise, these terms may become as May (2010) warned, ‘unduly philosophical…and at worst, destructive’ (p. 24).

Reflexivity, in the qualitative research tradition, is a practical skill and attitude by which a researcher is systematically aware of and attends to how knowledge is being constructed (Bloor and Wood, 2006). Elaborations on this basic definition have been offered by various authors and theorists within the field of qualitative methodology and methods such as consideration of what impact the researchers themselves make while researching or what Harvey (2013), Kvalsund and Hargreaves (2014) call the ‘researcher footprint’. Ho (2006), O’Toole and Beckett (2010), and Denzin and Lincoln (2002, 2008, 2009) also elaborate that the practice of conducting research reflexively includes the researcher having awareness and then actively mitigating their own biases, power and positionality in relation to research participants, the data generation processes, data analysis and the synthesis of writing. While this does not result in ‘objective research’, the empirical stance is formulated in accordance with the underlying ontological and epistemological foundations (Carter and Little, 2007; Creswell, 1998).

Like reflexivity, the notion of phenomenological reduction is similarly well theorised, which yet still becomes elusive when applied within the research tradition of phenomenology. There is a thicket of theoretical dispute which stems in part from philosophical roots, and these have resulted in diverse terminology being used within the literature, including the epoché (Husserl, 1964; Husserl et al., 2002), the eidetic reduction (Russell, 2006; van Manen, 2014), bracketing (Chan et al., 2013; Dowling, 2007; LeVasseur, 2003) and more recently bridling! (Dahlberg, 2006; Dahlberg and Dahlberg, 2004; Dahlberg et al., 2008; Vagle, 2009; Vagle et al., 2009).

However, these theoretical issues, like reflexivity explained above, are also practical skills which are learnt behaviours and therefore must be intentionally developed, practised and continually applied. They are essential skills involved in the very work of ‘doing research’ and crafting a viewpoint from which the researcher meta-cognates or thinks about their own thinking while undertaking research, and in doing so maintain a series of internal dialogues in various tensions with literary discussions, personal worldviews and theoretical frameworks (Engelsrud, 2005; Hammond, 2018; Subedi, 2006). As a result, be it the practice of reflexivity within the broader notion of qualitative research or within the specific practices of reduction within the phenomenological research tradition, there is a need for pragmatic guidance for beginning researchers in guiding them to develop these practically slippery skills essential to carrying out rigorous work in qualitative research (Berger, 2015; Depraz, 1999; LeVasseur, 2003; Pillow, 2003).

In this article I argue that mindfulness, particularly as practised in the ‘how’ and ‘what’ skills of dialectical behaviour therapy (DBT), presents practical skills for researchers to develop the required reflexive, critically reflective thinking skills required when undertaking qualitative research, specifically bracketing within phenomenological research. Specifically, I posit that the DBT approach to mindfulness is particularly helpful in developing skills to bracket the natural attitude and undergo the early reductions or epoché when studying participants’ and their own experience or lifeworld in phenomenological research. To begin with, I will briefly explore the philosophy which underpins a phenomenological approach to research and informs its application to social science research, then identify and analyse the common ground found between phenomenological research methods related to bracketing and the reduction and mindfulness. I conclude with a short explanation of how mindfulness was used in a recent phenomenological study to develop researcher reflexivity and the skill of bracketing which contributed towards the process of the early phenomenological reductions towards the epoché.

**Phenomenology: an outline of the philosophy as a framework for research methodology and methods**

Phenomenology is both a philosophy2 and a methodological3 basis for undertaking qualitative research. Three fundamental concepts frame both: lifeworld, intentionality and phenomenological reduction (Cerbone, 2006; Smith and Woodruff Smith, 1995). The first, lifeworld (Lebenswelt), is the central focus of phenomenology, the individual’s experiences, pre-reflectively and as free as possible from interpretation and cultural context (Dahlberg et al., 2008; Moran and Cohen, 2012; Wilson, 2015). Husserl’s insistence on the primacy of lived experience, developed particularly in his text *Cartesian Meditations* (Husserl), rejects the notion of
naturalism and the sovereignty of empirical science as the arbiter of truth (Husserl, 1960; LeVasseur, 2003). Instead, Husserl (1999) asserted that the real foundation is the life-world, ‘the absolute here’ (p. 153) or what he also called the natural attitude which is distinct from the scientific or theoretical attitude. This new basis for understanding is what sets phenomenology and the vast majority of social science research disciplines as distinct from previous philosophies which were concerned with the substance of knowledge (ontology), how what is known becomes known (epistemology), ethics or law (Bernet et al., 1993; Gadamer, 1976). Husserl (1999) explained why phenomenology offers a new philosophy of empirically understanding the world around us, including social and cultural dimensions:

The pre-given lifeworld is a subjective structure, it is the achievement of experiencing the prescientific life. In this, the meaning and the ontic validity of the world are built up of that particular world… which is actually valid for the individual experience. (p. 360)

The second fundamental concept, intentionality describes ‘the property of being conscious of something’ (Husserl, 1999: 70), which in itself is an easy statement to grasp, but practically is much harder to achieve, particularly for the beginning researcher. Intentionality represents the idea that one’s consciousness is always actional, meaning that consciousness is not so much something that one has, as it is something that one does (Moran and Cohen, 2012). Intentionality is also directional or pointed at something other than itself, and at the same time is indivisible from thinking or experience (LeVasseur, 2003).

Connected with the lifeworld, intentionality is consciousness oriented to the lifeworld and the outward experience of the natural attitude. Therefore, and importantly for developing the skill of reflexivity as a researcher, we need to become aware that as researchers we are simultaneously in and of the world. In other words, things around us or phenomena present themselves only partially or from the perspective to which we are presently oriented. The imperative of intentionality for the researcher then asserts the need and the possibility to understand the perspectives we as researchers inherently occupy and how we might gain a broader and more objective view and understanding in the process of conducting social research.

However, when reflective awareness (intentionality) is directed at one’s own experience of the lifeworld, the result is a shift in attitude from the natural to the phenomenological (van Manen, 2014; Wilson, 2015) or what has become known as the reflexive researcher stance. This shift indicates the third fundamental concept essential to undertaking phenomenological research which occurs in two stages called reductions. The first reduction, called the epoché, transcendental reduction or bracketing (all terms are used interchangeably in Husserl’s early works), was considered by Husserl as the indispensable method that the philosopher (or, in the case of phenomenological research, the researcher) must follow to observe the phenomena from all perspectives and draw together as much as possible a pure subjectivity (Bernet et al., 1993). The epoché is characterised by a ‘pure mode of apperception’ (Bernet et al., 1993: 62; Husserl, 1964) in which the researcher suspends or brackets out the natural attitude to gain as much as possible a non-judgemental and unbiased view of the lifeworld to reveal the underlying noetic-noematic structure of the lived experience of the research subject or phenomena as it is (Depraz, 1999; Moran and Cohen, 2012).

In phenomenology, after the epoché or transcendental reduction phases, one can undertake a second reduction to uncover the essences of experience and the lifeworld called the eidetic reduction. The eidetic reduction aims to understand the invariant meaning of objects or experienced phenomenon by bringing about moments of intuition about the object’s essence through the process of imaginative free variation (Depraz, 1999; Moran and Cohen, 2012). In imaginary variation, the inquirer varies all the possible attributes of the phenomenon in order to explore what is truly necessary or essential for the object or experience to be what it is. In a way, through these two reductions, the valid and subjective experience of one person is able to observe as objectively as possible observed with other experiences to find the universal truths or essences which make the experience or phenomenon what it is and not something else (Husserl, 1964; Husserl et al., 2002).

Although not identical or synonymous, in many ways the epoché and eidetic reductions can be equated with the reflexivity and reflection necessary to undertake rigorous and reliable qualitative research. Each time the researcher returns ‘back to the things themselves’ there is a necessity to lift the natural attitude which is accompanied by unhelpful judgements, past or present connections and the various lenses. Without the phenomenological reductions the lifeworld of the researcher is projected onto the phenomena under study, the research process, the data generation and analysis (Smith and Woodruff Smith, 1995; Todres and Wheeler, 2001; van Manen, 2002). Truly, the epoché and eidetic reductions enable the phenomena to be researched as it is, but these are learnt habits necessary for each effective qualitative researcher. It cannot be understated that the skills and knowledge to do this is not a natural aspect of the human psyche, but rather is something that researchers must learn, refine and apply throughout the research process and career.

**Problematic praxis in phenomenological research**

This notion of reduction or bracketing as it is referred to in phenomenological research has attracted significant attention in the methodology and methods literature (Dahlberg, 2006; Dall’Alba, 2009; Depraz, 1999; Dowling, 2007; Finlay, 1999; Todres, 2007; Vagle, 2014). Perhaps of most
significance has been the criticism of whether the methodology and methods can ever be fully separated from the researcher, their biases and pre-existing knowledge and which language should be used to explain the mechanisms of what the researcher does while undertaking phenomenological research (Dahlberg et al., 2008; Vagle, 2009; Vagle et al., 2009). As van Manen (1997) explains, to do ‘phenomenology is to attempt to accomplish the impossible: to construct a full interpretive description of some aspect of the lifeworld, and yet to remain aware that the lived life is always more complex than any explication of meaning can reveal’ (p. 8).

In response to this problem, philosophic phenomenologists and phenomenological researchers have developed protocols, processes, vocabulary, lists and ideas to attempt to bridge these gaps between philosophy and practice (Dahlberg and Dahlberg, 2004; Holloway and Todres, 2003; May, 2010; Wiles et al., 2013).

Armedio Giorgi (1997) was one of the first to apply the philosophy and fundamental concepts of phenomenology to empirical research by attempting to understand the qualitative meaning of experiential phenomenon rather than its measurement (Bloor and Wood, 2006; Dall’Alba, 2009). Giorgi articulates that for a study to qualify as phenomenological and faithful to the original Husserlian philosophy, the researcher must employ three linked elements. First, description. Second, that the description be completed with the attitude of the phenomenological reduction. Third, that in doing this, the most invariant meanings can then be found within the set context (Giorgi, 1997). Giorgi (1997) also highlighted that terms such as ‘experience’ and ‘phenomenon’ require more precise definition within the specific research context and that the role of consciousness (i.e. intentionality of consciousness) must be actively accounted for rather than ignored (Coffin, 2014).

Others, such as Creswell (1998) and Finlay (1999), established parameters which researchers can follow to ensure their research aligns with phenomenology’s clear epistemological position and strong philosophical grounding. Primarily, researchers must have a strong understanding of the underlying philosophical tradition of phenomenology (Vagle, 2014; van Manen, 2014). Palmer et al. (2010), Sorrell and Redmond (1995) also make recommendations for selecting methods, such as using in-depth interviewing with a small (up to 10) sample of participants, and reporting findings in highly descriptive ways such as using thick and rich description. In undertaking analysis, particularly in research seeking to understand the meaning of the lifeworld, Smith and Osborn (2008) and others espouse interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) as a two-stage interpretation process which creates a double hermeneutic (Joseph, 2014; Palmer et al., 2010). However, Vagle (2014) explains that this can perplex the researcher when trying to grasp the studied phenomenon and other authors such as van Manen (1997, 2014) and Vagle (2014) have critiqued IPA for similar reasons.

Although these researchers and theorists address some of the procedural issues of translating the philosophy of phenomenology into research methods and practices, there remains significant difficulty in realising the practice of the epoché and eidetic reductions (Finlay, 1999; Vagle, 2014). There is trouble for phenomenological researchers when selecting and using interview methods to elicit the participant’s experiences rather than affirming their own perspectives or opinions. There is also a tension between description and interpretation, and whether it is practically possible for the researcher to ever fully remove themselves from the phenomena and its observation (Dahlberg and Dahlberg, 2004; Dahlberg et al., 2008; Vagle and Hofsess, 2016). As Holloway and Todres (2003) challenge, how does one remain consistent and coherent with the philosophy of phenomenology while developing a flexible method to research the given context? Furthermore, how does the researcher develop an awareness of their own experience and bias in the first place (Kordeš, 2013; Williams and Treadwell, 2008)? And, how does a researcher learn the practice of reduction and continually bracketing or suspending their own assumptions, especially in an interviewing process? (Depraz, 1999; Engelsrud, 2005; LeVasseur, 2003). In addition to these practical problems, there are complex decisions to be made by the researcher in deciding if, when and how their own views should be integrated into the reporting of the study (Chan et al., 2013; Dahlberg et al., 2008; Drummond, 2007; Finlay, 1999; Vagle and Hofsess, 2016).

The problematic praxis of researcher reflexivity in undertaking qualitative research

These practicalities explored above also resonate with the related practices in qualitative research of researcher reflexivity and critical reflection. Berger (2015) explains that the goal of reflexivity is to allow the researcher to be aware, monitor and account for their values, beliefs, knowledge and biases impact the data generation, relationships with research participants and data analysis. Pillow (2003) extends this assertion stating that reflexivity and critical reflection are also a part of researcher practices to legitimise, validate and question research and are essential methodological tools necessary in all effective qualitative research. In many ways, these practices, synonymous with the phenomenological notion of bracketing, are essential to undertaking qualitative research (Bickman and Rog, 2009; Cohen et al., 2007). Likewise, the praxis of reflexivity is not an innate human skill, but rather like bracketing in phenomenology is one which has received significant commentary and remains a practice which must be both theoretically and practically developed.

In response to these practical challenges, I propose that mindfulness can provide explicit and practical skills needed to develop researcher reflexivity, and specifically the
practices of reduction when undertaking phenomenological research. I assert that in addition to providing practical guidance in skill development and protocol to enhance research practices in the field, mindfulness can also assist the aspiring researcher in remaining faithful to the underlying methodology and philosophy of phenomenology. There is a beginning field of scholarship in this area to which I am adding my own practice and experience (e.g. see Gokhale, 2016; Lemon, 2017; and Patrik, 1994). In the following section, I describe mindfulness and present the particular approach to mindfulness used in DBT as a practical framework to guide skill development, parallel with a phenomenological approach to data collection in qualitative research.

From the outset, I emphasise that mindfulness is not a catch-all or panacea for the limitations and challenges of undertaking research in a phenomenological way. Neither is mindfulness being recommended here as a ‘how to do’ phenomenological research. Rather, mindfulness can be enacted by researchers as a skill to bracket or reflexively work through critical thinking so that the natural attitude of the researcher which constantly thinks, analyses, makes connections, gets excited and distracted by the possibilities might be laid aside so that the researcher might instead ‘return to the things themselves’ (Husserl, 1964: 77). Mindfulness as a practical tool in phenomenological research is being suggested here as something that adds to the lived craft of phenomenology and assists researchers within other traditions in developing their reflexivity and skills in critical reflection.

Introducing mindfulness

‘Mindfulness’ connoting awareness, remembering and attention (also known as sati in the writings of the Buddha in Pali language) is an ancient practice and vital aspect of the ancient practice of Buddhist psychology found in all three originating paths (yanas) of Buddhism – Theravada, Mahayana and Vajrayana (Gokhale, 2016; Rosch, 2015). In the Western world, mindfulness – or paying attention with awareness to the present – now incorporates an extensive range of practices and ideas which are distinctly non-Buddhist (Rosch, 2015; Siegel et al., 2009). Some of these have recently come into vogue in popular culture in the form of colouring in books, apps and activities for health and well-being, often aimed at helping the user to become calm, centred or at peace. However, whether Buddhist or therapeutically based, calmness is not the end-goal of mindfulness (Hassed, 2011). Therefore, there is a need to clarify the definition of mindfulness before moving forward (Bishop et al., 2004).

Mindfulness has been empirically taken up by the field of psychology and therapeutic practice, which has resulted in a ‘thicket of terminological and interpretive dispute’ (Rosch, 2015: 274). The leading pioneer of mindfulness as espoused in therapeutic uses of mindfulness, Jon Kabat-Zinn (2003), defines mindfulness as ‘the awareness that emerges through paying attention on purpose, in the present moment, and non-judgementally to the unfolding experience moment to moment’ (p. 145). Bishop et al. (2004) published a seminal paper co-authored with 10 other researchers and practitioners to establish an operational definition of mindfulness. They suggest that mindfulness is ‘self-regulation of attention so that it is maintained on immediate experience, thereby allowing for increased recognition of mental events in the present moment… adopting a particular orientation toward one’s experience that is characterised by curiosity, openness and acceptance’ (p. 232). Others such as Hasted (2011) emphasise the importance of acceptance, suggesting that a moment of mindfulness occurs when the above-described awareness of the present experience simultaneously happens with acceptance (Siegel et al., 2009).

In the empirical Western therapeutic tradition, mindfulness practice is practised in two modes: focused attention and open monitoring, both of which derive from Zen, Vipassana and Tibetan Buddhism meditation traditions (Colzato et al., 2012). In focused attention, the consciousness is focused on a given object, for example, the breath, a particular somatic sensation or a tangible object, and the attention is continually brought back to the object when the mind wanders. This is usually a part of the earlier stages of mindfulness training in both Buddhist and therapeutic applications, which overtly practice and build the ability to ‘contain the beam of attention’ (Travis and Shear, 2010: 114). Open monitoring involves ‘the non-reactive monitoring of the content of ongoing experience, primarily as a means to become reflectively aware of the nature of emotional and cognitive patterns’ (Travis and Shear, 2010: 114). Open monitoring is characterised by being non-judgemental of the experience, including any thoughts, emotions and behaviours, and attending to the present moment rather than becoming distracted with other cognitive and affective ideas which exist in either the past or the future (Chiesa et al., 2011).

The theories and practices of mindfulness derived from Buddhist teachings and those within the field of therapeutic psychology have been adopted as the basis and core goal of a number of therapies. Examples include mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR) (Samuelson et al., 2007), acceptance and commitment therapy (ACT) (Springer, 2012), mindfulness-based cognitive therapy (MBCT) (Kabat-Zinn, 2003) and DBT (Linehan, 2013, 2015). All of these therapies belong to the so-called third wave of behaviourism, the success of which continues to be corroborated with empirical evidence. Each also holds in common that mindfulness is a skill that one employs for a time, with intent, and that the client can develop mindful awareness using activities and explanations that are specific to the type and goals of the therapeutic intervention.

One of the clearest explanations of how mindfulness can be employed as an intentionally used skill is found in DBT, which was developed by American psychologist Marsha Linehan (2013), as a modified form of cognitive behaviour...
therapy (CBT) to treat people with borderline personality disorder and chronically suicidal individuals. In DBT, mindfulness is explicitly taught as one of four core groups of skills which underlie and support all other skills taught in DBT. DBT mindfulness skills ‘are psychological and behavioural translations of meditation practices from Eastern spiritual training’ (Linehan, 2015: 151), which provide clear explanations and sub-skills which are practically useful and relatively simple to grasp. It is this particular version of mindfulness which I argue could be of particular benefit to phenomenological researchers. Here, I recommend the DBT mindfulness skills as ideal practical tools for crafting phenomenological research and developing researcher reflexivity. Primarily, this is because incorporating these skills aids the researcher to develop an awareness of their natural attitude, provide skills and exercises to learn the art of bracketing their natural attitude and develop objective critical reflection.

**DBT mindfulness and its usefulness to the craft of phenomenological research**

The practice and theoretical formulation of mindfulness as espoused by DBT aligns strongly with leading authors and definitions of mindfulness. DBT mindfulness embodies the two-component model of other mainstream definitions of mindfulness as proposed by Bishop et al. (2004) and others. Furthermore, the DBT approach to mindfulness includes the self-regulation of attention, which connotes the fundamental phenomenological concept of intentionality. DBT mindfulness also adopts a particular orientation to the consciousness, characterised by curiosity, openness and acceptance which equate to the phenomenological reduction.

In DBT, the skill of mindfulness is divided into two groups: the **what** and **how skills**. The mindfulness **what skills** can only be practised one at a time and cannot be employed simultaneously. **What skills** ‘are about what to do’ when being mindful (Linehan, 2015: 154). **Observing** involves noticing, paying attention, wordlessly watching and controlling one’s attention. **Describing** involves putting words to the experience, labelling what is observed and experienced. Learning to describe also means learning to not take thoughts and emotions as exact reflections of events. The final what skill, **participating**, involves the skill of participating without self-consciousness, fully entering into the activities and the present moment without separating the self from the ongoing interactions and events. Linehan (2013, 2015) is careful to distinguish between mindfully participating and mindlessly participating, the difference being participating with attention.

In the context of undertaking qualitative, specifically phenomenological research, the DBT **what skills** make for important conceptual companions. DBT **what skills** support the implementation of the fundamental concepts of phenomenology while also providing some much-needed practical support for developing the intentionality of the researcher’s consciousness. The DBT **what skill** of participating insists that the researcher engage with the phenomena and the lifeworld of the research participants by being present and active with the research participant. The other two **what skills**, observing and describing, then direct the researcher to the core physical business of what will form the basis of the data, thick and rich description which is a central technique of phenomenological research. However, taken alone, the **what skills** are not enough to lift the natural attitude and reveal the epoché which allow intentionality and reduction to take place.

Each of the three **what skills** in DBT mindfulness are used in conjunction with three **how skills**. Unlike the **what skills**, the **how skills** can be used independently or simultaneously and describe practical considerations of how one observes, describes and participates. Linehan (2015) explains that how one does the **what skills** involves ‘taking a non-judgemental stance (“non-judgementally”), focussing on one thing in the moment (“one-mindfully”), and doing what works (“effectively”)’ (p. 154).

Being **non-judgmental** is described as eliminating interpretations, allowing the observer, describer or participant to take a non-evaluative position where thoughts, emotions, behaviours and experiences are acknowledged without being qualified as good, bad, right or wrong and so forth. Observations, descriptions and participation are therefore distinguished or discriminated between, rather than balancing or prioritising, judging or evaluating. The second **how skill**, **one-mindfully**, encapsulates the essence of practising mindfulness which in its simplest explanation is ‘the quality of awareness that a person brings to activities’ (Linehan, 2015: 155). Being **one-mindful** focuses the attention, awareness and the mind to the current moment rather than splitting or dividing attention between activities and thoughts about the past or future. This skill of focused attention is not one that humans inherently possess; rather, it is one that can be developed with practice by concentrating the mind, letting go of distractions and becoming present in the moment. Linehan explains that individuals ‘need to learn how to focus their attention on one task or activity at a time, engaging in it with alertness, awareness and wakefulness’ (p. 155).

**Effectively** is the final **how skill** of mindfulness as explained and practised in DBT. It focuses on functioning effectively, or, in simple terms, doing what works using skilful means. In DBT, this skill links with other skills such as being non-judgemental, being willing, and the concept of wise mind where a synergy or balance is found between the rational and emotional mind. To be effective in mindfulness, the original goal of the activity and focus of attention must be kept in mind and focused by using one of the **what skills**. The three **how skills** can be utilised as needed during the time that one chooses to be mindful.
In phenomenological research, it is through the combination of the what and how skills that the consciousness can be intentionally directed and that the natural attitude can be suspended by non-judgementally and one-mindfully observing, then describing in thick description.5 For the aspiring researcher operating with a phenomenological methodology, the skill of mindfulness is particularly helpful during data generation, data collection and early stages of analysis. It is helpful during any parts of the research which require the suspension of the natural attitude and the adoption of a fully present and non-judgemental attitude, as required when undertaking the reductions or bracketing. In doing these things, one epitomises the practical realisation of intentionality, which is so central to the underpinning philosophy of phenomenology.

Mindfulness skills and the explicit development of bracketing and reflexivity become all the more relevant given that in qualitative research in general, the researcher is the primary tool for data generation and analysis (Brown, 2010; Engelsrud, 2005; Harvey, 2013). Perhaps even more so in phenomenological research than in other methodological approaches, the success of the research rests on the researcher’s ability to undergo truly bracket out themselves through the processes of epoché and then eidetic reduction. Mindfulness is given here as a skill and a very practical approach to creating clarity in a process which is undoubtedly difficult to translate from philosophy to practice. Although DBT offers but one model of practising mindfulness, without a doubt it is effective, practically understandable and theoretically sound, while also seamlessly aligning with the fundamental concepts of Husserl’s philosophy of phenomenology and phenomenological research practice. However, to echo the thoughts of Vagle (2014) and van Manen (1997, 2002), phenomenology is an ongoing and honed craft, this way of researching is not something one simply does (Coffin, 2014). Moreover, like any craft, phenomenology, reflexivity and mindfulness need to be practised and lived out. Therefore, to include mindfulness as a skill set within the craft of phenomenological and qualitative research, I advocate that the how and what skills must be practised and lived by the researcher.

Another feature of DBT mindfulness is the extensive resources available publicly which can be used to assist researchers wanting to incorporate mindfulness into their research craft and develop their reflexive and critical thinking skills. Linehan (2013, 2015) provides extensive explanations, practical approaches and exercises to develop skills both in the ‘DBT Skills Training Manual’ and the accompanying suite of teaching notes, handouts and worksheets. Although these resources are used most commonly in therapeutic contexts, they are also tremendously useful for those wanting to practice mindfulness in other contexts such as qualitative and phenomenological research.

Reflections on undertaking phenomenological research utilising DBT mindfulness

To demonstrate a practical application of the ideas explored above, I will share some reflections, thick description and data excerpts illustrating the usefulness of implementing DBT mindfulness during an ongoing research project, which adopts a phenomenological theoretical framework and research methods. Specifically, the examples will demonstrate how the DBT how and what skills were used to direct my consciousness (intentionality) to explore the lifeworld of the research participants and their experiences of the phenomena of listening and learning. Particularly in the following examples, I will show how mindfulness was used as a skill to suspend my own natural attitude to observe and engage with research participants as objectively as possible.6

The phenomenon under study was audience members’ experiences of learning to listen within the context of a classical music concert given by a professional Australian symphony orchestra. Ethical approval was granted by the overseeing institution and where data were generated using a concert observation schedule (completed by the researcher), a focus group with audience members and interviews with administration employees of the orchestra. Participants gave consent in both verbal and written forms. Concerts were selected for observation according to criteria specified in the research project, and research participants were recruited according to a procedure approved by both the hosting orchestra and the overseeing ethics council. The concert observation, focus group and interviews were conducted according to protocols developed for the research project based on a phenomenological research approach incorporating elements of DBT mindfulness. The data presented here represent only a fragment from the entire set generated for the larger research project.

Some of the explicit mindfulness prompts in the protocols included ‘prior to’, ‘ready to’ and ‘after’ checklists. These checklists included reviewing the phenomenological research process and mindset, ensuring the researcher was ‘set up for success’ to research (rested, materials and tools gathered, mindfully focusing by doing a simple brief focusing activity such as a body scan or breathing meditation having arrived at the research site), and reviewing the guiding research questions. In addition to these elements, the concert observation protocol included a mix of closed fact-based sections to complete and more open-ended questions or prompts. The interview protocol included a series of questions and prompts in addition to the ‘prior to’, ‘ready to’ and ‘after’ checklists.

After each concert observation, as a part of the protocol, I wrote a thick description of the researching and concert experience. Thick description is a common tool for phenomenologists, particularly in studies like this which adopt hermeneutic phenomenological methods (Geertz, 1998). Thick
description is useful because it captures a rich explanation of the cultural and social meanings that occur through pure observation and description (Randles, 2012). In this way, the thick description also captures the researcher’s experience (lifeworld) of the phenomenon. The researcher, thus, becomes a participant in the research. This is not only a standard feature of qualitative research in that the researcher is the primary research tool, but also inherently phenomenological as my own experience was observed and used as data.

Below is a fragment from a thick description written after a concert observation. It demonstrates my process of mindfully preparing for collecting data, having stepped into the concert hall and mindfully setting aside the natural attitude to begin the process of reduction and epoché. In the writing, notice how the mindfulness was guided by the how skills of observing, describing and participating, and how these skills are employed by following the what skills. Pseudonyms are used to protect the identity of the research site:

At this point, despite the excitement, I take a moment to check the observation sheet and view the phenomenological approach. So far, the notes on the sheet are on track and I briefly mindfully set myself in the space by observing and describing the body sensations, the thoughts passing through my mind, the feelings (not that there usually are any) being experienced. I note the excitement of being here with the ‘orchestra’ and the amazement that I get to research with this orchestra. I take a moment to experience the strain in my neck and shoulders and the jitter in my feet, just as it is. I remind myself to just be in the moment focussed on this task, to not judge the thoughts and sensations that come. In doing this I also notice how I am doing these things – by observing, by describing and by participating. The latter, participating, is one that I remind myself will be important to employ during this concert to get a sense of the listening. Because as I’ve noticed during the other observations, that though the instinct says to ‘write, write, write’, it is nearly impossible to experience listening and therefore any pedagogies in play within the context without stopping what else is going on.

The description and observations are made non-judgementally. There are no attempts to judge whether the observations or sensations are ‘good’ or ‘bad’, helpful or unhelpful to the research, relevant or irrelevant. The observation and description are kept one-mindfully in the present moment as there is no effort to banish away observations because they do not fit within predetermined theories or frameworks, or to latch onto specific ideas because they resonate with previously established experiences. Rather each idea, observation, thought or sensation is acknowledged as it is before moving on. Particularly, I find that if during field research or observations when there is minimal interaction with other people, there is a tendency to want to stay with or repeat over connections or ideas because they are particularly exciting or disturbing. This is a time when I know the natural attitude has slipped back into place. Acknowledging these thoughts and then choosing to consciously move on then allows me to return to the epoché and suspend the natural attitude which would get in the way of experiencing the lifeworld of the participants or work of researching.

An example of the difference between this curious non-judgemental attitude during observation is given below, as well as a non-example demonstrating when the natural attitude has invaded the phenomenological act. This thick description is taken from an observation completed towards the end of data generation and includes a reflection on the use of mindfulness with phenomenological research methods:

This is probably the most focused observation I’ve done. There were times where the mind did wander from the moment and experience. Sometimes the thoughts related to the music like ‘I wonder how they rehearsed this with the orchestra?’, ‘what could the musicians be thinking at the moment?’, ‘do they like/ value this kind of playing and performance?’, ‘how is the presenter keeping all this analysis in his head? I’m pleased to note now, and that during the performance, these kinds of thoughts were generally wondering or curious type questions and were non-judgemental without placing good or bad/black or white thinking over the thought. Other times the wandering mind went to things that had nothing to do with the music what so ever. Thoughts like ‘what is the schedule for tomorrow, am I catching an early bus?’, ‘I’d really like to watch another episode of Prison Break tonight!’. Other times there was a grey space as to whether the thought was on topic or judgemental such as ‘This concert space is perfect’, ‘Why can’t the orchestra do more of these concerts every year, surely every audience member needs an experience like this?!” or ‘I like this repertoire, but it’s not very common to most people’.

Each time the mind wandered, the response was relatively quick to mindfully tell the mind ‘those things are for later, for now be here’. This response to the straying mind stayed mostly the same and didn’t lose its non-judgemental tone (it is easy to get frustrated with the mind and say ‘stop doing that!’).

It takes so much less effort to be non-judgemental than when I first started doing mindfulness. Now it comes very naturally and the ‘buts’, ‘good’, ‘bad’, ‘right’, ‘wrong’ which used to trip me up are rare and few in between in both thoughts and writing.

By incorporating mindfulness as a series of skills employed to undertake the epoché in phenomenological research, I achieved a sophisticated level of researcher reflexivity. One was conducive to the other (Davies and Heaphy, 2011). Reflexivity is a core value of high-quality qualitative research which Subedi (2006) defines as the researcher becoming more open to, and accountable for, how they participate in the research and produce knowledge (Berger, 2015; May, 2010; Ruane, 2017). Bloor and Wood (2006) and Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2011) both use the word ‘mindful’ to explain the concept of reflexivity, stating that reflexivity ‘encourages researchers to remain mindful that
they themselves are part of the social world they study and should, therefore, consider how their own values and ... experiences may influence their perceptions’ (p. 23).

Like mindfulness, researcher reflexivity is not an automatic skill. It is a conscious choice which needs practice and awareness to develop (Berger, 2015; Chan et al., 2013; Subedi, 2006). Pillow (2003) even goes so far as to say that reflexivity, like mindfulness, is not a natural attitude and because of this fact, it pushes the researcher towards an unfamiliar experience, to challenge assumptions and operate in a space which is cognitively uncomfortable (Ruane, 2017). Certainly, DBT mindfulness skills find resonance theoretically and practically with developing the awareness needed to enact reflexivity providing a solution and allows more abstract understandings to unfold (Hammond, 2018), which are indeed core elements of qualitative and phenomenological research.

In the context of conducting the interviews with audience members, the same principles apply to suspend the natural attitude and occupy the space of phenomenological epoché. As I listened to my research participants, it was essential to actually listen to what they were saying, rather than wanting to start analysing what was being said or to connect what participants’ were describing to the theoretical framework for the study – an example of being one-mindful in the present moment.

At the same time, when working with the method of semi-structured interviews, the grey space between judgemental and non-judgmental thinking became more complex. A dialectic exists between these two positions, the recognition of which is especially true to the essence of DBT. To an extent, the researcher does need to listen to their intuition and reflexively respond to the conversation in order to pose appropriate follow-up questions and shape the interview to gain the best possible data (Berger, 2015; Brown, 2010; Rowley, 2012). Moreover, at the same time, mindfulness can aid the semi-structured interviewer in keeping thoughts and attitudes in check, which also helps the researcher in their embodied experience (Ruane, 2017). The judgement is of a different quality much more akin to the gentle attitude of non-judgemental curiosity advocated in DBT mindfulness.

Consider the following example of researcher cognition during a semi-structured interview constructed using the actual transcript of the interview combined with actual thoughts that came to mind as a researcher. The example is a portion of a transcript from one of the interviews with an education manager of the orchestra along with an example and a non-example demonstrating the differing qualities between judgmental and mindful non-judgmental thinking taking place in the researcher’s mind. The judgemental attitude is inherently non-phenomenological, wrapped up in the natural attitude, and does not demonstrate the DBT mindfulness how skills of description or observation, or the what skills of being effective or one-mindful, and does not have any qualities of researcher reflexivity. The mindful cognitions have a distinctly different quality, demonstrating the dialectic of including the researcher’s intuition while also keeping the attitude non-judgemental, curious and inquisitive. In essence, they are far more phenomenological, bracketed and reflexive in nature.

The reflexive thoughts of the researcher are indicated in italics and were not spoken in the interview itself. The majority of these thoughts are organic and have been fleshed out for the purposes of illustrating the example.

**Interviewer:** What do you think makes an effective listener? Is this something learned?

**Participant:** It’s a really good question, and one that we think about a lot at [our orchestra] especially in the education team. We recognise especially with our work in schools that listening is not just a skill in the realm of music but also in life. Listening and interpreting information in a multitude of ways is a really important skill to have... I think it’s really important that listening is not just something like taking in sound waves or something that happens to our bodies...

[Judgemental cognition: So it should be a good question, these took ages to come up with! It’s really good that the participant thinks about listening deeply, other interviews haven’t been nearly as on point. Or maybe I was asking the wrong questions in those interviews?]

[Mindful cognition: Ok, so the education team thinks a lot about listening as learning. I wonder how the other departments think of listening? It’s exciting to hear the participant talk about listening as something that is active, maybe later ask a clarification question if this means listening is participatory too?]  

**Participant:** …so with pedagogy we try to put in place ways of making [the listening and the context relevant] to their experience as a person. Which is a really key concept in education of differentiation...

[Judgemental cognition: Yes, mention of pedagogy this is going to be important and I like that the word experience was used, that really fits in neatly with my theoretical framework]

[Mindful cognition: All right, mention of pedagogy. Relevant to experience, that sounds interesting. Let’s see if we can get an example]

**Researcher:** Can you give describe a time when the orchestra has helped the audience make links between their experience and the music?
Participant: Sure! A recent example [was when we played] Brahms’ second symphony which was written after reportedly two decades of writer’s block, because he was so taken back by Beethoven and Beethoven’s shadow that he couldn’t write anything… [Brahms] took a holiday of two weeks in Austria and just kicked this writer’s block right out of the way and produced Symphony number 2, it was really incredible. What we then do when we begin to talk about this with [an audience] is ask ‘have you ever experienced writer’s block? Have you ever wanted to do something but couldn’t get to that endpoint … and so that understanding of context in relation to the piece can help the listener to be effective.

In addition to the constant tracking of the mindfulness of my own thinking, in my responses and follow-up questions it was important to remain effective in avoiding deciding if things were going well. I put away judgemental thoughts which tried to evaluate the moment or if the explanations the research participants were giving me of their learning experiences were relevant or useful. As seen in the example above, and as Linehan (Bishop et al., 2004; Linehan, 2015) explains, usually these unhelpful judgements include words like ‘good’, ‘bad’, ‘always’, ‘never’ or disqualifying observations using ‘but’ instead of recognising the dialectic using ‘and’.

Being non-judgemental in my wording of follow-up/probing questions and use of non-descriptive encouragers was also vital in minimising any influence I gave as research participants explained their experiences, thoughts and feelings about learning to listen at orchestral concerts. The mechanism for implementing these what skills were the how skills of observe, describe and participate. As identified in the other example given above, participating mindfully can be difficult when trying to also take notes, ensure that all the questions are asked and manage complex conversational dynamics during group interviews.

Summary
Phenomenology as an approach to social science research, as distinct from the underlying philosophy, is undoubtedly a challenging practice. Moreover, for researchers wishing to employ such a method or even the common practice of reflexivity in qualitative research, there is little pragmatic help in how to tangibly develop these skills or methods to guide reflexive and bracketed research practice. Therefore, as explored above, I assert that qualitative researchers in developing a mindful research practice can develop practical skills alongside theoretical knowledge of suspending and setting aside assumptions, ideas and theories. In particular, I have demonstrated that mindfulness is helpful to the phenomenological researcher in operationalising the complex philosophy which underlies the epoché and eidetic reductions.

There are three key implications for research which have emerged from this discussion on crafting phenomenological research using mindfulness. First, there is an ongoing imperative to examine the pragmatic implications of research theories and to problem-solve these practical issues as a research community, particularly in the case of phenomenological research methods which have grown out of metaphysical philosophic traditions. I have demonstrated here, in both theory and practice, that looking outside strict research methodologies into other traditions can help solve some of these practical problems. Second, I recommend that the practices of DBT mindfulness be further explored for their usefulness to phenomenological and qualitative research methods, particularly during data generation, early stages of data analysis and, more generally, as a means of developing the skills necessary to undertake reflexive and reflective research.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, it is imperative that mindfulness, like phenomenology and reflexivity, become more than just methods in doing research. For the methods explored in this article to be effective, it is not enough to read about mindfulness, write about phenomenology or reflexivity and then turn up to a research site and ‘do’ research in this manner. Mindfulness, like having the awareness of intentionality over one’s own consciousness, is a practised and crafted ability. These are skills that must be lived and breathed both within the research and in the daily life of the researcher, even to the point that these epistemologies and ontologies become a part of our own life philosophies as humans who happen to research.

In sum, I have proposed that mindfulness, as particularly prescribed in a DBT approach, can provide practical tools to help the phenomenological researcher develop skills to undertake the bracketing necessary as a part of phenomenological reductions, and more widely for qualitative researchers learning the skill of reflexivity and critical reflection. I have demonstrated these ideas in this article, having explored both theoretical issues and practical applications to the data generation phase of a research project such as by investigating how audience members learn to listen at orchestral concerts. While mindfulness is not a catch-all for solving the practical problems of researching using phenomenology, these two frameworks have a definite synergy and together
they can make excellent tools for crafting phenomenological research and focus on the present experience.
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Notes

1. These terminologies have emerged from the philosophical writings detailing phenomenology, which have given rise to the research methods which have followed in this tradition. Specifically, the term bridling has been espoused by Dahlberg and Dahlberg (2004) as ‘invok[ing] the thought of being respectful, or humble’ (p. 272) as opposed to bracketing, which asserts an air of aiming for an impossible and total removal of the researcher and their interpretation from the domain of social research. I acknowledge this input and see the way I have applied mindfulness to my research as a means of joining this conversation and the goal of understanding what it means to study phenomena and derive or interpret the hermeneutic meaning of phenomena through the lived world of others.

2. Phenomenology (from the Greek word ‘phainesthai’ meaning that which appears) began as a philosophy of understanding phenomena through human experience and consciousness. It was developed primarily by Edmund Husserl, who drew on works by earlier continental philosophers such as Lambert, Kant, Hegel, and Descartes (see Bernet, Kern and Marbach, 1993), Husserl took particular inspiration from his teacher Brentano, whose writing on intentionality underlie Husserl’s early works Ideas and Logical Investigations which developed phenomenology as a kind of descriptive psychology differentiating between the consciousness (noema) and the act of directing one’s consciousness (noemata). Philosophers who expanded Husserl’s foundations include Heidegger, Sartre and Merleau-Ponty Vagle (2014).

3. Leading voices include Han-Georg Gadamer (hermeneutic phenomenology), Alfred Schutz (sociological phenomenology), Max Van Manen (phenomenology of practice and pedagogy) and Emmanuel Levinas (ethical phenomenology) (see Cerbone, 2006; Creswell, 1998; van Manen, 2002).

4. I particularly acknowledge the validity of the debate around the term ‘bracketing’ versus reduction and bridling; however, the scope and focus of this article is aimed at how researchers might best practically deal with these issues rather than challenging semantics.

5. Certainly, these practices are not unique to DBT mindfulness and I acknowledge the potential usefulness of other models of mindfulness for phenomenological research such as those found in MBSR. Rather, DBT mindfulness is a practice I have employed from my own lived experience within the context of this particular research project.

6. As espoused by the literature, mindfulness was not only a practice I developed for this particular research project, but is a part of my daily life. I am particularly grateful to Julie Campbell, Rita Farley, Jenni Mazlin-Law and Dr Furhan Iqbal for introducing DBT mindfulness to me and the work they have done with me to develop these particular skills.
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Methods for Data Analysis

Throughout the data analysis process, I sought to engage with the multiple meanings presented by the data in all its messiness and complexity. While I followed an overarching plan, I did not try to impose a structure on the data or the interpretative process. I chose not to follow an established phenomenological analytical method such as interpretative phenomenological analysis (Joseph, 2014; J. A. Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009; J. A. Smith & Osborn, 2008). Such methods have been critiqued by van Manen (2002, 2014) and Vagle (2014) as being overly focussed on perceptions as opposed to experiences, lacking emphasis on interpretation and hermeneutics, and that the method does not give sufficient credence to the role of language, symbolism and gesture (Brocki & Wearden, 2006; Tomkins & Eatough, 2010; Tuffour, 2017). Instead, the constant “returning to the things themselves” (Husserl, 1999, p. 303) kept the writing and interpretation grounded in the phenomenological tradition (Cohen et al., 2007).

I began the data analysis process by completing any thick descriptions, field research notes, intuitive note taking and creating digital backups of any paper-based material including anecdotal artefacts collected from concert observations and protocol templates. Audio recordings of focus groups and interviews were downloaded and backups were made, stored and then prepared for transcription. Even during this process, I was mindful to file notes and fill in any gaps in the data (such as where abbreviations or shorthand had been used) to maintain a phenomenological stance and to bracket my own interpretations.

There was excitement at times and judgemental thinking and a want to delve into analysis immediately with themes and codes. And still, using mindful techniques I was able to observe, describe, where necessary write these ‘can’t wait’ thoughts down separately, and then non-judgementally put these aside so that interpretation and questioning could be reserved for later stages of the analysis (Bishop et al., 2004; Linehan, 2015). This approach during these early processes resonates with the advice given by phenomenological researchers such as van Manen (1997), Chan (2013) and LeVasseur (2003) who explain the importance of keeping investigations contextual to the whole data set. In simple terms, during the initial dealings with the data I chose deliberately to direct my consciousness - or intentionality - to the whole and the task of working with each piece of data as I handled it rather than being distracted or allowing judgement from my own lifeworld to infiltrate the early analysis. As the analysis unfolded, I appreciated the nuance this aspect brought not only to the data analysis but also to the way I crafted phenomenology to this research project (Coffin, 2014; Vagle, 2014).
Having transcribed and compiled the data from each orchestra, I worked through one case at a time, reading through the focus group and interview transcripts and relistening to the audio recordings several times. Partly this was done to refamiliarise myself with each orchestra and their data, but this step also served to immerse myself in the case and to take notes using intuitive analysis or what Rowly (2012) calls back brain analysis (Frey & Fontana, 1991). These notes consisted of questions which arose, links to literature concepts, connections with concert observations, and early hunches about the major themes. Again, this step was carried out using mindfulness techniques to maintain a phenomenological stance characterised by being non-judgemental, observational and seeking to describe, rather than interpret (Depraz, 1999; Siegel, Germer, & Olendzki, 2009).

Next, I returned to each interview and focus group transcript in the case for close reading and coding. Themes were coded using the software NVivo to aid with managing the volume of data and themes (Bowen, 2009; Greenbaum, 1993; Ha & Bunke, 2000; Todres, 2007). Following the recommendations of Coffin (2014) and Vagle (2014), as much as possible I used the language, terminology and phraseology of the research participants in the code titles to keep the analysis organic and close to the original phenomenon and experiences (Adu, 2016; Saldana, 2013). Having completed this inductive style of coding, additional readings of the data were undertaken using a top down deductive method following specifically set up codes in NVivo relating to each of the research questions, the questions of each protocol and bigger parent or umbrella themes such as pedagogy, outreach, education, listening, audience development, programming and learning (Blaney, Filer, & Lyon, 2014; Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). This process of inductive then deductive coding was undertaken in turn with each transcript within each orchestra case, again with the phenomenological reduction and bracketing achieved through mindfulness in place.

Once the entire case was analysed thematically, a broader view of the interview and focus group data was gained using some of the ‘explore data’ options offered by NVivo (Adu, 2016). I used the program to generate maps and charts of the data and looked at which themes were most prevalent by number and structure of child themes and the amount and quality of data in the various parent themes (Dowling, 2007; Todres, 2007). From this meta-analysis and working iteratively between the parts and the whole and the various data perspectives, I worked inductively and deductively as needed to identify the umbrella themes for the case (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). Parallel to these analytical processes and trying to understand the wider picture and what was unique to each case, I used the observational data to develop a thick description of the orchestra and the research participants (van Manen, 2002). Having completed
this analytic activity and the writing associated with each individual orchestra, I compiled the
data from all three orchestras to formulate a final chapter of discussion (see chapter 7).

The process described to this point reflects four of the six key activities that are vital to
undertaking phenomenological research described by van Manen in his text *Phenomenology of
Practice* (2014): reflecting on the essential themes that are characteristic to the phenomenon
under study, crafting descriptions of the phenomenon through writing and rewriting,
maintaining a balance and considering the parts and the whole, and maintaining a relationship
and orientation to the phenomenon and data (Vagle, 2014). Another of van Manen’s activities
which was in dynamic interplay throughout the data collection, analysis and communication
through the writing process was (and is) my commitment to a phenomenon that seriously
interests me, and the praxis of working out the nature of the phenomenon remaining orientated
to the world (van Manen, 2014). In this way, while guided by a phenomenological and
ultimately philosophically driven methodology, the work and analysis remained orientated to
the practical and formulation of theory which is deeply pragmatic (Gadamer, 1976; Peirce,
2011; Talisse & Aikin, 2011; van Manen, 1997).

The final activity recommended by van Manen (2014), investigating experience as we
live it rather than as we conceptualise it, was an important facet captured during the data
collection and was reiterated throughout the later reductions. During these reductions, I
revisited the words of my research participants as they explained their experiences and allowed
my own lived interpretive perspective to question and work with the data. I viewed the data
through the interpretive lens I hold as a teacher and pedagogue, my perspectives as a musician
with experience playing in orchestras and having an insider understanding of classical music,
the stance I hold as a listener and audience member, my position as an outsider to some of the
orchestral communities I worked with, and my lens as a researcher looking for the many and
varied ways people experience music and what meaning is made through the act of listening in
concert halls. Working between these various perspectives, and across the various data types
and different lifeworld experiences brought by the research participants, I began writing up the
key themes and interpretations in each case separately (Chan et al., 2013; Drummond, 2007).
Each successive draft of the writing sought to capture the phenomenon and the meanings
unfolding, linking where applicable ideas to the literature explored earlier and fitting theory as
tailored explanations to the data and the experiences of the research participants (van Manen,
2002). In this sense, the writing up of the research was also an essential component of the data
analysis process.
As part of these data analysis methods I continued to refine my practices of bracketing using DBT mindfulness. In the following commentary article titled ‘Methodological Coda’ I offer a reflection on the later learnings I gleaned from employing mindfulness as part of working with phenomenological bracketing. Here I revisit mindfulness terms of being a useful innovation as part of phenomenological research, and I elaborate on some of the limitations of hermeneutic phenomenological bracketing.

**Methodological Coda**
In this chapter I have outlined the methodological choices and the research methods utilised in this study. Particularly, in part 2 of this chapter, which took the form of an article, I presented a methodological innovation I developed as part of my approach to phenomenological research. In the article, I explained how I synthesised the philosophy of phenomenology with the ‘how’ and ‘what’ skills of mindfulness as practised in DBT, as a strategy for undertaking phenomenological data generation.

In this short ‘methodological coda’ or expanded cadence, I offer some writing I completed at the conclusion of the data analysis after composing the four discussion chapters (chapters 4-7). This additional section serves as a reflection on my use of mindfulness in the later parts of the data analysis and phenomenological practice. This writing also offers a new perspective on what my methodological innovation offers and how the remainder of the data analysis work unfolded as an additional commentary to the article published. Thus the coda is significant as it documents my later practices as a phenomenological researcher working in the discipline of applied education philosophy. To illustrate this reflection, I use the apt metaphor of the experience of listening in a contemporary concert hall and the different positions one might occupy within that space. I also draw together some final insights from the literature and expand upon my learnings and the potential this methodological innovation may offer other phenomenological researchers.

**The limitations of hermeneutic phenomenological bracketing**
During this research project, I observed three orchestra organisations (a metropolitan community orchestra, a professional world-class orchestra and a regional community orchestra) in their unique contexts and how they serve their respective audiences. Over the course of the project, I observed eighteen public concerts and engaged with each organisation during selected rehearsals, concert set up and pack down, and through passing conversations
with audience members and musicians. All were invaluable to this research because they provided very real and unmasked experiences of each organisation in context. It is, after all, at these interfaces between the phenomenon, the lifeworld of research participants and the researcher where meaning, and interpretation begin (Dahlberg & Dahlberg, 2004; Dahlberg, Dahlberg, Nystrom, & Drew, 2008; Vagle, 2014; Wilson, 2015).

As a phenomenological researcher, I strive as much as possible to put aside my own biases and interpretation. However, even as a phenomenological researcher, I cannot completely put aside my own experiences and the insight my own continuity and interaction with the phenomena bring (R. Berger, 2015; Kordeš, 2013). Certainly, to be phenomenological is to understand the lifeworld as the means through which research participants interact with the phenomenon under study, but there came a point in both the data generation and the analysis where my own lifeworld became part of the hermeneutic and was, indeed, valuable. During the concert observations I realised there were times where taking a very mindful and bracketed stance as a researcher was useful to encountering the phenomenon (Finlay, 1999). There were also times where my own experience and lifeworld as a fellow community musician, as a pedagogue and teacher, as an audience member and individual listener, as an avid listener of orchestral music, and as someone keenly interested in understanding audiences, became useful. Using these experiences I was able to access other viewpoints I could occupy that contributed to creating a phenomenology of pedagogies of listening.

In this respect, while phenomenology as a philosophy may aim to bracket out the self, I discovered that phenomenology as a methodology for research must also value the insight and intuition the researcher themselves bring. Being first person research, it is the researcher and their experiences who brings the richness and rigour to the data analysis in interoperative methods (Price, Barrell, & Rainville, 2002). Gadamer (1976, 1979) reflected on the scope of this universal paradox of phenomenology saying:

> It is the question of how our natural view of the world – the experience of the world that we have as we simply live out our lives – is related to the unassailable and anonymous authority that confronts us in the pronouncements of science (1976, p. 7).

It is therefore this fundamental experience of our being-in-the-world as researchers in tension and interaction with a desire to understand the “all-embracing constitution of the [life]world within” (Gadamer, 1976, p. 8) which becomes of most interest to me at this point.
in reflecting on the analysis. Or as Drummond (2007) asserts, the heuristic measure of the researcher - including their own experience - is an essential quality that keeps phenomenology’s focus on the real, rather than some abstracted transcendental world. Indeed, this is the original goal of the reduction in that it serves as a literal ‘leading back’. Importantly, those phenomenological reductions “always involve some relation to the phenomenologist’s own experience” (Drummond, 2007, p. 63).

Within my research process I note that the observations particularly became invaluable to the data analysis and understanding learning through listening and experience. Not only did the observations give me valuable insight into the mechanisms of how pedagogies of listening are enacted by arts organisations but also were an opportunity to ‘return to the things themselves’ (Husserl, 1964; Willis, 2001). They were grounding experiences and points of direct first-person reference to the phenomenon. They were times when I myself as a researcher would pause to ask ‘what is going on here? What is the experience of listening? And what in the experience is making a difference to how I am understanding and listening to the music?’.

To illustrate this hermeneutic aspect of the later analysis utilising mindfulness, I have synthesised a type of analytic thick description which invites you to imagine with me the different aspects of my own lifeworld which I used to work deeper into the phenomena.

Experiences within the concert hall: Many lifeworlds, many interpretations

Imagine a concert hall, resplendent and grand in its architectural conception. Imagine standing in the foyer bustling with people dressed in their finery prepared for an evening’s encounter with aural art. This is a place for hearing\(^{17}\) and though this is a secular space there is an undoubted reverence with which this thoroughly contemporary affair will be conducted. The drama of relationships plays out in aged and old traditions and rituals are an art within themselves though nobody speaks it. In this seemingly separate world to the hustle and bustle of everyday life, a humble bow begins the summoning up of the dead composers, and harmony, heavenly harmony rings forward. In sharing with strangers, meaning is socially constructed, unfolding in silence and sound.

---

\(^{17}\) Italicised text indicates titles of chapters in Christopher Small’s (1998) book Musicking: The meanings of performing and listening which has served as continual inspiration throughout this thesis, especially this section of writing and reflection.
Metaphorically, I can revisit the data generation and analysis in this imagined concert hall space. I can imagine myself as one of the audience member participants from this study, looking around at my fellow listeners engaged silently as musicians on stage take us on an aural journey. Perhaps I am like Raven or Patience and this is my first foray into the concert hall and the whole thing seems like an alien world. Perhaps I feel right at home as Morty, Mabel, Page or Randy might in this concert hall. There is an unspoken “unified kind of feeling… everyone is really focused” (focus group, “Raven”) where the “audience and [the] orchestra [are] tied together” (focus group, “Ramella”) by the music. And yet at the same time, while the music is all around, the “music is in here [puts hands on chest and ears]. Where I can feel it” (focus group, “Maurice”). It is a multidimensional thing, being an audience member and an individual listener. The experience and understanding facilitated is equally about both.

Perhaps I sit in this metaphorical space in one of the desks of cellos seated on stage like the arts organisers of the community orchestras who are active musicians within their organisation. I think about the notes, the technique needed to make them sound correctly. Perhaps I wonder like Poal how my performance as a conductor can best portray the composer’s intentions, or like Montana or Rosario reflect on how the repertoire choice will be perceived and received by the audience. Or perhaps I sit in the back rows of the concert hall as an educator, community orchestra pedagogue and animateur like Morty or Monica wondering what understandings I can take from this experience to apply to my own (less grand) context. As I move around the concert hall, occupying these various positions I adopt a different view of what’s really going on here. The experience of each gives me a greater appreciation and perspective of the whole and an understanding of the essences which hold this experience of participating and learning in common (at least to some degree) with all iterations of experience within the concert hall.

With this phenomenological maneuver, I am able to not only bracket out the natural attitude but also bring into focus other perspectives to work towards an etic understanding of learning through listening in the contemporary concert hall. In exploring first my own experiences and the qualities I bring as a teacher, musician, enthusiastic listener, community orchestra organiser, I am then able to “go beyond [my] own experience in order to ensure that [I] have identified what is essential rather than contingent” (Drummond, 2007, p. 63) in the experience
of listening and learning in the concert hall. Even greater rigour and complexity were achieved when I then moved between these positionalities and the experiences of the research participants. By looking at the phenomenon from each angle, inclusive of each hermeneutic interpretation of what was going on, I saw a bigger and multifaceted picture in which I could theorise how pedagogies of listening are enacted, what makes them effective, and the unique experience of listening in different concert halls with different orchestras. See protocols outlined in Appendix B-D (p. 232 onward) and worked example in Appendix E (p. 243) for exemplars of practice.

**Later learnings on phenomenology and mindfulness**

Though this metaphor may seem like an act of imagination and empathy, to enter into these spaces while conducting data analysis required the practices developed through mindfulness. The ‘how’ and ‘what’ skills explained in DBT mindfulness assisted me in focussing on these perspectives, to value them as they are, and to interpret them non-judgmentally. By being one-mindful I was able to focus on what was effective in the data analysis processes by observing, describing and where appropriate remembering to ‘return to the things themselves’ and just participating in the experience. These skills are what have made this research reflexive and have been the tools I have used to think about my thinking. Mindfulness has also guided me to engage more reflexively with the questions I am asking, how I am conducting myself as a researcher and what impact I may be having in the field (Harvey, 2013; Kvalsund & Hargreaves, 2014).

Another theoretical frame to reflect on these later learnings on phenomenology and mindfulness is to use Finlay’s (2005, 2009) notion of reflexive embodied empathy. Certainly, through bracketing or bridling my own lifeworld and at other times utilising it within the analysis I was able to more fully empathise with the perspective of the listener within the concert hall. In shifting between these layers of relationships—connecting, acting into and merging with (2005, pp. 279, 281, 283), during the research and data analysis I developed an embodied intersubjective relationship both with the phenomena and with the research participants. Such an approach resonates strongly with the notion of how the lived embodied experience of the researcher is not only “the vehicle of being in the world” (Merleau-Ponty, 1968, p. 82), but also “the vehicle for understanding the world” (Finlay, 2005, p. 271). It has been my experience of working with the philosophy of phenomenology that all too often the value of the researcher’s own lifeworld is negated in tireless efforts to bracket and bridle.
Whereas through mindfulness, I propose that the researcher is able to bridle the natural attitude, as per the aim in hermeneutic phenomenology. But also have a means of harnessing the insight and rigour the researcher’s lifeworld can bring to the analysis and writing of phenomenological research.

**Research Ethics**

In this final section of the research design chapter I explain the efforts I made to ensure the research was being carried out in an ethical manner and how these steps were differentiated according to each research context including. To begin I elaborate on the ethical recruitment of research sites and participants for this research project, then I explain the ethical considerations made during the data generation and analysis stages of the study.

**Ethical Recruitment of Research Sites and Participants**

Making contact and recruiting the three research sites required differing steps to ensure I was being ethical in my research practices. Principally this was because the regional community orchestras I had selected to target within reasonable driving distance were groups that I have had previous involvement with either as a musician or as a pedagogue. In the case of both the metropolitan community orchestra and the professional orchestra, I first contacted each organisation via phone using the contact number on their respective websites. At the metropolitan community orchestra, I spoke to the presidents of the organisation while the professional symphony orchestras I contacted redirected me to their education/outreach officers. Having explained the project and their proposed involvement both verbally and through emailed materials (a formal letter of introduction and relevant ethics documents) each orchestra confirmed their involvement via a formal letter from the respective coordinators.

In the case of the regional community orchestra (of which I had previously been a committee member many years prior), I first approached the organisation by email via their websites which included the formal invitation to participate and the relevant ethics documents. I did this to ensure the orchestra had more space to decide whether to be involved in the research project with minimal invasiveness to ensure voluntary and non-coerced participation (Knox & Burkard, 2009; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; Weiss, 1994). The regional community orchestra representative (the president) then contacted me about the project and then was happy to send a formal letter agreeing to be part of the research project. Having successfully recruited the
three orchestras as research sites I negotiated with each orchestra regarding the data generation and the ethical recruitment of individual research participants and which concerts and events I could observe as part of the research. All negotiations and contact with each of the three orchestras were carried out through the main contact for each organisation.

Having established a rapport at each research site, the main contact and I worked together at generating a list of suitable interviewees who could give their perspective as arts organisers according to the research goals. At the professional symphony orchestra, the main contact approached individual potential interviewees whereas at the community orchestra sites a general call out to arts organisers was advertised by the president for interested participants who then contacted me via email to arrange a time to meet. Having been put in contact with willing participants, I scheduled to interview them each separately at times and places which were most convenient to them. Follow up interviews were conducted as needed and as per the research agreement made with the orchestras. Some of these follow up interviews with the metropolitan orchestra and two of the interviews with one of the professional symphony orchestra participants were conducted via phone and video conference due to distance and time restrictions.

Audience participants were recruited at a predetermined concert event which was deemed suitable for both the recruitment of audience members as research participants and as a setting for focus group discussion. Where possible I negotiated that the invitation to participate in the focus group would be advertised via the concert program, social media, pre-concert education talks and or during concert announcements. As an incentive, it was also advertised that focus groups would be catered and that participants would have a chance to win two tickets to an upcoming concert by the orchestra.

**Ethical Considerations During the Data Generation and Analysis**

Ethical practices are vital throughout the research process to ensure integrity, rigour and a high-quality finished research product (Bickman & Rog, 2009; Homan, 1991). Approval to carry out the research was obtained from the Monash University Human Research Ethics Committee (MUHREC) (see Appendix A – p. 231).

As declared earlier, I have had some past involvement either as a past member or current audience member at concerts given by the regional community orchestra. About four years had passed since moving from the area and the eleven-month timeframe that the data was generated
with the regional community orchestra for this project, and sporadically I return to go to concerts given by this orchestra and to reconnect with friends. While this could be considered an ethical challenge, I argue that this insider perspective of knowing something of the orchestra’s performance practices, being able to appreciate the challenges of living in and serving regional communities and the strength of these previous relationships in fact enhanced the research. My established rapport as researcher and past member of the community allowed for a freer flow of conversation as well as a lived understanding of the research participants’ context (Gregory, 2003; LeVasseur, 2003). I was acutely aware of the difference this relationship could have and so was careful in the way I recruited participants. I also designed and carried out the research protocols mindful of power dynamics and of the possibility of exerting undue influence (Bickman & Rog, 2009; Knox & Burkard, 2009).

A final point relating to ethics regardless of the setting, though especially with the regional orchestra, was having an awareness of my ‘researcher footprint’ and to take measures to minimise it wherever possible (Harvey, 2013; Kvalsund & Hargreaves, 2014). In practice this often meant being chameleon-like by blending into the concerts given, being very giving of time and resources to completely accommodate the organisation’s wishes and time frames, being constantly mindful of working to create equity of power in relationships, and continually being pro-active about building positive relationships with members of the organisation through humour, providing hospitality and conversation. However, at times there was also the need to dialectically balance these efforts with tact and assertiveness to ensure the original goals and objectives of the research were met. For example when making sure that there were sufficient participants and time to conduct the interviews and focus groups or renegotiating spaces provided by the organisation for these activities when they were unsuitable due to excessive noise.

White and Corbett (2014) explain that carrying out research in rural or regional areas requires particularly careful thought and design which considers their differentiated context from metropolitan research settings (M. Anderson & Lonsdale, 2014). This meant being aware of comparative discourses when discussing regional and metropolitan areas (B. Green & Reid, 2014; McHenry, 2009; White & Corbett, 2014) and being sensitive to local cultural contexts and history (Duxbury & Campbell, 2009). An example of this was seen particularly during the interviews with the arts organisers and listening to their experiences of being part of the community support that the local people in rural places need. Certainly being able to draw on my own experience of living in this community in the past helped in expressing genuine
empathy and understanding of how important the orchestra’s service to the community is. Following the advice from the literature, I also gave communities opportunities to have ownership of their data and research (Kay, 2000) and any benefit of the research is returned to the community in a way which is helpful and supportive (Jacob, 1996) which are certainly factors which shaped the conclusions of this study. This awareness also ensured that power relations were identified and mindfully managed (Babbie, 2005; O'Toole & Beckett, 2010).

Summary
In this chapter in five sections I have outlined the phenomenological design utilised for this study. The first section explained the methodology chosen for this research project utilising the works of Gadamer (hermeneutic philosophy) and van Manen (phenomenology of practice) with specific concepts drawn from Small’s work on musicking and Dewey’s art as experience to construct a framework for researching the phenomenology of listening and learning. Section two introduced the research contexts and participant groups, which was followed by section three which explained the methods, protocols and tools employed for generating data. I elaborated on my use of phenomenology which I innovated using mindfulness and outlined these ideas in an article published in the journal *Methodological Innovations*. Section four was dedicated to explaining the research methods for data analysis employed which included a second article (a commentary) on later reflections on bracketing and phenomenology using mindfulness. The final section of the chapter addressed issues of research ethics and considerations.
CHAPTER 4

Pedagogies of Listening at a Metropolitan Community Orchestra

Introduction
In this chapter, I present the data generated with the Metropolitan Community Orchestra (MCO). Key findings indicate that listeners’ understandings of orchestral music are largely developed through relationships and building connections. I highlight that these relationships are valuable not only for the audience members’ sense of having a place within MCO’s community as listeners, but also the musical understanding it affords. Figure 4.1 provides an overview of the MCO data analysis and the relationships within it.

I begin contextualising MCO and providing some background to the research site, the concerts observed and the research participants. Then I present four core themes drawn from the data analysis:

- connections, relationships and MCO’s approach to listener engagement;
- MCO’s relational audience development practices;
- the notion of learned listener languages; and
- expanding the concept of pedagogies of listening.

Minor themes examined throughout the discussion of the four core themes include how MCO overcome barriers to listener engagement, the emphasis placed on grassroots ground up relationships, repertoire selection as an opportunity for engagement, and the ways MCO facilitates the concert hall as a place where learning happens through listening. The chapter gives a detailed exploration of how relationships and connection are developed by MCO and synthesises how this example can be understood as a relational approach to audience development.
Contextualising ‘Metropolitan Community Orchestra’ (MCO)

MCO is a well-established community orchestra that rehearses weekly in a metropolitan city in Australia.\(^{18}\) They present a range of concerts for audiences annually within their immediate community as well as concerts as part of tours further afield within the state and internationally. MCO has a membership of over eighty musicians between the ages of 10 and 80 who play across three ensembles and perform at every concert produced by MCO. The three ensembles were developed in response to a need to provide an education for younger musicians and establish a sustainable and renewing membership. The three ensembles are Junior MCO (a string ensemble students up to the age of 15 and grade AMEB 1-3 standard), Youth MCO (an orchestra for players up to the age of 25 and AMEB grade 4 standard and above) and the Metropolitan Community Orchestra (open to all players grade 5 standard and above).\(^{19}\)

\(^{18}\) The term ‘metropolitan’ is used as per the *Australian Standard Geographical Classification* (2014) and the *Characteristics and Main Features of ABS Location Classifications* (2016b, 2016c) discussed in the literature review (Chapter 2).

\(^{19}\) Please note that from now on, the term MCO will be used to describe the organisation as a whole and concerts by the organisation. All MCO concerts organised by the orchestra as part of their yearly season feature each ensemble at every concert.

---

\(\text{Figure 4.1 – Graphic representaition of key themes drawn from the MCO data analysis}\)
of the orchestras play with a standard symphony orchestra instrumentation of strings, woodwind, brass and percussion. However, each orchestra will often play with doubled or tripled parts to include more of the player membership in each concert. Aside from piano, no additional instruments outside of this traditional instrumentation are usually included unless the concert program calls for it.

Annually, MCO presents a year-long season of four to five concerts. Two of these concerts are annual traditions — a ‘Spring Showcase’ concert for family and friends where members of the orchestra play for each other in small ensembles, and a ‘Christmas Cheer’ concert, usually in collaboration with a local community choir. Other concerts presented by MCO each year are often themed concerts, one of which is usually a classical themed concert focussing on a major work from the canon of Western art music or the works of an individual composer. The other two themed concerts often combine a selection of Western art music and contemporary repertoire from film or stage. In addition to these concerts, the orchestra also tours annually, cycling between local tours around the state and further afield to New Zealand, and partners with other community initiatives as they arise; for example, local community Christmas carols, amateur musical theatre productions or partnerships with other community groups.

Background to the concerts observed and the MCO research participants
As part of the data generation process, I attended three MCO concerts as both researcher and audience member. Through these observations I was able to gain an understanding of MCO’s context, performance practices and audience development strategies, as well as interact with this community and their lifeworlds (Finlay, 2005, 2009). A detailed summary of these concerts observed is provided in Appendix F (see p. 250).

One unique element of MCO’s concert practice is that every performer at some point during these concerts has the opportunity to be an audience member. Every MCO concert includes performances by each of the three ensembles – junior MCO, youth MCO and MCO proper. During the performances by other ensembles, the musicians and musical director of the ensembles not playing go into the audience and join their families or sit as a group in the audience. These performers become active members of the audience and have the opportunity to listen as an audience member would, which is unique practice in my observation of other orchestras.

The MCO research participants are introduced below (see table 6.1 and 6.2) using the data collated from the focus group, the participants’ profile forms and the interviews with the
arts organisers. To assist the discussion, particularly those in later chapters across all three case studies all MCO research participants have pseudonyms beginning with “M” for metropolitan.

**Table 4.1 – MCO arts organisers interviewed**

(pseudonyms all have code “Mo” for metropolitan arts organiser participant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monika</td>
<td>Organising committee member – Plays violin in MCO</td>
<td>Monika has been president of MCO since its amalgamation ten years ago. She oversees the tours, logistics and general running of the orchestra as a volunteer. She is also a teacher at a local school, plays violin in the orchestra and takes a very hands-on approach to pastorally caring for orchestra members. She describes many proactive ways she has led the creation of programs and performance opportunities for the orchestra to be involved in the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Organising committee member – Plays violin in MCO</td>
<td>Montana is a member of one of the orchestras that amalgamated to create MCO and has been part of the organising committee for many years in various roles. Currently, her role includes organising, distributing and filing the sheet music library. Montana also re-writes and transposes additional required parts and helps with rehearsals and concert logistics. Montana plays the violin with MCO and another community orchestra in Brisbane and is a retired healthcare professional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morty</td>
<td>Organising committee member – Plays oboe in MCO</td>
<td>Morty is a postgraduate student currently studying music and orchestral conducting interstate but is still active by correspondence, performing secretarial duties for MCO. This role includes elements of marketing with poster design and promotion via social media as well as managing the ‘Friends of the Orchestra’ database and newsletters. Morty also plays the oboe with the orchestra at most MCO concerts throughout the year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 - MCO focus group participants
(pseudonyms all have code “Ma” for metropolitan audience participant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marny</td>
<td>Attends 1-2 concerts per year and attends MCO concerts to hear her sibling play the French Horn which is what she finds most special about listening. Like her siblings, she learnt an instrument while she was at school. Currently, Marny works as in the performing arts industry in design and administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallory</td>
<td>Attends every MCO concert to see her child play in junior strings as well as other concerts including orchestral music, popular and rock music. Mallory learnt piano as a child, grew up in a regional setting and currently works for a business in keeping accounts and archive records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Matthew is married to Mallory. He enjoys a wide variety of music and attends many concerts annually including helping with set up and ushering at MCO events. Matthew grew up locally and did not receive any formal music education. He has worked as a sound engineer and recording technician for a range of high-end sporting and popular music acts/events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margie</td>
<td>Grew up locally and enjoys popular music including rock, pop and alternative music. Margie is currently studying to enhance her work as an artist and author but has never studied music. The concert where she responded to the call for research participants was one of her first concerts featuring an orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maeve</td>
<td>Grew up learning piano, singing and participating in school music programs which she says has fostered a love of classical music, opera and musical theatre. Maeve is heavily involved in statewide musical theatre company productions as well as being MCO’s resident master of ceremonies for every concert for the past few years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maree</td>
<td>Retired dedicated charity helper. Maree came to learn music later in life as the youngest of her ten children began high school. Maree was a founding member of the two ensembles which amalgamated to become MCO. As a result of her involvement with various orchestras and choirs, Maree has learnt to play eight different instruments. MCO has awarded Maree ‘life membership’ in recognition of her significant contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>Maurice first became involved with performing arts at university where he stage managed musical productions. This involvement has remained a hobby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of his with other community organisations, building and designing sets. He was part of the army in his African home country and played the assembly bugle. He then become a missionary teacher which sent him, his wife Mabel and family around the world to live throughout Africa, UK and Australia. He is now retired and frequently attends orchestral concerts. He still enjoys volunteering where he can with various organisations.

Mabel

Mabel is married to Maurice, happily retired from nursing. She described herself as ‘Maurice’s managing director’. She has attended concerts recently by MCO and values their performances because it means she and Maurice do not have to travel to hear a good variety of quality orchestral music. Mabel says she has always had an interest in classical music and that living in various places around the world has provided opportunities to hear many wonderful concerts.

Connections, Building Relationships and Listener Engagement

The MCO arts organisers and the focus group participants all shared that the sense of community they experience while listening at MCO concerts plays a significant role in meaningful listening learning experiences. In particular, they explained that having a personal connection and “relationship between the audience member and the individual musician within the orchestra” (interview, “Morty”) led to engaging listeners, which worked as a catalyst for learning in the concert hall.

For some of the focus group participants, the sense of community is strongly influenced by personal connections to members of the orchestra, whether they be family members or close friends. Not only did the focus group participants speak fondly of how much they enjoy and are proud to see their friends and family perform, but also the opportunities afforded to talk about music and gain a deeper insight into the performances both at concerts and during the rehearsal periods. Marny said, “it’s a joy to come and watch my brother” and Matthew, whose child plays in the orchestra, spoke about how being part of the MCO community through this connection continually changed how he listens at concerts. He said:

I’ve been hanging around these people for a little while now and I come in early and set some stuff up and do that sort of thing... The people themselves [in the orchestra]
are an eclectic group of people… a wide variety of backgrounds, and personalities, and places… It makes you change the way you look at the music that they’re producing… [and how] you listen to it.

For Matthew, the change in his experience began when he began to form interpersonal relationships with the musicians in the passing interactions he had during set up or helping with the raffle draws. His wife Mallory, who also engages with the orchestra weekly by staying with their child at rehearsals, similarly recognised that knowing the background of orchestra members might help people to listen as it had changed her own understanding through listening. However, she also recognised that while personally knowing the musicians is valuable, it was the music that provided an “escape from whatever is happening in people’s worlds”. Mallory explained that for her, the orchestra and their concerts were opportunities to enjoy “just being part of something that is bigger”. She saw this engagement as important for the community and as a way of “helping people enjoy the music”.

In a previous study, I examined how interpersonal relationships between players and audience members enhanced listener’s experience of being part of community orchestras (Nicholls, 2014). Particularly the study conducted with a community orchestra in a regional setting noted that the direct personal relationships make community orchestras unique from professional orchestras (Nicholls, 2014). Furthermore, relationships in this instance served as an aspect of organisational practice which actively accommodates a diversity of listening practices (Julian Johnson, 2002; S. Thompson, 2007), and affords learning opportunities which enhance musical understanding (Cain, 2013).

A variation of this type of engagement is described by Matthew and Mallory who are not members of the orchestra, but supporters of the orchestra via their child. Here Matthew and Mallory’s intrapersonal engagement can be understood through the concept of interpersonal learning as described in the work of M. C. Smith and DeFrates-Densch (2009) and Zandvliet (2014). Applied to this analysis, I identify that it is through personal relationships and ongoing interaction (such as coming to set up before concerts, picking a child up from rehearsals and having informal contact with the other musicians) that these audience members come to understand things that make a difference to their own listening. Here, the musicians of MCO have a part in the ongoing development of individual listener’s engagement and developing understanding through interpersonal relationships and the listener’s ongoing participation within the community (MacDonald, Hargreaves, & Meill, 2002; Wright & Kanellopoulos, 2010). Whereas for Matthew, engagement and new understandings were more directed by
talking to others and finding out about the music and instruments, Mallory’s learning came through insight, through feedback and interaction (Zandvliet, 2014).

There were also audience members in this community who participated in the focus group who did not have an immediate connection to the orchestra yet were regular attenders of MCO concerts. They too found the sense of community manifested at MCO concerts was valuable to creating fresh understandings of listening and appreciation for the coordination required to produce music as an orchestra. One audience member commented:

I think it’s the interaction too, between all of the groups of the orchestra… it’s about working together, seeing them do that and understanding that it’s important. I like watching that, watching the dynamics… [and] understanding how important or how hard it is to play a musical instrument and to work together (focus group, “Maree”).

Some audience members also commented on their experience of the sense of community created within the audience itself. For example, Mabel and Margie commented how they not only enjoy watching the orchestra, but also watching the audience and how they respond to the music which gave them cues into understanding their own listening experiences.

The arts organisers who are also active players in the orchestra also recognised the connection they experience with the audience and the importance of this connection in developing and facilitating learning with their audiences. In all the interviews, the arts organisers spoke about how engagement with their audience relies on “that more relational performance style” (interview, “Monika”) which was observed in the accounts of the audience members above. Morty, one of the younger MCO arts organisers, said:

I would say the most important thing is getting that connection between the individual musician, the way that they play and their personality, with the audience members… [it’s] a very important thing… we are very unique in having an afternoon tea where we are able to meet the audience members ourselves… and I think that’s a very good thing for other community orchestras to do. Because the audience wants to know the people and get to talk to them and they really enjoy that… it creates a really unique atmosphere to have that much support from the audience, for the musicians and for each other.

The MCO arts organisers talked further about how they actively promote the creation of a community, however it can be interpreted that their understanding of building community
also contributes to an understanding of relationship and relationality as a means of doing audience development. MCO’s development of junior strings and youth symphony not only provides a space for young musicians to be inducted into orchestral playing, but also, over time, allows the audience to see these junior members graduate through the ensembles. At the ‘Romantic Masters’ and ‘Christmas Cheer’ concerts, the conductor took time to acknowledge orchestra members who had graduated to the next ensemble and highlighted the young ages involved, which were met with thunderous applause. Morty said, “looking at them, you can see the enjoyment that the adult orchestra are having listening to the youth playing. It’s really nice”. This intergenerational involvement between youth, adults and senior members of both the orchestra was certainly a highlight in the descriptions given by the audience research participants of this particular community.

Pitts (2005a, 2005b) reflects on the vitality that being part of a listening community brings to the listening experience. In a study on a similarly close-knit community at a regular chamber orchestra music festival, Pitts explains that though there may not be a familial connection, audience members through the community connection experienced a shift in the way they perceived and experienced their own listening from a solitary activity to a communal one. The lifeworlds of the MCO focus group participants reflect similar themes, particularly in relation to the importance of interactions with musicians and those occurring within the audience. The MCO focus group participants explained how they appreciate the coordination it takes to produce the music and enjoy the experience of listening in close quarters and seeing the musicians as the music is performed.

Listening, for the focus group participants, both who have a personal connection to the musicians and for those who do not have a personal connection, is more than a musical activity. Rather, listening is also social, and the social experiences had while being part of this community help them to understand something of their own listening experiences. Born (2012, 2013) explains that to understand this ‘social’ element in music, the term must be understood pluralistically. She explains “social mediation occurs on a number of distinct and mutually modulating or intersecting planes” (2012, p. 263). For Matthew, Marny, Morty, and Monika, the social mediation of the experience is important for how they understand their experiences of the music and the MCO community, so much so that the social mediation, the community and the music are understood as one and the same phenomenon.
Overcoming barriers to engagement

In the interviews, the MCO arts organisers explained how concert design is very intentionally structured to help build connection and relationship with their audiences. This design was evident during the concert observations where I saw how the spatial organisation of the concert hall and space was made for building relationships and engagement. At each concert the audience was always seated in close proximity to the orchestra and, rather than being seated separately, the musicians of other MCO ensembles always sat with and amongst the audience. Monika and Montana explained that this informality helps people to perceive the orchestra as accessible and the concert hall as a comfortable place to be. Morty explained how other aspects of MCO’s performance practice are designed to do the same thing. For example, by choosing not to dress up in formal black attire or “the penguin suits” as Morty calls it, helps to “show that these are just regular musicians performing” because ultimately “presenting as really fancy and really elite, sort of doesn’t help listening”. The literature also identifies these issues as so-called ‘barriers’, however almost exclusively these issues relating to engagement are discussed in connection with marketing, audience recruitment and retention (Baker, 2000; Dobson, 2010; Hayes & Slater, 2002). However, as these discussion chapters unfold, I will highlight that these are also issues integral to theorising learning and listening experiences in the concert hall. Particularly I will revisit these ideas in chapters 5 and 7.

The MCO focus group participants highlighted that being in close proximity to the orchestra was valuable to their listening and engagement with the music, which provides insight into this analysis of MCO’s relational performance style. Matthew said that “having the orchestra in close contact” and going to performances in venues where the performers are “right there, they’re in touching distance” removes barriers to his listening and enables him to feel involved as part of the music making. The arts organisers strategically set up close proximity between the audience and the musicians as part of their relational performance practice. For instance, Montana, one of the arts organisers, commented that “the audience sits fairly close to us and [are] really connected, we’re not miles away” and seeing the musicians relaxed and “really enjoying themselves… smiling not being sort of stiff like” also “immediately connects us with our audience”. This sentiment was echoed by other focus group participants who described MCO concerts as “formal but casual”.

The experiences of the focus group participants and the relationship they are able to have with their own listening, the music and the musicians is enhanced through this closeness—both by proximal distance and by having the musicians “right there”. The listening experience is then one in which the audience experience the musicians in close physical quarters, but also
understand there to be a more equal and accessible relationship. In his thick descriptions of attending a concert in a grand and purpose-built concert hall, Small (1998) describes the exact opposite experience. A very different and formal relationship is created where there is a physical separation between audience and performer delineated by the stage, the all black formal attire of the performers, where performers and listeners enter and exit through different doors, and that even that the orchestra is elevated above the audience by the stage. Small notes that these factors, which the research participants in this study have identified as barriers, result in a very different relationship between the listener and music, and the audience and performer — one which is characterised by distance and anonymity as opposed to the “relational approach” described by the MCO research participants. In contrast to Small’s description, the MCO performs level with the audience, in less formal attire and within very close proximity with their listeners. This ultimately facilitates access, a sense of inclusion and an invitation for the audience to be part of the musicking. As Matthew summarises in his experience: “there’s no barrier to the music and it makes you feel like you’re basically in the orchestra and part of it”.

More insight into this relationship and connection created through close proximity was described by the focus group participants who spoke about how being able to see the whole orchestra and watching the instruments further bolstered this sense of connection. Furthermore, they explained that these things helped them to listen attentively and make meaning of their listening and concert experiences. One focus group participant said, “like when I was listening this afternoon, the people that I watched and really listened to were either the cellos because I play cello or people that I personally knew” (focus group, “Margie”). Mabel also commented, “I love being able to watch the instruments, the players”. Certainly, this visual access which promotes a connection between sound and sight and assists the listener is enhanced at MCO concerts where the orchestra regularly performs on tiered platforms. However, this was not something identified by the arts organisers as something they thought could help the audience members listen and understand the music. Rather, the staging plan was something done by the orchestra to help the musicians see the conductor.

As in Pitts’ (2005a, 2005b) study of the chamber music festival where performances were given ‘in the round’ and in intimate spaces, the MCO audiences explain that being in close proximity to the players significantly impacts their sense of connection to the performance and the performers (Cook, 2012, 2013). Planning performances in this way helps break down physical and perceptual barriers about classical music and is a key theme in cultural management and audience development literature (Dobson & Pitts, 2011; Hazelwood et al.,
2009; Roose & Vander Stichele, 2010). In this case, as Matthew said, there are “no barriers” which have further significance and benefit beyond what is explained in the literature. Choosing to have a more informal approach (not wearing “penguin suits”, not being “stiff like”) and choosing to have the audience in close proximity engages the audience’s listening in a unique way. There is an emphasis on interaction between the audience and orchestra as mutually important, rather than the maintenance of a silent and distant barrier between strangers. The way MCO actively builds connection and relationship with the audience ultimately helps the audience to make meaning out of the listening experience and equips them to be confident audience members. These are social and psychological benefits (Ballantyne, Ballantyne, & Packer, 2014) that also create space for learning and fresh understanding to emerge for the listener.

Both the arts organisers and the focus group participants recognised that having a master of ceremonies addressing the audience during concerts was another vital practice for making the concerts less formal, more relational and for making the concert experience and listening more accessible. Monika explained that this “relational approach” of using a master of ceremonies had deliberately become part of MCO’s concert practice. She identified that doing concerts “like the [state symphony orchestra], with no speaking … and big program notes… didn’t work for our group. It really didn’t work. It needed to have that more relational performance. People like that”. Likewise, Morty identified that because Maeve, MCO’s regular master of ceremonies, is not an orchestral player she is more useful to the audience as “she does a wonderful job with the research and explaining it in a way that’s relatable to the audience”.

For the audience members, these are elements of MCO’s concert practice that profoundly aid them in their learning about the music, listening and enjoyment of concerts. Matthew and the focus group participants talked about how the information given by Maeve, the master of ceremonies, encouraged them to listen in different ways:

Matthew: I think the set up by Maeve does make you reconsider what you’re about to listen to… [and as the music] starts, your brain is thinking about the story that goes along with the piece… so that then makes you listen differently too and feel different things. And it’s a great thing and I hope [they] keep on going [doing this] … because it definitely helps with the learning if you don’t know who Mendelsohn is or what he did…
Mabel: Yes, that is fascinating.

Margie: That’s a learning that makes us appreciate it [the music] more, I think. You’re keen to understand so you listen to that and you appreciate it more.

In the literature on audience development and concert hall performance, there is little discussion of the use of speakers, master of ceremonies or animateurs. Certainly there is evidence of this happening in concert halls as explored in the literature review both throughout history and in present practice (ABC Radio, 2015; Melbourne Symphony Orchestra, 2015; Philharmonia Orchestra London UK, 2009; Rissmann, n.d.), but the effects and how these impact the listener’s experience have not yet been examined. More prevalent in the literature is the examination of program notes (Botstein, 1992; J. D. Kramer, 1988; Marguilis, 2010). However, as seen in the case of MCO, while program notes listing the works, composers, musicians in each ensemble and thanking the supporters of the orchestra are distributed, they function more as a memento from the concert than a tool to explain the music and highlight aspects to listen for. As Monika and Morty explained:

Theoretically speaking we could get away without having any programs, but yeah, people like to keep them, have their names in them, I try not to leave anyone out (focus group, “Monika”).

I think the audience prefers that communication with someone, rather than being very disconnected and having to read it themselves. If you get Maeve to read — she does a wonderful job with the research and explaining it in a way that is relatable to audiences and stuff. That’s kind of what we have gone with, rather than having to write up the program notes for it (interview, “Morty”).

It is evident that these spoken program notes delivered by the master of ceremonies build the relationship between audience and orchestra by creating a relatable place to start the listening, in addition to facilitating access through being part of a more informal environment. The spoken, rather than read, program notes give the audience points of reference as well as encouraging them to listen attentively, and “listen differently”. In this case, this more informal, relational approach is doing more than simply removing barriers for these audience members.
They are educating the audience, encouraging the development of listening capabilities and resulting in confident listeners who feel a deep sense of personal connection to the creation of the music.

However, the focus group participants also recognised that MCO’s relational approach is something presented in multiple formats for the express purpose of connecting with the many and varied learning and engagement needs of the audience — a theme also present in the interview data and concert observation. It was clear that MCO recognises an imperative to not only build relationships and listener engagement through overtly speaking with the audience (for example having Maeve engage the audience as the master of ceremonies), but also providing space to interact with listeners (for example having afternoon tea, having musicians sit in the audience and having the audience in close proximity to the musicians). These points indicate that the arts organisers identify a need to do things differently to suit the preferences and learning and engagement needs of their listeners, and that these efforts are also recognised by the audience members.

**The importance of grassroots relationships - ground up, not top down**

Another series of strategies employed by the MCO arts organisers which help build community and connection for listeners are the use of local guest soloists and composers. The orchestra also actively builds partnerships with other community groups, both musical (for example other community bands, the state musical theatre company, local choirs, and partnerships with orchestras further afield) and non-musical (including the State Equestrian Centre). Montana explained: “rather than having to get someone outside, it’s sort of homegrown and we can do our own sort of thing. I think people relate to these soloists, they think they’re one of them and doing a wonderful job”.

Monika explained that the partnerships the orchestra had formed with other community groups were valuable for taking orchestral music out of the concert hall and into the community and being able to serve different audiences. These partnerships had “been really good for the orchestra, but also for the other groups, you know, to have that cross-fertilisation”. These partnerships and opportunities to outreach to different audiences add to the repertoire of engagement and teaching strategies for the orchestra, in addition to the extensive work done by the orchestra engaging with various audiences through their local, further afield, and international tours.

To bring this section to a close, I offer a reframing through the work of Dewey and what he coined as the situational understanding of experience. Dewey (1964, 1998) theorised
that understanding and identifying the nature of non-reflective experiences, habits and customs could explain the barriers to engagement a learner is likely to experience and thus make the experience non-educational. In the case presented so far, I have analysed how MCO disrupts traditional practices that preclude engagement for their audience (proximal distance between performer and audience, formal attire, formal approaches to program notes) and makes engagement possible through a relational approach which is built from the ground up and through individual relationships between performers and listeners.

As the research participants attest and Dewey asserts, social and situational understandings are required for facilitating pedagogies of listening and educative experiences for audience members. Furthermore, when these barriers to experience are mitigated, the experience of listening becomes engaging and therefore potentially educative. So far in this orchestra these factors include social and relational aspects (having individual relationship or relationality to the musicians or music), spatial considerations (being in close proximity to the performers), customs and traditions (adopting less formal protocols in relation to performance dress, choosing to speak to the audience and guide their listening), or what can be summarised as paying attention to what Dewey and others call ‘felt difficulties’ (Cambridge, 2017; Hildreth, 2012).

**MCO’s Relational Audience Development Practices**

The MCO example and practice brings a further dimension to these Deweyan concepts. Not only are these social and relational factors, spatial considerations, and customs/traditions vital to creating an environment in which experiences and relationships are propagated, these relationships also function as the tools for audience development and learning. MCO’s “relational approach” is one which dismantles barriers to engagement and learning by working from the ground up rather than imposing a top-down systems relationship.

MCO’s concert practices and the explanations given by the research participants point toward a significant and relational view of audience development. The research participants’ experiences reflect accepted definitions of audience development as the culminating efforts of programming, education and marketing given in earlier chapters (Maitland, 2000; R. Rogers, 1998; Sigurjónsson, 2010b). The MCO audience members had experiences that “enhance and broaden a specific individual’s experiences of the arts” (R. Rogers, 1998, p. 1) and through a combination of marketing, programming and education they “enhance… their enjoyment, understanding and confidence across the art forms” (Maitland, 2000, p. 6). Moreover, the MCO is clearly engaged in a “long-term process of attracting and engaging target arts participants,
audiences… and retaining them by establishing and maintaining strategic, dynamic and sustainable relationships” (Roberts, 2012, p. 22). Furthermore, these practices and relationship building efforts facilitate worthwhile listening experiences for their audiences.

However, MCO’s version of audience development is something unique amongst these definitions. It is not a situation where the acts of audience development - marketing, programming and education - create relationships and build connection for audience members. Rather, MCO’s practice indicates that the goals of audience development are achieved because of their relational practices. Relationships and building connection make all the difference to their audience members’ experiences of the music and enhance their listening and understanding — be it through relationships and connections built between individual musicians and audience members, audience members and the music, or audience members with each other as a community of listeners. MCO’s focus on relationships and building connection as audience development reveals new insight into the ways that learning and listening pedagogy can be considered and practiced in the concert hall. Particularly these relationships which facilitate a relational approach to audience development are evidenced in MCO’s intentional formal but casual ‘relational focussed’ concerts and the ways they advocate for developing and showcasing homegrown talent.

Given this is an emerging contribution different to that already found in the literature examined so far, I now return to the research participant’s experiences to examine more closely this notion of relational audience development and the mechanics of MCO’s pedagogies of listening. Is this something which is afforded by community organisations such as MCO because of their unique and close relationship with their community? How have the orchestra organisers come to develop this approach to audience development? What might such a view of listening experiences offer in theorising an education-centric approach to audience development?

When explicitly asked about audience development, two of the arts organisers did not recognise the term and said they did not know what it meant. The third participant, Monika, said she had heard of audience development, saying that building and retaining an audience through relationships is the starting place. As she said, the relationships must come first, “you have to have an audience first to develop them, don’t you?”. However, all three of the arts organisers identified that developing an audience includes “stretching the boundaries with what the audience is prepared to come and listen to” while also maintaining practices that continue to build positive experiences and relationships. Monika summarised, “you know they want to have a good afternoon out, which is why we put on afternoon tea”. Monika’s response to the
question ‘what does the term audience development mean to you as an organiser of this orchestra?’ indicates an awareness that relationships mediate MCO’s marketing and programming practices to connect with their audiences and help building experiences which are engaging. So, while the arts organisers may not articulate audience development as a conscious practice, as demonstrated in the analysis above, it is certainly something present through the relationships and connections they actively build with their audience.

MCO’s arts organisers was most easily able to describe the ways that marketing and programming are used to “sustain and expand existing or regular audiences or visitors” (R. Rogers, 1998, p. 1) as well as making their concerts welcoming to people who are new to orchestral concerts. In addition to doing interviews on the local radio stations, posters and mailouts, the orchestra has also created a ‘Friends of the Orchestra’ program whereby audience members can subscribe to receive discounted tickets, a mention in concert programs, email updates, newsletters and a special badge to wear. Morty, as the secretary and coordinator of the ‘Friends of the Orchestra’ also spoke about how Facebook and social media were being used to connect with the audience by sending out images of rehearsals and short videos of concerts. Though having adopted digital approaches to their concert practice, the orchestra still very consciously “do hard copies” (interview, “Monika”), particularly for attendees from nursing homes, caravan parks and other places where people may not have access to the internet. In relation to marketing, Morty also spoke about how the orchestra “don’t want to put [ticket prices] up, because we like making it accessible for as many people as possible”. All these descriptions of marketing are consistent with the cultural management literature reviewed earlier (Clopton et al., 2006; Costantoura, 2001; B. M. Kolb, 2005; Rentschler, 1999).

**Repertoire selection as an opportunity for engagement**
The arts organisers spoke at length about the importance of how repertoire choice (programming) is used to make listening and learning experiences accessible. However, more than this, they also explained how repertoire could be used as a tool to expand audience member’s listening, by building relationships and connections between what is familiar and what might be new. Montana talked about the importance of having a combination of familiar repertoire with other works that may be new to the audience which could induct audiences into the world of orchestral music. She explained, “even though you don’t want to play common pieces all the time, you’ve got to have a few common pieces, so audiences go to the concerts”. Again, this is consistent with the literature on programming for audience recruitment and development (A. Brown, 2004; Lin, 2008).
Monika likewise explained “we try and select the pieces that the [ensembles] and audience will manage, that will also be a challenge”. One example she gave was the ‘Romantic Masters’ concert I observed, which she said “really lifted the standard of playing for a lot of people in the group. And it wasn’t too bad audience-wise hopefully”. Monika, Montana and Morty all explained that because of these understandings, MCO’s repertoire and therefore concerts are carefully planned around the need to present concerts, which will be of interest to the audience but also ultimately also help people have connection with the music and bolster relationships between orchestra and audience, and audience and music. However, as Morty summarises, these goals are not only achieved within each concert individually, but also across the year of concerts given by MCO. He said, “every year we have done that kind of layout where we have a purely classical concert, a purely modern kind of concert and then one that is kind of mixed like… we have generally always done that kind of layout and we have found that works well and it caters for everyone’s tastes”. In this way MCO ensures that there is “something for everyone” (interview, “Monika”) as well as responding to the preferences and interests of their audiences and community.

The MCO concert hall as a place where learning happens through listening
After some of the initial concert observations and an interview with Monika, I was curious to explore how the arts organisers of MCO had come to learn these programming, marketing, educative and relational practices which develop their audiences. Three messages came from the follow-up questions and interviews. Both Montana and Monika explained that “some of it is trial and error” and that the practice of producing concerts for their community has evolved. Morty explained that his practices around social media and creating the Friends of the Orchestra program originated from “usually looking at what the professional orchestras do and try to do something similar… and I take ideas from different places and think that would work really well for us, if we were able to set something up like that”. Monika also explained that one of their new arts organisers who is a member of a young political party organisation is adapting the publicity strategies he has seen used. However, from an education perspective, perhaps one of the most profound moments in the interviews was when Monika explained how her vocation as a teacher informed how she thought about learning in the concert hall and MCO’s audiences. Furthermore, her experience informed how she goes about interacting with audiences and how best to design concerts for listeners through this relational approach.
Monika explains:

Monika: Because it’s the teacher in me you know. If they’re [the audience] not getting it, you help them get it.

Researcher: Ok, so it’s the predisposition towards thinking not everything that we’re doing here is assumed as core knowledge to everybody.

Monika: That’s right. And it’s about being inclusive too and that’s not just inclusive of the people who play, it’s also inclusive of the people who listen. And we try hard to have something for everybody in concerts.

Researcher: Being inclusive. It’s the teacher in you that tells you what you need to do with an audience.

Monika: Yeah and [the conductor] is the same, she’s a teacher too and so is Maeve [our MC], and so is [the leader of the junior strings]. So, there’s a few of us running it here. But then we’ve got people like Morty who aren’t teachers who are a very good counterbalance.

Phenomenologist Max van Manen addresses this idea of “knowing what to do when you don’t know what you’re doing” (2015, pp. 42, 44)—what he calls pedagogical tact (1979). For van Manen, pedagogy is not simply a way of teaching, but a complex and slippery phenomenon made up of pedagogical moments, tact and sensitivity. As he explains, “a certain kind of seeing, listening and responding to a particular child or group of children in ever-changing situations” (2015, p. 35). Monika’s explanation of how MCO’s audience development practices have emerged and evolved resonates strongly with van Manen’s approach to theorising pedagogy, albeit in a context different from his original work which focussed on children, parents and schooling. Towards the end of his text, van Manen identifies three ontologies of practice, or ways of pedagogic being, which are clearly evident in the excerpt above. The first ontological practice, pedagogical sense, is evident in Monika’s comment that she knows that there is more to putting on a concert and that “it’s the teacher in me” that helps her to know what will help the audience listen attentively and connect with the music. Van Manen’s second ontological practice, pedagogical sensibility, is evident in Morty’s
explanation of how he looks to other organisations for inspiration to see what might work in his context. And van Manen’s third ontology of pedagogical acting is evident in MCO’s “trial and error” to work out what works and what is not so effective for both their musicians and their audiences (van Manen, 2015, p. 99). Together these practices constitute what van Manen describes as pedagogical tact.

What is also clear in the work of van Manen is that pedagogical tact seems impossible without a strong sense of relationship and connectivity. For MCO, this relationship and connectivity, combined with their awareness of situational and social understandings of ‘felt difficulties’ (or barriers) informs their audience development and pedagogical practices (Dewey, 1964, 1998). Through relational grassroots strategies, MCO provides experiences which challenge and develop the listening of their audiences. What is also encouraging is that the focus group participants also identify that the MCO concert hall is a place where learning happens through listening. As Maurice explains “that’s a teaching thing. Every time this orchestra is playing, they are teaching at some level”.

However, the experiences of the focus group participants require an extension to van Manen’s theory of pedagogical tact (2015) which will be examined more closely in the next section. In short, the MCO example highlights complex ways of learning and teaching which challenge traditional notions of pedagogy and insist on the primacy of pedagogy as not only actions and relationships, but also in objects and experiences, the latter being something Dewey (1963, 1980) would certainly affirm. By means of outlining the specific details of these pedagogy, Appendix I (pages 274-289) outlines the elements of the concerts which research participants identified as things that challenged, changed, taught or enhanced their listening experience. In all, thirty-four different ‘pedagogies of listening’ were identified and described by the research participants. They encompass a range of spatial, relational, collective, individual, cognitive, affective, resourcing and embodied practices.

Learned Listener Languages
In moving towards an expanded view of pedagogy and audience development in the concert hall as exemplified by MCO, there are three final points I wish to highlight in this analysis. First, the unanimous affirmation by the MCO research participants that listening is a learnt skill. Second, that listening practices are diverse and are not hierarchical. Third, that individual listeners make sense of their listening experiences using the literacies that they already possess in addition to accessing the pedagogical practices employed by the orchestra at concerts.
While the arts organisers found it difficult to articulate how learning occurs at their concerts, it was clear across all interviews and the focus group data that there is a unanimous belief that listening is something which is active and a skill which can be learned or developed. The arts organisers and the focus group participants unanimously identified that there is no one correct way to listen. As Morty explained:

Everyone is different in the way that they learn… I suppose that everyone can be trained to listen in a certain way, the musical theory kind of way… but others may not want to and some don’t think like that… I think there are different ways of listening… you don’t have to listen in a certain way and I don’t think that is going to change.

Here, Morty not only described the fact that there are different ways of listening, but that all different ways of listening are valid for the person. Furthermore, for him, the way that a person learns is connected to the ways in which they will listen. Certainly, this latter idea was echoed in the conversations with the focus group participants as well. He highlighted that although audiences can be ‘trained’ to listen in certain ways, such as by understanding the theory of music or being cognisant of the technical elements of the music, these ways of listening are not hierarchically more superior to other ways of listening. They are simply different ways of listening, which are appropriate to the individual.

Similarly, learning to listen was something which must be differentiated for the multiplicity of ways audience members listen at MCO concerts. Furthermore, the arts organisers explained how they individually experimented with a variety of concert elements that allowed to them to listen in their own ways and felt that MCO concerts were important and supported their listening skill development. One of the focus group discussions highlighted the complexity and multiplicity of ways listening experienced by these audience members in the MCO concert hall.

Researcher: Is listening something that you can learn… this sort of educated listening where you’re able to make meaning out of the experience of listening?

Maree: It depends on who you are.

Matthew: Absolutely something you can learn.
Mabel: Active listening you can learn, you can compare it if you want to with the living. Because it can transport you to memories you’ve had and or present day or all that sort of thing.

Monika: I’m sure that if I hadn’t been given the chance to do music as a kid [and learn to listen], I wouldn’t have learnt necessarily.

These experiences and explanations of the focus group participants affirm the need to theorise listening as something which is not only learnt, but also diverse. It is the differentiation in the experience of listening that must be valued in a theory of learning through listening and audience education. Listening research indicates a hierarchy that elevates the virtue of cognitive approaches over affective and embodied means of conceptualising listening (see Adorno et al., 2002; Behne, 1997; Deliège & Sloboda, 1997; DeNora, 2003). My interpretation of the MCO data challenges this emphasis on the cognitive and by implication troubles current theory the teaching and learning of listening. The experiences of the MCO focus group participants are not consistent with Elliott’s (1995, 2005b) ideas on school-based instruction which asserts a clear divide between declarative knowledge (knowing about music) and procedural skill (knowing how to listen). Other more specific pedagogies of listening explored in the literature review focus on what to listen for (Copland, 1988; Drobnick, 2004), experimental listening skills (E. F. Clarke, 2005; Tinkle, 2015), aesthetic approaches (Adorno et al., 2002; W. T. Anderson, 2016; Gold, Frank, Bogert, & Brattico, 2013), and developing a certain ‘taste’ or appreciation for music (Hargreaves & North, 2010; Hennion, 2001; Hund, 2014). Instead, what the MCO research participant data advocates for is an emphasis on curating experiences where audiences can listen in a multiplicity of ways, and that through a relational approach, listening experiences as a medium facilitate learning taking place.

The focus group participants explained how their experiences and the diversity of their own backgrounds enabled them to make sense of their musical experiences, helping them to access the music and to make abstract sound something concrete that they could engage with through emotion, embodiment, remembering, knowing about, somatic, imaginative, social and cognitive/logical experiences. In describing their experiences, the focus group participants highlighted the differentiated ways in which they listen and use their experiences to make sense of their listening. This is seen, for example, in Maurice’s explanation of one of his listening experiences which demonstrates how listening and meaning-making happen for him through embodiment, remembering, being in the moment and having a connective social experience:
Maurice: I close my eyes… I prefer music in here [puts hands on chest]. Where I can feel it.

Researcher: Sure. So, what’s that like? Is it a physical thing, you feel the vibration, or is it an emotional thing, or is it a, it makes you remember things or colours or shapes?

Maurice: No, I live in the moment. But I’m back from what’s happening and the people who are there. Alone isn’t lonely when you’re with music.

For Matthew, his previous work as a sound engineer gave him a literacy which he used to make sense of the music and draw meaning from the experience:

Matthew: Three things run through my mind as I watch an orchestra. One is that I imagine how I would set all the audio stuff up to record it. And its pretty hectic with an orchestra that size. And then I think about, I imagine the music not so much the music like sheet music but as levels… Because that’s what I’m used to seeing on a desk. And then I try and absorb some of it instead of thinking constantly about it, just try, and absorb myself in the music… And so I can see how you can sort of merge music and I’ve done that with recording and that sort of stuff, producing. But yeah, I try to enjoy it but sometimes your brain is just like ‘click, click, click’.

Researcher: Sounds like a tricky balance.

Matthew: Yeah it is.

Maeve and Marny who both have backgrounds in musical theatre explained how they use their technical knowledge in these fields to understand the music being played in the concert:

Marny: You’re going through all the technical things. I choreograph
dances in my head every time I’m listening to a piece of music. If I’m sitting there and if it’s really taking me away, I’m on a different plane. And I’m just, there’s dancers coming in.

Maeve: Or the moves get bolder.

Mallory summarised how these experiences and ‘languages’ with which each audience member was already familiar contributed to having a type of musical literacy, a foot in the door which allowed them to understand and make meaning out of their listening experiences:

Mallory: I think it’s whatever your background is. Or however you’ve moved into music that then challenges or changes things in how you listen. You work with what language you’ve got. So, if your language is dance, or costume, or whatever, or sound tech-ing, or everything.

These ‘languages’ which the audience members bring with them to their listening experiences and learning in the concert hall allow them to access the music in ways that are personally meaningful to them. While they may not be speaking using the technical languages of music or displaying traditional music education literacy, what is being demonstrated is a need to reconsider the audience member as a listener who brings with them other ‘languages’ which they can use to understand and learn the skill of listening in the concert hall. Such an approach not only affirms Dewey’s (1963, 1980) assertion of education as experience and van Manen’s (1997, 2015) notions of pedagogical tact, but also spurs the ongoing development of a new emerging understanding of pedagogies of listening and audience development.

**Expanding MCO’s Pedagogies of Listening: Doing more than they think**

One of the valuable aspects of the research methods adopted for this study is the affordance of emic and etic positions, which I was able to occupy as a researcher. As a researcher, I was an outsider to MCO, but I was also an insider as an audience member who experienced the same concerts as the research participants. As a musician and member of community orchestras I was able to understand and empathise with the arts organisers, and yet use my own understanding and insight as a pedagogue and audience developer with other orchestras to analyse MCO’s practice. At the same time, I had the privilege of not only attending the concerts and experiencing MCO’s practice for myself, but I also was able to get an insider view from
the arts organisers, as well as the perspective of other audience members. Another way of framing this positionality in terms of phenomenology is using Finlay’s (2005, 2009) notion of reflexive embodied empathy.

From these different emic and etic perspectives using reflexive embodied empathy, I wish to highlight two key points to add to this analysis. The first relates to audience development and educative practices in the concert hall. As highlighted earlier in this chapter, thirty-four different pedagogies of listening were identified (see Appendix I – see p. 257). What is striking in this analysis is that the audience had a strong sense of what was helping them to learn in the concert hall. Yet, when asked about the educative practices of the orchestra, the arts organisers had little awareness of the good work they were doing and the value listeners were taking from these listening experiences. Perhaps this is an encouraging lesson, and also a further challenge that troubles what constitutes pedagogies of listening and audience development. From the experiences of the MCO research participants and the theory applied here, it is evident that there needs to be a more encompassing understanding of what in the concert hall can be considered as pedagogical.

The second insight I drew from the data was observed during every MCO concert and was a practice unique amongst the orchestras I observed. As I mentioned in the background to MCO at the beginning of the chapter, every concert includes performances by the various ensembles that comprise the whole of MCO (their youth orchestra, junior strings etc.). However what is significant from the perspective of the audience is that when they are not performing, the musicians of the other ensembles sit in and amongst the audience. This practice blurred the roles in the concert hall between audience, listener and performer (including conductor/musical director). During the data generation I asked the arts organisers what impact this practice might have on the audience. The response was uncertain, however, it was certain that this practice was valuable to the orchestra members and the audience, bridging the divide and providing a variety of listening opportunities within the single concert. Monika explained, “I expect our orchestra to be part of the audience”. Morty likewise recognised the benefit to the performers and being able to say “wow, look at these musicians, how much they have developed in this amount of time… we enjoy watching them”. Morty also recognised the variety and interest it afforded the audience, he said “with a different orchestra, you have a different conductor, people sitting in different places, sometimes it’s the same musicians but playing different instruments. I think it keeps the concert very interesting for them (the audience)”. Moreover, these opportunities also allowed for different opportunities to listen to
a variety of ensembles, to see different conductors leading, and different repertoire performed in a single concert.

However, as an audience member, I also perceived that MCO’s multiple ensemble concerts could contribute to modelling audience behaviours, seeing performers as co-listeners and further blurring of the role between player, audience and listener. Seeing the equality of role created by the performers coming into the audience as listeners, the many ways the performers personally interact with their audience and the value the orchestra placed on listening as an important thing to do was particularly important to my experience as an audience member and provoked me to re-question the roles and boundaries of musicians and listeners in the concert hall. The audience members identified that they enjoy the variety of ensembles which perform at MCO concerts, that they can hear and see different things as a result of this practice and that they gain wider experience and understanding of listening as a result.

**Summary**

For MCO, while issues of programming, marketing and education are certainly part of their organisational practice, opportunities afforded them as a community orchestra are harnessed to develop grassroots initiatives which ultimately act as catalysts for listener engagement. Thus, the MCO case demonstrates a relational approach to audience development and pedagogies of listening. It is through relationships that the arts organisers identifies the felt difficulties of listeners and works to eliminate barriers that hinder engagement and educative listening experiences. When barriers are reduced, and listeners can build relationships with the musicians and the music, the concert hall becomes a place of learning and engagement through relational experiences. A discussion has begun that problematises the current literature on listening and music education, one that requires a broader understanding of the notions of teacher, learner and learning. This requires further understanding of how listening is learnt in the concert hall and the diverse ways in which listeners make meaning using the languages and associations of their own prior experiences.
CHAPTER 5

Pedagogies of Listening at a Professional Symphony Orchestra

Introduction
In this chapter I present the data generated with the audience members and arts organisers of the Professional Symphony Orchestra (PSO), and the key themes drawn from the analysis I conducted (see figure 5.1 for an overview of the PSO data analysis and the relationships within it). I wrestle with the nature of learning in the concert hall, intricate questions around what helps audiences in their listening and understanding of music, and how this orchestra finds a balance with different goals, audiences, listeners and contexts. After introducing the PSO and the research participants, I use four overarching themes to explain how pedagogies of listening operate in the context of this orchestra through:

- personalisation pedagogies;
- giving the listener freedom to learn and interpret;
- valuing the audience’s capabilities to learn and engage; and
- balancing tensions between opposing artistic and education goals.
Contextualising ‘Professional Symphony Orchestra’ (PSO)

PSO is one of six full-time professional symphony orchestras based in one of Australia’s capital cities (Australian Broadcasting Corporation, 2012; Garrett, 2010). In addition to permanent orchestral musicians, PSO employs a large team of marketing, programming and education staff who coordinate their concert productions and performances. PSO also employs various auxiliary, contract and casual staff for specific projects with national and international soloists, including technicians, facilitators, animateurs and presenters. This orchestra, like others of its kind, is mostly funded through philanthropy, which enables PSO to perform over six hundred and fifty concerts per year and, according to internal reports, reach an audience of over three and a half million people. In addition to these reported figures, PSO concerts are frequently live streamed on the internet, recorded for sale and included in radio broadcasts. Through these means and by coordinating a variety of parallel concert series PSO caters to the diverse

---

20 These figures and information have been taken from the orchestra’s own annual reports available on their public webpage. I have not included citations to protect their identity within the context of this research. Similarly, the reference list for this thesis does not include references to the publicly available materials used in the preparatory and pilot research.
musical tastes of their patrons. Various events and ensembles are designed specifically for touring and outreach projects, including specific education concerts and in school programs.

The PSO’s dedicated education team are the group within the orchestra’s organisation primarily responsible for managing the orchestra’s school outreach programs and designing and producing concerts for children and families. Projects related to this study included: a series of interactive concerts for young children and another for families; a series of guided listening concerts; public free mass concerts; and, pedagogical materials generated by the education team for teachers and educators. To a lesser extent the education team also coordinates with the orchestra’s programming team who oversee the ‘mainstage’21 season performances. PSO mainstage performances also frequently include educational or outreach elements designed to help patrons engage with the performances, including pre-concert talks, post-concert conversations, interactive public concerts, program notes and a concert series for adults designed to develop skills for listening to classical orchestral music.

Background to the concerts observed and the PSO research participants
I observed six concerts to gain an understanding of PSO’s context, audiences, performance practices and audience development strategies. Given the diversity of PSO’s annual concert offerings, concerts were selected to observe a variety of audiences (children and adults), performance contexts (education, mainstage and entertainment) where pedagogies of listening may be present. I have included a detailed summary of these concerts in Appendix G (see p. 252).

I introduce the research participants below (see tables 7.1 and 7.2) using the data collated from the participants’ profile forms and the interviews with the arts organisers. Whereas the community orchestras generated sufficient participants from a single focus group (5-8 participants), two focus groups were needed and conducted after contrasting concerts to provide an adequate number of participants comparable to the other two research sites as recommended in the research methods literature. Focus group 1 consisted of three audience members recruited via verbal invitation during the pre-concert talk at one of PSO’s mainstage concerts22. The two participants in focus group 2 were recruited via invitation after the pop

---

21 ‘Mainstage’ concerts were described by the arts organisers as the largescale full orchestra performances presented in formal settings, such as the states performing arts centre and dedicated.
22 The fact that these audience members were recruited via the pre-concert talk suggests that they are already highly engaged, a factor which was considered in the data analysis and held similarities with other focus groups in other orchestras who were actively involved in education or the orchestra by proxy.
style concert. To assist the discussion, particularly those in later chapters across all three case studies, all PSO research participants have pseudonyms beginning with “P” for professional.

**Table 5.1 – PSO arts organisers interviewed**
(pseudonyms all have code “Po” for professional organiser participant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poppy</td>
<td>Employed full time as leader of the education and outreach team.</td>
<td>Poppy has worked with the PSO in varying capacities since 2012 and joined the education team in 2014. She holds degrees in music performance and is currently completing studies in education. Poppy is responsible for the community-based instrument education programs run by PSO as well as leading the development of education concerts and programs for children and families. Her work includes the orchestra’s annual involvement in a national education week program and some outreach aspects of PSO’s work. Poppy is also a contracted pre-concert presenter for the PSO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polo</td>
<td>Employed full time as leader of the administration and programming team.</td>
<td>Polo leads a large team responsible for the programming of PSO’s concert season including selecting how many concerts, where the concerts are held, the repertoire, soloists and the design of concert series. He has been with PSO for two years and has held positions with other international orchestras previously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Employed full time as part of the programming team. Frequently presents pre-concert talks.</td>
<td>Powell’s role with the PSO involves managing the library and sheet music. He developed a handbook to guide the preparation of pre-concert talks and gives a range of pre-concert talks with the PSO at concerts, on local radio and at community events. Powell is also involved in various community music projects outside the PSO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Poal is one of the artistic directors and concert presenters. Poal conducts the orchestra as one of the artistic directors in conjunction with the principal conductor and programming team. He collaborates with Polo to develop PSO concert series to draw new audiences to the concert hall. Particularly for the PSO, Poal’s work includes coordinating a concert series for new concertgoers, mass public free concerts, events associated with national education week celebrations and performances of film music in concert. In addition to his involvement with PSO Poal is frequently invited to conduct other professional symphony orchestras in Australia and internationally.

Table 5.2 - PSO focus group participants
(pseudonyms all have code “Pa” for professional orchestra audience member)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS GROUP 1 (participants recruited at the ‘Romantic Russia’ concert)</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pauline</td>
<td>Pauline</td>
<td>Pauline is a retired teacher who lives on the aged pension. She attends any concert she can within budget and accessibility given her mobility disability. She was taught music as a child in a boarding school where she learnt piano in what she describes as a punitive and old-fashioned way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrice</td>
<td>Patrice</td>
<td>Patrice works in the health services and volunteers with her local art gallery and performing arts groups. She lives in a regional area and travels whenever she can, sometimes for up to seven hours, to attend concerts by PSO. She plays the piano for her own enjoyment and is grateful for radio and other means by which she can access classical music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Page is a retired health professional, university lecturer and researcher in the field of audiology. While she has had a few piano lessons, she is interested in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
understanding music better rather than simply listening to it. She attends as many concerts and arts events as she can using public transport.

**FOCUS GROUP 2** (recruited at the ‘Classical Hits You Know and Love’ concert)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Background and Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Grew up in regional areas and currently works in internet and communications development. He learnt piano and saxophone growing up, played in various orchestras and bands and through school went to a variety of arts performances. As an adult, he attends popular music concerts occasionally and listens to a variety of music using personal technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>Patience grew up in India and had her first introduction to music through her fiancé Patrick. Academic achievement was important in her schooling, however, music and the arts were not included in her formal education. She works in childcare and listens to a limited range of music which she says Patrick is trying to expand. The concert attended for this study was Patience’s first experience of an orchestra and concert hall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Complexity and Distinction**

The data generated with PSO were intensely rich and complex which was reflected initially in the sheer volume of themes and sub-themes generated during my analysis of the data.\(^{23}\) Partly I attribute this complexity to the number and diversity of concerts\(^ {24}\) I had access to during the data generation timeframe. However, the complexity of the case was evident in the very different roles and relationships the research participants have with the orchestra as an institution. The data revealed that these audiences and arts organisers drew points of distinction within their listening experiences and practices that provoked important questions that are central to the broader work with this research project. I turn to addressing these delineations and questions in the next section.

The first point of distinction rests with the role of the arts organisers I interviewed, the professional positions they held within their orchestra and the wider practice of audience

---

\(^{23}\) In the course of the thematic analysis of the PSO data I derived 81 themes (NVivo nodes) and 216 sub-themes (NVivo child nodes). By comparison, the MCO case data (discussed in chapter 4) yielded 26 themes (NVivo parent nodes) and 88 sub-themes (NVivo child nodes), and the RCO case data (to be discussed in chapter 6) yielded 42 themes (NVivo parent nodes) and 180 sub-themes (NVivo child nodes).

\(^{24}\) For example, being able to observe the four ‘Spaced Out!’ family concerts which were held on the same day and the two ‘Romantic Russia’ concerts which were performed at two different venues for two different audiences. A total of 9 concerts were observed within the data generation time frame of a year, in comparison with 3 concerts each observed with the MCO and RCO cases.
development. While the arts organisers involved in the MCO and RCO cases were zealous in their practice, they were volunteers who had largely not heard of terms such as audience development nor thought explicitly about learning in the concert hall. By contrast, the PSO arts organisers - Poppy, Polo, Powell and Poal - were full-time employees of the orchestra and generously shared many diverse experiences of working with this orchestra and others as professionals. Their expertise in the field of developing audiences and producing orchestral concerts meant they were very able to clearly articulate what their organisation does to enhance the listening experience for audiences and what strategies PSO employs for education and engagement.

The second point of distinction which I expand throughout this analysis that contrasts with the other two cases presented are the ways the focus groups participants explained how they relate to the orchestra as listeners and PSO patrons. As seen in the MCO case in the previous chapter and will be observed in the RCO case, the audience members’ experiences and learning in listening are closely intertwined with the personal and immediate connections they have with the musicians of the orchestra. The PSO focus group participants - Pauline, Patrice, Page, Patrick and Patience - described very different listening experiences which were shaped by their experiences with the concert hall and orchestra as an institution. Elements included: ticket prices and accessibility (for example, being pensioners, coming into the city for performances or “having public transport or having a computer” (focus group, “Page”); being able to get to the concert hall via public transport); engagement with materials and broadcasts produced by PSO (as both Page and Pauline said “thank God for ABC Classic FM”); the well-being and enrichment they attributed to engaging with PSO and other arts organisations; the knowledge and experience they bring to the concert hall as listeners; and their perception that being able to hear “a world-class orchestra live” and “just the whole experience and being immersed… is a real treat” (focus group, “Patrice”). I observed that the audience member’s experiences at PSO are directly shaped by a professional or institutional barrier in place. The focus group participants involved in this study did not know the musicians personally, and they explained how the rituals, performance practices and holistic ‘experience’ of PSO concerts very much shaped the ways they engaged with the music as listeners and audience members.

**Questions raised by the data**
Page, Pauline and Patrice raised questions which provoked tensions between learning and enjoyment at concerts, and questions regarding how learning and education should be framed
within the context of audience engagement. These questions provoke deep seated themes at the heart of this research project—how pedagogies of listening are experienced by audience members, what constituted learning and engagement in the concert hall, and how education and learning are defined within the context of the concert hall. Even within this focus group there were starkly contrasting views on what constituted learning and how experience played into their ongoing musical development through attending concerts. Pauline raised an initial question about the language used to describe learning experiences. She contested “I’m just wondering if people can actually educate somebody into being an audience”. Her comment was part of a larger conversation which is extended in the following extract from the focus group transcript which illustrates the complexity of understanding the nature of experience and learning in the concert hall that I wrestled with in the analysis.

Pauline: I’m not questioning that it [education] adds context and that sort of thing [listening]… and it’s interesting to have context … I’m just wondering if people can actually educate somebody into being an audience, you know?

[disagreement]

Patrice: I think you can. Having worked in the [art] museum context, I think it matters a huge amount.

Researcher: By the sounds of it, [listening at a concert] is more than just enjoying though?

Pauline: Oh yes. … it can overwhelm you, if it connects with you.

Page: But that creates meaning [and learning] in itself doesn’t it?

Pauline: Yes it connects with something in my life, [but] there are so many people in the audience listening in different ways.

Page: Yes true, it’s tricky.

Patrice: I think that is the starting point for me. For me it’s hearing a piece of music… and I’ll need to get that information, I’ll nearly break down doors to find it… Then I start the process of trying to understand the context, the education process for me.

Pauline: For me it’s the other way around.

As the data revealed these questions I re-examined how the initial research questions and the intent of the project had been framed — the basic necessity to research education in
the context of audience development in the contemporary concert hall. I re-questioned whether the phenomenon I was examining was truly education or whether it was simply collecting meaningful experiences, and where delinations the literature had made between learning, entertainment, engagement and meaning making needed to shift in light of the data. Yet in returning to the lifeworlds of the participants in both focus groups, it was evident that these listeners were keenly aware that their PSO concert experiences made a difference to them and were part of their learning and development as skilled listeners. They each saw their engagement in the concert hall as valuable and vital to how they observed their knowledge and understanding of music expanded through listening.

Each audience member’s experience was distinctive in indicating “what helped” (focus group, “Patrick”) their understanding and learning to develop. In more general terms, for Pauline it was that there is something in the concert that “connects with something in me”. For Page it was that she “comes now to be challenged by [the] music” and that she “loves watching the orchestra take on new challenges”. Patrice and Patience explained in more concrete terms how their listening experiences sparked their learning and inquiry. Patience explained that just in attending her first orchestral concert with PSO she “learned what the snare drum was… moreover, I started to pick the sound out when [I listened to other pieces], because of the lighting and introduction given by the conductor”. Patrice said “[concerts] are a starting point for me… it piques my interest… and I go [and] learn more. Then I’ll share it with everyone, that’s just me!”

The PSO focus group participant’s experiences and the specific practices of this orchestra, its tradition and rituals raise important questions. What pedagogies of listening work and why? Do audiences need or want to learn about listening in concert halls? What is the link between learning and enjoyment in being an audience member? And what does all this teach us about how education fits within the broader view of audience development in the context of a professional orchestra? In the case of experiential learning, aren’t we all learning all the time anyway?

As I have asserted in the MCO case, having an experience does not equate to having an educative experience. Dewey explains for an educative experience to happen the experience must imbue two principles – continuity (recognising that all experiences influence future experiences) and interaction (the internal and objective conditions of the experience). These two principles (continuity and interaction) will continue to be of significance in the rest of my analysis, as well as being evidenced in the small extracts of the focus groups in interviews I have shared so far.
Offering some theoretical insight on these questions, the literature on audience development, marketing and education advocates for the importance of teaching audiences for the future sustainability of the concert hall (G. Crawford, Gosling, Bagnall, & Light, 2014b; Lindelof, 2015; R. Rogers, 1998; Wolf, 2006). The current dominant paradigm supporting an aesthetic approach to developing listening to orchestral and Western art music champions the importance of gaining technical arts knowledge in order to appreciate and listen attentively rather than simply hear (Dura, 2002; Hargreaves & North, 1997; Hutchinson, 2009; Regelski, 2006). However, as will become apparent in this case, these two issues of sustainable audience development and the replication of technical knowledge of music are not something that all the audience members possessed or necessarily valued. Alternatively, for that matter the issue of audiences acquiring technical or theoretical musical knowledge were not a high priority in speaking with Poppy, Polo, Powell and Poal the arts organisers either.

Recurring themes in the arts organisers’ responses suggested the core values that underpin their audience development practices and approaches to education within the concert hall. These values are significant because they have not been reflected in previous research. The arts organisers all spoke about the importance of sparking and “developing a curiosity about listening amongst [the] audience” (interview, “Poal”) and “extending people’s experiences” (interview, “Polo”) while keeping the experience accessible, comfort, and engaging. Poppy added that there is an imperative to value the “individual nuances” and “differentiation [in the ways] audiences listen” which gives listeners “the tools to be open to interpretation” rather than having the institution of the orchestra act as the keepers of
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25 Accessibility is a term used in marketing approaches to audience development and relates to issues of physical accessibility to buildings/concert halls, times and duration of performances, prices of tickets and mitigating other factors which may present barriers to prospective or current audiences. Accessibility can also relate to issues of programming in audience development such as selecting repertoire which is of interest or relevance to audiences, creating programs of music which are appealing or suited to various tastes in music (Baker, 2000; Baumgartner, 2002; B. M. Kolb, 2005; Rentschler, 1999; Rentschler, Radbourne, Carr, & Rickard, 2002).

26 Comfort is a notion explored in the work of Sigurjónsson (2009, 2010b) which extends the audience development framework, specifically marketing, which considers physical aspects of the concert hall and how these relate to Dewey’s environmental aspects of experience. For example, room temperature, lighting and seating (Kronenburg, 2014).

27 Engagement in relation to audience development literature is frequently termed in reference to marketing and programming – selecting works and producing concerts which are appealing to audiences and will increase audience attendance. Specifically, studies by Dobson (2010); Dobson and Pitts (2011); (Radbourne, Johanson, & Glow, 2014; Radbourne et al., 2009); Kawashima (2000); Pitts (2005b, 2017) and reports by Maitland (2000, 2006b, 2008) and R. Rogers (1998) look at how audience types or segments can be best engaged, and how culturally aware non-attenders (Winzenried, 2004) and new audiences to the orchestral concert hall can be engaged (Dobson, 2010; Dobson & Pitts, 2011; Farrell & Mann, 1994; Lin, 2008).

28 As reviewed in the literature see E. F. Clarke (2005); Deliège and Sloboda (1997); Hennion (2001); Rinsema (2018); Umemoto (1997).
interpretation. In short, as Poal explained it is essential to “never underestimate the capabilities of the audience” as independent learners.

These values relating to PSO’s audience development attest that learning is indeed part of their audience development approach. This is the case at concerts described explicitly as part of education series and also at mainstage concerts. However, the ways that the arts organisers explained their approaches to developing audiences (the means by which the focus group participants made meaning and learnt about the music) and my observations of the PSO concerts challenge many of the traditional understandings around musical learning and knowledge acquisition. Combined with the findings of the MCO example, the PSO data point toward a need to reconsider how education and learning are framed within the specific context of the concert hall and the practice of audience development.

It is becoming evident from the participants’ experiences that the role of education in mainstage concerts is unclear and that the language of ‘learning to listen’ or ‘audience education’ seems inadequate to explain what is going on. There is some insight into the nature of experience and music education given by Balloffet, Courvoisier, and Lagier (2014), Dobson and Pitts (2011), Julian Johnson (2002), and Muller (2015). However, these studies reflect on school engagement programs or marketing and programming-based audience engagement strategies in the concert hall. There remain questions about the links between learning and mainstage performance, and as the focus group participants raised above, specific questions about how enjoyment relates to learning experiences in the concert hall. While so far the MCO data suggest that enjoyment leads to learning and attentive listening, the PSO participants present an extension to the question of whether learning or education efforts in the concert hall can also be attributed to listening enjoyment. These are issues I take up in the next section in conversation with Dewey’s (1963, 1998) philosophy of art as experience and experience as education, and are matters reflected in all three concert hall contexts which I will consider again in greater depth in chapter 7.

**Applying experiential education theory**

To review briefly, as previously mentioned in chapter 3, Dewey’s (1963, 1998) praxial and pragmatic philosophy is one in which learning, which is both social and interactive, is made possible through two principles of experience - continuity and interaction. These notions link to the research questions I posed about how learning and listening are experienced in the concert hall, the influence of pedagogies of listening and how pedagogies of listening build and equip audiences. Continuity refers to the ways experiences build on each other and are
connected to create learning which is cumulative. Interaction is the social process through which there is an authentic acknowledgement of the aesthetic aspects (cognitive, affective, embodied, spatial) that exist internally and externally and the roles they play as educational forces or catalysts for transformative experiences (1980, pp. 36-40; 46-51). As Dewey reiterates throughout his works, not all experiences are educational and while educational experiences may be enjoyable, not all enjoyable experiences are educative (Dahlman, 2007).

However, my analysis of the PSO data demonstrates a new application of Dewey’s philosophy of education as experience. There is a rub between the context Dewey formulated his philosophy of education for, contexts currently examined in the literature and this present context of the orchestral concert hall. Dewey formulated his theory in dialogue with what he identified at the time as a strict authoritarian approach to traditional education applied within a school or classroom context. In contrast, the context and mechanisms through which experiences happen in the PSO concert hall are markedly different as public cultural institutions. A second challenge is that while the pedagogues (the arts organisers) to some extent can control or manipulate the experiences of audience members, there is a need to re-think how Dewey’s first principle of experiential education is conceptualised and applied. The audience at each concert changes and the individual listener does not attend concerts as one would attend a traditional class as in Dewey’s theory, so rather in the concert hall continuity is present between experiences of the individual listener — be they musical, cultural or otherwise.

Looking further abroad there are many authors who followed and adapted the Deweyan philosophy of experiential education. However, as I have asserted in the literature review and selecting Dewey as a guiding theoretical frame, those who followed in the footsteps of Dewey’s philosophy including the branches of study into experiential learning (D. A. Kolb, 2015; Moon, 2004; D. T. Moore, 2010), reflective learning (Barrett, Ballantyne, Harrison, & Temmerman, 2009; Hébert, 2015), and the tensions between informal learning (Folkestad, 2006; L. Green, 2008, 2012), learning in informal contexts (Gross & Rutland, 2017; Veblen, 2012) rest essentially on the basis of the experiential education philosophy. I continue to examine the data and apply Dewey’s ideas on experience as education and the roles they play within pedagogies of listening in the next section.

**PSO’s Pedagogies of Listening**

In this section, I present a thematic analysis of how PSO addresses education as part of audience development, how these practices underpin the development of their pedagogies of listening, and what this adds to an expanded theory of learning through art and educative experiences. I
then return to questions about how an audience learns in the concert hall raised in the previous section. My analysis illustrates the relationships between learning and enjoyment troubled in the previous section, how experience contributes to the participants’ learning and understanding of music, and what values the PSO pedagogues imbue in their design of concert experiences.

As a brief overview, the four themes I drew from the analysis that I explore in this next section are: first, personalisation pedagogy so that the audience experiences it as something which is relevant, human and within grasp. Second, having the freedom to engage with the listening and create their own interpretations because the orchestra refuses to be the sole keeper of interpretation and knowledge. Third, the significance of valuing the audience’s capacity as skilled listeners and independent learners. Finally, the importance of balance by designing concerts which facilitate opportunities for education and enjoyment, aesthetic appreciation and knowing because the orchestra recognises the variety of audience types and ways in which audience members listen. The analysis draws out new contributions to what is understood about listening and learning in the concert hall.

**Personalisation as a pedagogy of listening**
Like the MCO research participants, the PSO focus group participants spoke about how knowing something about the composer or the performer gave context to their listening, and created a connection between them and the music. Again, these connections built between the audience, orchestra, and music arise in the next chapter where I examine the lifeworlds of the RCO research participants. On a cognitive-aesthetic level, Page and Patrice explained that “getting… the program notes online and reading them before a concert” and attending pre-concert talks are important for this reason usually because they give something of the composer’s historical background, and social context. This clearly aligns with the literature on program notes and providing historical context to listening (J. D. Kramer, 1988; Marguilis, 2010). However, as Pauline highlighted, there is also an aesthetic, affective and sometimes a somatic experience that takes place when the listener realises or discovers something which is similar between the composer or musician and their own life experiences. She said, “like [today knowing about how hard it was for the composer in their country] sends shivers up my spine; it connected with something in me”. As theorised by Dewey, this symbiotic aesthetic interaction — part of conscious or pre-conscious experience — transforms the abstract art into something which is relatable. It is this link made in experiencing the artwork with this context in mind and the listener’s own experience which in turn transforms the listener’s attitude
towards the music. The art (otherwise abstract) becomes relatable to the individual listener through their present and previous experiences, be they inside or outside the concert hall. This continuity in action assists the listener to make fuller meaning out of the listening experience and constitutes a learning experience.

During the observations, where I had my own listening experience as part of the audience, I observed how having contextual information or having an emotional response while listening made a tangible difference to the ways I was able to understand the music. Similar explanations were given by the focus group participants which corroborates the phenomenon. One experience was during a performance where a soloist was performing a concerto. I was lucky enough to be sitting in the first few rows and as a cello player myself, marvelled at how this masterful player executed difficult passages and expressively manipulated phrases. The art was rendered beautiful to me. After the concert, I attended a post-concert conversation, an organised event for interested audience members where the soloist and conductor were being interviewed and shared their thoughts on the music played during the concert. They sat in lounge chairs, enjoying a beer and spoke using common colloquialisms.

For me as a listener, I was able to encounter these performers as ‘ordinary’ people who had worries about certain movements, made mistakes and shared anecdotes about how their previous teachers had reprimanded their playing and what they would say if they were in the audience. The preconceptions I held about these performers being culturally elite, utterly different and completely other (to me) were broken and I saw them in a different light. Below is an extract from a thick description written after this experience and the effect it had on me as a listener.

What I found most remarkable about this experience was the ways in which the seemingly super-human, musical demi-god-ish performers became very, very human. They had stepped down from their podiums and the stage and were here in front of me, having a beer as seeming equals…. It seems invaluable that interactions before audience members like these should take place – giving a human side to playing and creating ‘elite performances.’

A similar experience occurred at one of PSO’s more informal concerts designed to introduce newer audiences to classical music. Throughout this concert, the conductor introduced each work. Sometimes he gave historical context to the music, explained what was
The conductor also gave his own insight into the music, explaining that they do not enjoy conducting the chorus section from ‘Les Toréadors’ because it is used as the anthem for a rival football team, after which they donned their home team scarf. Or how ‘Brisindi’ is actually a drinking song though it sounds quite lavish (during which the conductor was handed a glass of sparkling wine consumed in one gulp!). The concert also connected the music with popular culture and gave opportunities to join in in ways that were more immediate to the audience’s experience. For example: encouraging the audience to sing along to Capua’s ‘O Sole Mio’ with the more familiar lyrics from Elvis’ song ‘It’s Now or Never’; conducting the audience as they clapped along, following the dynamics; having pyrotechnically charged canons go off during the ‘1812 Overture’; and introducing the ‘William Tell Overture-Galop’ by saying “bring out the dancing girls,” at which point a dozen can-can girls began to dance in the aisles of the concert hall under a shower of red, blue and white confetti.

Apart from being immensely entertaining, these concerts and moments where the music became highly relatable through the explanation from the conductor or interaction with the musician changed my own perception of what classical music can be. Though intellectually I knew most of this background information having studied music before, there was an emotional shift in the way I connected with the music. For me, the commentary and the listening experience engaged with something that was immediate to my experience and broke through the walls that I had imposed or that had been imposed by my previous learning and engagement with the music as a high art. I began to question what assumptions the listener might have and the impact this may have on their listening and learning engagement.

In a follow-up interview, I was able to ask the conductor of the concert, Poal, what his thoughts were around helping people to find links between their own experience and the experience of listening or the context of the music. He explained that “it’s just breaking down the stereotype”. Poal explained, “there’s a certain reverence in the orchestral world [for classical music] … for the history and the composers… which is kind of an important component”. However, as the literature also asserts, breaking down these stereotypes and realising “at the end of the day we’re all people” (interview, “Poal”) helps people connect with the music in a more meaningful way than simply revering it because it is understood to be.

29 The ‘every day’ nature of classical music is a discussion gaining traction in research by authors such as Boal-Palheiros and Hargreaves (2001); DeNora (2000); Frith (2012) and Rinsema (2018), as well as reviews and public media by Buron-Hill (2018); Burton-Hill (2018b); Melbourne Symphony Orchestra (2015); Rissmann (2016); RTÉ National Symphony Orchestra (2010). This discourse is speaking out against notions such as classical music is dead and assertions about the declining relevance of orchestras in modern society (Phillips, 2008).
something that should be revered. During a follow up interview, I was able to probe deeper into this notion of bringing a human connection, rather than a reverent observance to listening to orchestral music. Paul explained:

> The word is humanised… [we want people to have] a human experience of the music…
> So, if they connect with me personally they’re going to connect with the music better…
> I’m just a regular guy [too]… I hope that people would think of it as just music and wouldn’t think of it as classical music… so that when people hear a classical melody, they don’t all of a sudden go ‘oh my brain has to respond differently’ because it’s classical music.

It was clear that these moments where the music becomes more relatable because of the input by the musician made a difference to the focus group participants’ listening as well. For the regular concert-goers, Pauline, Page and Patrice, having the performer’s or the conductor’s own perspective made the repertoire more accessible on an aesthetic level as they unanimously responded saying “I wish they did more of that” (focus group, “Page”). However, this personalisation of the music also made the listening accessible for focus group participants who rarely or have never been to a classical music concert. Patience and Patrick said:

**Patience:** The conductor pointed out at the start of the night, he was like...

**Patrick:** Personable.

**Patience:** Yeah… I think just part of being interested [in the concert] was the conductor. He was personal you know, a few jokes were running, it just made it a bit more interesting because I hadn’t really been to an orchestra before, or listened to classical music at all, really… it helped me connect better with everything that’s going on and with him as well.

**Researcher:** You were able to be more interested in him as a person, he’s not a no one to you anymore?

**Patience:** Yeah… and for me, things became tied up to something I knew, like I knew the Elvis song.

For Patrick and Patience, this personal connection and insight given into the music helped them to connect with the music which while similar to the insight given by the relationships in the MCO and RCO case, has a different nuance in that the relationship is not
one that is immediately personal. As in my experience with the cello soloist in the ‘International Guests: Cello concerto’ concert, the conductor was more than an artist. They were relatable and enabled Patience and Patrick to understand things about the music that they may have otherwise not been aware of or may not have been open to because of the music being ‘classical’. Shifting the idea of the orchestral concert experience music from being as Patrick identified “a highbrow event” to being a personalised and relatable experience makes all the difference for their engagement and learning through listening. This insight is not only significant for the conversation on audience development, but also brings insight into how pedagogies of listening can be designed and implemented, a point I return to in chapter 7. As Poal explained, “that’s a big shift for people and I think also in terms of them engaging with the orchestra”.

Pedagogies such as pre and post-concert talks and interactions with the musicians serve to make music and the experience of listening more relatable. Learning is not something additional to the listening experience but is inherent to the experience and meaning-making. The artistic work, the music in itself, as Small (1998) explains, does not have any intrinsic meaning. However, through this pedagogical personalisation, meaning is created for the listener in the experience they have with the music. Framing meaning making and the importance of relational pedagogies requires a philosophic shift in thinking about how learning and therefore audience development functions as experiential education. This also offers a more dynamic view of education within the context of audience development and potentially how the other components, marketing and programming, interplay within a philosophy of teaching and learning to listen.

**Freedom to engage, learn and interpret as a pedagogy of listening**

As I examined in the literature review, there are a multitude of ways in which people listen in the concert hall.30 The PSO data likewise presents a strong opinion that because of this diversity in ways people listen there must also be differentiation in the ways an orchestra facilitates learning for audience members. Poppy, PSO’s education officer, said that the first step is to

give the audience permission to engage, and the listener permission to learn. Poal, Powell and Polo all spoke about the need to make connections between the listener and the music, and to ensure that the programs are appealing to the audience member. As Powell explained, “you’ve got to be very careful not to be prescriptive… [to say] ‘you will feel this’ is not really fair” because people “don’t all listen the same ways”. This is the complexity of pedagogies of listening in the concert hall - providing a variety of ways in which the audience can engage with the artwork, while also relinquishing control over how the audience should respond or interpret the artwork. Poppy explained that in her work in education with the PSO:

It’s just being gentle and understanding of our audiences, but also not making assumptions… I think it comes back to giving our audience permission to learn, to interpret in a way, and sometimes you have to be quite explicit with that, and say ‘You might look for this, you might look for that, you might think about this in a theoretical way, or you might just think about how it makes you feel. Whatever your interpretation, that’s cool, here’s the piece’.

In a sense, such an approach in which the institution refuses to be the gatekeepers of interpretation is counter to the traditional way in which symphony orchestras have operated. This is something which PSO recognises in practice as one of the arts organisers said: “[People] still assume that we are the keepers of all knowledge because we come from a particular history and trajectory”. But the key to making the arts accessible and therefore creating experiences that are conducive to learning is recognising the “plurality [of listening and interpretation] and allowing people to feel like their interpretation is valid” (interview, “Poppy”).

The focus group participants highlighted the efficacy of these strategies in their own experiences. They explained the many ways that they access physical (non-social) resources to learn more in order to prepare for concerts, listen intently and employ different modes of listening to make sense out of their concert hall experiences. For example, Page said “it’s handy getting that email saying ‘prepare for your concert’”. Page, like Patrice also appreciated being able to access the digital programs online. As Poppy explained, making these resources available is just one-way PSO strives towards not only “giving people the permission to learn”, but that presenting these materials in an open way that also gives the listener “permission to interpret [the music]”.

The argument for differentiation raised by the focus group participants and arts organisers is reiterated in commentaries on music engagement and participation offered by
Burland and Pitts (2014), Radbourne et al. (2014) and Johnson (2002). However, the connection between music participation and the role and the power that the orchestra holds as an institution in relinquishing control over the interpretation of musical works is something not present in the education-audience development literature. Neither is the notion of how audiences can be enabled and equipped to interpret arts works in a differentiated and diverse manner. Theoretically, the ideas around engagement and audience experience are present in the works of Botstein (1992), Elliott (2005a), Dura (2002) and many others, but the description of how this can be practiced in the context of a concert hall is lacking.

These themes of knowing or understanding the audience, the status of the concert hall and orchestra as cultural institutions, and public lifelong education raise important questions about the democratisation of music education. Given the focus of this research on pedagogies of listening and understanding the mechanics of educational experience I am mindful in hindsight that the question of how orchestras such as the PSO ‘know’ their audiences, their wants and needs was not part of my questioning with the arts organisers. Certainly insight into what groups of listeners are looking for in coming to orchestral concerts is studied in terms of marketing as evidenced by the various audience segmentation studies and demographic reports published which PSO accesses (see Australia Council for the Arts, 2013, 2017b; Clopton et al., 2006; Constantoura, 2001; B. M. Kolb, 2005; Roose, 2008). Likewise, in the interviews the arts organisers explained how programming choices are made based on feedback from subscribers to the orchestra and attendance data. However, questions of what is being taught, the power orchestras hold as public institutions, for whom concerts are designed, and how the orchestra comes to know and decide what should or should not be addressed in reality lie outside the scope of this current research project.

What was evident in the conversations with the employees of the PSO is a common belief that all listeners have a “toolbox of things that [they] can use in order to listen to things in different ways” (interview, “Poal”). Furthermore, the PSO employees saw that part of the role of the orchestra as a public arts organisation is to help facilitate the development of this toolbox so that audiences have greater access and understanding of orchestral music. This data echoes that evidenced in the example of the MCO and RCO participants in many ways. Namely in the case of PSO this development is undertaken through pre and post-concert talks, providing the program ahead of time, sending reminder emails about ‘getting ready’ for upcoming concerts, and speaking with the audience in open terms rather than prescriptive and technical language. Poppy explained that in these pedagogies recognising the plurality of ways people
listen was integral to helping listeners activate “knowledge structures that [they] can refer to”. Furthermore, encouraging audiences to engage on their own terms through these pedagogies means also welcoming and allowing listeners “to interpret things in different ways” (interview, “Poppy”).

The PSO’s willingness to facilitate audiences interpreting music freely challenges conventional approaches to listening pedagogy. It is not purely an aesthetic approach, nor can it be a technical musicianship approach espoused by DeNora (2000), Levinson (2009a) and others. Ecological (E. F. Clarke, 2012, 2013), more progressive approaches or blended praxial philosophies (Hohr, 2010; Regelski, 2005) are not suitable either for explaining how the practice and philosophy of listening education function either. Chiefly this is because the PSO employs a combination of approaches for certain audience types with the addendum that experiences should promote the autonomy and engagement of the individual listener. At the same time, I suggest that an experiential model requires some application to the specific context of the concert hall. The very nature of the concert hall, the transient nature of the learner (in this case the audience) and the abstractness of the art form do not meet the requirements set out by Dewey in Art as Experience and Experience as Education. Particularly, the importance of continuity in educational experience is absent as are some of Dewey’s finer elaborations on progressive organisation in learning, social control and aesthetic learning (1963). Rather the notion of continuity must be considered as a type of relationality between and across experiences that happen both within and outside of the concert hall.

At the heart of this significant paradigm shift which reconceptualises the place and function of education in the concert hall is the recognition that the audience, rather than being a singular mass is truly a differentiated group of individual listeners. Such a view also poses a significant challenge to those wanting to engage audiences with pedagogies of listening. To truly embrace pedagogies which value and advocate for listeners being skilled is to encompass a plurality of interpretation. As a result, such a practice does mean orchestras as institutions, to an extent, need to relinquish the hold on interpretation which has been inherited in the classical music tradition (J. H. Johnson, 1995; Nicholls, Hall, & Forgasz, 2018). Such a shift in paradigm links with the next theme about valuing audiences as skilled listeners and independent learners.
Valuing the audiences’ capacities as a pedagogy of listening

The focus group participants explained how their listening in the concert hall was enacted using largely the skills, knowledge and understanding they brought with them. Page, Pauline and Patrice, whom I spoke to after the ‘Romantic Masters’ concert, were all avid concert attendees and enthusiastic about understanding their listening and appreciation of classical music.\(^{31}\) Patrice and Page particularly spoke in detail about the ways that they prepare for concerts by reading the programs online, becoming familiar with the repertoire by “listening to the best recording or YouTube performance” they can find (focus group, “Page”), and learning as much as they can about the composers and what was going on in their lives at the times. All three of the focus group participants in this group also spoke about how they make plans to attend pre-concert talks and how this information is given usually in the style of a lecture interspersed with recorded excerpts, which sparks connections with the knowledge they have from other concert experiences.

Pauline, Page and Patrice’s efforts to prepare for concerts demonstrates that they autonomously develop their own learning and understanding, which informs the development of their skills for listening. They are independent and skilled learners and have developed confidence to bring their own interpretation, which holds continuity with their own experience. Furthermore, they actively seek out opportunities to find out more about the music and to engage with musicological, theoretical and technical aspects of performances they become part of as listeners. Page explains that her preparation was about developing “careful listening to try and get the structures [of the music] in [her] head to help [her] listen”. For Patrice who has less of a technical understanding of music, familiarising herself with the music as she “listens at work [with the music] playing in the background” is her mode of preparation. Patrice also explains how she draws on her knowledge and experiences of interpreting visual art where she draws parallels between “images from the same timeframe to spark [her] intrigue into what is driving” the music.

In contrast, both Patrick and Patience rarely attend concerts by orchestras and only occasionally listen to classical music. The concert they attended sparked conversations during the interval and after the concert about the music they enjoyed, found familiar or parts of the concert they found engaging. Patrick explained that these “conversations changed our listening”. For Patience, the conversations with her partner Patrick helped her to “know what

---

\(^{31}\) I acknowledge that this data represents one segment of the audience and may not be reflective of audiences less familiar to the concert hall and classical music.
all the instruments were” so she could later “pick the individual sounds”. For Patrick, the conversations are an opportunity to share the knowledge he had gained about music in high school and connect this performance to previous experiences of classical music. They explained that the conductor’s introductions highlighted to them that classical music is “actually something we listen to a whole lot more than [we] think”. They felt the experience “made it ok to join in with the audience and the music” and that they were a valuable part of the concert rather than simply passive spectators.

A helpful way of understanding participants’ experiences and engagement as autonomous learners in relation to cultural capital as explained in sociological literature - specifically that of Bourdieu (1984; 1990) - and theorists who have applied sociological theory to the field of music education such as Wright (2010) and Prior (2005, 2011, 2013). Pitts (2005a, 2005b, 2009, 2014, 2017), who applied sociological theory to audiences to understand musical engagement at chamber music concerts, explains that social capital in the context of learning through being an audience member is more than simply a tool for understanding what resources an audience member has and accesses (Grenfell, 2014; Rössel, 2011). Rather, in understanding how people use and accumulate cultural capital (skills, tastes, attitudes, and symbolic tools including education) and the forms it takes (embodied, objectified and institutionalised) within the context of the concert hall, audience developers might understand what understandings and knowledge listeners bring and acquire as audience members (R. Moore, 2014). Furthermore, a sociological perspective can help theorise how audiences may participate, engage with orchestras and what is needed for audiences to have agency over their own learning and engagement in the concert hall (Pitts, 2014, 2017).

In the case of the PSO focus group participants, each participant holds a very different level of cultural capital, and the skills, tastes and tools they have are partly what they use to both understand their listening experience and pursue independent learning. The participants’ physical embodiment of their cultural capital (what Bourdieu called ‘habitus’ — their dispositions developed through their life experience) ties into the types of engagement audience members are likely to seek, which concerts will likely appeal to them, and how they then might function as learners in the concert hall (H. S. Becker, 1984; Merga, 2015; Prior, 2013; Swartz, 1997). Or to explain differently, a sociological perspective asserts that in understanding audience experience, engagement and learning from this sociological perspective, pedagogues in the concert hall can be used to predict and even plan for what information audiences may want, which segments of audiences will likely engage with particular pedagogies of listening
and what information or skills can be assumed or left to the listener who also is viewed as a listener with agency over their own learning engagement. However useful this theoretical perspective may be, there are definite limitations to how accurately segmentation and marketing focussed approaches can contribute an understanding of to how well individual listeners and their educational needs are be understood. This raises questions about the democratisation of public music education, how an orchestra ‘knows’ their audiences and what is consequently decided as being most important for audiences to know or understand. However, these questions reach beyond the scope of the present research project at hand.

While Dewey does not offer any significant insight into this aspect of individual learning and engagement with the arts, Small would proffer that musicians (and I extend to listeners) are only as literate as they feel the need to be (2016). Taking these views into consideration, it is essential however that such a differentiated view of audiences as demonstrated in the PSO example does not necessarily mean ‘converting’ them into seasoned concertgoers or connoisseurs of the orchestral repertoire. The interviews with Polo, Poal and Poppy continually testified to this point. While sociologists argue there is a certain cultural capital associated with the concert hall and orchestral audiences, as Polo explains, “being more accessible … does not mean dumbing down”. Rather it simply means that pedagogues must be more multifaceted in their approaches to audience development and “address the audience on their own value and in their own words and ways they want to experience music”.

Polo, Powell, Poppy and Poal explained the multifaceted ways they utilise pedagogies of listening in their work with the PSO which also aims to value the audience’s capacity as skilled listeners and independent learners. Although they did not explain in detail how their organisation specifically gathers and understand data on audiences, Poppy explained that her work begins with understanding and “respecting what each of our various audience segments are after”. She then went on to explain how PSO offers a wide range of concert series with differing intentions for different audiences they have identified. Examples include concerts for engaging parents with their young children in active music making and listening, concerts for adults and high school students who want an in-depth understanding of the elements or building blocks of music such as the ‘Listen to This!’ series, concerts with a relaxed atmosphere for listeners new to the concert hall, and concerts designed to be Autism or Asperger’s friendly.

Specifically, Poppy explained that in her work as education manager for PSO it is vital to understand the audience’s needs and interests. She explained how her work often requires
considering the question of “at which point you can talk about music in specific traditional [technical or music theory] terms” and when more detailed or superficial focus on learning should be implemented. As Poppy explained, “people get most meaning from what you’re presenting if it’s delivered in a way that makes sense to that person and has meaning for them and when it respects what the listener is seeking in the experience”. Understandably, there is a space here to further research how orchestras come to ‘know’ their audiences beyond audience demographics and marketing trends with the design of education work in mind.

In the context of individual concerts, Powell, a regular presenter of pre-concert talks for the PSO, said that he has learnt to carefully pitch his information according to the audience and the information the PSO has gathered on them. He explained that his audiences are often “educated, intelligent, but not necessarily that knowledgeable about music”. He has learnt that there are “shortcuts” or pedagogical assumptions he can make depending on the audience, such as not having to introduce certain instruments, not having to explain historical figures or links to major musical figures and works. At the same time, as Poal explained, there is a careful balance in “never underestimating the capabilities of the audience… they’re so much more capable of understanding things than we think they are generally”.

The sociological literature visited earlier aligns with this need identified by the arts organisers to understand the cultural capital of orchestral audiences and the habitus of listeners. Just as Poppy, Powell and Poal illustrated, PSO audiences come to the concert hall with a set of skills, knowledge and behaviours which can be generalised to some extent to a group knowing information about their cultural and listening habitus. Or as the audience development literature explains in its marketing terms, there are audience segments and types which can be derived in understanding the demographics, values and wants of audiences. Similarly, the typologies of listening and the sociological research on the habitus of listeners (Adorno & Hullot-Kentor, 2006; Adorno et al., 2002; Blaukopf, 1992) calls for a differentiated view of the audience, not only in terms of their participation and engagement but also their needs, wants, previous knowledge and understanding when considering listeners as learners.

One significant contribution from the field of sociology which utilises Bourdieu’s (1984) theory of habitus, and which resonates with this aspect of audience development, is Becker’s text Art Worlds (1984). Becker asserts, as does Small, that the arts are not an object, but an action. Furthermore, it is the audience’s participation in the art worlds (be it by listening, performing or creating) that creates meaning. However, as Becker explains, to help the
audience create meaning as participants in the concert hall, there is not only an imperative to understand the audience, but also to value them and allow them to engage with music on their own terms. This is further illustration of the argument I made in the opening article of this thesis examining the history of audience development and Becker’s argument in his text *Art Worlds* (H. S. Becker, 1984; Hess, 2014; Nicholls et al., 2018). Taking Becker’s ideas on board, I argued that enacting pedagogies of listening within the concert hall must mean seeing the art world of the concert hall as a part of an ongoing evolution. The practices and conventions of the art world must be understood as regulators between the art and audience rather than artifacts to be treated with a museum-like preservation attitude.

Considering the PSO data in light of Becker’s work, pedagogies of listening can function as practices and objects that can regulate the relationship between the artform (music) and the audience. At the same time, Becker’s theoretical frame still accommodates the imperative highlighted in this case to frame pedagogies of listening as a differentiated approach to education. As Poal explained, “it’s silly to keep playing to one particular group of people. That’s the opposite of what I think a modern orchestra is all about”. Instead, “keeping the art form vibrant and relevant” means offering various types of concerts, being aware of audience wants and needs, and creating concerts that support the ways audiences want to experience music, the PSO is able to be “all about accessibility and connection” (follow up interview, “Poal”).

**Balance in pedagogies of listening**
The final theme that was evident in the analysis was the importance of balance which links directly with the issue of differentiation raised in the previous section. Balance considers the tensions present between varying artistic and educational goals, the wants and needs of audiences, and the variety of ways in which audiences listen, learn and engage with the orchestra. In a way, these tensions bring this case full circle and speak to the complexity and questions raised at the beginning of the chapter about education and entertainment, having experiences which are meaningful for learning, and how education fits within the broader context of audience development.

In this section, I highlight two interconnected tensions that were evident in the discussions with focus group participants and arts organisers: the tension between education and entertainment, and a tension that rests between the various ways of knowing and how these are valued within pedagogies of listening. What is most significant in this work is that an
approach that holds these issues in tension provides real practical direction towards understanding audience development as experiential education.

The first tension was at play in each focus group discussion and in interviews with the arts organisers. During the focus groups, the words enjoyment or enjoy were used thirty-nine times during discussions, which, in the context of the overall data was a significant finding given there were no questions asking about enjoyment in listening. Particularly these discussions focussed on what constitutes enjoyment, whether learning is necessary for the enjoyment of listening and how having an enjoyable time helps with engagement and wanting to understand more about the music. Patrice and Pauline illustrate the tension between education and enjoyment in the following conversation:

Pauline: I don’t know that [being taught information] increases my pleasure. I don’t think I’ve got to be educated into enjoying it, I enjoy it, it’s meant to be enjoyed.

Patrice: Look you’re right [knowing the history or music theory] doesn’t change how much you enjoy the music. I’m going to enjoy it anyway. [But what] makes me think and wonder what is disturbing or the cacophony to the ear, I sort of question why, why this is grating on me and what is it.

At the same time if you understand the context of what’s happening or where that music was, the origins of that music, what was driving them to write like that, suddenly you encounter that whole new appreciation [it’s an even] bigger enjoyment.

What Pauline and Patrice’s experiences reflect, as do the values explained by the arts organisers, is that the experience makes most impact when both education and entertainment come together. Particularly for Pauline, “hearing it in person and watching people perform… and being in the presence of really good musicians” makes the experience both enjoyable and meaningful. For Patrick, when there was opportunity for engagement, to know more about the music and “knowing that other people were enjoying [the experience]” created the most impact.
Likewise, for Patience and Page, enjoyment and ultimately learning came from “being involved in the experience”.

These were tensions the arts organisers spoke about in relation to education and entertainment. Polo explained, “sometimes [giving an explanation] is very good, you shouldn’t do it always but sometimes it’s good to have. I like to preserve a bit of the ritual and mystique in the concert hall”. He and Poppy both explained that there is a balance to be struck between giving people what they want, what they want to achieve as pedagogues, and simultaneously upholding aspects of the concert hall tradition.

How this tension relates to the broader context of pedagogies of listening in the concert hall will be returned to in chapter 7. The focus group and interviewed research participants also wrestled with this question, As reflected in Patience’s comment, “but seriously… am I missing out on something not knowing?… Do I need to learn to listen more than I listen to enjoy?” Poal, who often conducts for the PSO and designs concerts too, wrestled with this question and offered the following insight:

Do we want to make experts out of people? It’s unrealistic I think to be able to do that. We’re trying to bridge the gap between somebody who has no analytical ability when they’re listening and the musician who has every analytical ability. So, I guess there’s somewhere in that huge gap that enhances their listening experience.

[We] have to accept the fact that you can’t teach everybody to be an expert, and that is not really what you want to do. It’s about opening up the possibilities, experiences and opening up different ways of thinking [and feeling] music… We [the orchestra] can’t ever take the place of a comprehensive music education. That’s too big a job for a start… What our prime job is… to draw out their curiosity, and that’s what will drive audience development, ultimately.

The second tension requires pedagogies of listening to equally value and facilitate the full range of aesthetic response, ways of knowing and learning about music which allow the audience to make their own interpretation of the artwork. The PSO arts organisers spoke about how they incorporate multiple ways of knowing and understanding into the ways that they speak to the audience, their program notes and pre-concert talks because they recognise the need to differentiate as well as facilitate different ways of learning. As Poal recognised, “in a
single concert hall, everyone’s got a different ability to analyse the music”. Poppy spoke about how she incorporates embodied and physical ways of understanding into her educational performances and how it assists people to interpret what they are listening to. For Powell, who regularly presents pre-concert talks for the PSO, this balance is about recognising that the “analytical stuff I that I like doing” while important is “certainly not the only way to talk about music, and it’s not the only thing that can provide a good experience”.

Similarily, the value of aesthetic responses are acknowledged by the audience members who spoke about how feelings, mood and sensations helped them make sense of the listening experience. The aesthetic response was valuable to both the more experienced concert goers of focus group 1 and to Patience who reported on her first experience of a professional orchestra performance. Patrice explained “people are always going to listen and respond to music differently”, but Patience identified that extra-musical elements such as the conductor addressing the audience, the setting of the concert hall and other audience members also impacted her aesthetic awareness. She explained “I like the little talks [the conductor or presenter] do… it makes it more interesting and connected”. Indeed, as Poal, identified in his interview, as did Page and Patrice in the focus group, the aesthetic response of not only individuals but also the combined audience is something quite “extraordinary… when the whole room is unified emotionally. That’s what makes the live experience so special, the audience’s reaction all at the same time and those things are unspoken, but definitely you can feel them in the room” (interview, “Poal”).

**Summary**

In analysing the PSO data, I have wrestled with intricate questions about the nature of educative experiences in the context of pedagogies of listening. Four major themes were distilled from the data which illustrated how PSO design and enact pedagogies of listening within their concert halls and with their audiences. Using the data, I showed how personalisation can bring about meaningful learning and can render arts experiences accessible and relatable. I also demonstrated how learning is rendered more meaningful when there is freedom to investigate and interpret, and that the value the audience bring as skilled listeners and independent learners needs to be recognised. Finally, pedagogies of listening require tensions to be managed, balanced, and is something essential to the experience and meaning-making.
CHAPTER 6

Pedagogies of Listening at a Regional Community Orchestra

Introduction
In this chapter I present the data generated with the audience members and arts organisers of the Regional Community Orchestra (RCO), and the key themes drawn from the analysis I conducted (see figure 6.1 for an overview of the RCO data analysis and the relationships within it). In this chapter I reveal how this orchestra develops pedagogies of listening for their audiences and equips listeners in this region to engage with the orchestra and learn. Led by the experiences of the research participants, I draw on Dewey’s framework of art as experience (2005) and experiential learning (1998) and use Small’s philosophy of musicking (1996, 1998) to contribute contextual understanding of these frameworks in action and make an argument for positioning listening pedagogies as being social, spatial, and relational. After introducing the RCO and the research participants, I begin the analysis by examining the social significance of inclusivity in the regional context and the role relationships play in pedagogies of listening through emic and etic positioning. I then go on to explain four pedagogical dimensions RCO use to curate concert experiences for learning through:

- learning conversations;
- social and musical experiences for engagement through guided listening;
- the physical space of the concert hall; and
- themes and visual presentation as pedagogies of learning.
Contextualising ‘Regional Community Orchestra’ (RCO)

RCO was established in 2006 with a handful of musicians and has grown to a membership of over forty who play in a community orchestra and smaller ensembles formed as needed to serve the community. They rehearse weekly in the largest town in the region and perform between three and five concerts per year in townships across this region covering over 8,500 square kilometres and home to a combined population of just under 30,000 Queenslanders (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2016a; University of Adelaide, 2015). During this study their performance events included a fundraising dinner for local charities, quartets and other small ensembles for community events and partnerships, and their annual end of year concerts with a BBQ dinner at interval. Like MCO discussed in chapter 4, RCO also undertakes tours to more remote country towns in their large state and has smaller ensembles that perform as needed for

---

32 While the concept map for the themes distilled from the RCO data analysis appear to be more sparse when visually represented in this way in comparison to those of MCO and PSO, the data if anything was denser in these areas and resulted in a more focussed hermeneutic analysis on fewer themes.

33 The term ‘regional’ is used as per the Australian Standard Geographical Classification (2014) and the Characteristics and Main Features of ABS Location Classifications (2016b, 2016c) discussed in the literature review (Chapter 2).
community events.\textsuperscript{34} RCO also has a long tradition of designing and performing dedicated educational concerts for children and their families and regularly facilitates workshops to include non-member musicians from other towns across the state.

RCO serves an inner regional community, meaning residents have more limited access to goods and services than their inner and outer urban counterparts (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2014, 2016c), and a majority of the population is directly involved with local agricultural industries (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2016b, 2016c; Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2004). As will be borne out in my analysis, arts experiences are highly valued by regional communities such as these since they provide much-needed opportunities for social connection (Hardcastle, 2015; Kay, 2000). Driven by this social motivation and their appreciation of opportunities to access performances without long travel hours, regional audiences can be much more open than metropolitan audiences to experiencing and engaging with unfamiliar musical forms such as orchestral music (Costantoura, 2001; McHenry, 2009; Terracini, 2007).

RCO respond to the socio-geographic challenge of maintaining a full orchestra on a volunteer basis by welcoming any player interested in improving their skills. Students and professionals who were part of the orchestra while they lived in the region often return to join the orchestra for weekend workshop rehearsals and major performances. In another response to their membership challenges, RCO currently partners with a wind orchestra from another town 200km away who share similar socio-geographic characteristics. The resulting transient membership means that RCO must frequently modify music to suit the skill levels of players and adapt orchestrations to fill absent parts. For example, saxophones and bass guitars have been included either in place of or in addition to orchestral instruments not commonly played by community members such as bassoon, french horn and double bass.

To balance the sound of their expanded and ever inclusive wind and brass contingent, RCO has also taken to routinely individually mic-ing and amplifying the string section during concerts. An unintended benefit of the use of amplification is that RCO are able to adapt to the various venues they perform in. For example, with an amplified string section, the orchestra are able to play outside and to adjust the orchestra balance to suit each “country town hall” they play in. RCO’s inclusive approach to involving many players and instruments significantly influences repertoire selections. While concerts often include music from the classical

\textsuperscript{34} Please note that from now on, the term RCO will be used to describe the organisation as a whole and concerts by the organisation. All RCO concerts organised by the orchestra as part of their yearly season feature each ensemble at every concert.
repertoire, they also present a variety of original works, arrangements of film music, music from the jazz and big band repertoire, medleys of music from stage musicals, contemporary compositions for orchestra, Australian works, and selections from popular music. This variety of music is purposefully selected for the orchestra and their audiences and is, at least to some extent, enabled by the expanded instrumentation RCO chooses to accommodate.

**Background to the concerts observed and the RCO research participants**

I observed three concerts to gain an understanding of RCO’s context, audiences, performance practices and audience development strategies. A detailed summary of these concerts is given in Appendix H (see p. 255).

I introduce the research participants below (see table 6.1 and 6.2) using the data collated from the focus group, the participants’ profile forms and the interviews with the arts organisers to provide further context for the analysis and discussion ahead. To assist the discussion, all RCO research participants have pseudonyms beginning with “R” for regional.

*Table 6.1 – RCO arts organisers interviewed*

(pseudonyms all have code “Ro” for regional arts organiser participant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosabelle</td>
<td>Long-serving organising committee member</td>
<td>Rosabelle began with RCO in its early years and continued to play and volunteer on its organising committee through the changes it has undergone. During this time she has become a mum, volunteers her time to various other community initiatives and manages the family farm business. She learnt piano and cello as a child and continues to play in orchestras for her own enjoyment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronnie</td>
<td>Organising committee member</td>
<td>Ronnie and her husband both play in the orchestra. She is a full-time working professional in the health field, plays in the orchestra and volunteers on the committee as the driving organisational force for concerts and events such as fundraising dinners, raffles, arranging catering for concerts and writing the program. Ronnie grew up playing at school, in orchestras and has also</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rosario, an Organising Committee Member and trombone player, retired to the region having worked as a nurse and on her husband’s dairy farm. Rosario came to music after her children had grown up and began learning saxophone as part of a music festival held in the country town she was living in. She continued to learn as part of a small community group and believes music is the reason she is able to find joy in life. Rosario continues to learn and play as part of the RCO as well as volunteering to organise the music library and parts for players.

Table 6.2  RCO focus group participants
(pseudonyms all have code “Ra” for regional audience participant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raelene</td>
<td>Raelene grew up going to musical comedy shows and continued to enjoy these as an adult whose husband would sing in community productions. Her son plays in a heavy metal band, and Raelene finds she is being constantly surprised and fascinated by music. Raelene is now a retired senior and is enjoying local performances and her duties as a grandmother. Age 50-60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Rachel grew up in the country and learnt piano as a child. She has encouraged her children to learn music and attends concerts by RCO to support her eldest child who plays French horn. She listens to a range of music, loves hearing music performed live and appreciates the effort it takes to perform. Age 40-50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramella</td>
<td>Ramella grew up locally in a self-labelled ‘non-musical family’. She never learnt any musical instruments but admires people who can. Particularly, she enjoys listening to music and supporting friends from work and club sport who play in the orchestra. RCO is her only experience of an orchestra, partly she says, because other orchestras are far away and difficult to access and because she perceives them to be much more ‘fancy’. Age 30-40.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Randy learnt music and a collection of instruments at school before going on to university to study music and sound technology. She moved to the region to teach at the local school and has attended various performances by orchestras. Though classically trained, she enjoys sound recording, helping her students to understand how music works. Randy played with RCO until recently becoming a mum for the second time. Age 30-40.

Raven is a young mum who learnt many instruments as a child and continues to play the piano at church. This concert was her first experience of an orchestra which she said she very much enjoyed, though she was nervous about coming to something new and different. Age 20-30.

Grew up in a family who moved around a lot, including living for a while in the Torres Strait. Though she would have loved to learn a musical instrument, there was no tuition available in the regional places her family lived. She enjoys going to a variety of performances and has encouraged her daughters as they grew up to learn music. She is interested in how sound works and is exploring sound again with her grandchild who is blind. Raine attends RCO concerts for the enjoyment of listening as well as supporting friends and family who play with the orchestra. Age 50-60.

The Social Significance of Inclusivity in the Regional Context
In the current study, both audience and arts organsier participants described the RCO and groups like it as being essential to the social and cultural life of regional communities like theirs. The RCO arts organisers explained that “there aren’t a lot of opportunities where we are to play together”, and that being part of an orchestra “and delivering music like this makes you feel good” (interview, “Rosario”). Perhaps this is why, as Ronnie explained, RCO has “always been inclusive.” She described the various decisions described previously (in relation to orchestra membership, amplification, repertoire, etc) as “a necessity in order to not exclude people from playing”.

Another dynamic described by the arts organisers that motivates the inclusive practices of RCO is that like other clubs, groups and societies in their community, the orchestra membership is in constant flux. The participants explained that this is caused by students going on to study in larger cities, professionals completing work contracts, and families moving on
which has significant ramifications for how the orchestra is managed and can be used in the community. The inclusive practice of welcoming players who are transient or return for workshops and concerts not only bolsters the instrumentation of the orchestra, but is an important response to the challenge of serving a regional community. Similar observations have been made in previous studies in regional arts engagement which echo the RCO arts organiser’s concerns regarding rejuvenation and sustainability (see Hardcastle, 2015; Kay, 2000; McHenry, 2009). Likewise Schippers and Bartleet (2013) provide commentary reflecting these themes of community resilience in regional areas, as do reports on the social significance of community arts groups produced by the Australian Council for the Arts (2010, 2015; 2017).

Transience aside, RCO musicians are very much a part of the local community. This is evident in the arts organiser’s various descriptions of being recognised at work or at the shops or else at concerts when audiences realise “that’s my optometrist or that’s my kid’s school teacher!” (interview, “Ronnie”). For the arts organisers, who are also musicians within the orchestra, being a community orchestra means more than simply being made up of members of the community; it is also about serving their community by organising or being part of fundraising events for local organisations, working in partnership with leaders in the community to curate events or theming concerts around interests or local celebrations. In these ways, the orchestra’s view of its function is one of service and responsiveness to the needs of the community. This includes fulfilling a social a need, as well as providing musical experiences that are meaningful, highly relevant and genuinely connected with their audiences. As Rosabelle explains:

We are different, we are opening up a space for our audience.... [professional orchestras] go to [local towns around here] to put on concerts, but I really think there is something very unique or I guess special when you reach people where they are as opposed to having an orchestra of others come to us.

Focus group participants who regularly attend RCO concerts also acknowledged the social benefits RCO brings to the community. Raine and Randy explained that concerts offer “opportunities to get out” and somewhere that they can “connect with friends, sharing social connection”. Ramella highlighted the importance of social inclusion in her experience, explaining that “you never just listen” at RCO concerts. “We come here to have a sense of belonging and togetherness”. Ros, explained that “your experience of enjoyment”, social inclusion and belonging “is increased when you know everyone else is experiencing that too”.
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First-time RCO concert attender, Raven, also recognised the value of communal and social music experiences, saying, “yeah, live is better”. These experiences of the focus group participants are consistent with Rosabelle, Ronnie and Rosario’s assertions about the social significance and benefits of inclusion in regional arts engagement, and are likewise reflected throughout the literature reviewed on the Australian context (Australia Council for the Arts, 2010, 2015; Costantoura, 2001; Kay, 2000; McHenry, 2009; Terracini, 2007).

**The role of relationships pedagogies of listening**

Beyond its social function, RCO musician participants explain that being part of the community also serves a significant pedagogical function, which contributes to their audiences’ listening and learning experiences. Rosario reflected that her friends and family who enjoy attending concerts, are “the sort of audience members who probably wouldn’t go if they didn’t know someone playing.” Focus group participants similarly spoke about the significant role of their personal connections with the musicians in creating a social environment in which to learn about listening and make meaning (a theme I also addressed in chapter 4). For example, Ramella and Raine explained that except for RCO, they had “never seen an orchestra” and, importantly, that although they first “came because we enjoy supporting friends,” now they “also come here to enjoy listening”.

Research on community music groups and arts in Australia, which is overwhelmingly quantitative, reports the number and types of arts organisations within regional and outer urban geographies (Australia Council for the Arts, 2010, 2015). Likewise, there is a range of studies, often marketing focused and usually exclusively dealing with professional organisations, which explore how orchestras specifically can attract audiences (Baumgartner, 2002; Roose & Vander Stichele, 2010), particularly those who would not normally attend orchestral concerts (Dobson & Pitts, 2011; Winzenried, 2004). However, these reports under-emphasise the significant role of interpersonal relationships with local artists in attracting regional audiences to arts experiences and the way the social environment enhances audience engagement and learning.

The literature on experiential education identifies the vital role of social and proximal elements in creating experiences that are educative (Gross & Rutland, 2017; D. A. Kolb, 2015; Moon, 2004). Dewey (1966, 1980, 1998) throughout his work espouses the importance of “the conditions, physical and social and how they contribute to building up experiences that are worthwhile” (Dewey, 1998, p. 35). In the case of RCO, one of the most significant social conditions is the interpersonal connection between audience members and local musicians. The
orchestra not only offers audiences “something different. Something unique. Something, you know, that they don’t have to travel to Brisbane for necessarily” (interview, “Ronnie”) in the context of their regional community, but also, as Rosabelle describes, that ‘something’ is significant because of the unique relationship RCO has with their audience and the potential it affords in creating experiences for listening and learning. She explains:

[The state professional orchestras] tour [regional places] but we reach people where they are… we identify with the people here and they are awestruck that there’s an amazing, this amazing orchestra right here in their backyard….

Both the RCO arts organisers and sociological literature on taste and preference in the arts identify that classical music, concert halls and orchestras still have a lingering perception as being elitist spaces for highbrow art (G. Crawford et al., 2014b; Peterson & Kern, 1996; Wagener, 2012). Yet, as Rosabelle highlights, despite regional touring programs undertaken annually by professional and part-time orchestras (Lettts, 2015; Wainwright, 2014) who are seen as outsiders, there is a greater significance to be had in the experience of attending concerts by “regular”, “local musicians”. Furthermore, being “regional musicians in regional concerts for regular people” the social relationship acts as a mechanism for inclusion, learning and engagement with orchestral music.

Like Dewey (1998), this orchestra clearly appreciates that social conditions contribute to learning experiences. Furthermore, RCO very deliberately harnesses their connectedness with their audience who are “just like them” to facilitate engagement with orchestral music listening experiences for learning. Ronnie explains:

---

35 The West Australian Symphony Orchestra (WASO), Adelaide Symphony Orchestra (ASO) who serve the state of South Australia, Melbourne Symphony Orchestra (MSO) who serve the state of Victoria, the Tasmanian Symphony Orchestra, the Sydney Symphony Orchestra (SSO) who serve the state of New South Wales and the Queensland Symphony Orchestra. These six orchestras were established originally by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation in the 1930s to provide live orchestral music for radio programs and since as a result of recording technology have evolved in their purposing over time (including from 1985 being coordinated by the National Concert Music Department who initiated regional touring programs, being corporatized in the 1990’s and eventually dismantled from the ABC in 1997 (Australian Broadcasting Corporation, 2012; Garrett, 2010; Letts, 2015).

36 Including the Australian Brandenburg Orchestra, the Australian Chamber Orchestra (and its various iterations-ACO2, the ACO collective) and part-time orchestras such as The Australian World Orchestra, the Northern Territory’s ‘pro-am’ orchestra the Darwin Symphony Orchestra, and The Australian Discovery Orchestra who routinely broadcast their concerts over the web for remote access.
I think that it is important for the audience to know that we’re not professionals... that we’re teachers and we’re kids... we’re mums and retirees.... We’ve got single people, couples and... a whole family involved almost... We range in ages from 12 to 75... and we’re not some special breed. *We’re just like them.*

We always acknowledge [our local partners] so that they (the audience) can see that we’re not some homogenous other, that we’re part of the community. *We’re just like them.*

We’re a mixture in ourselves. I think that reflects the community as well... and we always want people to know *we’re just like them* and they are always invited... to join us. (emphasis mine)

Why are Rosabelle and Ronnie so insistent that this regional orchestra is “just like” its regional audience? What purpose is served by this positioning of the audience in relation to the orchestra? Moreover, how does it function as pedagogy? These are the questions I take up next.

**Pedagogies of listening and being a reflection of the listening community**

In the following discussion, I apply the concept of emic and etic positioning (Cuneo, 2011; Harris, 1976) to better understand the relationships between the audience and the musicians of the RCO. I then go on to examine how these emic and etic positions operate as physical and social conditions (Dewey, 1998) to support the educative experiences of the audience, thereby contributing to the unfolding understanding of pedagogies of listening as audience development in this orchestra example.

The musicians of the orchestra occupy at least two emic (or insider) positions. First, they are insiders to the local community; they live locally and are part of the social, political, economic and cultural structures around them. Second, as musicians, they are also insiders to the world of the art form, music. They play, can read the music and have a specific set of knowledge and skills which allows them to understand and interpret the art form. Moreover, being orchestral musicians and players of a repertoire including classical music, the musicians are insiders to the traditions and practices associated with performing with an orchestra. But when they take up their musician roles at an RCO concert, they have personal relationships with audience members such as family or friends, or at the very least are seen by listeners as a reflection of themselves as a ‘regular person’ at a concert for people like.
double-positioning, their emic positions - both as musicians and as community members – are blurred. For the audience, this seems to have a beneficial effect.

From the perspective of the audience, in other orchestral music performances, the musician is someone other (Cuneo, 2011; Wagener, 2012); someone who is on a stage, who is physically separated and marked as being part of a different group with a different role to the audience (Small, 1998). The musician is a person who is proficient, skilled and knowledgeable and in this context of a traditional concert hall only relates to the audience through the music they play (Pitts, 2005b). However, in the case of RCO, the audiences are connected to the musicians, if not as family or friend, then certainly as someone familiar within the community and who was from the community. Audiences are able to see themselves in the musicians, and they see the orchestra as a reflection of their community and all that involves. The significance of this insider positioning is that the music is being performed by a ‘regular person’, someone ‘like them’ as a listener. As such, the ‘otherness’ which they might otherwise feel towards musicians is not encountered to restrict or limit their listening experience. Instead, seeing the musicians as someone like them creates accessibility, adds meaningfulness to the listening experience and enhances enjoyment and engagement. From an experiential learning perspective, this kind of enjoyment and engagement with the art or learning object is essential to creating experiences that are educative (Dewey, 1998, 2005). Through these relationships that establish a social environment of inclusion and induction, audience members become insiders to music through listening and engagement in the concert hall.

Curating Concert Experiences for Learning Through Social Relationships and Insider Perspective
With an acute awareness of their audiences afforded by their insider perspectives as both musicians and regional community citizens, the RCO arts organisers are able to curate concerts and tailor the social environment where learning happens through social and musical relationships. These choices facilitate not only the way the concerts are conducted, but also intentionally organise opportunities for musicians and audience members to interact one on one, with each other as ‘regular people’, facilitating the social experience of the audience as a whole. Furthermore, the ways in which RCO produces concerts and facilitates listening experiences is recognised by audience members as valuable. The concert hall is a place which is inclusive and constructive to learning.
Curating concert halls as spaces for learning conversations

Working with the challenges of performing in town halls and harnessing the social potential they offer to promote worthwhile interaction opens various opportunities for learning conversations between musicians and listeners. Rosabelle explains that choices to work without “a green room for our musicians”, to have dinner with the audience over interval and to have the musicians mingle with the audience are examples of how RCO intentionally chooses “not to be kept separated from the audience”. These choices provide opportunities for learning conversations to take place similar to those discussed in the literature on learning in museums and art galleries by Allen (2002), Knutson (2002), and Leinhardt and Knutson (2004).

However, the interval and the learning conversations are also facilitated by RCO’s emic awareness of their audience and their experiences as members of a regional community. As Rosabelle explains, “the fact is that most people at the places we play at… have come long distance [for concerts]” and the imperative of “you have to feed them” is an opportunity the orchestra can use to connect and mingle with their audience. Hospitality of this sort is seen not only as a way of caring and connecting with their audience, but is also part of their identity as regional folk. As Rosabelle explains hospitality and catching up over a meal is very much “a rural, regional ‘country’ thing” that has become a part of their version of doing orchestral concerts.

Other aspects of RCO’s concert practice which may seem auxiliary to the musical performance are likewise opportunities RCO takes to connect with and have learning conversations with audience members. Even the choice made by the arts organisers to delay packing up after a concert and to invite the audience at the end of the concert and via the paper program to “meet a musician” or “come and have a chat” are ways RCO curates concerts to intentionally build relationships and opportunities for learning conversations. During the observations, I noted particularly how the musicians came into and around where the audience had been sitting rather than expecting or waiting for the audience to approach them. In doing this, the musicians stepped out of ‘their space’ or a place which is reserved for the musician only, and join the audience as equals. In doing this, listeners were able to get up close and personal with the instruments, ask questions and share their experiences with the musicians too.

Ronnie explains that when the musicians have their instruments with them, there is an opportunity to “explain the instruments, even let them (the audience) have a fun play or a closer look”. Rosabelle explained that these times are particularly significant for her because “the audience is really interested and that’s exciting”. She explained how these conversations and
times before the concert, during interval and after the concert before pack up, are chances to “share my passion with them (the audience)” . These multiple opportunities and invitations to talk and interact with the musicians over tea, coffee or dinner served at interval are privileges and practices which are not part of traditional orchestral concert practice. These are elements RCO has derived from their own experiences of being insiders and a desire to help the audience to feel at ease and equalise the barriers to “make the orchestra accessible … and a place to engage to our regional audience with music” (interview, “Ronnie”).

The interactions derived from hospitality and opportunities to mingle with the musicians were important aspects of audience experiences. The emphasis on engagement and the mutual feeling that barriers were dismantled because of these practices was reflected in the comments made during the focus group. Ramella, Raine and Rachel all agreed that these aspects of RCO concerts are special because they help “you feel more at home.” Through these conversations over meals and with musicians, Raelene had learned that “classical music is for me!” As an inclusive practice, Raelene explained that these social opportunities also make the concert hall a place “where it is ok to take the grandchildren”.

The social environment curated at RCO concerts is “certainly about engagement” with the listener, as Rosabelle explained. However, the ways in which concerts incorporate opportunities for musician-listener interaction is more complex than simply “having some more informal [elements and] incorporating more traditional components” (interview, “Rosabelle”). The notion of finding a balance between formal and informal is one highlighted in the literature on audience development, for example by removing barriers to engagement or access, considering how informal contexts can give rise to learning as in museums, art galleries and festivals (Karlsen, 2009; Leinhardt & Knutson, 2004; Winterson, 2010), and examining audience comfort (Sigurjónsson, 2009, 2010b). However, the RCO example speaks more of a synthesis between informal and formal. RCO concerts do not involve musicians switching between being members of the orchestra and ‘regular people’, nor do the listeners alternate between being actively engaged and being passive listeners.

The orchestra members’ insider (emic) experiences as community members enable them to synthesise social and musical dimensions of their concerts for learning and engagement. As Ronnie explained, “here there’s no hierarchy… this is the human quality that makes it [the music] more accessible”. Furthermore, this human element found in creating everyday interactions in a space traditionally perceived as socially rigid helps to flatten traditional hierarchies associated with orchestral music which exist, as Small (1996, 1998) asserts, through the social conditions established. At RCO, the engaged audience of listeners
are positioned as equals with the musician and the music (B. M. Berger, 1970; Dobson & Sloboda, 2014; Reeves, 2015; Small, 1996, 1998). Furthermore, the audience too become insiders to the music and are afforded unique and valuable access to the musicians which affords a special learning experience. This access and insider perspective is not seen as a privilege as it might be in a more formal or traditional concert hall context, which is illustrated by Small (1998, pp. 15-19). Rosabelle explains in the following extended quote:

You’d never have that level of personal engagement with the musicians if you went to [a professional orchestral performance]. It would be a privileged experience that you could either pay for or win an experience of sitting with some of the musicians at the dinner afterwards or something.

… I one time remember having a chat during interval with some audience members with my cello. I was able to answer some questions [they had and] they were like “Now I get it, now I get the music and why it was doing that sort of thing!” … You’d never have that if you went to [the capital city performing arts center].

Opportunities to meet musicians or to learn about the instruments of the orchestra from the players being in close proximity is a pedagogy sometimes employed at children’s concerts by professional orchestras (Wainwright, 2014). These learning conversations often unfold between the learner and an ‘expert other’ (a musician from the orchestra, a learning engagement officer) and have been shown to be effective for learning, particularly in informal contexts such as such as museums and art galleries (ABC Radio, 2015; Ballantyne et al., 2014; Leinhardt & Knutson, 2004). However, taking into account the way the orchestra positions itself as an insider, as “just like them”, which flattens the hierarchy often found between ‘expert other’ and listener, the listener becomes an insider to the music (Campos, Moreno, & Landaeta, 2011; Dickinson, 1983).

**Curating social and musical experiences for engagement through guided listening pedagogy**

Carefully curated social and musical relationships are the foundation for RCO’s pedagogic practice and learning experiences through listening. Raelene explained “it’s a communal sort of thing at this orchestra… I listen differently, and I participate. I’m not passive”. Ramella explained how “the intensity of the people playing and the people listening around you actually rubs off and makes you listen.” Raelene said, that “at RCO concerts my foot can listen. It’s ok
if you want to groove around when the movement factor is coming out… the music is in you and its ok if the movement is the expression of how you listen because the music is in you”. This freedom and engagement in listening reported by the focus group participants is something the arts organisers intentionally strive towards and is central to their pedagogic practice. As Ronnie explained:

    We don’t want them to just sit there in their chairs. We want to meet them, to connect with them and give people that bit more of an insider view of what happens in the music.

Ronnie’s sentiment expresses the impetus behind curating educational concert and listening experiences which differentiates their concerts from “very formal concert hall experiences” (interview, “Ronnie”). At each RCO concert, and indeed at the concerts I observed by MCO and PSO, I observed how the master of ceremonies was not only an announcer but also a guide for listeners through the program and musical experience. The master of ceremonies would give points of reference, familiar elements to listen for or give background to the work which practically related to ways the audience could listen. Furthermore, these introductions, as Ronnie explained, are intentionally given to “refocus the audience into what they’re listening to and for preparing them for what they’re about to hear”.

Rachel explained how the master of ceremonies’ commentary not only prepared her for listening but also “brought the music alive” and brought about new ways of thinking about listening. She said, “I remember that time during an RCO concert including Saint-Saëns’ ‘Carnival of the Animals’ the [concert master’s] commentary was about listening for animal sounds… it was the first time I really realised I’d listened attentively to an orchestra”. However, more significant for theorising learning through listening is that this development in her knowledge of orchestral music, instruments and listening was brought about through the social and musical environment curated by the orchestra. As she explained, “I listened with a new kind of thinking”. Furthermore, this experience equipped her with new skills for listening that she then brought to future concerts, orchestral, and non-orchestral music. She explained:

    [When I listened to music at the concert] I began looking for sounds other than music sounds and trying to imagine what it could mean because I understood the orchestra by understanding the sound. I learnt to listen not only for the musicality or the beauty but what else the music could represent.
Rachel’s learning experience highlights the truly participatory and active nature that listening can embody in the concert hall when pedagogies of listening are employed which is evident not only in the lifeworlds of the RCO participants, but also those in the MCO and PSO chapters already presented. Furthermore, because of this active listening facilitated by the master of ceremonies which served as a social and mechanisms, resulted in having an experience where learning takes place. For Rachel, because of the experience she had with this orchestra, she became an insider to the music and is able to apply that understanding to other listening experiences where she now becomes an interpreter of music and meaning. Where previously she felt more passive, because of the pedagogies of listening encountered at this RCO concert, Rachel feels she participates more as an equal partner and as a vital part of the music making not only as an individual listener but also as part of the audience and shared corporate experience.

Small’s (1998) notion of musicking which I explored in the literature review (chapter 2) and research design (chapter 3), offers a complementary voice to the insight into social relationships in learning experiences to those already provided by Dewey. Small asserts that the meaning of music and musical experiences does not reside in art objects themselves, but in acts of being part of the music. As such, Small conceptualises music as a verb, “to music” and explains that anyone who “contributes to the nature of the event that is a musical performance in any capacity… whether by performing, by listening [or any number of activities]” (Small, 1998, p. 9) contributes to the musicking taking place.

As Small explains, and as I have highlighted in Rachel’s example above, “the act of musicking establishes in the place where it is happening a set of relationships” (Small, 1998, p. 9). In combination with the concepts drawn out of Dewey’s work, I assert that learning in the concert hall for RCO audience members not only happens through the social experiences Dewey speaks of, but also that these relationships can be curated to create relationships between the listener and the music, the musician and audience, listener and experience. The meaning and the learning that are facilitated by these experiences is therefore, as Small asserts, not found in the music-as-object, environmental, cultural, ritualistic practices of the concert hall, rather in experiences and relationships that are created between the musickers in the concert hall because of the social and musical environment.

I assert that other activities that are part of RCO’s musicking here that contribute to the set of relationships which curate experiential education in the concert hall. The quality of these activities and relationships is imperative to the music as well inclusive. The activity and the relationships foster mutually emic relationships and set these as the basis for pedagogical
practice. What may be considered as supplementary or unrelated to the music itself must be considered part of the musicking and therefore an element which can be curated to support learning through listening. As in the RCO example, musicking for learning then includes speaking with the audience, or conversing with a musician over dinner, setting up chairs so that the audience sits in close proximity with the orchestra or any other range of ways which curates the concert to promote inclusivity and engagement. This is a space I explore further in the next section.

For the focus group participants, being part of the musicking with RCO and their experiences of learning are also times of feeling unified and part of something bigger. As Ramella explained, “when we listen, we come here and have a sense of belonging and togetherness, and I think it is the music that ties the audience and the orchestra together”. While my analysis of the social environment for learning and the curation of experiences highlights human interaction, it is ultimately, as Ramella says, the music itself that does the connecting. Raine explains in similar terms that:

Being part of the audience and listening reminds you of the bigger picture you are part of” … “it’s like a kind of unified feeling when the music plays and everyone is really focused and enjoying the music. It’s a buzz that allows you to express the enjoyment of listening too.

RCO’s pedagogical practice rests in how these relationships are formed and enable people to engage and learn through music — be it by being a musician, audience and listener. However these relationships are dynamic in that they are not only intrapersonal (that is person to person), but also present between individuals and society, and communities and the music. These relationships in their various forms are what create educative experiences for musicking and are the premise for how pedagogies of listening function as “how we learn through musicking” (Small, 1998, p. 13). More than this, as the experiences of the participants have attested, it is the basic premise that music (Small, 2016), as is experience (Dewey, 1980, 1998), are actions, not the holders of or originators of meaning. Their participatory nature mediates meaning making and frames the relationships formed within them as pedagogies of listening for experiences which have educational impact.
Curating the physical space and concert hall layout in pedagogies of listening

As explored in the introduction to RCO and the concert descriptions, RCO performs in a variety of venues. This challenge of constantly adapting to playing in different performance spaces causes the organisers to think carefully about the layout of the concert hall. Particularly, they must consider how to use the physical space of the venue to shape the audience’s experience and opportunities to understand something of the music being played. My observations of RCO’s concert practices and the experiences of the research participants demonstrate that the physical space of the concert hall and how it is used is a multifaceted issue.

In the literature review, I explored how concert hall design, concert-giving and audience listening evolved through a historical-musicological perspective (Nicholls et al., 2018). Further afield, Forsyth (1985, 1988) explores how the architectural design of concert halls and how spaces within them can be designed to facilitate social interaction. There is also a growing body of research investigating how space in museums, libraries and art galleries can be curated to promote learning and ‘visitor talk’ (Balloffet et al., 2014; Leinhardt et al., 2002; Leinhardt & Knutson, 2004; Sabeti, 2015). However, the impact of concert hall layout is something not yet explored in relation to audience development and education, much less as a possible tool for shaping pedagogies of listening.

For the RCO focus group participants, being able to see while listening and the obstacles faced by the orchestra and listeners in non-purpose-built spaces significantly impacted their listening experiences. For Raelene, Raine, Raven and Rachel, the venues for RCO concerts made it difficult to see during concerts because often the orchestra is flat and level with the audience. Rachel observed, “we could have been a bit higher. I was ok but there was a lady shifting in front of me trying to see. We actually need a tiered or sloped floor either for them or for us”. She identified other aspects of these spaces that also distract from the listening, “like being drawn to the bright green exit signs and the fire extinguisher signs”.

37 Considerations by RCO include: acoustics; how the weather, wind, shade and sun may affect audiences and musicians during performances outside; how architectural features of the hall can be utilised or avoided if the performance is inside (e.g. stages, sloped flooring, posts or columns); whether food is being served during the performance; whether smaller ensembles are also performing; if any additional presentations or activities are happening (as in the case of the dinner fundraiser concert); or if projections or visuals are being used. Safety considerations must also be made including keeping fire exits clear and accommodating prams and wheelchairs. See appendix H for an overview of the concerts (p. 255).
In conversation with other members of the audience during concert observations, one listener commented how having a “visual connection gives you the perception that you can hear better”. In relation to her learning specifically, Ramella explained that the visual aspect and “being able to see the whole orchestra and the players” is a significant factor in helping her to make meaning of her listening. She said:

Like tonight, I had really good seats, so I could see… I could watch when someone was preparing, when a big bang was going to come. Or you could see when the violins came in at different times, how it get layered. Definitely being able to see them helps me listen.

RCO mitigates the challenges of physical space by purposefully arranging the layout of chairs and space to maximise the audience’s ability to see and engage with the orchestra. During the observations, I noticed that chairs were set up in different blocks, with staggered rows and sometimes seating areas were set aside for children. Where possible, the orchestra was set up on slopes or raised platforms to afford the audience a better view of the musicians and instruments as they listen. The orchestra also took advantage of architectural features such as stages to seat audiences to give them an even better view of the orchestra. As Rosario explained, “creating a musical experience” and learning what works best for the audience and orchestra takes time and ingenuity. “It’s more than just setting up and playing”.

This careful thinking about seeing the concert hall space observed in the data can be framed in a few ways in relation to pedagogies of listening. Dewey states educative experiences are made “making the most of the opportunities present… The principles [of education as experience] become concrete only in the consequences which result from their application... everything depends upon the interpretation given as they are put into practice (Dewey, 1998, p. 6). This notion is observed in the way RCO considers how they set up their performance spaces to best benefit the listener. Small’s detailed description of the impact that the space of the concert hall itself, including the direction of the chairs, the use of a stage, the doors through which musicians and audiences enter and exit and the austerity witnessed in the decoration contributes to the meanings of performing and listening and the subsequent rituals and etiquettes observed (Small, 1996, 1998).

A greater nuance may be appreciated by bringing in the additional theoretical framework of theatre semiotics which can be useful in bringing a greater depth to this part of
the analysis. Theatre semiotics, derived from the general pragmatic field of semiotics established by de Saussure and Peirce (James, 2011; Peirce, 2011) provides a language with which to describe this phenomenon of how the physical space can be curated to enhance the audience listening and learning experience. Traditionally theatre semiotics have been primarily concerned with the construction of meaning through the relationship between the literary dramatic text and its physical enactment (Elam, 1980; Gallegos, 2015; McConachie, 2008; Shu, 2012). However, as Carlson (1989, 1990, 1993) posits, the consideration of semiotics can also be orientated towards understanding how signs within the theatre, such as the importance of seeing in listening and visual distraction raised by the RCO research participants, “are produced with the ways they are received and creatively interpreted by a public” (Carlson, 1990, p. 12). As such, meaning (and as I extend, understanding or learning) is therefore generated and exchanged through processes of signification and communication. These processes include how the theatrical text (in this case musical performance) is perceived “visually and acoustically…., the physical organisation of the playhouse itself: its dimensions, the stage-audience distance, the structure of the auditorium (and thus the spectator’s own position in relation to [their] fellows and to performers)” (Elam, 1980, p. 34).

What is described as proxemic relations in the work of Elam (2002) resonates with the descriptions of the focus group participants. Specifically, the focus group participants described that the regional and local factors of performances, and the systemic spatial conventions at play at RCO concerts, defines how exactly “the layout helps” their listening experiences (focus group, “Randy”). Borrowing the terminology of theatre semiotics, Randy is describing how the proxemic, aestheticlogicalic and interstitial aspects of RCO’s performance practice are intentionally manipulated (Dymkowski & Wiles, 2013). The experience is proxemic in that the audience gains a sense of togetherness because of their closeness to each other and the musicians, aestheticlogicalic because the aesthetics of the space enhance focus and concentration and, as Ramella explains, there is an understanding that “watching and the visual are also part of the performance” (interstitial).

What theatre semiotics offers to this analysis is a language to describe the role played by these visual aspects in orchestral performance which is has previously been considered as an essentially aural and cognitive-affective phenomenon. Particularly, investigating the concert hall space through the lens of proximal relations finds resonance with the pragmatic analysis already undertaken through applying Dewey’s ideas on learning experiences and the social environment, and Small’s explication of meaning-making through musicking. In this way, musicking, the meanings and the learning through listening, the social relationships created in
having an experience and the physical space or proximal relations of the concert hall become aspects which must be considered when investigating pedagogies of listening in the concert hall. These factors are extramusical languages that pedagogues work with in order to create the learning environment.38

**Using themes and visual presentation as pedagogies of listening**

Ronnie explains another way the RCO helps the audience to make meaning from their listening experience is that “often our concerts have a theme”. For RCO the construction of the theme goes beyond choosing music “that we love to play and ones that also have a special meaning for the particular theme”. The theme can also include extra-musical aspects of performance which support audience connection with the music, interpretation and making meaning out of their experiences.

For example, RCO held a concert to raise money for a charity for returned veterans and to commemorate the 100-year anniversary of the armistice. The concert was part of a larger project the orchestra was involved in and included input from a local historian and the regional Return Services Leagues Club (RSL). In the foyer, the RSL had provided a display of photos, medals and memorabilia. The local historian had prepared a visual presentation of photographs, short text information and images of artefacts telling the story of soldiers from the regional area who had served in World War 1 which was projected onto two large screens either side of the orchestra. RCO accompanied this presentation with a performance of Barber’s ‘*Adagio for Strings*’, a solemn sombre work which was followed by a minutes silence and the playing of the Last Post.

To use Brook’s term (1972) from the field of theatre semiotics, these ‘empty spaces’: the walls, the projector screens, the foyer, the inclusion of a cenotaph and local cadets on duty were utilised as “fillable spaces” (Elam, 1980). Through the use of these spaces and visual signals, the orchestra curates cultural and theatrical sub-codes that provoke listener engagement and connection to help the audience generate meaning through experiencing the music within the space. For example: the kinesic codes which governed gesture, movement and expression; the vestimentary codes communicated in the uniforms of the cadets and orchestra; the pragmatic rules and rhetorical codes at play during the rites of the minutes silence and Last Post; and the historical and ideological psychological codes the audience were able to use to

38 Extramusical elements are connected with the idea of extratextual elements borrowed from theatre semiotics (Elam, 2002; McConachie, 2008).
interpret and bring meaning to the performance (Elam, 1980; McConachie, 2008; Rayani-Makhsous, 2013).

Similar examples of how RCO utilises these empty spaces, particularly with visual cues, were observed at the other concerts. During the concert held to celebrate the orchestra’s 10-year anniversary, photos from the orchestra’s archives were projected onto two large screens during interval and the encore. Likewise, at other concerts, digital media and projections on screens behind the orchestra are used to direct the audience’s attention to listening for narratives in the music or to help the audience connect the aural experience of listening with visual cues, which help support meaning making (Thwaites, 2008).

It is important to emphasise that this filling of ‘blank spaces’ is not undertaken as decoration or filigree to the concert itself. Rather, RCO views these elements of their practice as ways of helping the audience engage because they recognise that music in itself is quite abstract. As Rosabelle explains, “any visual [we add] is always about something happening in the music” because we want to help listeners “feel more of a connection and the sound to make more sense”. Rosabelle’s explanation resonates clearly with the assertion of Small (Small, 1996, 1998) that music in itself is meaningless, it is the act of experience, of musicking through and the relationships between object and subjects, which bring about meaning making in performing and listening.

Further resonance is also found between the theories of musicking, experiential education and using theatre semiotics taken up in this analysis so far in that all three orchestras studied in this project (MCO, PSO and RCO) — the audience, the listener, the learner — are positioned as active and essential to the performance (Brook, 1972; Carlson, 1990; Dewey, 1964, 1998; Rayani-Makhsous, 2013; Small, 2016). In terms of learning, this is significant in that visuals and space as discussed here become tools which can be employed by audience developers to intentionally shape the listener experience and direct the audience’s focus. Even in the case of when the music being performed is unfamiliar to the listener, visuals and theming as exemplified in the RCO context, gives the listener a point of reference. Rosabelle gave one particular example about guiding the audience through a suite of music from ‘An American in Paris’ by Gershwin saying:

The music is quite quirky, and you might not, even if you know the movie, be able to connect with it at all. Without the visual [for some listeners] it’s just sort of sounds. But when you see the visual of these images behind us the orchestra as its being played, suddenly there’s something to hold on to as you listen.
To connect these ideas from another perspective, as with theatre semiotics, through these decorations, displays, projections, imagery and music, the environment and surrounds attempt to link in with the listener’s prior experience. The experience of these extramusical elements within “environing conditions… and surroundings are conducive to having experiences that lead to growth and are worthwhile” (Dewey, 1998, p. 35).

**Summary**
Through theoretical insight from Dewey, Small and the discourse of theatre semiotics, I have analysed how RCO orchestra develops relationships, spaces and practices that invite and include the listener. I have argued that this orchestra’s pedagogies of listening are grounded in the reflection they see of themselves as insiders to the music they play and the community they serve, and why this is so significant for their regional audience. The experiences and lifeworlds of the audience participants attest to the impact of space, place, time, layout and visual elements to enhance listener engagement with the music. Using theatre semiotics, I unpacked how meaning is derived from these extra-musical elements to enrich the understanding the listener generates from the concert experience. All these elements, both musical and non-musical, the relationships built between the musician and the listener, and the relationships built between the listener and the music are carefully curated by the RCO arts organisers. To explore these themes from the data I drew on the Dewey’s work on social environments and conditions for educative experiences, Small’s insights into the meanings of listening and performing shaped by ritualistic, cultural and environing aspects of the concert hall, and I used the language of theatre semiotics to highlight how meaning is generated from visual and spatial cues about the music and experience of being an audience.
CHAPTER 7
Pedagogies of Listening and Audience Education in the Orchestral Concert Hall

Introduction
Having presented my examination of the MCO, PSO and RCO data, this final discussion chapter brings together all the findings so far to derive the most important structures and essences using an interpretive hermeneutic approach. First, I address an issue of language and how pedagogies of listening are conceptualised, which proved to be a sticking point as the analysis across the previous three chapters unfolded. Second, I revisit the central themes derived from the MCO, PSO and RCO data and present these in vignettes to provide a thick analytic description of the phenomena. Third, I outline four essential qualities that are inherent qualities in pedagogies of listening: relationality, tensions, differentiation and technologies. Finally, I conclude that when these essential qualities of pedagogies of listening are in place, the resulting practice increases the agency of listeners in their own learning and musical development, and audience access and confidence within the art form.

Talking About Pedagogies of Listening
In the earliest chapters I spoke about pedagogies of listening in directive terms - ‘learning to listen’, ‘educators and pedagogues’, and pedagogies as things that are done to and for audiences. A reflexive turning point happened during my analysis of the data. In chapters 4, 5 and 6, I portray that in the context of the concert hall, the relationships between orchestra and listener, listener and audience, and audience and artform must be understood differently than what is traditionally implied in a student-teacher relationship. In this reflexive turn the original research questions have not changed, but having conducted the analysis of the MCO, PSO and RCO examples it is evident that the meaning implied by the questions needs refocussing. It has become quite clear that this language used to set up the research study does not fully represent participants’ experiences nor does it give credence to experience as the medium or

39 The central research question stated in chapter 1 asked: How is learning experienced by listeners in the orchestral concert hall and what pedagogies of listening do orchestras employ to facilitate learning as a strategy for audience development? The subsidiary questions focussed on how audiences experience pedagogies of listening, the understandings of pedagogies of listening held by orchestras as arts organisations and how pedagogies of listening contribute to equipping and skilling audiences. For full statement see page 20.
catalyst for change. In this final chapter I will work towards a phenomenology that sees these notions of learning, pedagogies and the role the arts institution plays with a far more refined and nuanced perspective.

To speak of ‘learning to listen’ now seems reductive and does not recognise the continuity, interaction and complexity of having ‘an experience’. The phrase ‘learning to listen’ seems now to imply that there is an imperative for audiences to learn a certain way because of the singularity of what it is to listen in a certain way and to engage within expected parameters. Learning about the music and making meaning happens through the act of listening and being part of the audience. Thus, I realise with a greater understanding the importance of the doing, being and having of experience. As well as the changing and moving quality that is inherent in all learning experiences. This was a point not lost on Dewey who likewise recognised the dynamic rather than static nature of experience. He explains, “an experience is always what it is because of a transaction taking place… they live in a series of situations (1998, p. 41). In Experience and Education, Dewey captures the growing and ever-changing nature of experience by quoting a most beautiful excerpt by Tennyson.

… all experience is an arch wherethro’
Gleams that untraveled world, whose
    margin fades
For ever and for ever when I move
(Alfred, Lord Tennyson, Ulysses (1842), in 19-21; (1998, p. 27)

As I move through this final analysis, I take on a modification of language which represents a conceptual shift in my thinking from than with which I began this research project. I adopt language which shifts meaning and emphasis necessary to portray as fully as possible the phenomenon and the lifeworld of the research participants. Such a reflexive turn in my phenomenology recognises the always partial view even the most rigorous research can attain. In speaking of ‘learning through listening’, I shift the emphasis away from the experience of ‘learning to listen’ as a top-down imposed directive, to one which is mutually reliant upon both what the arts organisation does and what the audience member brings and gleans from the experience. In doing so I am trying to capture something of the changing flux and transitionary give and take in the nature of transformative (educative) experiences which was evident to Dewey. Also, in modifying my conceptualisation, I tailor to this context, the orchestral concert hall, a language which was previously derived from a formalised schooling paradigm.
Similarly, I find that the baggage carried with using descriptors such as ‘teaching’, ‘learners’, and even the broadest notion of ‘education’ to limit one’s capacity to fully comprehend the complexity of what is going on when we speak of experiential learning through listening. As I moved through the analysis, there was a clear shift in my language describing teaching and learning. The MCO example highlighted relationships which lie beyond the traditional notions of teacher and learner. In re-listening to the PSO participants’ experiences, I heard about the many ways they advocate for and follow their own initiative in making meaning through their listening experiences. In the case of the RCO, I found my language as I reported the findings shifting towards a model advocating for the notion of curating experiences and talking of how concert design and planning factor into audience development (the culmination of education, programming and marketing) practices.

Thus, the listener must be understood in the concert hall as a catalyst to their own learning as much as the organisation is a designer and curator of experiences. The traditional notion of the teacher-student relationship or the educational institution does not align with the types of relationships evident in the concert hall. Together, through these relationships, musicking and meaning are curated by the arts organisation, and learning is realised through these complex processes and relationships. While education is addressed as a significant aspect of audience development by Rogers (1998), Hanna (1984), Maitland (2000) and others, here in this final analysis, I am wanting to draw attention to more than simple matriculation, retention and engagement of new audiences. I am attempting to speak of what transforms experience and knowing beyond aesthetic appreciation. Or as Dewey would say, what vital sense defines experiences as being educative in quality when we say “that was an experience” (2005, p. 37).

**Reviewing Pedagogies of Listening in Three Contexts**

Having taken this reflexive turn, I now summarise the key themes drawn from each of the research contexts and the theoretical perspectives I have applied so far in the discussion chapters. To begin each summary, I have formulated a vignette to convey the most important parts of the analysis, which I present as an analytical rendering of the phenomena through thick description. This is a methodological maneuver I have included as I move into this deeper discussion and eidetic understanding of the phenomena in an effort to do as Husserl (1970) instructed — “zu den Sachen selbst!” — to return to the things themselves. In doing this, I highlight what was most important within each context, but also direct attention to the differences and nuances between the three research sites.
VIGNETTE 1: Pedagogies of Listening at a Metropolitan Community Orchestra Concert

We arrive at the school hall where this afternoon’s concert by the Metropolitan Community Orchestra is being held. It is a warm, sunny afternoon and there is a pleasant breeze about. We pay a small fee for admission to the greeters in the hall foyer. They advise us that afternoon tea will be served at the interval and encourage us to purchase some raffle tickets which will go towards supporting the orchestra. According to the black and white paper program, we will be listening to an afternoon of music including arrangements and excerpts of Brahms symphonies. Until now, all we knew about the program was what we could assume from the advertised concert title — Romantic Masters. The musicians are busy setting up their instruments and greeting friends and family who have come to listen. There is an all-around friendly vibe and sense of busy-ness as we take our seats.

The orchestra begins to assemble and soon the sounds of tuning and last-minute rehearsal begin to mingle with the conversations of the audience. The audience sits on plastic school chairs arranged in three large blocks separated by aisles. Thankfully, the side doors of the hall have been opened to allow the breeze to cool the hall. We are so close to the orchestra that we can read the music on their stands. The string section sits level with the audience, while the brass, woodwind and percussion sections are raised on platforms so that they can see the conductor.

The musicians are dressed uniformly in matching black MCO polo shirts and black trousers. They all make last minute preparations before the concertmaster stands. The oboe plays the tuning note and the audience conversation volume dulls as the orchestra tunes. With a nod from the concertmaster, the entire orchestra stands and the conductor, dressed all in black, enters to applause. However, she is not alone. The master of ceremonies and the president of MCO enter too. They welcome us to the concert and thank us for coming to listen. The master of ceremonies then introduces the first work to us – ‘Symphony No 4, Movement 1’, by Brahms — providing some short biographical information about the composer, what year the work was premiered and something of the character of the piece. Throughout the concert, she will return to the stage to
introduce subsequent pieces in a similar fashion. Having already taken their seats, the orchestra prepares to play.

The music begins, and we find ourselves craning our necks a little to try and get the best view of as much of the orchestra as possible. It is a little difficult given the string section is seated level with us, but the sound of the lush harmonies so iconic to Romantic compositions is good. After all, at live orchestral performances, seeing is an important part of hearing. After another piece of music there is a small break in the program when, to our surprise, musicians who had been seated in the audience with us stand to get their instruments and form a smaller strings group which the master of ceremonies introduces as ‘the junior strings’. Rather than leaving the stage to sit separately, the ‘youth orchestra’ who had been playing come and sit in and amongst the audience members, blurring what would have been a sharp division between those performing and those who shall sit listening.

The program provides some insight, stating that the first work was performed by the youth orchestra and that the concert this afternoon will actually feature two ensembles in addition to the full MCO orchestra. After another couple of shorter works, the master of ceremonies introduces the full orchestra which includes adult, youth and junior musicians. The master of ceremonies also introduces the next work in the program, ‘Hungarian Dance Number 2’ by Brahms, explaining that we are going to be transported by the music to a humble village. The next piece of music is introduced with a short sad story and the eschewing mournful melody raises goose bumps on your arms and the hair on the back of my neck.

At the interval, afternoon tea is provided and the musicians mingle and socialise with us. We also meet some other audience members who have come to support a friend playing today. As they talk enthusiastically about the various MCO projects their friend has been part of this year - including concerts featuring film and modern music, and the local ANZAC day memorial concert — it becomes apparent that this orchestra is involved in many and diverse ways with the local metropolitan community. After the interval, the concert continues…
As I examined in chapter four, relationships were the key contributor to MCO audience members’ meaningful experiences of listening and learning. Through analysing the data, I illuminated MCO’s unique approach to audience development which was afforded by the relationships and connection they build with their listeners. Having a personal relationship with the orchestra and its musicians was an initial catalyst for listener engagement but beyond this, the MCO’s thoughtful ‘relationship first’ approach was vital in breaking down barriers that might otherwise have precluded deeper audience engagement. MCO is distinguished from professional orchestras in this willingness to do things differently in order to facilitate meaningful musical experiences for their audiences.

Drawing on the work of Pitts (2014, 2017) and Small (1996, 1998), I proposed that the kinds of relationships built in the MCO concert hall create social and psychological conditions that enable audience learning through the experience of listening. At MCO these relationships serve to not only help the audience to feel comfortable in the concert hall (as Sigurjónsson, 2010b suggests), but also to feel included, vital to the musicking going on, and primed to receive the most from the listening experience. I applied Dewey’s (1998, 2005) concepts of situational and social understanding to unpack these pedagogies and relational practices and to theorise MCO’s unique conception and approach to audience development as experiential education.

VIGNETTE 2: Pedagogies of listening at a Professional Symphony Orchestra Concert

Dressed in our finery, we arrive at a very opulent performing arts complex. We have known the program for some time, so we have been able to read the orchestra’s notes on the music and listen to recordings in order to familiarise ourselves with the music prior to this evening’s concert. In the foyer, we collect our tickets from the box office and check in our jackets and join the audience who are standing in small groups, sipping wine and talking in hushed tones. A bell sounds to tell us the concert hall doors have opened, and we make our way to our designated door.

We collect a glossily printed program from the usher and find our allocated seats in the stalls of the huge purpose-built auditorium which has an additional two balconies of seating towering above us. Though the audience seating is tiered in the auditorium, from our seats in the stalls on the floor level the orchestra is seated on stage above us and positioned as if on a lofty artistic pedestal. Some of the string section musicians are on stage already and gradually the rest of the orchestra emerges from the stage doors.
They seem to be in a completely separate world to us and surely we would never meet, except through this encounter. Their dress code confirms this division - the men smartly dressed in black matching suits and women dressed in modest formal black attire - an old tradition kept.

The lights dim a little and the oboe’s tuning “A” is heard above the quiet din of the audience. The concertmaster stands to preside over this seeming sacred ritual and the audience on cue becomes silent. After tuning, the lights dim further so that only the stage is brightly lit and the audience sits in darkness. We wait in anticipation, focussed on the stage. In unison the audience breaks into applause and the orchestra stands as the conductor, dressed in suit tails, enters the stage with the soloist carefully carrying a cello which is no doubt a priceless instrument. Though we are strangers to each other, and will each likely experience the music differently, we as listeners in this collective audience will share this time and space mediated by the art form that is classical music performance.

It is a wordless experience. Yet all the while information is communicated, not only in the music, but also in the gestures, the protocols and rituals followed, and the stoic conduct of all involved. The first work, a concerto, begins; and in listening, we make sense of the music. We do this through our prior experiences, but we also generate new understanding from our present experiences of the surroundings, the selection of repertoire being performed, the performance itself, and the unspoken code of conduct being followed. The audience listen still, silent and seemingly passive. Though much understanding and meaning is being made.

At another PSO concert on a Saturday morning, children and parents are seated on the floor on cushions with five musicians seated on a small stage low to the ground. An animateur is facilitating a workshop where children are actively invited to listen for specific selections of classical music. Here the behaviour observed while the participants listen is framed in terms quite different from the very formal ritualistic conduct of the audience in the concert described above. The children and adults are busily involved with the music-making by singing along, calling out as a chorus to questions asked by the animateur, clapping along with the music, or playing small hand-held percussion instruments. All of these activities, including the chattering and
giggling, are seen as vital opportunities for musicking together and for learning through listening.

Things are different again at a PSO promenade style concert full of noteworthy and memorable symphonic highlights. The orchestra is accompanied by a dazzling lighting presentation which highlights elements within the music: a spotlight on the snare drum soloist during ‘Bolero’ which grows to include the whole orchestra; a wash of watery blue lights during ‘The Blue Danube Waltz’; and a glittering disco ball reflects snow-like effects onto the concert hall interior during ‘Let it Go’ from the movie Frozen. Other additions punctuate the concert such as red, white and blue confetti and cancan girls who dance in the aisles during ‘The Infernal Galop’, and pyrotechnic explosions from canons during the ‘1812 Overture’. All these spectacular additions to the concert are introduced by the conductor who also serves as compere and guide for the evening. Through his jokes and stories, we feel at ease and come to understand something of the human-ness of classical music. Rather than sitting as bystanders, we are invited to participate in this music making and to hear with fresh understanding. It is evident that at this concert and in this space, and by the invitation to listen attentively and participate there is a shared understanding that listening for this audience will be different from those at the other two concerts just described.

In chapter 5, I identified four key themes that explain how pedagogies of listening are experienced in the PSO context, rendered again through the thick description above. First is the importance placed by listeners on their experiences of the music and musicians as relatable and human, as illustrated in the description of the children’s and promenade concerts. The second theme was also raised by the audience participants who highlighted the importance of being invited to interpret and the value they found in being guided in their listening as in the first concert described. The third theme evident in all the concerts described related to the ways that educational, artistic and engagement priorities are balanced within the PSO approach to audience development. The fourth theme was evident across the data which demonstrated the importance of valuing and recognising the autonomy of listeners as independent and capable learners. To support this analysis, I incorporated Dewey’s criteria for educative experiences (1998) and his notions of continuity and interaction (2005) to closely examine the social, objective (cognitive) and internal (affective) mechanics present in the lifeworlds of the participants.
However, the lifeworlds of the participants posed a challenge to current formulations of education as experience and I sought to explain in further detail how and what constitutes educative experiences in contexts such as the concert hall. The PSO context offered a variety of concert examples which I examined and understood using the interviews with the staff who direct audience development initiatives. The staff articulated how they as professionals frame learning and education within the concert hall and I incorporated theoretical perspectives from sociology (H. S. Becker, 1984; Bourdieu, 1984), dialectics or tensions (Zuss, 2014) and blended educational theories (E. F. Clarke, 2005; R. Crawford, 2017) into the analysis to arrive at a differentiated view of audiences and educational needs. The absence of an immediate personal relationship with the orchestra was also distinct from the examples found in the community orchestras MCO and RCO, which I proposed as being important to the experience of listening and learning.

VIGNETTE 3: Pedagogies of listening at a Regional Community Orchestra concert

After a long drive we arrive in the small country town where the RCO are playing this evening. As we park, already we see musicians with their instruments, mingling outside the aged community hall and warming up while others stop to welcome and greet friends and family arriving for the concert. We make our way inside the small hall. The orchestra is set up at one end and the audience (nearly in touching distance) are arranged in what seems an unconventional space for an orchestra concert. Our tickets come with a raffle ticket and token to collect our BBQ dinner meal at the interval. We are also given a paper program which lists the wide range of musical genres we are to hear this evening. Each piece is accompanied by the name of donors who have chosen or bought the score and a small note giving us some insight into the work and what to listen for. The program also includes in large friendly letters, “please come and meet us after the concert” and a very explicit invitation for anyone who is interested to join the orchestra for fun at their weekly rehearsals.

Audience members around us greet each other and talk animatedly about the concert ahead. We notice a number of instruments not usually included in a symphonic orchestra and that the comparatively small string section is mic’ed. The concert begins with the orchestra standing in unison and the audience join them in welcoming the conductor. The first work is performed unannounced, whereas other works are introduced by the concertmaster who also functions as master of ceremonies for the
concert. There is a mixture of music being performed, some of it is familiar whereas other pieces are new to us. Sometimes the audience is encouraged to clap or sing along, and in other pieces the audience sits quite still and silent, listening in reverence.

My analysis of the lifeworlds in the RCO example illustrated a unique perspective on the centrality of relationships to audience experiences and learning in the concert hall — an important feature that is of particular significance in the discussion that follows. I highlighted the ways in which the musicians and organisers, who saw themselves as a reflection of their audience, acted as a catalyst for their audience development and educative practices. Furthermore, I examined how pedagogies of listening were borne out of the dynamic interplay of emic and etic positionings and how the musician and listener interact within the arts worlds of which they are part (H. S. Becker, 1984; Harris, 1976). The RCO data reflected the findings of other studies on the benefits and importance of regional arts engagement (see for example Hardcastle, 2015; Kay, 2000; McHenry, 2009; Spring, 2013; Terracini, 2007), and demonstrated the significant impact community orchestras are making as a ‘training ground’ for audiences and safe space which renders learning about orchestral music accessible and relatable. I drew on work from the field of sociology to explore these themes (see Apple, Ball, & Gandin, 2010; Born, 2011; Bull, 2014; DeNora, 2000), Dewey’s writing on social conditions for learning experiences (1998, 2005), and theories on learning conversation and space by Allen (2002), Knutson (2002); Leinhardt et al. (2002).

Through the RCO participant lifeworlds I examined how physical space, time, social experiences, musical experiences, and visual and thematic elements of concerts are carefully curated to create pedagogies of listening. To illustrate this, I extended Dewey’s framework of art as experience and experiential learning (1998, 2005) and used Small’s philosophy of musicking (Small, 1998, 2016) to highlight how these innovations contribute to listeners’ understandings of music through listening. I also positioned pedagogies of listening such as observed at RCO as not only musical, but also social, spatial, and relational.

**Essential Qualities in Pedagogies of Listening**

By compiling and re-examining the analysis of all three research sites, I have distilled four qualities that are essential to pedagogies of listening in the context of the orchestral concert hall in general terms. I characterise these qualities as: relationality, balancing tensions within pedagogies of listening, differentiation, and technologies in pedagogies of listening. Each of these represents an essential quality of the pedagogies and practices. Therefore, these qualities
general to pedagogies of listening are not merely individual pedagogies/methods in and of themselves, they are paraxial philosophies at the heart of pedagogic practice. In this section, I elaborate on these qualities and illustrate how they contribute to experience of learning through listening.

The essential quality of relationality
Pedagogies of listening are relational practices which render the abstract tangible or personalised. However, the quality of relationality is not only limited to social and interpersonal types of relationships within the concert hall, but rather is a notion that must encompass broader conceptualisations. The term relationality also extends to include the relationships between the listener and the music, the music and its performance context, the listener and the collective audience, and even the listener and their own prior listening experiences. According to this definition, relationality is perhaps the single most prevalent factor considered by arts organisers when designing pedagogies of listening. Relationality is complex multifaceted and interconnects with the other qualities of pedagogies of listening—balancing tensions, differentiation, and technologies—through which relationality is manifested.

Framing relationships as a quality of pedagogies of listening extends the work of Small (1996, 1998) and Dewey (1998, 2005), who likewise acknowledge the pedagogical importance of relationality with objects and spaces. Dewey explains that “works of art are means by which we enter, through imagination and the emotions they evoke, into other forms of relationship and participation than our own” (2005, p. 347). Small echoes this argument in his assertion that to listen to music is to enter into a relationship with the music and the act of musicking, and that in this relationship meaning and understanding are generated. As he explains “art is knowledge as experience” (2016, p. 19). Likewise, the lifeworlds of the audience members attest to the centrality of relationality in terms of relationship with the arts organisation, relationship with the artwork and artists, and relationship with fellow musickers and listeners. Relationships that are formed are absolutely essential to the quality of listening experiences and pedagogies of listening.

Relationality as a quality in understanding pedagogies of listening in the concert hall therefore requires a complex multiplicity of meanings in relation to music performance, learning and education as part of audience development. Combining the data from MCO, PSO and RCO, and mapping the core themes generated from the analysis illustrates the webs and ways that aspects of the listening experience are interrelated and impact the many ways listeners listen, learn, and how they are taught. To illustrate the complexity of the relationships
and the many different ways relationality is present in pedagogies of listening I have combined the maps given in chapters 4, 5, and 6 into a single visual presented in figure 7.1.

**Figure 7.1 – The combined map of key themes in the MCO, PSO and RCO lifeworlds**

Themes connected using colour coded lines as in previous chapters

![Combined Map of Key Themes](image)

Despite the complexity and heterogeneity, there are commonalities to appreciate that highlight important essences in the different facets of relationality within experience and practice of pedagogies of listening. First, it is evident that pedagogies of listening among these orchestras are not hierarchical in that there is no pre-ordained order or goal of achievement to be reached. Second, because of the very nature of audience attendance at concerts and the vast range of backgrounds and experiences listeners bring and use when engaging as listeners in the concert hall, pedagogies of listening are neither developmental nor sequential. Rather, they are relational. In practice, as I have come to understand from my own background as a school-based music teacher, this means that arts organisers cannot plan on audience members engaging with musical elements or concepts in a structured, sequential way as would be the case in traditional understandings of education as in formal school education programs. Because there
cannot be a ‘curriculum’ for pedagogies of listening within the context of the concert hall there must be another way of envisaging education, one which focusses on practices that can render and curate the experience as one which is relatable.

In mapping this complexity and expanding on the quality of relationality, I am illustrating something of the hermeneutic structure of pedagogies of listening from a different phenomenological vantage point. It is a methodological maneuver essential to produce a rich and layered understanding. Furthermore it is this combined and multilayered eidetic perspective which is most useful when trying to answer questions about what makes effective pedagogy and practice in relation to education, audience development and the contemporary concert hall. For pedagogues (animateurs, audience developers and educators), this means that replicating hierarchical, sequential or other arboreal structures to learning (such as those found in schools or formal learning contexts) is likely to be ineffective because there is a necessity to recognise the vast variety of stimulus and input (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; E. Gordon, 1980; Hedin, 2010). This is something particularly important that I have come to understand in my own practice as a school teacher, community orchestra audience developer and animateur. As a way of showing the inner workings of my analysis of social-relational practices, I have compiled an overview of the practices observed during this research project in Appendix L (see p. 314) with full details and elaborations given in Appendixes I, J and K (see p. 257 onward).

**The essential quality of balancing tensions**
Within the diversity of pedagogies of listening, it is also evident that there are various tensions that are part of the essential quality of learning through listening at these orchestras. Figure 7.2 illustrates the themes discussed so far with these tensions arranged graphically. There are five tensions I go on to explore in this discussion:

- entertainment — education — experience;
- artistic expectations — artistic aspirations;
- formality — informality;
- cultural rituals — the tension between what is tacitly known or made explicit; and
- audience as collective — listening as individual.
The PSO context reveals tensions between artistic aspirations and desires for engagement and more direct forms of education, which rest (sometimes uneasily) alongside the traditions and rituals inherited by the PSO as part of a long historical tradition. Because of their seemingly incompatible agendas, education and audience development are sometimes at odds with one another, an issue likewise wrestled with in the work of Millard (2006), Wagener (2012), and Balloffet et al. (2014).

Even at this late stage of the analysis, there remain lingering questions over this tension between entertainment and education within the audience development agendas of the professional concert hall. How and why should audience development happen? What is the place of education within the cultural and social rituals and expectations which have been inherited and are replicated as part of the orchestral tradition? And, how can the aspirations of the artistic management team guide and direct the audience members’ attention while respecting each listener’s position as a skilled and autonomous learner? These are questions that animateurs, audience developers and educators in the concert hall context must not dismiss, but work within and between according to the specific practice and setting.
For the community orchestras, issues of tradition, ritual and institutional expectation were a lesser tension evident in their concert practices. However, this raised other tensions between how to function within formal and less formal concert formats. There are also tensions evident in the ways the orchestras decide which audience behaviours and etiquettes are assumed tacit knowledge and which of their expectations of the audience need to be made explicit. Both the MCO and RCO data provide perspectives on how to manage this tension. Specifically, their comments addressed the bigger challenge of how to curate experiences for audiences that balance listening and letting the artform speak for itself.

Across all three orchestras the findings highlight tensions around how much of the etiquette and knowledge of orchestral performance must be made explicit versus how much can be left as assumed or tacit knowledge. How does an orchestra curate audience experiences which value a multiplicity of ways of listening while balancing issues of being prescriptive and descriptive? How do initiatives to guide audience experiences value both affective and cognitive responses in listening? And what emphasis is there on individual and corporal or audience engagement with each listener being both an individual listener and audience participant? These are questions that must be continually asked by animateurs, audience developers and educators operating in the concert hall context, and according to their specific context.

On an individual level, there were also tensions observable in the individual experiences of the research participants. Particularly, there was a tension evident in the experiences of the focus group participants between thinking, feeling and just being while listening. In terms of education, their descriptions of learning through listening also represent a tension between knowing that (declarative knowledge) and knowing how (procedural knowledge) which was difficult to reconcile at times. Similar tensions were found in the experiences of the arts organisers particularly in relation to questions of how much of the concert-going experience and behavioural expectations of listeners should be made explicit in the concert versus how much can remain tacit. For example, reminding the audience to hold their applause until the end of the symphony being performed (explicit), or having the orchestra gesture to the audience when and how active participation from the audience was encouraged.

Similar tensions were described by the PSO research participants each of whom came to the concert hall for different reasons and enjoyed their listening experiences because of their own input and learning aspirations. At this research site, these research participants described other tensions that needed to be balanced for very different audience members. Tensions rested between being explicit and sometimes prescriptive in guiding the audience’s interpretation.
while listening versus being non-descriptive; balancing learning goals with artistic aspirations and wanting to demystify classical music rendering it human while other times wanting to keep some of the artistic mystery as part of the listening experience. By visualising the eidetic structure of the phenomenon these tensions are able to be represented iteratively in all their complexity, rather than being reduced to a hierarchy or linear explanation.

While many of the central issues examined here were posed by the research participants as questions, I suggest that reconceptualising them as tensions remains consistent with the participants’ lifeworlds while providing some theoretical traction. Furthermore, such an approach reinforces the interconnection and ongoing dialogue that the experience of an artwork and the teaching and learning of the artwork must have with each other. Thus pedagogies of listening are not enacted in a separated fashion from the experience of the artwork, in this case orchestral music, rather they are part of what makes an artistic experience. To adopt a Deweyan (1964, 2011b) approach, I formulate education here as art as experience, and because of the specific conditions of the experience, these experiences are educative and are rendered meaningful. This is how education as part of audience development manifests itself in the concert hall, not separate from, but as part of the artwork. Learning in the concert hall happens in the messy middle, in the grey between seemingly opposing positions, and as part of the experience. Education as part of audience development occurs as part of a continuum, balanced in these tensions I have discussed. To explain differently and to extend Small’s (1998) notion of musicking, learning, experiencing and meaning-making are part of musicking and contribute to the artwork and meanings of performing and listening.

There is also within this phenomenology a need to acknowledge the importance of both what is intentional and what is unintentional in enacting pedagogies of listening. As I engaged more deeply with the data, aspects of the concert hall listening experience presented as potential pedagogical catalysts. These realisations were something which continually surprised me throughout the analysis. Furthermore, when examined closely it was also evident how interrelated and dynamically they were experienced as I re-examined the participants’ and my own lifeworlds and shifted between various positions as a researcher, musician and educator.

In the case of the MCO, the concluding part of the analysis titled ‘doing more than they think’ highlighted how the physical set up of the concert hall contributed to creating learning experiences, which was also a point I addressed within the analysis of the RCO and PSO data. However, the arts organisers’ perception that using tiered staging for the orchestra was purely for the benefit of the musicians was not recognised as an aspect of their performance practice which the audience valued and saw as an important facilitator of their listening and learning.
experience. In contrast, the RCO arts organisers were keenly aware of the impact the spatial arrangements and how to best use the space to produce a balanced orchestral sound which would allow audience members to hear each instrument. Such is the case that the RCO frequently performs with the orchestra enhanced with microphones to ensure that the smaller string section can be balanced with the larger brass and woodwind sections.

The implication of acknowledging the various infinite tensions in pedagogy that can manifest within the concert hall does not mean that every characteristic, pedagogy or experience will be necessarily educative, as Dewey would presumably applaud. As demonstrated in the analysis in the previous three chapters, continuity and interaction in experience is present in balancing these tensions, and no matter the mechanism or pedagogy being described for it to be effective, continuity (each experience a person has will influence future experiences) and interaction (the continual readaptation and situational influence the environment has on a present experience) must play a part (Dewey, 2014, p. 346). Continuity and interaction thus form important theoretical cornerstones and yardsticks in conceptualising the ongoing practice of pedagogies of listening.

For audience developers and educators wanting to explicitly design pedagogies of listening or experiences for learning, while the options may be endless as to what can be considered a mechanism within a pedagogy of listening, it is the whole experience and still more, the experience of the individual person that must be kept in mind. To frame this problem differently, it is useful to return to the work of van Manen (2015) and his writing on pedagogical tact. Or as he explains, “knowing what to do when you don’t know what to do” (p. 41). In the case of the community orchestra arts organisers, their work as pedagogues stemmed from their experiences as an audience in a similar position to their listeners. In a regional context, pedagogical tact reflected emic and etic experiences as regional citizens and listeners. In general terms, the arts organiser’s pedagogical practice grew out of them looking to practices of other like organisations, their own experiences of what was needed by the audience, and bridging gaps in knowledge by listening to “the teacher within”.

Empathising and embodied experience is where pedagogical tact comes from and is therefore where audience developers can look to in creating an effective practice. Recognising the importance of pedagogical tact is immensely important to not only affirm the good work being done in concert halls already, but where audience developers may also draw on their own lifeworld, the experiences of their listeners and what they observe audiences doing in concert halls. Through empathy and embodied experience, ideas and innovations for new pedagogies of listening practice have space to grow and work through logistical, artistic and educative
challenges. The interviews with the arts organisers and their experiences of working with audiences attest to the importance of trial and error, looking to examples of practice, finding the gaps and continually seeking to understand what in a musicking experience would help the listener make meaning in the moment. These are the experiences where pedagogical tact shift pedagogic practice.

A distinct tension present in this phenomenology is between the various components of the aesthetic experience. The participants identified that there were certain elements of experience which appealed to their intellect, for example learning about the composers, gaining some insight into the music by reading the program or listening to a commentary. Other aspects of listening experiences were described as being sensory, such as the various parasympathetic and frission responses that spontaneously happen and contribute to the listener’s meaning-making through musicking. In the analysis, I also identified many and varied emotive experiences which in turn helped listeners to make sense of the music. However, what is important amongst these intellectual, embodied and emotive components of aesthetic learning experiences is that by themselves they do not constitute ‘having an experience’ that is educative.

Dewey likewise theorised the interconnections between the components of the aesthetic experience in relation to education as what he called inquiry. Following the idea of a tension, Dewey explained that the fulfilment of inquiry (experience as education) as being “more massive and more subtly shaded” (2005, p. 23) and being a process rather than an endpoint. As he explains “experience is the result, the sign, and the reward of that interaction of organism and environment which, when it is carried to the full, is a transformation of interaction into participation and communication” (2005, p. 22). These are notions which I have already explained fit neatly with the work on musicking and music education by Small (1998), and the explication of the nature and components of knowing and knowledge has been well traversed already (see W. D. Bowman & Frega, 2012; Volbers, 2012; Westerlund, 2003).

Contrary to compartmentalised segregated theories of knowledge or those which assert a Cartesian split between emotion and intellect (Bruce & Barbone, 2011; Žižek, 1999), the continuum of experiences which constitutes educative listening experience is not one which is in conflict with each other. My analysis and the lifeworlds of the audience members demonstrate that cognitive understanding, frission and emotive responses to music are not pitted at odds with one another so much they manifest in a balance the listener strikes according to the place, space, time and the skills and experience they themselves bring.
The arts organisation plays a part in helping listeners strike this balance through valuing different focusses within pedagogies of listening treating the components of experience and inquiry as part of a tension, rather than an either-or paradigm. I have collated the various pedagogies of listening observed at the three research sites and indicated which aspects of experience and inquiry they most target- ways of thinking, feeling and embodied knowing (see Appendix L – p. 314). Full elaborations on each individual pedagogy can be found in the appendixes relating to each orchestra (Appendix I, J and K – see p. 257 onward). I have defined thinking, feeling and embodied pedagogies of listening on the explanations given to me by the research participants. Thinking pedagogies are those teaching efforts that target developing knowledge and declarative understanding of music through listening experiences. Feeling or emotive pedagogies are those efforts which aim to make explicit an emotional response or relation to the music. And embodied pedagogies are those which the participants explained as times where the physical surroundings, participation and experience were significant to their understanding of the music.

For me, one of the most fascinating tensions I wrestled with in the analysis rests between the individual act of listening and the corporeal involvement in the concert hall as part of the collective audience and the interplay these two have in terms of thinking about pedagogies of listening. Regrettably, this tension is one which has not received much theoretical attention in the literature from the perspective of audience education, though there is research on audience experience given in a handful of works. Small (1998) explains in his chapters Sharing with Strangers and The Drama of Relationships that the experience of being both listener and part of the audience is reliant upon a complex series of relationships which, though commonly dismissed as a passive element of concerts, rightly deserves greater attention. Burland and Pitts (2014) build on Small’s work using the notion of embodiment, flow and moral questions of musical responsibilities and liveness to assert a case for the importance of audience members and their experience (L. Bennett, 2014; Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, 1996). Wagener (2012) approaches the tension from a question of audience and listener behaviour, etiquette and arts consumption.

What I understand is that there is a need to recognise the aliveness and active involvement listeners have as part of the audience, as well as a greater acknowledgement of the impact audiences have within the concert hall. There is a symbiotic relationship between performer and audience, however it is a relationship that is more than fiscal. Each has a part to play in the creation of the art form, the ongoing evolution of the concert hall, and the facilitation of the listener learning experience.
The essential quality of differentiation
In considering the data across the three orchestras and their eidetic structures, it is evident that the practice of designing and curating listening experiences for learning must be differentiated according to the context in which they are to be experienced. Pedagogies of listening as mechanisms for learning require a multifaceted approach that accounts for both the multiplicity of pedagogical possibilities and the multiplicity of ways that individual listeners might experience them. In the data analysis I found commonalities in practice across all three orchestras (for example the common assertion of the central importance of repertoire choice, physical environment and building relationships between the learner-listener and the artwork), however each time this same phenomenon becomes apparent, it does so in a way which follows the concepts of continuity and interaction.

As the community orchestra arts organisers stated in their interviews, their orchestras’ practices are distinct in quality from a professional orchestra though they share the same tradition and practice in many ways. What they offer their audiences, the close responsive relationships they are able to form with their community and the interpersonal connections they have with their audience is not only central to their artistic and pedagogical practice, it is what makes them distinct and of vital importance as artistic institutions. Therefore, in theorising pedagogies of listening for the contemporary concert hall, it is necessary to take this argument for differentiation seriously. Context matters and therefore simply trying to reproduce or transplant practices from one concert hall or orchestra to another will inevitably be ineffective. There is something inherently different about the learning experience one might have at a community orchestra concert from a professional orchestra concert, and vice versa. One is not better than the other, rather, each serves a unique purpose.

There is a second aspect of the phenomenon of pedagogies of listening that must also be considered in the light of differentiation, which has been echoed throughout my analysis of the participants’ lifeworlds: listening. Listening and making meaning of listening experiences is a differentiated phenomenon. This is evident throughout the literature (see Bigand & Poulin-Charronnat, 2006; Campbell, 2006; Lowe, 2007; Mansfield, 2002; Sigurjónsson, 2009), and cannot be emphasised enough when considering questions of learning and curating experiences for understanding.

During the focus groups, I was privileged to hear about the many and varied ways the audience members listen and then create understandings of their listening experiences. Similarly, it was very clear in the interviews with the arts organisers at all three orchestras that there can be no singular way of listening or framing the act of listening because of the wide
diversity of listeners and experiences present in audiences. This value of diversity is congruent with the literature by authors such as Bull (2014) and Pitts (2005a, 2005b). My contribution and extension to the literature here is that enacting or designing pedagogies of listening cannot simply seek to replicate or promote a single preferred frame of reference in order to be effective. I will elaborate further on this point of differentiation later in the chapter.

Pedagogues (animateurs, audience developers and educators) within the concert hall need to not only understand and recognise the many and varied ways that listeners listen, but also value and account for this diversity in their practice within the concert hall. Adopting such a differentiated view of listening, therefore, ensures that the ways audience members’ listening is developed and the ways that listening experiences are curated are inclusive and not replicating artistic, social or educational cultures for their own sake. Pedagogies of listening as mechanisms for learning thus requires a broad and multifaceted approach in practice, which is perhaps even more necessary for audience developers and pedagogues than in other forms of education.

The essential quality of technologies
In addition to the three qualities essential to pedagogies of listening in the concert hall presented so far (relationality, tensions, and differentiation), the analysis highlighted specific mechanisms through which they were enacted or realised. Across all three concert hall contexts, audience members explained that there were certain technologies (applied equipment and knowledge), which influenced their experience and learning. These include: program notes; having an animateur, pre or post-concert talk or master of ceremonies who explicitly guides the listeners; thoughtful design, including use of space, lighting, and seating; using projections, decorations and theming to communicate something of the musical meaning being portrayed; the repertoire itself and the repertoire choices made by the organisation; making information or recordings accessible via social media; accessing different types of concerts presented by flexible ensembles; and making purposeful time before or after the concert for learning conversations.

All of these mechanics and technologies contribute to the listening and learning experiences of audiences. However, more than being added bits to the music making, following the philosophy of Small (1998; 2011), these technologies are vital to the musicking going on because of their pedagogical effects. In and of themselves they are objects and artistic choices without significant pedagogical value. But when they are in relationship with the listening experience and utilised for an educative purpose as part of the holistic experience, they can
take on new meaning and significance for the individual listener. As Small (1998) would agree “the act of musicking establishes in the place where it is happening a set of relationships, and it is in those relationships that the meaning of the act lies” (p. 13).

Thus, two technologies both essential to the musicking and learning going on through listening evident in the orchestras in this study are the physical space of the concert hall and visual technologies within the concert hall. The first, the physical space of the concert hall, highlights the role that architectural features, the layout of the concert hall, lighting and the effects that proximity have on the experience of the listener. To a limited extent the space of the concert hall has been considered in relation to patrons’ access and enjoyment (see Beyer, 1967; Forsyth, 1985, 1988) and a wider discussion of the importance of the concert hall as a space for curating social and musical engagement has been taken up by Beranek (2015) Chanan (1994) and Kronenburg (2010).

However, theorising the pedagogical value and the pedagogical purposes the concert hall space itself can serve in the context of creating learning experiences through listening has not yet been explicitly addressed. In previous chapters, I took guidance from theatre semiotics theory (Carlson, 1989; McConachie, 2008; Shu, 2012; Strong & Longman, 2010) and discussion by Knutson (2002) and Leinhardt (2002; 2004) on learning conversations in museums to show that the physical performance space can be curated to enhance audience listening and learning experiences. At the community orchestras, the proximity of the orchestra to the listener afforded opportunities to connect hearing with visual cues from the musicians as they played. At PSO the formality of the concert hall was a valued part of the listening experience though there was a greater divide between musician and listener.

Similarly, the second technology that complements the qualities of pedagogies of listening are the visual practices audience developers implement to facilitate learning experiences through listening. Sloboda (1985) and others in the field of music psychology and perception attest to the significance of visual stimulus during listening and the impact this can have on meaning-making and understanding (see Deliège & Sloboda, 1997; Juslin & Sloboda, 2010; Lehmann et al., 2007). Across the three research sites, the research participants reported practices including special lighting, the visual impact of the concert hall itself, multimedia, decorations and gesture which all enhanced their listening experience and understanding of what was going on. I have included my analytical working which illustrates aspects of the physical space and visual technologies that the audience members identified as being vital to their understanding of listening and meaning making across the three research sites (see Appendix L – p. 314).
Agency and Access as the Result of Pedagogies of Listening

It is very clear across sites that agency and access were the results of thoughtful pedagogies of listening. In the explanations given by the audience members, I saw how pedagogies of listening promoted the empowerment of listeners in their own musical learning and acted as sparks that ignited curiosity into listening more closely. In the conversations with all the arts organisers, I heard about how their simple desire to share wonderful music, to bring about new experiences and understandings, and to share their passion for the art were the impetus for their practice.

Thus, to round out this discussion I suggest that when pedagogies of listening are enacted according to these essential qualities discussed, listener agency and audience access flourish. Pedagogies of listening and the curation of learning experiences through listening thus become a catalyst for the ongoing evolution of the concert hall and the art. Becker discusses this notion in his text *Art Worlds* (1984) where he describes the collective and collaborative activity that is creating art (musiciking). Furthermore, Becker explains that the cooperative web of activity created in creating and participating in the art world is the very thing that brings it into existence. The concert hall is part of “a bundle of systems” (p. 158) and it is participation within this art world – all the choices, activities and ongoing living out – that give meaning and ultimately educative experience. As Becker explains “art worlds, rather than artists, make works of art” (p. 198). Pedagogies of listening, therefore, contribute to this elongated and inclusive process, and the listener and audience are integral to it.

Summary

In this chapter, I synthesised my analyses of the MCO, PSO and RCO data to produce a framework for understanding four essential qualities of pedagogies of listening that can enhance the experience of learning through listening. I began by confronting the challenges posed by the underlying concepts behind the language used to talk about pedagogies of listening, learning, teaching and education in the concert hall. I then revisited the phenomenon through vignettes to provide an analytical rendering of the phenomenon. I employed this method so as to revisit the core themes present in each orchestra’s practice and context. Using the previous three chapters and the analysis undertaken so far, I then turned to formulate a framework which reflects the most important structures and essences of pedagogies of listening in the orchestral concert hall. The notions of relationality, balancing tensions, differentiation and technologies were outlined as four essential qualities present in pedagogies of listening. The chapter concluded with a short discussion on the result of pedagogies of listening and how
listener agency in learning and audience access indicate effective audience development and education.
CHAPTER 8
Conclusions

In this brief final chapter, I revisit the research questions and how I have addressed them in this project. I also summarise the key findings, contributions and recommendations which have come from the work and outline avenues for future research. At this point, it is worth revisiting the research questions set at the beginning of this study to guide the discussion to come. The central research question asked:

*How is learning experienced by listeners in the orchestral concert hall and what pedagogies of listening do orchestras employ to facilitate learning as a strategy for audience development?*

To support and further focus the research I also formulated the following auxiliary inquiry questions.

- How are listening pedagogies experienced by audiences within professional and community orchestra contexts?
- What understandings do professional and community orchestras have about audience development strategies and pedagogy that help audiences to listen to and understand music?
- How do pedagogies of listening improve audiences’ and individual listeners’ experiences of music?

**Addressing the Research Questions**

Drawing on data generated in three contrasting contexts, I constructed a phenomenology of listening as it was experienced in a metropolitan community orchestra concert hall, professional symphony orchestra concert and a regional community concert hall. Through thick description, I rendered the experience of listening and analysed the data to explain the essential qualities of the pedagogies employed by orchestras to facilitate listener learning and engagement. Drawing largely on theories of experiential education by Dewey (1963, 2005) and musicking insights from Small (1998), I generated a phenomenology and pragmatic philosophy of learning through listening which I hope will be useful to practitioners in the field of audience development.
I concluded that pedagogies of listening are experienced musically, socially, spatially and relationally. Through understanding the lifeworlds of the research participants, I affirmed Small’s (1998) formulation of music as a verb where listening is considered a vital part of musicking within the concert hall. I specifically demonstrated how these musical, social, spatial and relational experiences are differentiated across different contexts. Furthermore, I theorised the unique pedagogic practice of each orchestra in light of its particular emic and etic relationships with listeners.

With arts organisers I generated and examined data that documented their understandings and practices in relation to audience development. While the terminology and language of audience development was largely absent from the vocabulary of the arts organisers in the community orchestra context, their practice was alive and well. They spoke of how pedagogical tact and listening to ‘the teacher within’ help guide their practice and that their positioning as fellow community members provided insight into how best to design and curate concerts to support their audiences to listen to music. Interviews with the professional orchestra arts organisers and my observations of their concerts demonstrated a dynamic and multifaceted approach to audience development, which worked within tensions between artistic aspirations, audience expectations and concert hall rituals and tradition. It was evident from these interviews that education works within wider strategies for audience engagement; that engagement is vital to learning, and that engagement must value the individual listener and the skills and experience they each bring to the concert hall.

When arts organisations employed intentional pedagogies of listening, audience members reported that their experience of the music changed significantly. In brief, the musical experience became something that was no longer ‘other’ or abstract, transforming into something in which they could find resonance with their own lifeworlds. However, as highlighted at the end of chapter 7, there is a greater benefit to be appreciated when pedagogies of listening are employed. The individual listener is equipped with agency and access to the artwork, through the work of the orchestra as artists, and their work as an institution. When they are employed, pedagogies of listening thus empower listeners’ own musical learning, spark curiosity and interest in engaging again with the artwork, serve as positive experiences which encourage engagement with other artworks and become a catalyst for the ongoing evolution of the concert hall and the art form.

Following on from these effects and as evidenced in the lifeworlds of the participants, I concluded that pedagogies of listening as a strategy for audience development are vital for building and equipping confident and capable audiences for orchestral music. Particularly, my
analysis highlighted the unique role that community orchestras play as safe spaces for audiences to develop their skills and engagement. This was particularly true for listeners who had limited knowledge of orchestral music, for newcomers to the art form, and for audiences in regional contexts. I also demonstrated in my analysis the need to value and build the capabilities and capacities of community orchestras in both regional and metropolitan settings as a vital service in the broader scheme of building musical engagement, experiences and learning. Thus, my analysis contributes to a theoretical formulation of education initiatives within audience development and offers concrete examples of practice.

**Contributions to Scholarship**

The first contribution to scholarship was published as an article as part of the literature review in the peer-reviewed journal Paedagogica Historica (see chapter 2 part 1). The article dissected historical accounts to construct a brief history of the concert hall and the origins of audience development as a practice. While historical accounts of the concert hall are a well-established field of scholarship, to my knowledge, I am the first to examine these historical accounts in an effort to understand audiences, their behaviour, listening and efforts to educate through classical music performance. This work contributes a historical context for understanding the origins of audience development and engagement practices as well as a reference for understanding and empathising with current audience listening etiquettes. Particularly this can assist audience developers in recognising the impact traditions associated with the concert hall can have for audience attendance and engagement, and the directions the evolution of the concert hall may take in the future.

The second contribution to scholarship is demonstrated in the methodological innovation I designed and implemented using mindfulness in phenomenological research. I published the theoretical part of this paper in the peer-reviewed journal Methodological Innovations (see chapter 3 – methods for data generation) and have demonstrated the final working out of this practical application in the discussion chapters and methodological coda included as a commentary article in chapter 3. I argued that mindfulness is a highly useful and effective tool in addressing the issue of bracketing and provides some theoretical and practical traction when grappling with the complex practice of phenomenological research. In this innovation I offer a tool and a means for producing meaningful research, integrating the lifeworld of the researcher that also brings focus and rigour to the data generation, analysis and writing of phenomenological research. Furthermore, I have contributed an innovative solution to one of the core philosophical challenges faced in the practice of phenomenological
methodology and methods for research namely addressing the issue of bracketing and the eidetic reduction. For researchers in the fields of music, education and audience development I have modelled a fresh expression of hermeneutic phenomenology which is relevant to the wider practice of bracketing in qualitative research.

The third contribution was demonstrated as part of a reflexive turn early in chapter 7 where I discussed a shift in language, which had come about as a result of my analysis of the data. I discussed how traditional descriptors such as ‘teachers’ and ‘learners’ and their associated baggage were too reductive to explain fully the type of learning that goes on through experiences in concert halls. I theorised how the changing and transitional nature of transformative educational experiences differ from those within a traditional educational context and the ways in which learning and making meaning happen through the act of listening and being part of the audience. I also highlighted the need to see the listener as a catalyst to their own learning as much as the organisation is a designer and curator of experiences. Thus, redefining the importance of the various types of relationships that play a part in learning experiences that are present between listener and orchestra, orchestra and audience, listener and arts institution, orchestra and artform, and audience and artform.

A fourth contribution is the way I have documented the practices of orchestras and their pedagogical activities. As an empirical study, this is a significant contribution to the scholarship on audience development and education. These fields contain a wealth of practice, yet a paucity of empirical research and theorisation. Particularly, in chapters 4 and 6 I have captured the pedagogical work of two community orchestras from contrasting contexts. A contribution which speaks of the importance of relational practices and the unique position community orchestras hold in the ongoing evolution of the concert hall. These are significant contributions to the understanding and value of community orchestras in society for the lifelong engagement of people with music and how educative experiences can be cultivated with intention. Furthermore, these two chapters attest to the unique role community orchestras play in developing audiences for classical music, the ways they encourage and support listeners in their engagement with the art form and provide a safe space for newcomers to the concert hall.

The fifth contribution to note was captured in chapter 7 where I distilled the data into four themes (relationality, differentiation, tensions and technologies) which I used to present a fresh understanding of education and engagement in the field of audience development. Through these themes I was able to illustrate how pedagogies of listening function within the context of a metropolitan community orchestra, professional symphony orchestra and regional community orchestra. A contribution given the under-researched and theorised nature of the
field. In theorising learning through listening experiences, I challenged conventional understandings of how education and experiential learning works in settings such as concert halls which is an important contribution to practitioners working in the field of informal learning and lifelong education. To further support this contribution and the field of scholarship in community engagement, education and outreach I also presented practical demonstrations of how educative experiences were formulated and facilitated by arts organisers. This contribution is particularly valuable to educators and pedagogues working outside the constraints of traditional formal education including arts organisations, community organisations, museums, galleries, religious and social organiser groups to name but a few.

The sixth contribution relates to the nature of pedagogies of listening which I theorised and illustrated throughout chapters 4-7. Through the analysis of the data generated at three contrasting research sites, I concluded that pedagogies of listening are not only musical concerns, but also enacted and realised in the social, spatial and relational aspects of the concert hall. The theory worked out in these chapters contributes both practical and philosophical grounding for pedagogues and leads to the recommendations I have detailed below. Furthermore, I have also indicated where like practice is indicated between contexts and brought a theoretical perspective to the practice of education in the concert hall.

Limitations
As with any empirical research, there are limitations to study and its findings which impact the recommendations and potential application of any conclusions. Largely, the limitations of the current study are imposed by the scope and scale of a doctoral research project, including time limitations and the number of research contexts and orchestras able to be considered. I acknowledge that while the three orchestras selected for this study demonstrate a breadth of practice, data generated through 18 concert observations, 10 interviews and 4 focus groups do not capture the diversity of pedagogic and artistic practices in contemporary Australian concert halls. Likewise, I acknowledge the limitations of data generated by participants of similar ethnicities, socio-cultural backgrounds, life stages and formal educational qualification. Certainly, there is a greater diversity of opinion and experience to appreciate and understand.

I also assert that there may be some limitation imposed by the methodological choices made. Though I do believe that the choices I made were the most appropriate for the study, its aims and the focus on understanding lived experience, a different methodological approach would certainly bring out different nuances and focus. For example, it would be interesting to
consider what a sociological approach, mixed methods or broader data generation methods might have yielded. Similarly, despite my best efforts to bracket my own worldview and biases, and the innovation to phenomenological research that I engineered; it is certainly possible that my own experiences as a teacher, animateur, musician and listener may have limited my analysis. I am conscious of the fact that perhaps because of this bias I saw pedagogy in places other researchers may not, and that I theorised aspects of pedagogy which potentially may be differently theorised through another lenses.

**Recommendations**

As a result of this study and its findings, I suggest a number of recommendations in addition to a call for further investigation into education and learning in settings such as the concert hall. First, I invite other researchers take up and trial the methodology and methods developed here, not only to verify their usability and applicability to researching learning in contexts such as the concert hall, but also to verify the rigour I have found in pairing phenomenology with mindfulness.

Secondly, I recommend further qualitative studies to be conducted in the field of audience development so that more dynamic understanding and effective practice in this area might be developed. There is a wealth of practice and good educational work going on which should be documented and warrants much more empirical research. Based on my own experience in this study, I note the value of grounding research into practice and pedagogy in sound philosophy. Having a pragmatic philosophy which underpins pedagogies of listening helps navigate some of the tricky aspects of practice as well as solving bigger questions relating to purpose, meaning and direction. Having a philosophy of experience likewise provides answers to questions about the nature of meaningful experience, why and how education matters to arts experiences. These observations are made in the work of Dewey (2011b), Small and Walser (2011) and other pragmatists who recognised the importance of philosophy within effective practice (Peirce, 2011; Putnam, 2011; Talisse & Aikin, 2011).

Thirdly, there is an ongoing need for further research into community orchestras and informal education settings. The need is twofold, first to further understand their practices and the impact they have on the engagement and development of the communities around them; and second to understand aspects of their impact which could not be investigated within the scope of this thesis. It would be interesting to investigate also the impact community orchestras have on health and wellbeing, lifelong learning, intergenerational engagement,
cultural transmission and the evolution of the artform. Certainly, in Australia there is some good work and research already happening in this space (see for example Australia Council for the Arts, 2017a; Hardcastle, 2015; Mitchell, 2016, 2018). Further qualitative investigation into the audience development practices of orchestras would serve to benefit practice and capture the good work going on. Similarly, comparisons across other art forms (for example jazz bands, concert bands, string quartets etc.) and informal contexts for learning (for example museums, art galleries) would be useful to both empirical research and the ongoing development of practices in community engagement and education.

Fourthly, for professional orchestras there are unresolved questions around the democratisation of audiences. As I wrestled with in chapter 5, there is a need to understand how orchestras as public arts institutions come to understand the needs and wants of their audiences. Beyond audience segmentation studies, quantitative demographic research and understanding ticket buying behaviours, there is a need to understand how audience developers come to ‘know’ the diversity of their audiences. There is an imperative to understand what these ways of knowing mean for how concert seasons, outreach and projects are designed, whose understandings and educational goals are being privileged, and what a musicking and experiential education philosophy could contribute to bring about changes in practice.

Finally, having observed current good practice in both professional and community orchestra settings, there is a definite need for a platform to share these practices and ideas. Be it a publication or a forum for sharing, there are invaluable lessons to be learnt from sharing practice across both professional and community contexts.
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APPENDIX B- Interview Protocol Developed for the Research Study

PRIOR TO INTERVIEW
☐ Participant has received explanatory statement
☐ Returned completed consent form
☐ Date and time for interview organised
  o Date: ______ Time: ______ Place: ______
    (ensure place is going to be mutually beneficial)
  o Mode
    ▪ in person OR phone
    ▪ Contact details: phone ________________________
      Email ________________________
☐ Friendly reminder sent via phone or email

BEFORE THE INTERVIEW
☐ To bring list
  o Paper copy of interview questions; notepad and pencil case; audio
    recorder and backup (including batteries); bottled water x2 (one for
    interviewer, one for interviewee)
  o Make sure interviewer is ‘set up for success’ and ready to interview
    (lunch, good sleep, mindfully focussed)
    ▪ Also remind self of main research questions and relevant points
      to the overarching methodology (phenomenology)
☐ Check interview space/location is…
  ▪ Quiet for recording; comfortable temperature and seating; tidy
    and gives good impression

AFTER THE INTERVIEW
☐ Note time interview finished: _________ total interview time ______
☐ Post interview notes and reflections complete
  o Do this as soon after the interview as possible
☐ Copy audio recorded files onto computer and backup, label
☐ Is a follow-up interview necessary?
  Yes  No
  o Contact participant to plan a follow up interview
  o Date: _________ Time: _________ Location: _________
THE INTERVIEW

- **Introduction** explain who I am as interviewer; thank participant for being part of the study; remind that they will be anonymous
- **Check** “Is it still ok for this interview to be recorded?”
- **Turn on recording devices**

QUESTIONS

1. Tell me about your role/work with the ____________ orchestra?

2. Tell me about the audiences who attend your orchestra’s concerts. What makes playing for these audiences unique? OR What do you think is special about attending a concert by an orchestra for your audiences?

3. What sort of things do you think help an audience to listen to orchestral music?
   PROBE:
   - What has helped you to listen to music in the concert hall?
   - Can you tell me about an experience you had when learning in the concert hall changed how you listened?

4. Are you aware of any tools that your orchestra uses to help audiences develop listening or audience membership skills?
   OR
4b. What does the term ‘audience development’ mean to you as an arts organiser/(title of their role)?
   PROBES:
   - Can you tell me about some of the audience development activities that your organisation does to teach listening in the concert hall?
   - Has your orchestra worked with any consultants/outside groups to help teach listening?

5. What do you think the future of the concert hall might look like, from an audience development or education perspective?

6. Do you have an experience about interacting as a pedagogue with audience members that you could share with me?

7. What inspires or motivates you to continue working on audience development projects?

END

*Thank the participant, let them know when they can expect to hear back about the research and please to contact me if there are any questions*
APPENDIX C - Focus Group Protocol Developed for the Research Study

PRIOR TO FOCUS GROUP

☐ Participants have received explanatory statement
☐ Returned completed consent form
  o Total participants for this focus group <___>
  o Records of participants contact details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone and email</th>
<th>Consent form</th>
<th>Yes to online activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

☐ Date and time for focus group organised
  o Date:  Time:
  o Place:
☐ Food and beverage service booked-
☐ Organise someone to help with the focus group as an observer

BEFORE THE FOCUS GROUP

☐ To bring list
  o Paper copy of interview questions for researcher; notepad and pencil case; enough participant profile sheets for each participant; audio recorder and backup (including batteries); signs for room; name tags for participants (printed sticky labels- first name only)
☐ Make sure interviewer is ‘set up for success’ and ready to interview (lunch, good sleep, mindfully focussed)
  o Also remind self of main research questions and relevant points to the overarching methodology (phenomenology)
☐ Set up:
  o Signs to focus group room; water for participants; food and beverages set up well before event; name tags for participants; participant profile sheets and pencils on table; watch/clock to keep time
☐ Check interview space/location is…
  ▪ Quiet for recording; comfortable temperature and seating; tidy and gives good impression; chairs set up to promote conversation amongst participant (not one way talk with researcher)
AFTER THE FOCUS GROUP

☐ Note total focus group time ____
☐ Collect participant notes on tables and profiles
☐ Post interview notes and reflections complete
  o Do this as soon after the interview as possible
  o Listen to tapes, make sure nothing important has been missed
☐ Copy audio recorded files onto computer and backup, label
☐ Plan post focus group online forum activities/ follow up contact if necessary
☐ Facilitate post focus group online forum activities
  o Activity #
    ▪ Date:
    ▪ Follow up question:
  o Activity #
    ▪ Date:
    ▪ Follow up question:
THE FOCUS GROUP

- **Introduction** explain who I am as interviewer and my stake in the research being carried out; thank participants for being part of the study; remind that they will be anonymous
- **Check** “Is it still ok for this interview to be recorded?”
- **Turn on recording devices**

QUESTIONS

1. Tell me about your patronage of the _________ Orchestra? (may include concert types, regularity of attendance)

2. What concerts by the _______ orchestra do you tend to choose to come to?

3. How do you listen at these events/ What makes listening special for you?

4. Have you noticed anything that occurs in the concert hall or anything done by the ________ orchestra which helps you to listen?
   - **PROBES:** Does anyone…
     - Read the program notes given at the concert? Do you attend concerts with a friend or gather before/after the concert to talk about the concert?; Read the notes about the concert or any materials sent out by the orchestra?
   - **How do you experience the music as a result of engaging with these resources?**

5. Do you do anything before or after the concert which helps you to listen or understand the music/performance?

6. Can you share a story about a time where something you learnt has changed the way that you listen in the concert hall?
   - **PROBES:**
     - Was this a thing you learnt something formal or informally acquired?
     - Why did this make such an impact for you?

7. What do you think makes an effective listener? Is this something learned?

8. Do the ways that you’ve learnt to listen to orchestral music in the concert hall enhance or add anything to your listening of other music genres/contexts?
   - **PROBES:** Does learning to listen matter?

9. What audience behaviours help/encourage attentive listening? What is done by other audience members that doesn’t help your attentive listening?

10. **SUMMARY QUESTION:** What do you think was the most important things said during our discussion? Is there anything we missed?

END

Thank the participants; remind them of the online forum activities; let them know when they can expect to hear back about the research and please to contact me if there are any questions

Is there anything more anyone would like to add before the recorder is turned off?
Welcome! Thank you so much for your time and input into this research project. As we get set up or as the focus group progresses please take some time to tell us about yourself by answering the questions below.

First Name: ___________________  D.O.B: ___________________

Please, tell us about yourself
You may like to include occupation, where you grew up/live, what concerts do you attend? What type of music you enjoy

How often do you come to concerts by SBCO or other orchestras?
☐ Never, this was my first time  ☐ Rarely, 1-2 per year
☐ Sometimes, 4+ per year  ☐ Very regularly

Have you learnt music formally before?
☐ Yes  ☐ No
Please, briefly outline

________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________

Do you have a favourite piece of orchestra music? What makes listening to this music special?

________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX D- Concert Observation Protocol Developed for the Research Study

PRIOR TO OBSERVATION
☐ Collect and save any documents or artefacts on orchestras or venue’s webpage/social media including publicity
☐ Is there a pre-concert talk
☐ Review phenomenological research process and mindset

READY FOR THE OBSERVATION
☐ To bring: pencil/s, observation sheet, spare note paper, something to lean on
☐ Make sure observer is ‘set up for success’ and ready to interview (lunch, good sleep, mindfully focussed)
  ☐ Also remind self of main research questions and relevant points to the overarching methodology (phenomenology)
☐ Collect any artefacts on the way into the venue

AFTER THE OBSERVATION
☐ Post observation notes and reflections complete
  ☐ Do this as soon after the observation as possible
☐ Scan PDF copies of any documents, photos, artefacts
☐ Transcribe written notes into Word and scan copy of original notes
☐ Collate all data and save into a folder (including backup)
OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

ABOUT THE EVENT
Orchestra: Time & Date:

Concert Title: Venue:

Additional Background Information
• Number of musicians; orchestra type (e.g. chamber, symphony, alternate) and details

Ticket Information
Cost $ Point of purchase Seat /non allocated

Venue Description

Why has this event been chosen for this study?

The Concert Program (including particulars about soloists if any; presence of interval; also note any variations to the program here) and rough timing if important: ★ any that are familiar

Remember to take photos, if possible of…
• The venue inside/outside/lobby; any noticeable architectural feature which may be pedagogical
THE CONCERT

Observations about the Setting:
- Were there any ushers or other people conducting the event? What appeared to be their role? What was this interaction like?
- Use of lighting – was the audience in light or darkness? What effect did this have?
- Were there any announcements before the performance? Was the sound amplified or acoustic? Was the concert audible?
- What was the mood/affect of the audience before the performance? What about after?
- Does anyone address the audience verbally during the concert? What were the nature of these interactions for the audience?
- Did anything special, interesting or unusual happen during the concert?
- Was there an intermission? What occurred?

Observations about the Audience:
- Are there any children? Generalising, what percentage of the audience has grey hair? How is the audience dressed? How are they behaving? What are people doing on the outside as they listen? How large is the audience? How are the audience responding to the performers?
Observations about the Orchestra:
  • What are the performers wearing? How are they arranged? Is there anything in the way that the stage is set?

Observations about Listening:
  • Including, familiar am I with the program? Does this make a difference?

After the Concert:
  • What were the most memorable parts of the concert? Having finished the concert experience, what do you want to do most now?
  • Attempt a thick description at explaining what the experience of the concert was like (choose a focus e.g. a single piece of music; emotion/affect response; any memories triggered; understanding which came together)
Discussion with Audience Members
APPENDIX E - Example of completed concert observation protocol

CONCERT OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

Date: ____________________________

CONCERT ATTENDED: ____________________________

PRIOR TO OBSERVATION

☐ Collect and save any documents or artefacts on orchestra's webpage/social media including publicity

☒ Is there a pre-concert talk

☐ Review phenomenological research process and mindset

READY FOR THE OBSERVATION

☐ To bring: pencil(s), observation sheet, spare note paper, something to lean on

☐ Make sure observer is 'set up for success' and ready to interview (lunch, good sleep, mindfully focussed)

  ☐ Also remind self of main research questions and relevant points to the overarching methodology (phenomenology)

☐ Collect any artefacts on the way into the venue

AFTER THE OBSERVATION

☐ Post observation notes and reflections complete

  ☐ Do this as soon after the observation as possible

☐ Scan PDF copies of any documents, photos, artefacts

☐ Transmit written notes into Word and scan copy of original notes

☐ Collate all data and save into a folder (including backup)

1st movement for winds and brass
CONCERT OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

Date:  
Concert Attended:  

OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

ABOUT THE EVENT
Orchestra:  
Concert Title:  
Time & Date:  
Venue:  
Additional Background information:  
- Number of musicians; orchestra type (e.g. chamber, symphony, alternate) and details

Ticket Information
Cost: $25  
Point of purchase:  
Seat:  
Allocated:  

Venue Description
-

Why has this event been chosen for this study?
-

The Concert Program (including particulars about soloists if any; presence of interval; also note any variations to the program here) and rough timing if important:

Program - see attached

- Music played over PA.
- Musicians helped pack up and have a chat with friends in the audience.

The reaction was almost universally the same, hugs, applause, 'well done', that was great.
CONCERT OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

Date: ____________________
Concert Attended: ____________________

Remember to take photos, if possible of...
- The venue inside/outside/lobby; any noticeable architectural feature which may be pedagogical

THE CONCERT

Observations about the Setting:
1. Were there any ushers or other people conducting the event? What appeared to be their role? What was this interaction like?
2. Use of lighting - was the audience in light or darkness? What effect did this have?
3. Were there any announcements before the performance? Was the sound amplified or acoustic? Was the concert audible?
4. What was the mood/affect of the audience before the performance? What about after?
5. Did anyone address the audience verbally during the concert? What were the nature of these interactions for the audience?
6. Was there an Intermission? What occurred?

Discussion:
There is a strong sense of community and familiarity. Welcomes at the door/ask where the the concert which are focused on the community. The audience numbers are quite large.

None

See program annotation

No interruption - but there was switching between ensembles -

Observations about the Audience:

- Are there any children? Generalising, what percentage of the audience has grey hair? How is the audience dressed? How are they behaving? What are people doing on the outside as they listen? How large is the audience? How are the audience responding to the performers?

1. Audience is generally still and entirely silent
   - music includes songs!
   - on leashes by owners.

2. Lively - people tap feet in time

3. People smiling as they recede the tune.

4. Lively - people nodding tapping (2 items)

5. Lively - people tapping feet

10. Overall: I like this one - it's "Ice Castle", I play this on piano.

11. "How the wind"

12. Lively - people tapping feet

Very clean. There are groups of people here to support individual musicians. Greg is working who is on placement had a group of young "stylish" types come to see him play.
CONCERT OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

Date: ____________________________  Concert Attended: ____________

Observations about the Orchestra:
- What are the performers wearing? How are they arranged? Is there anything in the way that the stage is set?
- Performers wear black.
- Strings arr. extended quartet style - use both standing conductor front & centre, baton in hand.
- Lead: go to drum kit and piano (placed behind ensemble)

Observations about Listening:
- Including, familiar am I with the program? Does this make a difference?
- Listening and observing (unjudgmentally quite naturally) that the PA is making a significant impact - as does the outdoor setting bit's just
- Contrasts by the winds who seem more natural
- Familiarity of pieces
  - Excitement when recognise pieces not noticed on program e.g. #12 - the song from Charlie the Unicorn
- Very relaxed atmosphere, - people closer to the ensemble are very quiet, still people further away talk freely 'soaking up the vibe'

After the Concert:
- What were the most memorable parts of the concert? Having finished the concert experience, what do you want to do most now?
- Attempt a thick description at explaining what the experience of the concert was like (choose a focus e.g. a single piece of music; emotion/affect response; any memories triggered; understanding which came together)
Discussion with Audience Members

- Community orchestra - transient, belonging
  - a place for adults to play for self

A few people asking about what I am doing

Great concert, wish there was more, more music.
- What did you like most? - the jazz, hearing something new different
  - but was really nice - sitting on the lawn with a drink, it was ok for the kids to play
  - like music - something unique - getting to see the mechanism of

How does listening/choreograph make it special?

Really love the cello, wish I could have learnt, like the sound, feel of it

Love listening to 2 cellos and stuff
Three Outdoor Sketches
By Brendan O’Brien

Zoosters Breakout
By Hans Zimmer, Arr. Paul Lavender

Let it Go
By Kristen Anderson-Lopez & Robert Lopez, Arr. Larry Moore

The Godfather
By Nino Rota, Arr. Robert Longfield

Waltz (La Plus Que Lente)
By Claude Debussy, Arr. Matthew Moreno

Adagio from Symphony no. 3 (“Organ”)
By Camille Saint-Saëns

Jesu, Joy of Man’s Desiring
By J.S. Bach, Arr. Elliot Del Borgo

First Light at Coopers Creek
Arr. Mark Walton

African Marching Song
Arr. John O’Reilly

Theme from “Ice Castles”/a
By Marvin Hamlisch, Arr. Michael Story

Rondeau
By Jean-Joseph Mouret, Arr. David Marlett

The Woodwind Polka
Arr. Andy Clark

Take the “A” Train
By Billy Strayhorn, Arr. Victor Lopez

I Got Rhythm
By George & Ira Gershwin, Arr. Calvin Carter

J.D. Meets the Rhythm Section
By Randy Sabien

We have no money, please do you want to hear it?
Take of thanks
MC sees you later!
CELEBRATES 2016

End of Year Concert
5.30pm
Saturday 26th November

Tickets
Family $30
Adult $15
Concession $10

Optional BBQ dinner at interval
Meal vouchers must be pre-booked by 21/11
Includes steak or sausage burger, salads, dessert, punch, tea & coffee
Adult meal $12.50
Child meal $7.50 (12 & under)
Beer & wine available to purchase

Tickets and Meal Vouchers available from:

For more information see:
www.facebook.com
APPENDIX F- Summary of Metropolitan Community Orchestra (MCO) Concerts Attended and Observed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Additional Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Showcase</strong></td>
<td>A showcase of the musicians who formed small ensembles, performed trios, solos and arrangements of music they had chosen themselves. Also an opportunity for year 12 music extension students and AMEB students to perform their exam work. This concert is an annual tradition of MCO</td>
<td>Approx. 230 people- mostly friends and family of the performers (the president said this was typical for this particular concert)</td>
<td>No interval, lengthy concert MC introduced acts in brackets. Merchandise for sale and fundraising raffle towards the end. Lots of movement and distraction from ensembles getting ready and people using the toilets and bar during the performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local services club with a supper and access to bar and drinks. Audience is sat around large tables where supper is served during the performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large chapel assembly area at a local school. Lights on and doors open to let air circulate. Orchestra performed on tiered staging and guest community choir arranged to the side with microphones</td>
<td>Approx. 270 people- including adults, children, family and friends of the musicians. Large contingent of senior citizens, some of which is involved with the social day trip organised by the local Probus club.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>including afternoon tea during the interval. Musicians joined the audience for afternoon tea and had an opportunity to meet. Each piece was introduced at length by the MC with composer information, historical context and at times instructions to sing along or listen for certain parts of the work. Each piece also had a slide shown on the projectors which included pictures relating to the work, the composer and the title of the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christmas Cheer Concert</strong></td>
<td>An annual afternoon concert including performances by MCO’s three ensembles in collaboration with a local community choir. A range of music including arrangements of Western art music which had a Christmas theme, film music, popular Christmas carols which the audience was encouraged to sing along with by following lyrics which were projected onto two screens above the orchestra. Orchestra is informally dressed in black with the MCO polo shirt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large chapel assembly area at a local school. Lights on and doors open to let air circulate. Orchestra performed on tiered staging and guest community choir arranged to the side with microphones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Masters</td>
<td>A themed ‘classical music’ concert</td>
<td>Performance of arrangements of music by Romantic composers- mostly excerpts or individual movements from larger works.</td>
<td>Performances by Junior strings, Youth Symphony and MCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school assembly and sports hall</td>
<td>Full lighting</td>
<td>Orchestra arranged on tiered staging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Included afternoon tea at interval with the musicians,</td>
<td>MC introduced the works as before</td>
<td>Data projector used to display the title of each work with descriptive pictures during the concert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fundraising raffle and merchandise on sale at the door</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX G - Summary of Professional Symphony Orchestra (PSO) Concerts Attended and Observed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Additional Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ‘mainstage’ concert part of MSO’s core series. Performance included works by well-known romantic composers and a world premiere of a concerto by a living Australian composer. The performance was given by the orchestra’s chamber orchestra lead by the concert master. Afternoon concert.</td>
<td>A main concert hall in one of the city’s major performance venues for classical music.</td>
<td>While the concert hall was not full, the audience were very still and silent during the performance. There are a few children in the audience with a mix of younger adults and older audience members. Audience is seated in tiered permanent seating across a stalls area and two balconies. Audience is very quiet during interval, seemingly insular.</td>
<td>Preconcert talk was given in the concert hall which included a short analysis of works included in the program with CD excerpts, followed by a conversation with the composer whose work was being premiered. The concert master also introduced and gave some insight into the final concerto for the evening giving points of interest to listen out for. Focus group 1 held after this concert and participants were recruited using an announcement after the preconcert talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A repeat of the concert described above. Evening concert.</td>
<td>A concert hall at one of the universities located in a neighbouring city.</td>
<td>No children or youth from what I can see, lots of older audience members. This audience follows the common rituals of the concert hall observed so far, except for applauding after the third movement of the concerto. The audience is very talkative and interactive with each other. They wave to friends across the concert hall and talk to each other across the rows during interval about the concert, where each other is from and other concerts they have attended.</td>
<td>Preconcert talk was given as above by the same presenter. After the interval, an additional work not noted in the program was performed. The concert master explained beforehand that it was in memory of a local patron of the arts who had recently died. The concert master introduced the concerto as in previous concert, though a little more informally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four sessions repeated across a morning. Each session is 30 minutes long and designed for children 0-5 years of age and their families. The session is highly interactive, focuses on one piece of the popular classical repertoire and is part of a series which takes place eight times a year. This concert is performed by six musicians of the MSO and is facilitated by a presenter.

Saturday morning sessions.

A space in the city’s town hall. Participants have their ticket checked, can park their pram and are then welcomed by an usher who helps them find a cushion on the floor and a hand-held percussion instrument. Chairs are also available. The musicians are on a raised dais with the audience only 2 metres away.

The city’s premier concert hall within an opulent and impressive building dedicated to the performing arts.

The audience size ranged from 50 to 150 participants including children, babies, parents and grandparents. Each participant has an instrument and direction is given to the parents/carers as to how to engage the children with the instrument. While the audience is never silent, there is no expectation set that they should be. Rather, the concert is about participating and getting to know the music.

Participation included making loud and soft sounds, differentiating between metal and wood instruments, using language to learn rhythm, identifying number of beats and sounds, listening to and for particular instruments. Facilitator incorporated AUSLAN.

The pace of the session was intentionally quite fast, short focussed segments combined with a variety of participation and movement to keep the attention of the young audience. After the concert, the audience were invited to come and meet the musicians and have a closer look at the instruments.

No verbal communication is made between the audience and musicians during the concert, except for a loudspeaker announcement about turning off mobile phones at the beginning.

After the concert a post concert conversation is held in one of the foyers with MSO’s musical director, the conductor and the soloist of the concerto. This is a very informal panel style chat about the concert, the musicians connection to the music and thanking the audience for coming.

Large audience filling most of the concert hall of 2500 seats. Diverse age range. It is very clear that this is an educated audience who know the rituals and cultural practice of this concert hall setting- no applause between movements, still and silent listening, silence during tuning etc.

International Guests: Cello concerto

A ‘traditional’ and very formal symphony orchestra concert of an overture, concerto and symphony from the classical canon which forms part of MSO’s mainstage concert series.

Weekend evening concert.
This concert is part of a three concert series focusing explicitly on exploring one piece of the classical repertoire with a well-known educator and conductor. The concert is advertised as part concert, part interactive lecture, and links with a full formal concert of the selected work later in the MSO’s concert season.

Monday night concert.

A concert hall in one of the city’s major performance venues. Tiered seating across stalls and two balconies.

A mix of audience members from grey hair to children fill the concert hall. There are also distinct groups within the audience including school groups and a group of people with visual impairment.

The audience is mostly still and silent though interacts with the jokes told by the presenter.

The concert analyses and explains the inner workings of a concerto—the music made pedagogical, its secrets laid bare that all the audience can enjoy the inside knowledge. The approach is short explanation then performance of an excerpt or singling out melodies/chords.

There is also a mix of anecdotes about the composer, explanations of why the composer is significant still today, historical context and technical music analysis (discussion about keys, motifs, structure).

The concert concludes with a performance of the work without interruption.

The concert hall of 2500 is sold out. Wide range of ages and stages who engage with the concert by clapping with the music when directed, cheering and singing along.

The audience is told at the beginning there are no rules here, join in and enjoy.

A truly spectacular night! From the real canons whose pyrotechnics accompanied the 1812 overture, the Can-Can girls who danced in the aisles, the impressive light show which was choreographed to the music, hearing ‘all the best bits’ of the classical repertoire, and of course the banter and comradery between the orchestra, conductor and the audience. This concert really did make classical music fun and accessible.

Focus group 2 was held after this concert.
### APPENDIX H- Summary of Regional Community Orchestra (RCO) Concerts Attended and Observed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Additional Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A picnic style concert held on a Saturday afternoon at a local heritage listed homestead. The concert also showcases the orchestra’s smaller string and wind ensembles. The event is MC’d by the concert master and includes brackets of music played by each ensemble. The repertoire includes a variety of contemporary compositions, music from films, arrangements of folk songs, jazz standards and arrangements of classical music.</td>
<td>This is the third consecutive year RCO has played this style of concert and it has become an annual event, held in one of the townships of the region. The audience is seated at the picnic tables on a sloped lawn or have brought their own chairs and blankets. Stalls are set up selling tea and coffee, glasses and bottles of local wine, and cheese and cracker boxes.</td>
<td>The audience seems to very much enjoy the casual and relaxed nature of the afternoon. They include families, friends of various ages who have come in a group, couples and family and friends of the musicians who have come to support the orchestra. The audience also includes a few well behaved four-legged audience members who sit on leash with their owners.</td>
<td>Before the concert, during the interval and one of the pieces commemorating the formation of the orchestra, a pair of screens either side of the orchestra shows a montage of photos, taken of the orchestra at various performances and rehearsals. As the audience enters the concert hall, there is a friendly mood as people meet up with each other and the orchestra musicians greet their family and friends. During interval, the musicians join the audience for the light supper, mingling and talking. The concert concludes with a short vote of thanks by the founding president who speaks of traditions and asking who has been to concerts. In a comparable manner, the MC gives background information on the music being played as well as linking the program with RCO’s history. While this is a more relaxed concert with the addition of the picnic, informal seating and outdoor venue, the audience is generally quite focused on listening. The musicians wear blacks and their more informal orchestra polo shirts and careful attention has been given to setting up the space so that both the musicians and the audience sit in the shade of the trees and that the music is audible through the amplified PA system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A concert which exemplifies RCO’s regular concert practice. The concert is held on a Saturday evening in the local town hall. The strings section is microphoned, an MC introduces the pieces in brackets giving background and the program includes a variety of music including arrangements of film music and suites of themes from well-known musicals, the titles of which are listed with on the program distributed to the audience. The orchestra is joined by the wind and brass players from the ensemble from further West, with whom the RCO has a partnership. During interval, a light supper is served, and the raffle is drawn.</td>
<td>The concert takes place in the town hall, a regular venue for RCO concerts. The space is bright and the orchestra plays on the floor rather than using the stage. The audience is arranged on the same level as the orchestra in a semicircle with two aisles. Speakers project the sound of the string section and electronic piano.</td>
<td>The audience is mostly full with an attendance of approximately 220 people including children, youth and adults, including seniors. While there is a casualness to the way the audience chatters during the orchestra tuning, brings their coffee/tea cups into the concert hall after interval and the way they dress-- the audience is quiet and still during the performance. Some tap their feet to the beat of the livelier well known movie scores and a couple use their phones to take photos during one of the pieces the orchestra first played when they formed 10 years ago. After the performance, the audience mingles with the musicians and some help put the chairs away.</td>
<td>The event is MC’d by the ensemble. Throughout the concert, the MC introduces the pieces in brackets giving background information on the music being played. The orchestra shows a montage of photos, taken of the orchestra at various performances and rehearsals. The audience seems to very much enjoy the casual and relaxed nature of the afternoon. They include families, friends of various ages who have come in a group, couples and family and friends of the musicians who have come to support the orchestra. The audience also includes a few well behaved four-legged audience members who sit on leash with their owners. During the concert, audience members closer to the musicians are very quiet and still while people further away are more talkative and ‘soak up the vibe’ of the afternoon. Both before and after the concert, and as the other ensemble plays, the musicians mingle and sit with their friends and family in the orchestra.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This concert is another annual RCO tradition and is representative of their ongoing practice. It is widely talked of in the community as being their best concert of the year and includes a pre-ordered BBQ dinner and dessert at interval. The program includes medleys of music from film and musicals as well as a range of well-known classical works nestled within arrangements. In contrast to other years, the orchestra plays the entire program rather than having some sections of the concert played by the string ensemble. The program is also notably shorter than previous years when this concert showcased nearly every work the orchestra rehearsed over the year.

The venue is a small country town hall which regularly hosts everything from debutante balls to community dances and weekly indoor bowls tournaments. Admittedly, the hall is not designed for orchestral performance. It is very small, the metal chairs have been used at the hall for over 50 years to seat just over 100 people, and the audience is often observed moving from the front seats to sit on the stage at the back of the hall after interval because the sound of a full orchestra can be overwhelmingly loud.

The audience is lively and greets each other as they arrive at the concert. As usual for the RCO, the musicians mingle with the audience before and after the concert as well as eating dinner with them during the interval. Seniors are the largest contingent of the audience, though there are also a number of children and adolescents. Both prams and wheelchairs.

As the music plays, the audience listens quietly though people are seen tapping along to the beat during livelier pieces, smiling when they hear familiar music, children block their ears with their fingers during the “loud bits mummy!” A seldom few take photos from the back of the hall. The audience is often observed moving from the front seats to sit on the stage at the back of the hall after interval because the sound of a full orchestra can be overwhelmingly loud.

A paper program listing the pieces, composers and arrangers is distributed. The program also includes a notice saying ‘New Members Always Welcome’ giving details of who to contact, when and where rehearsals take place, a list ‘thank yous’, next year’s calendar of events and contact details for the orchestra. At the end of the program in large font it reads “Clap and cheer for something extra” “Please feel free to join us for a chat after the performance” is written at the end of the list of pieces which is indicative of the relational approach this orchestra has to building community and connecting with their audience. The MC also reinforces the friendly, community atmosphere thanking the audience for coming, recognising familiar faces and introducing the music in segments with a focus on inviting the audience to click their fingers in time, sharing insight into the orchestra’s favourite pieces and giving the audience things to listen for.
APPENDIX I- Pedagogies of listening reported in the Metropolitan Community Orchestra (MCO) data

A pedagogy of listening is defined here as a means of teaching or learning which aids the listener to make sense or meaning from the musical experience provided by the orchestra.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy and Description</th>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Links to Literature and Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience Being Able to See</strong></td>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I love being able to watch the instruments… being able to see every member of the orchestra” (focus group participant)

Being able to see the musicians and the instruments links the listening experience with instrument timbres, instrument groups and builds an interpersonal relationship between the listener and musicians, as well as building an understanding of how instruments work and sound together.

**Pedagogy observed at…**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring Showcase</th>
<th>Christmas Cheer Concert</th>
<th>Romantic Masters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Audience Interviews</strong></th>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Links to Literature and Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the concert in between pieces, the master of ceremonies directly engages with audience members asking questions and how they think the concert is going</td>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>No observed during these concerts but described by the arts organisers as a practice used during their children’s concerts on tour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Spring Showcase</th>
<th>Christmas Cheer Concert</th>
<th>Romantic Masters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Audience “Participation”</strong></th>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Links to Literature and Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“We always have sing-along for the Christmas Cheer Concerts… the audience members really enjoy getting involved and singing” (interview, “Morty”)</td>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>While the arts organisers found this an easy pedagogy to explain, the audience members in the focus group debated the idea of ‘participation’ from an array of views. Some</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Spring Showcase</th>
<th>Christmas Cheer Concert</th>
<th>Romantic Masters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“we do that so the audience can participate”
(interview, “Monika”)

Active participation elements which the audience are usually musical but also simple for people to catch on to. The audience is either instructed or encouraged to join in during the course of a concert for example clapping in time with the music, singing along with a known tune or with a leader/choir.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Showcase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Cheer Concert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ ✓ ✓

didn’t think that joining in with singing meant participating, others saw it as a fantastic element of the concert practice which “really gets you [and] makes you feel like you are part of what is happening on the stage”. However, there was also debate that having chosen to go to the concert and being an audience member in the traditional sense was active participation already: “You’ve already chosen to participate when you went and bought a ticket or put it on your calendar and said ‘Yep I’m going to that’” “When you sit down you are participating, [it’s still] participation even though you’re not verbally [or physically] doing anything” (focus group participant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Showcase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Cheer Concert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ ✓ ?

Audience Research and Revisiting the Music after the Concerts
“If you know the piece, you want to go home and look it up somewhere. But that’s after, not beforehand. You don’t know what’s going to happen.” (focus group, “Maree”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Showcase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Cheer Concert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓

Links to Literature and Analysis
Some of the audience members spoke about how they enjoy getting the program out after a concert and looking up recordings of some of the pieces on YouTube or in their CD collections. The arts organisers too explained this is something they do when they are listeners at a concert and when they are preparing to learn a new work for orchestra. Some of the audience members who were family members also spoke about how the players share which pieces are coming up, however other audience members said they could only research pieces after the concert because they can’t know what the program will be.
### Balancing Listening with Thinking

“*But yeah, I try to enjoy it but sometimes your brain is just like ‘click, click, click. All that insight can sometimes actually stop you listening*” (focus group, “Matthew”)

This is a way of listening initiated by the individual audience member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Spring Showcase})</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Christmas Cheer Concert})</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Romantic Masters})</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Being Aware of Sound Vibrations while Listening

“I tend to, I prefer music in here [puts hands on chest and ears]. Where I can feel it... [and] live in that moment. But I’m back from what’s happening and the people who are there. Alone isn’t lonely when you’re with music” (focus group, “Maurice”)

This is a way of listening initiated by the individual audience member, though it is certainly aided by having a good acoustic environment, certain types of music or sitting in proximity to the orchestra.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Spring Showcase})</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Christmas Cheer Concert})</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Romantic Masters})</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Links to Literature and Analysis**

In the interviews, the focus group and my own observations of the concerts, there was a definite tension between the activities of listening- either immersing yourself in the listening experience and allowing that experience to be pedagogical, and actively listening to understand the music (whether it be in a technical musical way or being cognitively aware of intellectual elements, or emotions, somatic sensations).

This is a tension of active listening and listening pedagogy yet to be explored in detail in the literature, but separately these elements of aesthetic experience, intellectual engagement, affective listening, and embodied listening have been examined in the literature review.

Links to literature on embodied listening and acousmatic listening see: Engelsrud (2005); Finnegan (2012); Barreiro (2010); E. F. Clarke (2012)
“Community orchestras are sort of handy like that aren’t they... you can meet them and talk to them”
(focus group, “Mabel”)
The relationship between listeners and musicians becomes the key conduit or catalyst through which listening skills are developed and audience experiences are enhanced.

Pedagogy observed at...
Spring Showcase Christmas Cheer Romantic Masters
✓ ✓ ✓

Choreographing Music
“I choreograph dances in my head every time I’m listening to a piece of music”
“[we did a concert for] the grand finale [of a] horse show... so we choreographed music to their dressage. It was a humungous amount of work finding themes ... and program music that fitted for each thing and then writing joining bits” (interview, “Monika”)
Accompanying the music with actions or movement which enhance an element of the music to help the audience understand or make sense the listening experience.

Pedagogy identified by...
Arts organiser interviewees Audience focus group
✓ ✓ ✓

Pedagogy observed at...
Spring Showcase Christmas Cheer Romantic Masters
✓

Closing Eyes to Listen
This is a listening strategy or skill employed by the individual listener which helps focus their attention. With eyes closed, the listener may be able to become more aware of somatic sensations caused by vibrations, be able to imagine or visualise stories or memories evoked by the listening, or simply remove themselves from the audience around them to find some “alone space” with the music.

Pedagogy identified by...
Arts organiser interviewees Audience focus group
✓

Pedagogy observed at...
Spring Showcase Christmas Cheer Romantic Masters

While relationships in the scope of audience development are often seen as key elements of marketing and programming, here in a community orchestra the connection built between the orchestra and the listener affords a whole array of opportunities and ways of inducting listeners into orchestral music and equipping them to be confident listeners.
However, this seems to be something very unique to community orchestras
See: Nicholls (2014)

Links to Literature and Analysis
This appears to be both a way of listening for the audience members, and a way that orchestras can communicate the meanings and ideas in music to help audiences make sense of the listening experience.
In the concerts I observed, there were sections of some of the Christmas music when the brass section would stand for a fanfare or where actions were required for songs which were led by the choir.

Links to Literature and Analysis
Closing eyes to listen appears to be a pedagogy which sharpens the listener’s attention on the listening experience- to be “in the moment”
There is a possible link here with the concept of being mindful (Bishop et al., 2004; Kostanski & Hassed, 2008) and is a practice often employed in formal courses of
### Concert format
“[doing concerts] like the Queensland Symphony... it really doesn’t work. [We] needed to have that more relational performance. People like that” (interview, “Monika”)
The concert format can be a very broad area of pedagogical practice. It can include the theming of concerts through repertoire, the inclusion or exclusion of intervals, how the intervals are conducted (for example within the same space, with afternoon tea or as a simple break), how the items in the concert are arranged to engage interest, portray ideas or evoke emotion, to the consideration of how long people can listen and sit.

#### Pedagogy identified by...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Links to Literature and Analysis
The analysis of both the focus group and the interview data demonstrate that this orchestra recognises the needs and interests of their community and responds to this in the ways they plan and execute their concerts. Predominantly this involves programming and selecting repertoire, but also includes considering how the orchestra will present within the venues available to them and how they interact with their audience within these spaces.

### Concert hall space setup
“There’s no barrier to it. It makes you feel like you’re basically... part of it”
“We specifically designed... how we were performing... [in the venue]” (focus group, “Maurice”)
This pedagogy considers how the concert hall environment, set up, the location of key elements in the space (e.g. the performers, the audience, rest rooms, the foyer, ticket offices) and how this can be used to enhance the audience experience and listening. The set up of the concert hall may also include the use of screens for projections and images, whether the audience has aisles through it, if the orchestra is at the same level as the audience or if they are on a stage, and how the space is used by both the audience and the performers.

#### Pedagogy identified by...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pedagogy observed at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Showcase</th>
<th>Christmas Cheer Concert</th>
<th>Romantic Masters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Links to Literature and Analysis
In classroom pedagogy and museum learning literature there is reference to how classroom environments can aide learning (B. M. Kolb, 2005; Trofanenko & Segall, 2014). There is one study by Appleton (2008) which looks at how the set-up of concert halls impacts the audiences experience and studies on the impact of musical spaces (Born, 2013; Knutson, 2002; Rodriguez, 2014) but this is an area of research in need of further study.

### Dimming the Lights

#### Pedagogy identified by...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Links to Literature and Analysis
listening study for example Tinkle (2015); Ultra Red (2012).
“dimmed lights and things... that sort of like made you, from a visual perspective, it made you connect... with the music” (focus group, “Mallory”)

A choice by the concert organisers to dim the lights over the audience during the performance.

### Exposure and Experience

“just exposure therapy almost, just giving them [the audience] an opportunity” (interview, “Montana”)

A belief that making orchestral performances accessible and providing a diverse range of listening experiences is important and valuable to the audience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
<th>Spring Showcase</th>
<th>Christmas Cheer Concert</th>
<th>Romantic Masters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pedagogy identified by...**

- Arts organiser interviewees
- Audience focus group

**Links to Literature and Analysis**

This pedagogy can take a range of forms—from removing barriers to audiences attending concerts (Baker, 2000; Dobson, 2010), providing a range of music and performance contexts for audiences (M. Savage & Gayo, 2011; Suthers, 1993; Wagener, 2012), and being an orchestra which is focussed on connecting and reaching out to their community. Certainly these are not new themes within the audience development literature, but they yet to be considered as pedagogies of listening.

### Instrument Timbres, Learning about Instruments and Sections of the Orchestra

“explaining instruments, because people don’t always know what they are” (interview, “Montana”)

This is generally an explicit pedagogy which takes the form of a speaker or master of ceremonies introducing instruments, explaining how they work, their instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
<th>Spring Showcase</th>
<th>Christmas Cheer Concert</th>
<th>Romantic Masters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pedagogy identified by...**

- Arts organiser interviewees
- Audience focus group

**Links to Literature and Analysis**

The committee members talked about how this is usually a feature of their touring concerts and education concerts with children. But it is also a feature of concerts including a concerto with a soloist such as the “Romantic Masters” concert.
family and often a demonstration of the instrument. The other method of teaching is using a piece of music which highlights certain instruments in an explicit way and links the name and sound.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Pedagogy identified by...</th>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
<th>Links to Literature and Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Showcase</td>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Spring Showcase</td>
<td>Predominantly at MCO concepts are communicated to the audience through the MC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Cheer</td>
<td>Audience focus group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the focus group the audience members spoke fondly of their experiences of hearing “Peter and the Wolf” or “Carnival of the Animals” and the lasting impact this experience had on their learning about music. There was also a belief that knowing the names of the instruments provided confidence for the listener, and that selecting repertoire which helped the audience to learn about the instruments was valuable.

**Introducing Concepts**

This usually occurs through an master of ceremonies or speaker at the concert, though can also be achieved through social media and the program. Concepts can include the theme of a concept which links the pieces of music, explaining the instrument families within the orchestra, or giving other conceptual information which is part of the program design which will help the audience to connect with the music and listen attentively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Pedagogy identified by...</th>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
<th>Links to Literature and Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Showcase</td>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Spring Showcase</td>
<td>Predominantly at MCO concepts are communicated to the audience through the MC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Cheer</td>
<td>Audience focus group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Knowing the History or Background of Music**

“Ros... introduces each piece with a little bit of history about it. That’s a learning that makes us appreciate more I think. You’re keen to understand so you listen to that and you appreciate it more” (focus group, “Margie”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Pedagogy identified by...</th>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
<th>Links to Literature and Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Showcase</td>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Spring Showcase</td>
<td>Predominantly at MCO concepts are communicated to the audience through the MC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Cheer</td>
<td>Audience focus group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Listening Skills Across Genres

“Everything in the orchestra used to be really meshed, but [I] can now separate the sounds and that’s a great ability to do. That’s something I have really noticed myself changing in the way I listen” (focus group, “Matthew”)

Where the listening skills and knowledge developed in one genre of music are used to understand a more unfamiliar genre of music to an individual listener.

Learning to Listen from a Young Age

“If you get to a child young, you can bring them into music early” (focus group, “Matthew”)

“It’s something you grow up with… [but people need to be] taught the right etiquette to use. It’s a societal thing” (focus group, “Maree”)

Learning to listen is a multifaceted skill, not only involving the development of knowledge to understand music but also the social etiquette of being an audience member specifically at orchestral concerts which carries its own set of tacit rules.

Modelling

The orchestra, when they are not playing, model audience behaviour.

Online Concerts and Recordings
The orchestra provides audio/video recordings of pieces as part of their upcoming programs to familiarise the audience with the concert repertoire. This can be done via social media or the digital newsletters distributed by the orchestra.

The audience members talked about how they enjoyed following up pieces after performances, using the program to find performances on YouTube or music subscriptions services. They also commented that often community orchestras do not publish their programs prior to concerts.

Open Rehearsals
When the orchestra runs rehearsals, usually dress rehearsals, which are open to the public and for audiences to come observe. This pedagogy allows the listener to understand how parts work together, understand the process of creating a performance and can provide insight into the work as it is broken down in rehearsals. For this orchestra, this pedagogy occurs every week for the musicians who are able to see the other ensembles rehearsing as the next sets up/packs down.

Pedagogy observed at...
- Spring Showcase
- Christmas Cheer Concert
- Romantic Masters

Pedagogy identified by...
- Arts organiser interviewees
- Audience focus group

Links to Literature and Analysis
One arts organiser talked about how this is a strategy used by professional orchestras which may be useful for their orchestra. In attending rehearsals at MCO I observed how this pedagogy could be of particular use, and the arts organisers certainly commented on the value it adds to the musicians as they see each other improve each week.

Orchestration/Arrangement
“it is a different sound compared to what they are used to... having a different setting, with different instrumentation... [or] playing different variations and different arrangements and whatnot...I think they enjoyed that” (interview, “Morty”)

Purposefully selecting arrangements of repertoire which not only are accessible to the players but also will make the listening accessible to audience members. This may involve truncated or ‘medley’ style versions of long or complex works, choosing arrangements which involve other community groups such as choirs or allow audiences to sing along/actively participate in the music, or selecting arrangements of works include additional instrumentation (e.g. inclusion of non-orchestral instruments such as...)

Pedagogy observed at...
- Spring Showcase
- Christmas Cheer Concert
- Romantic Masters

Pedagogy identified by...
- Arts organiser interviewees
- Audience focus group

Links to Literature and Analysis
Arrangements of works make the bulk of MCO’s repertoire. In addition to the reasons explained in the description, the arts organisers also spoke about how they are seeking arrangements of works by local composers. The arts organisers also spoke about how arrangements which bring something unexpected or surprising, particularly for their Christmas Cheer Concerts where the standard repertoire is known so well can afford new listening opportunities for audiences as well as interest for the players.
saxophone) or arrangements which highlight certain instrument groups.

**People as a Pedagogic Tool**

“creates a sort of relatability. If I’m a normal person sitting in the audience and I see you, a normal person playing music… that thing you’re playing is not quite so foreign to me anymore” (focus group, “May”)

This pedagogy very much relates to the discussion of relationship and connection as audience development and a means of equipping audiences with skills to listen attentively. The emphasis is on recognising that the musicians are “ordinary people” and creating opportunities for musicians and audience members to interact personally such as through afternoon tea during the interval, the musicians being accessible to the audience members, having personal relationships with musicians as family or friends, or having presenters who can help bridge the gap.

**Presenters/Speakers During Concerts**

“that makes you listen differently too…[it] makes you reconsider what you’re about to listen to.. it definitely helps with the learning” (focus group, “Matthew”)

“explaining it in a way that’s relatable to the audiences” (interview, “Morty”)

The arts organisers explained that having a big range of players, both in age from 80 to 11 years old, and in playing ability helped them to “all gel… as just ordinary people” [MCO-Helen-Int1]. Without doubt, though this pedagogy is difficult to articulate and theorise, this notion of relationships and building connections as audience development is the main tool through which MCO builds their audience and equips them to be confident and attentive listeners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
<th>Links to Literature and Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Showcase</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Cheer Concert</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Masters</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Showcase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Cheer Concert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
<th>Links to Literature and Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Showcase</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Cheer Concert</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Masters</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Showcase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Cheer Concert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explicit Teaching as Problematic

“How do you do it that’s polite? Like, if you go to [a large concert in a professional venue], you’d think people know how to behave generally but they don’t always know” (interview, “Monika”)

This pedagogy relates to the way which teaching is undertaken in the concert hall. How explicit should the teaching be? How much should be implicit? How much can you rely on the tacit knowledge of audience members to know the etiquette or appropriate ways of listening? And how do you communicate expectations in a way which is polite, respectful of all levels of experience present in the audience?

Program/Program Notes

Distributing to the audience a sheet or booklet which outlines the program for the concert with background notes which help guide the listening. For MCO, these programs also include a list of players, sponsors and friends of the orchestra (subscribers)

Links to Literature and Analysis

This question is an ongoing challenge to practitioners wanting to teach within the concert hall. There is little research on how to approach education particularly in adult mainstream orchestral concerts but some helpful places to start may include: Burland and Pitts (2012); Kemp (1997); Small (1998); Tobais (2003); Wagener (2012).
Public Education Concerts
These concerts are specifically planned concerts to be an educational listening experience for audience members. Often these are children’s concerts which focus on teaching the sections of the orchestra, are concerts where the repertoire has a theme in common or concerts designed to actively involve the audience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by...</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Showcase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Cheer Concert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to Literature and Analysis
MCO includes these concerts as part of their local, state and international tours. See also: ABC Radio (2015); Johanson and Glow (2011); Suthers (2008)
Both the audience members in the focus group and the arts organisers explained that these sorts of concerts were important to them, were a significant influence in helping them to be comfortable with orchestral music or were stand out memories of their childhood.

Seeing the Performers Enjoy Themselves
“the players have to sort of smile and things and sort of connect... not be too stiff-like... [or the] conductor... look[ing] all hoity-toity”
“the main thing is the orchestra members look as though they’re enjoying it... so they [the audience] can enjoy it... engagement through enjoyment” (interview, “Montana”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by...</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Showcase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Cheer Concert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to Literature and Analysis
The arts organisers talked about how performers can build a rapport with the audience through their own enjoyment of the music and performing. It was difficult to say how exactly this enhances the listening and understanding of the music in a cognitive sense, but there is an element of affective change and embodied experience which alters during such an experience.

Social Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Links to Literature and Analysis
“we put information about the pieces and works of music as a post... we use [social media] in that way and many different ways of connecting. But then again, that’s a different audience there” (interview, “Morty”)

Social media can be used as an education tool in addition to its usual marketing role. Posts can include videos of rehearsals, recordings of repertoire to be played at concerts, introduction videos to genres, instruments, history of music and composers.

Platforms include: Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, Forums

**Theming Music or Concerts**

A programming approach which creates a pedagogy of listening that helps the audience to understand the connection between pieces in a concert, to act as a launch pad for understanding the music in more depth, or a way to interest audiences that they might attend because the theme or repertoire is of interest to them.

**Using Imagination while Listening**

“I’m sitting there and it’s really taking me away. I’m on a different plane”

“It’s like a visualisation thing” (focus group, “Maurice”)

This is a pedagogy of listening employed by the individual listener to help them understand or make meaning out of the listening experience.

**Variety**

Though there is much practice by professional orchestras and other orchestras like MCO (G. Crawford, Gosling, Bagnall, & Light, 2014a; Philharmonia Orchestra London UK, 2009; Waldron, 2013), there is little investigation on how social media impacts listening engagement and experiences. Certainly there is scope in this pedagogy for further exploration.

**Links to Literature and Analysis**

MCO purposely programs their concerts to include a variety of genres which are communicated via the theme which is often the title for the concert e.g. “Christmas”, “Romantic Masters”, “Out of this World”, “Lights, Camera, Action”.

While there is research which discusses programming in this way as a marketing or audience engagement tool (G. Crawford et al., 2014b; Lin, 2008), as a pedagogical or educative tool it is yet to be explored.

**Links to Literature and Analysis**

Visualisation has been described as one of the elements of musikerleben and was described by Behne (1997) in an analysis of listening styles.

The use of visualisation was described by many of the audience members during the focus group in a variety of guises, and something I also experienced during my observations of the concerts.

**Variety**
“a very mixed dynamic type of music to keep your interest... it’s very important from a listening perspective not to have all the music the same”

“And for people who aren’t used to seeing orchestras, if you are going to bring something like this to the masses, it has to have something for everyone. They [MCO] pull it off pretty well”

(focus group, “Matthew”)

“you have different ensembles that play at different times throughout the orchestra... it keeps the concert very interesting for them, because it’s not the same” (focus group, “May”)

Variety can relate to repertoire and programming, ensemble type, concert format, concert hall set up and formality of concert. Here these are not simply marketing tools, but are aspects of the concert experience which alter the listening experience and help to keep the audience’s attention focussed.

**Visual Pedagogies**

“At the ‘Lights Camera Action’ concert, they had dimmed lights and things, movie excerpts on a projector screen... that sort of made you from a visual [perspective] connect the scene with the music” (focus group, “Mallory”)

“We have PowerPoint projections, which will either have some images that are related to the work or what the work is trying to convey”

“It’s something to focus visually when people are listening... or the words for sing alongs” (interview, “Monika”)

These pedagogies include any visual aspect of performance which enhance the listening experience to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pedagogy observed at...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Showcase</th>
<th>Christmas Cheer Concert</th>
<th>Romantic Masters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pedagogy identified by...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pedagogy observed at...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Showcase</th>
<th>Christmas Cheer Concert</th>
<th>Romantic Masters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Links to Literature and Analysis**

Visual pedagogies were talked about by both the focus group and the arts organisers. My observations included their reports of the PowerPoint projected onto screens in the concert hall space, but I also experienced that being able to see parts of the orchestra was visually helpful as was the program in helping to create understanding about the music and what was happening during the concert.
create affect, embodied experience or cognitive stimulus to create meaning from the listening experience.

### Watching Interactions

“I like watching people... looking around the audience. I get in trouble for watching people”
(focus group, “Mabel”)

“The interaction between all the groups of the orchestra... its about working together and seeing them do that and understanding that it is important... [it helps you to] understand how important or how hard it is to play a musical instrument and to work together”
(focus group, “Mallory”)

This is a pedagogy employed by the individual listener which helps them to understand what is going on as the music plays. It involves watching and observing the interactions not only between the musicians as they play, but also the audience as they listen.

### Watching the Conductor

“I love watching [name] conduct... she conducts with her whole body, you can feel it”
(focus group, “May”)

“[the conductor] is so animated you can see [them] bringing in the parts of the orchestra and you can think ‘I get it, I see that’... [its] learning by watching”
(focus group, “Maurice”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by...</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watching Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching the Conductor</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Pedagogies identified by both audience members and arts organisers ............................................ 15
• Categorisation of pedagogies of listening reported in data according to recorded experience
  *note some pedagogies fit into more than one category
  o Cognitive ........................................................................................................................................ 23
  o Affective ......................................................................................................................................... 14
  o Embodied ....................................................................................................................................... 9
  o Orchestra directed ......................................................................................................................... 24
  o Individually implemented ................................................................................................................ 13
    ▪ Within these categories, some research participants reported that these pedagogies of listening directly related to their…
      • Enjoyment of listening ............................................................................................................... 4
      • Appreciation of the music ......................................................................................................... 5
      • Learning the etiquette of listening/being an audience member .............................................. 2
      • Improved their attention to the listening ............................................................................... 3
APPENDIX J- Pedagogies of listening reported in the Professional Symphony Orchestra (PSO) data

A pedagogy of listening is defined here as a means of teaching or learning which aids the listener to make sense or meaning from the musical experience provided by the orchestra. Mainstage concerts include Romantic Russia, Cello Concerto; Family concert includes Family Concert: Spaced Out! sessions; Pops concerts include Classical Hits You Know and Love and Listen to This! concerts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy and Description</th>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Links to Literature and Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Instruments</strong></td>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Audience focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We collaborate… but at the moment… it’s not the ‘we expect it’ phase yet” (interview, “Poppy”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving listeners access to the instruments or to look more closely at the instruments of the orchestra is a pedagogy present more so in family and pops concerts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At one set of concerts, public pianos were accessible to audience members before and after concerts in the foyer, with an invitation to play or have a go.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessing and Listening to Recordings</strong></td>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Audience focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“hearing [the music] again helps me to relive the listening [experience]. I listen again to learn more about it too” (focus group, “Page”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group participants spoke about how they access recordings of music they know will be played at concerts, or music they have heard at concerts to listen again and develop further insight into stylistic, musical and historical context. There is a firm belief that being familiar with the music is important for developing an appreciation, knowledge and understanding of classical and orchestral music.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The literature corroborates the assertion that familiarity helps in the development of aesthetic understanding and appreciative listening. PSO has an active social media presence which they also use as a platform to provide recordings and videos of linked performances.

Links to: J. O. Becker (2010); Hargreaves and North (1997, 2010); Huron and Margulis (2010); P. A. Russell (1997)

Linked to the pedagogy ‘building familiarity’.
### Accessing the Program Notes Online

“I get ready for a concert [by getting] the program online, I read it at home on my iPhone and find the best YouTube recording of what I’m going to hear and I listen to it” (focus group, “Patrice”)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1 ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Performers or Performance Elements that Enhance the Learning Experience

“It makes it more fun for someone who doesn’t listen to classical music... having that extra bit of entertainment” (interview, “Patience”)

“[the laser lights] were good, they were intentional, but I found it a little distracting as well” (interview, “Patrick”)

Examples observed at concerts included: light and laser presentations, additional singers or dancers (e.g. can-can dancers during Bizet’s *Galop Infernal*), mirror ball and lighting (e.g. creating a snow effect during *Let it Go*), having acrobats performing to accompany the music, streamer and confetti air canons, having pyrotechnics and canon prop (for *1812 overture*)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1 ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis vs. Emotive Response

“learn[ing] to be a listener or to listen effectively...that can be on analytical level or it can be on an emotional level. You don’t need to have all of the - well you don’t need to have the ability to analyse to have an emotional reaction to the music. You know that is innate, that is organic and that is part of

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1 ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The orchestra sent emails before concerts with the program notes attached.
The venues also sent email communication a few days before concerts saying ‘get ready for your concert by...’.

It is evident that for those audience members who want ‘that little bit of background’ or insight, having program notes available digitally is valuable and constructive to learning.

There is a difficult grey space and tension between the entertainment value these aspects of the performance add to the concert experience and the distraction they may present. In my own listening, I appreciated the multi-modal presentation of the pops concerts and what value it added to developing my own understanding. And at the same time, like the audience members, I too agree that there is a place and time for these elements of a performance.

There is a definite tension between cognitive and affective responses to music, what is considered valid and how this should be most effectively approached in the context of education. What is certain, is that an effective pedagogy of listening needs to consider and value both.

Links to: E. F. Clarke (2005); Edwin Gordon (1971); Hutchinson (2009); Rinsema (2018); Suthers (1993)
Announcements to Focus the Listening
May include information about the music, a brief overview of the narrative, conceptual ideas or musical content.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the children’s concerts, these introductions were given by the facilitator of the workshop. At the pops concerts these introductions were given by the conductor who also served as animateur.

Links to: McParland (2009)
Link to speaking to the audience and pre-concert talks.

Designing Audience Interaction/Being an Animateur

“Never try to over simplify things… understand that [the audience] are so much more capable of understanding complex things that we think”
(interview, “Poal”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to: Rentschler et al. (2002); Rissmann (n.d.)

Repertoire Selection

“It’s about giving access to blind spots, learning there is more out there”
(interview, “Polo”)
Relates to the issue of programming and selecting music for audiences. Repertoire may be chosen because it is familiar, may be new, or may give the audience experiences which are diverse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PSO offers a wide range of repertoire which is selected and marketed to specific audience segments. This aspect of programming aligns with the arguments and ideas reflected in the literature.

Links to: A. Brown (2004); Shire; (2012); Lin (2008); Páramo (2010); R. Rogers (1998); Wainwright (2014)

Pedagogies of Listening as like a ‘Toolbox’

“It’s about giving the audience a selection of tools… to equip them so that they respond and approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An understanding of pedagogies of listening as being like a tool box aligns well with the argument of the variety of ways people listen, engage with and understand through listening. Taking on this ‘toolbox’ analogy means
“the artworks in ways that matter and make a difference to them” (interview, “Powell”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audience Participation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy identified by...</td>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Audience focus groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at...</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
<td>Pops Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Audience Participation

“I thought it was fun” (focus group, “Patrick”)
“It made it more engaging” (interview, “Patience”)

At concerts, audience participation included the conductor inviting the audience to clap along to the beat of the music; clapping or tapping louder or softer as conducted; invitations to sing along with well-known songs; questioning. At concerts that were more workshop focussed (e.g the family concerts), participation was much more encouraged as a way of engaging, teaching and involving the audience.

Auslan/ Using Sign Language

Using Australian sign language paired with keywords spoken, or using sign language and gesture to explain concepts or musical cues to the audience

Pedagogy identified by... Arts organiser interviewees Audience focus groups

Mainstage Concerts Family Concerts Pops Concerts

Pedagogy observed at... Mainstage Concerts Family Concerts Pops Concerts

Avoiding Jargon

Pedagogy identified by... Arts organiser interviewees Audience focus groups

Mainstage Concerts Family Concerts Pops Concerts

challenging efforts to replicate certain types of learning or knowing, a challenge to balance priorities and ways of understanding, and challenges what the role of education is within the concert hall.
Links to: Abercrombie and Longhurst (1998); Blaukopf (1992); Chanan (1994); E. F. Clarke (2005); Edwin Gordon (1971); Hutchinson (2009)

Links to: discussion and resources by animateurs see Blaukopf (1992); Freeman (2005); Prior (2011); Rinsema (2018); Rissmann (n.d.)

In the context of the family concerts, the facilitator consistently used gesture and Australian sign language to communicate key ideas about the music being played. In the context of the pops concert, the conductor used gesture to conduct the audience’s clapping volume, when to start and when to stop.

Depending on the concert, the materials available to the audience were written to suit the audience and the demographic being targeted.
“At all costs, avoid jargon in your pre-concert talks. It’s a very simple rule but it’s one that I live by and have brought into my teaching as well. There is a point where you can start to talk about music in those specific terms but [you have to know your] audience member” (interview, “Powell”)

In speaking to the audience, in writing program notes. This may include explaining overly technical musical vocabulary and wording materials for audiences carefully so that they are more understandable to more of the population.

**Balancing Learning Goals**

“You’ve got to be very careful not to be prescriptive” (interview, “Powell”)

“It’s important to let the art speak for itself”

“I think balance… you have to find out a way to do a variety of different things” (interview, “Polo”)

Dialectics are central to how pedagogies of listening are formulated in the concert hall – balance between entertainment and education; educative and interpretative spaces; cognitive and affective approaches; describing, interpreting and prescribing ways of listening.

**Familiarity and Listening**

“Familiarity helps a little bit, hearing it again and being able to relive it [helps] too” (focus group, “Patrice”)

“It’s a vast jigsaw puzzle… listening to it [more] times helps me to understand it” (focus group, “Page”)

The experiences of the audience members attest to the power that being familiar or building familiarity with the repertoire assists the audience in their listening and understanding of the music.

This is congruent with the literature on listening and perception, the psychology of listening and preference in listening.
Being able to See
Being able to see the musicians and conductor well during a performance assists the aural perception of sounds and the audience’s interpretation of the music.

Building on Connections to Create Meaning
“[music makes sense] when its connected with something in my life” (focus group, “Pauline”)
“I think you want to be very sparing about talking about your own reaction to [the music] because the audience is not here to hear what you think about it; they’re here to think about the piece... you’ve got to be very careful about not being prescriptive” (interview, “Powell”)
“resources are important, but more important is that personal message from the performer or personal connection. You’ve got to do this because everybody hears things differently” (interview, “Poal”)

Pedagogy identified by...
Arts organiser interviewees
Audience focus groups
✓
1 ✓
2 ✓

Pedagogy observed at...
Mainstage Concerts ✓
Family Concerts ✓
Pops Concerts ✓

PSO concerts were performed in venues designed for the purpose of giving concerts. Seating was tiered to assist the audience in having a full view of the orchestra musicians, and the orchestra was also staged using risers and platforms. Being able to see is part of the social and spatial understanding of how pedagogies of listening function.
Links to: B. M. Berger (1970); Boal-Palheiros and Hargreaves (2001); Born (2012); W. Bowman, Frega, and Stauffer (2012); Chanan (1994); Dobson (2010); Gross and Rutland (2017); Hess (2018); Rodriguez (2014)

Building connections between the experience of listening and the listener’s personal experience is essential for creating meaning and understanding in pedagogies of listening. Dewey (2005) speaks of this connection in his notions of continuity and interaction. Connections can be built through social means (speaking to the audience, gesture, ritual), symbolic means (evoking memories or associations with the music), selecting repertoire, or by many other means which are relational.
The data highlights the importance of building connections to create meaning by utilising the personal message from the performer to the listener; and starting with what the listener finds meaningful.
Links to: Dewey (1963); Sandlin, O’Malley, and Burdick (2011); Small (1996, 1998)
Concerts for Children
Designing concerts for children with specific pedagogical and learning aims in mind is a special craft. The design of these concerts considers not only the music, but how it will be presented, who will present, and why and where the concert is being held. See description of family concerts for more detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pops Concerts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to: ABC Radio (2015); Campbell (2006); De Vries (2011); Doddington (2014); Johanson and Glow (2011); Laurence (2010); Myers (2005); Rinaldi (2001); RTÉ National Symphony Orchestra (2010); Schiller (2006); Suthers (1993, 2008)

Pops Concerts
“a show or a concert of popular orchestral music presented in a really high level entertaining way. It was kind of like a little tasting menu of classical hits; and we did short versions of famous pieces and well-known music” (interview, “Poal”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pops Concerts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See description of “Classical music you know and love” concert.
It is evident that this type of concert design is for a specific segment of audience members and targets cultural non-attenders as a means of demonstrating that orchestral and classical music is not so different from listening to other types of music.
From the descriptions given by the audience members- these concerts seem to be more about engagement as a form of education.
Links to: A. Brown (2004); Hayes and Slater (2002); Hazelwood et al. (2009); Hess (2018); Lin (2008); McConachie (2008); Prictor (2000); Rössel (2011); Winzenried (2004)

Conducting the Audience
“It made it more engaging as opposed to just sitting and listening… it included me as part of the music” (focus group, “Patience”)

Not only encouraging the audience to clap or sing along, but using gesture to engage them musically as part of the performance e.g. having them clap louder or softer, showing them when to start or stop ‘their part’.
At the children’s and family concerts – each audience member had a handheld piece of untuned percussion to play, the facilitator helped the audience to create

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pops Concerts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related to the theme of ‘children learn by doing’ and ‘audience participation’
soundscapes to accompany the music, the audience also performed various ostinati and rhythms in parts with the music to accompany the musicians.
See description of the Family concerts and pops concerts.

**Challenging Listening Boundaries**

“I come to be challenged by music, to push the boundaries” (focus group, "Page")
“as an artistic programmer taking an audience on a journey and getting their trust... being able to develop that taste or idea of giving people the sensation of ‘oh I’ve really discovered something’. That’s what audience development means for me”

[interview, “Polo”]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by...</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1 ✓ 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pedagogy observed at...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This pedagogy was more evident in the mainstage concerts than the pops or family concerts. In conversations with the arts organisers, it was evident that challenging audience’s boundaries should always be done in relation with known repertoire or using known repertoire as a segue to something new or unfamiliar.

Links to: Prictor (2000); R. Rogers (1998); Shire; (2012); Wainwright (2014)
Linked to repertoire selection and programming

**Creating Emotional Connection to the Music**

“Firstly, how does it make you respond emotionally and why?.. what is it about the music that makes you feel that way? Why does it make you feel like that?
That’s an interesting discussion to have, because that really gets people listening very intently”

[interview, “Polo”]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by...</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1 ✓ 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pedagogy observed at...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The literature certainly speaks about the affective responses listeners have to music and the perception of music in relation to somatic and emotional response.

Links to: J. O. Becker (2004); Bigand and Poulin-Charronnat (2006); Elliott (2005a); Finnegan (2012); Gabrielson (2010); Gold et al. (2013); Hallam (2010); Rentfrow et al. (2011); Sloboda (2010)
Links to talking to the audience.

**Creating an Informal Environment**

Considers how the rules, rituals and etiquettes of a concert might be shaped in order to create a space for listening and learning accessible for specific audience demographics or musical performance purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by...</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pedagogy observed at...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to the discussion on informal pedagogies and learning.

Links to: Cain (2013); Clements (2012); Dewey (1966); Dobson and Pitts (2011); Gross and Rutland (2017); Knutson (2002); Wright and Kanellopoulos (2010)
**De-mystifying Classical Music**

“... so that when people hear classical music they don’t all of a sudden go ‘oh my brain has to respond differently’ ... That’s a big shift for people” (focus group, “Page”)

Helping listeners to realise that classical music is more familiar and present in their listening than they realise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to: DeNora (2000); Hennion (2001); Julian Johnson (2002); Pitts (2005b); Rentfrow et al. (2011); Rinsema (2018)

See also de-sacralising classical music.

**Developing Listener Agency**

“People still assume that we are the keepers of all knowledge because we come from a particular history and trajectory of music. So again, the key is plurality, and allowing young people to feel like their interpretation is valid” (interview, “Poppy”)

The PSO arts organisers spoke of the importance of encouraging and empowering audiences to have an increased awareness of having their own interpretation and agency over their understanding and interpretation of classical music. PSO arts organisers spoke about how being less prescriptive in explanations of music, encouraging imagination in listening and guiding the audience to make their own conclusions about the music were important to their audience development practices. Linked to issues of developing the listener's curiosity, developing a nuanced perception of performance and development of musical language and literacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development of Musical Languages**

“It's about increasing access. I still remember the first time I could recognise the form of the piece just by listening. I was like woa!” (focus group, “Patrick”)

Includes developing vocabularies to speak about experiences of listening, learning specific terminology, knowing names of instruments, and making links between other disciplines to create meaning in listening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by...</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pops Concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to: Botstein (1992); Howell (2011); L. Kramer (2012); Lindelof (2015)

**Differentiation**

When made explicit, it was highly evident that recognising the diversity of ways music can be
“People are always going to listen and respond to music differently” (focus group, “Patrice”)

Recognising the vast variety of ways that people listen and catering pedagogies of listening to acknowledge and develop these many different ways of listening and responding to music.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2 ✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience focus groups</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience focus groups</td>
<td>Pops Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

interpreted empowered the audience and encouraged people to ‘have a go’

Links to:

Dimming the Lights and Feature Lighting

Dimming the lights during a performance increases audience focus on listening and can reduce distraction. Feature lighting can be used to highlight musical aspects such as particular instruments, moods or to evoke certain emotions in listening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>1 ✓</th>
<th>2 ✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience focus groups</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience focus groups</td>
<td>Pops Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a historical practice taken from Wagner’s audience development work. There is little research to understand this practice and the impact it has as a pedagogy of listening.

Links to issues of the physical environment and concert hall and the impact it has on listener experience.

Links to: Appleton (2008); Horowitz (2005b); Leonard (2007)

Explicit Guided Listening Concerts

“Particularly for the more inaccessible works. Audiences may need more help for its to be easily digested. You can transform someone’s experience of a work just by spending five minutes before you play it pointing out a few things and explaining a couple of the compositional devices that are going on” (interview, “Poal”)

See concert description of Listen to This! and Family Concerts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience focus groups</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience focus groups</td>
<td>Pops Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See concert description of Listen to This! and Family Concerts

Links to: Farrell and Mann (1994); Forney and Machlis (2014); Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark (2006); Tobais (2003)

Emotional Responses to Listening

“Everyone feels something and usually they feel something very similar. And that's extraordinary when that happens, when the whole room is unified emotionally. That's what makes the live experience so special is the audience’s reaction all at the same time and those things are unspoken, but definitely you can feel them in the room” (interview, “Poal”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience focus groups</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience focus groups</td>
<td>Pops Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a definite imperative to value emotional responses to listening and to balance this with cognitive or more technical knowing responses.

A strong link to literature on the psychology of listening, but not so much explanation of the pedagogy of listening and emotion.

Links to: J. O. Becker (2004); Bigand and Poulin-Charronrat (2006); Elliott (2005a); Finnegan (2012); Gabrielsson (2010); Gold et al.
### Musicians Showing Expression While Performing

“I like the expression while [the performers were performing] it was just so deep, I felt what she was performing then” (focus group, “Patience”)

Having the musicians show their emotions while performing helps convey meaning and understanding of the music for the listener.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pops Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to: Antonietti, Cocomazzi, and Iannello (2009); Dobson (2010); Jacob (1996); Kemp (1997)

### Feeling Welcome and Comfortable

When audiences feel welcome and comfortable, they engage with the music freely and listen as part of the music, rather than being treated as spectators or onlookers at the performance. There is merit in acknowledging the role the audience plays in orchestral music and allowing them to have agency within the concert hall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pops Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to: Costantoura (2001); Jeong and Marie (2012); Sigurjónsson (2010a); Winterson (1998)

### Giving the Best Possible Performance

“A combination of all these things together, but the product has to be excellent. Ultimately the music always wins” (interview, “Poal”)

Both the audience members and the arts organisers believed that having the best possible quality of music was essential to pedagogies of listening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pops Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to: Baker (2000); Dewey (1963); Myers (2005); Radbourne, Glow, and Johanson (2010)

### Having Contexts that Enrich the Listening Experience

Contexts include the physical surroundings, extramusical elements of performance, social engagement as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pops Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Giving context was observed in each concert albeit by different means. Sometimes it was by spoken information given by performers, other times these elements were communicated by the paper based program, the performance context...
well as giving context to the listening by teaching about the historical and musical context of music, the composers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or by additional elements added to the performance.

Links to: Bamberger and Brofsky (1979); Campbell (2006); E. F. Clarke (2012); Copland (1988); Elliott (2005a); Fineberg (2006); Hutchinson (2009); Karlsen (2009); Sexton (2012)

### Hearing Aid Settings

“One thing I would love for them to do more is the hearing aid reminder about switching hearing aids to the right setting” (focus group, “Pauline”)

Letting audiences know about listening loops or reminders to switch hearing aids to settings to avoid negative feedback whistling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by...</th>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience focus groups</td>
<td>1 ✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the research participants was an audiologist who shared that performance venues often have hearing loops for people to tune into if they have hearing aids.

### Helping People to Find the Message in the Music

“I kind of like to think of every concert as an education concert to some extent. I’d like to think that we’re learning something all the time, that all of us are, the performers and the audience... We’re trying to put it into a modern context and see what we can learn about ourselves and history and our place” (interview, “Poal”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience focus groups</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to: Bamberger and Brofsky (1979); Campbell (2006); E. F. Clarke (2012); Copland (1988); Elliott (2005a); Fineberg (2006); Hutchinson (2009); Karlsen (2009); Sexton (2012)

### Humanising Classical Music

Any number of strategies which helps to bring a human and relational dimension to the music as an artform.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience focus groups</td>
<td>1 ✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a definite theme highlighting how important it is for people to see classical music as something that relates to them and is relatable. Be it in having a post-concert conversation or pre-concert talk; by allowing the audience direct contact with the musicians or sharing information which helps the audience to relate directly to the musician on an equal level.
Humour
“there were a few jokes running, it just made it a bit more interesting because I hadn’t been to an orchestra before” (focus group, ‘‘Patience’’)

Interviewing Players
An animateur or conductor doing short interviews with musicians or other performers during the concert to give an insider perspective to what the performing experience is like. May also include interviewing composers during pre-concert or post-concert talks.

Knowing about the Composers
“I try to learn as much as I can about the composers... I want to know what was happening in that period in history, what was influencing that particular piece” [Patrice]

“Particularly more inaccessible works, a bit of history and context of the composer can really, really transform peoples experience” (interview, “Poal”)

Sharing information about the composer either through the program notes or spoken during the concert to give context to the listening experience.
### Knowing the Names of Instruments
Highlighting and naming instruments in the orchestra so that listeners can understand more about their function within the orchestra and musical works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ✓</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See description of *Listen to This!, Family Concerts and Music that You Know and Love concerts*

Links to: Drobick (2004); Hess (2018)

### Knowing the Musical Structures
“Knowing the structure means knowing what I’m going to listen for” (focus group, “Page”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ✓</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ✓</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedagogy observed at…

In the concerts I observed the structure of the music was sometimes made explicit in the pre or post concert talks, or during the concert in information shared by the conductor or animateur.

Knowing the structure guides the listening experience and helps bring what is abstract into a form which is recognisable to the listener.

Links to: Bigand and Poulin-Charronnat (2006); Boal-Palheiros and Hargreaves (2001); Cabedo-Mas and Díaz-Gómez (2013); Dibben (2012); Judith Johnson (2001)

### Knowing the Story or Narrative Behind the Music
“I always listen to stuff and [try to] find the backstory on why the piece was written, the [composer] or a bit more information… I find that interesting and helpful” (focus group, “Patrick”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ✓</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ✓</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedagogy observed at…

Knowing the structure and narrative behind the music guides the listening experience and helps bring what is abstract into a form which is recognisable to the listener.

Links to: ABC Radio (2015); Campbell (2006); Copland (1988); Marguilis (2010); Philharmonia Orchestra London UK (2013)

### Learning about the Social and Historical Context of Music
“I want to know what’s happening or where the music was, the origins of that music, what was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ✓</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ✓</td>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedagogy observed at…

Certainly, knowing the social and historical context of music was a significant part of what helps the audience members understand and appreciate the music. However, it is not clear how this practically links to their appreciation or
driving them to write like that. And suddenly you encounter that whole new appreciation” (focus group, “Patrice”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

application of this knowledge to other listening experiences.

Links to: Bamberger and Brofsky (1979); Copland (1988); Gimbel and Vroon (2003); Edwin Gordon (1971); J. D. Kramer (1988); Levinson (2009a); Regelski (2006)

Learning Conversations with Friends
Where audience members meet to talk about their experiences and listening in the concert hall either formally (such as during a post-concert talk or presentation) or informally (self-directed). In having these conversations with peers and fellow audience members, listeners gain a richer appreciation and understanding of the music, composers or musicians.

Pedagogy identified by…
Arts organiser interviewees
Audience focus groups

Pedagogy observed at…
Mainstage Concerts
Family Concerts
Pops Concerts

✓ 1 2 ✓

For some of the audience members I spoke to, these conversations were vitally important to understanding their own listening experiences, particularly for Philip and Jess who are married to each other. It is interesting that this pedagogy was not recognised as something significant to the arts organisers.

Work by Forsyth and others talks about how the architectural design of concert halls can influence the social flow of people and assist in helping people to have conversations for learning. Likewise, literature from museum pedagogies also speaks of this way of facilitating learning.

Links to: Allen (2002); Knutson (2002); Leinhardt et al. (2002); Leinhardt and Knutson (2004); Waldron (2013) Beranek (2015); Forsyth (1985, 1988); Shu (2012); Strong and Longman (2010)

Listening as Participatory
Making explicit the important role listeners play in the concert hall as part of performances and in the life of the artwork.

Pedagogy identified by…
Arts organiser interviewees
Audience focus groups

Pedagogy observed at…
Mainstage Concerts
Family Concerts
Pops Concerts

✓ 1 2 ✓

Beyond the obvious need for audiences as a financial stakeholder in the arts, all too often audiences are positioned as passive to the artform, merely present as onlookers. However, in the light of Small’s theory on musicking, audience development can reconsider this attitude and recognise through pedagogy the importance of audiences and their role within the artform which is orchestral music.
### Listening to what is Important

"you learn how to listen and what is important and what is less important, that is just by opening your ears and trying to penetrate into that soundscape. Then if you want to go deeper and really submerge yourself in music you know a little bit about form and structure you will actually be able to recognise this is an that form, this is a sonata form”

(interview, “Polo”)

The audience members spoke about how watching the conductor was a way of understanding what was important in the music to listen to.

**Pedagogy identified by…**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pedagogy observed at…**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to: Elliott (2005a); Hutchinson (2009); D. Moore (1963); Pitts and Burland (2013); Prictor (2000); Radbourne et al. (2010)

### Making Links to Popular Music

"it [the music] made sense because it was tied up to something I knew… it felt like more familiar ground… I wasn’t aware that I was actually listening to classical music”

(focus group, “Patience”)

**Pedagogy identified by…**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pedagogy observed at…**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the arts organisers and focus group 2 participants particularly, having the links made explicit between the orchestral music they are hearing and popular music they are familiar with not only assisted in engaging their attention in listening, but also built a relationship with the music that began learning and understanding for them.

Linked to familiarity in listening.

Links to: R. Crawford (2017); Dickinson (1983); Middleton and Manuel (2014); Nuenfeldt (2007); Odendaal, Kankkunen, Nikkanen, and Vakeva (2013)

### Meet a Musician

“breaks down any barrier, break down any wall that might be there”

(interview, “Poal”)

**Pedagogy identified by…**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to: ABC Radio (2015); Philharmonia Orchestra London UK (2009); Rissmann (n.d.)
Be it in person, our through descriptions in the program. Audience members valued being able to know something about the person playing the music, to follow their careers, and any opportunities it presented to get to know the music better.

### Pedagogy observed at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Modelling

“when I do my pre-concert talks I make a point of going, really framing it very clearly and saying “This is what I hear, what do you think?” And I mean there’s not time in 20 minutes to actually get people to put up their hands and share with me what they think, but if there was, I’d do it. But I ask people to share with the person next to them, and I say quite explicitly “This is what I take from it, and this is why, here’s an example, but you might think differently, and that’s fine. I hope that I’ve given you some tools with which to listen” (interview, “Powell”)

Modelling how pedagogies of listening apply by speaking aloud what cognitions, feelings and sensations happen as you (an experienced listener), listen to the music.

### Maintaining the Rigor in Listening

“never try to over simplify things ... really understand that they're [audiences] so much more capable of understanding complex things than we think they are generally... [classical] music is complex and that's what I love about it... that's what makes ... a bit more interesting and different is its complexity.” (interview, “Poal”)

### Not Prescribing a Singular Way of Listening

“I think we can still take some steps towards being more accessible and that does not mean dumbing down, that means just addressing your audience and with their own value and in their own words and in the ways they want to experience music. But be open and accessible and that is what we should be striving towards I hope.” [Polo]

Links to: J. D. Kramer (1988); Myers (2006)
See also description of *Listen to This!* concert.
Being open and equipping audiences to interpret music rather than prescribing a singular way or message listener’s should be finding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

think it's one thing to say “Oh, we don’t mind how you interpret it, everyone has their own method of interpreting words and that’s fine”, but also the way we’re doing things is quite prescriptive really, and that’s what we try to change in education.” [Poppy]

Links to:
Linked to notion of differentiation and multiple ways of listening literature.

Peer to Peer Teaching and Learning
“this peer to peer model, buys into that, and acknowledges that kids are more likely to learn from other kids.” (interview, “Poppy”)
Informal or curated conversations between audience members which develop awareness, engagement and understanding through listening and audience experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The literature on museums and visitor engagement speaks of ‘learning conversations’ and how this can contribute to pedagogy and learning.
Links to: Allen (2002); Knutson (2002); Leinhardt et al. (2002)
Links to learning conversations.

Performances Replicating Original Contexts
Concerts which as much as possible replicate original performance contexts including instruments, audience etiquettes, venue, acoustic treatments, original manuscripts or music, and other elements of performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to issue and pedagogy of differentiation. I certainly observed that different concerts utilised different pedagogies according to the demographic of the audience in attendance, and the intentional audience for the concert.

Pitching Pedagogy for the Age of the Audience
Links with the issue of differentiation. ‘Pitching the pedagogy to a certain age range’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Player Profiles Published in the Program

“I like the way that PSO gives you information about the musicians” (focus group, “Page”)
“I like following their careers” (focus group, “Patrice”)
“The [subscribing patrons] love the players. They want to learn about the players... [that’s why] we include the biographies in the programs of soloists... and [in our app] which football team they like and what not” (interview, “Poppy”)

**Pedagogy identified by...**
- Arts organiser interviewees
- Audience focus groups

**Pedagogy observed at...**
- Mainstage Concerts
- Family Concerts
- Pops Concerts

Including information in the program is linked to the issue of opportunities to meet musicians and humanising music.

### Pre and Post Concert Talks

“First of all of course provide information that you cannot put in writing ideally, and secondly it should warm up people to the concert.” (interview, “Powell”)

Orchestra organised sessions hosted by a presenter, often conducted lecture style or as a panel discussion. These are advertised to the audience and attended in addition to the main performance.

**Pedagogy identified by...**
- Arts organiser interviewees
- Audience focus groups

**Pedagogy observed at...**
- Mainstage Concerts
- Family Concerts
- Pops Concerts

Links to talking to the audience, humanising music
- Links to: Bigand and Poulin-Charronnat (2006); G. Crawford et al. (2014a); Hutchinson (2009)
- See descriptions of Romantic Russia and International Guests: Cello Concerto concerts.

### Preparing for a Concert

Research and listening that the individual listener does before coming to a concert to become familiar with the repertoire.

**Pedagogy identified by...**
- Arts organiser interviewees
- Audience focus groups

**Pedagogy observed at...**
- Mainstage Concerts
- Family Concerts
- Pops Concerts

This is interesting data in that it demonstrates the independent and autonomous learning that goes on within the concert hall. The individual listener in this situation is driving their own engagement and understanding with the music. Certainly, this ‘preparation’ was something undertaken independently by each of the participants in focus group 1.

### Programming as Pedagogical

“The key concept there is interpreting information. So I ask what will help our audiences to interpret

**Pedagogy identified by...**
- Arts organiser interviewees
- Audience focus groups

The literature reflects on the use of repertoire in programming and audience development. However, the data emphasises that programming can be done from a viewpoint of
what they’re listening to. So the first point there I think is having some context. And I think certainly one of the key education pedagogies that I try and weave into our work is that someone is more likely to find something engaging and interesting and worth their time” (interview, “Poppy”)

Using choices of repertoire for the purposes of teaching something of the music or using a theme in the music selection to tie programs together which then gives the audience members information to inform their listening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>helping the audience to understand something of the music by the repertoire selected.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to: A. Brown (2004); Cambridge (2017); R. Rogers (1998)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Researching Music Independently
Linked to preparing for a concert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1 ✓</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Links to preparing for a concert, but the participants spoke of how they also research into general history, visual and performing arts history and sought out a variety of other information which assisted their listening and meaning making during the concert experience. Both the arts organisers and the participants in focus group 1 reported this pedagogy as being helpful to their listening.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource Packs
Materials published by the orchestra ahead of concerts-particularly for children, families and school performances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1 ✓</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSO had their resource packs available on their website and regularly sent them to schools and projects the PSO provides concerts for. Resource packs often included guided listening lesson ideas, worksheets, information about performers and composers, and information for teachers bringing students to concerts. Links to: Wainwright (2014); Winterson (2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speaking to the Audience
“I like the little talks they [the conductor or pre-concert talk presenter] do” (focus group, “Patience”)

“Yes, I wish they did more of that” (focus group, “Page”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1 ✓</td>
<td>2 ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Mainstage Concerts</th>
<th>Family Concerts</th>
<th>Pops Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While often seen as a break with the tradition of concert giving, speaking to the audience during a concert brought immense value to the experiences of the research participants. They spoke of how these talks, with limited jargon and designed to guide the listening, helped them to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
make their own meaning from the listening experience.
It was also interesting that the arts organisers I interviewed all iterated the importance of not ‘telling’ the audience what to hear, but rather using these opportunities to guide and empower the audience to develop their own interpretation in listening.


Targeting Audience Interests
“[It’s silly just to keep playing to one particular group of people. That’s the opposite of what I would think a modern orchestra is all about, if it’s all about accessibility and connecting with people and keeping the artform vibrant and alive and relevant.” (interview, “Poal”)

Having an awareness of the various types of audience, their values and interests and using this as part of the audience development strategy.

Teaching Concert Etiquette
“[At some concerts] we explain the behaviour code as they [the audience] arrive... we do allow for a space where they can ask questions of me or of musicians if they’re able to come up. We encourage that in the break during rehearsal. So, while we kind of lay out expectations, it’s less about the cultural appropriateness because I think that is quite flexible but still allows opportunities for [audience members] to show their enjoyment or explore their enjoyment or understanding of the piece” (interview, “Poppy”)
Explicitly explaining to the audience what behaviours are and are not appropriate.

**Teaching Listening as Embodied**

“I really try to ensure that listening is something that it’s not only taking in some soundwaves, like something that happens to our bodies in a kind of physical sense. The key concept there is interpreting information. So I ask what will help our audiences to interpret what they’re listening to” (interview, “Poppy”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
<th>Links to balancing priorities and musical goals</th>
<th>Links to: Finnegon (2012); Gershon (2010); Stevens, Dean, Vincs, and Schubert (2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pops Concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The ‘Even If’ Factor**

“...the ‘even if’ factor which I love. Even if we were to go “This is how we want you to think about the music. So we want you to know it’s about this pagan ritual, and that the girl dances herself to death. This is the only way to interpret it, this is the right way, now listen to this piece”. That’s not going to – if you surveyed everyone coming out the other end of the concert, they’re not going to have the same interpretation. We can’t ensure everyone comes away with the same information, and that they hear the piece in the same way. Because we all have various different backgrounds and fonts of knowledge that have led us to this point. So we can’t actually ensure, even if we think it’s the right thing, that everyone comes away with the same understanding. So why fight against that? You use that as a resource and a prompt, rather than a kind of make a value judgment on it if that make sense.” (interview, “Poppy”)

**Pedagogy observed at…**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
<th>Links to theme of differentiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pops Concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Venue as Pedagogical

Considering how the venue or concert hall may impact the listener’s experience and how it can be best curated to enhance the experience or direct the attention of the listener to make meaning from the experience. For example:

“We change the experience- hearing that same Prokofiev symphony in an abandoned industrial building is different. Ideally you should be able to provide that because the experience of that piece, which was written in a period that Russia was very much in the industrial revolution, it would be totally different... Or a chamber music performance in [an intimate sitting room] or wherever, in different environments, if you put it in a different context, in a different space, literally.” (interview, “Polo”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience focus groups</td>
<td>1 ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the different concerts observed were given in different spaces which were selected according to the music and the audience in attendance. However, with the concerts I observed twice it was interesting to see how the different architectural design of the concert hall impacted my own listening and experience. See for example Romantic Russia concert descriptions.

There is a small field of literature on the impact space and performance venues have on audience experience which is of relevance here. Links to: Beranek (2015); Beyer (1967); Forsyth (1985, 1988)

### Using and Explaining Technical Terminology

“As the pre-concert talker, quite a lot, because you’ve got to pitch what you’re saying at your audience’s level of knowledge... also as my manifesto on who I think the audience is and how to speak to them, because, I think, it’s really important that – you can give people technical information, but, you have to explain it.” (interview, “Powell”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Pedagogy observed by...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience focus groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to avoiding jargon and pre and post-concert talks.

I observed a different set of vocabulary and language were used at different concerts, according to the audience present. See concert descriptions.

The participants also spoke about how certain shortcuts can be made according to the concert – particularly this is relevant for pre and post-concert talks.

As Powell explained: “I think there’s a point at which you can start to talk about music in those specific traditional terms but only if the student or the audience member, I feel, leads you in that direction because I think people get most meaning from what you’re presenting if it’s delivered in a way that makes sense to that person and has meaning for them.”
**Videos Introducing the Music**

“every week we made a little video with the conductor or soloist at the beginning of the rehearsals, just ten minutes... but also if you played in the foyer ... in a loop in the intermission and before the concert and it was about the pieces. [It would] tell you something about the pieces that you’re going to hear, it works very well.”

(interview, “Polo”)

Producing and publishing short videos to introduce music, soloists or instruments available via social media or online platforms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts ✓</td>
<td>Family Concerts 2 ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pops Concerts ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Practices similar to this example include Philharmonia Orchestra London UK (2009, 2010, 2013); RTÉ National Symphony Orchestra (2010)

**Visuals and Projections**

“visual teaching aides, multimedia that's been very important, because you can get some pretty big concerts across visually that would take a long time to unpack verbally just by seeing it on the screen”

(interview, “Poal”)

Links to additional performers or performance elements that enhance the learning experience.

“You can get across very complicated concepts using a simple visual analogy, much easier than if you were just talking to people. I think that’s a major area that we have to concentrate on”

(interview, “Poppy”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td>Mainstage Concerts ✓</td>
<td>Family Concerts ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pops Concerts ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meta-Analysis:**

- Total number of pedagogies identified in MCO data .......................................................... 69
- Pedagogies identified by arts organisers only ................................................................. 63
- Pedagogies identified by audience members only ......................................................... 3
- Pedagogies identified by both audience focus groups and arts organisers .................. 21
- Categorisation of pedagogies of listening reported in data according to recorded experience
  *note some pedagogies fit into more than one category*
  - Cognitive ..................................................................................................................... 23
  - Affective ...................................................................................................................... 14
- Embodied .......................................................... 9
- Orchestra directed .............................................. 24
- Individually implemented ...................................... 13
  ▪ Within these categories, some research participants reported
    that these pedagogies of listening directly related to their...
    • Enjoyment of listening ...................................... 4
    • Appreciation of the music .................................... 5
    • Learning the etiquette of listening/being an audience member .... 2
    • Improved their attention to the listening ..................... 3
APPENDIX K- Pedagogies of listening reported in the Regional Community Orchestra (RCO) data

A pedagogy of listening is defined here as a means of teaching or learning which aids the listener to make sense or meaning from the musical experience provided by the orchestra.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy and Description</th>
<th>Pedagogy identified by…</th>
<th>Links to Literature and Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>As Social Learning</strong></td>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Audience focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It’s never just listening. You don’t go there to just listen. You go to enjoy yourself and the music. We listen and come here to bring happiness and to have a sense of belonging and togetherness” (focus group, “Ramella”)</td>
<td>The social element of experiential learning is discussed by Dewey and others, as is the notion of listening as social. However, the audience members in the focus group explained that this social experience also contributes to the meaning and understanding they create of the listening and music experience. Links to: Back (2007); Ballantyne et al. (2014); E. F. Clarke (2005); Dewey (1963, 1980); Moon (2004); D. T. Moore (2010); Sharpe et al. (1991); Small (1996, 1998)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td>Anniversary Concert</td>
<td>Springtime Winds and Strings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Audience Experience as Pedagogical | Pedagogy Identified by… | Linked to pedagogies of listening as social learning experiences. The phenomenon of being in the same space and sharing a communal experience was something very much valued by the audience members. They explained that not only did they take their social cues from other audience members, but that the actions of other audience members gave them insight into the music that helped them to interpret and understand their own listening experiences. Links to: Back (2007); Ballantyne et al. (2014); E. F. Clarke (2005); Dewey (1963, 1980); Moon (2004); D. T. Moore (2010); Sharpe et al. (1991); Small (1996, 1998) |
| “Having other people there with you, seeing how they react... in a concert as an audience member there’s more of a sense of atmosphere... that sense of being with others and doing things together... the closeness of people... being in a group... experiencing the same thing; the communal. That’s a really valuable thing” (interview, “Ronnie”) | Arts organiser interviewees | Audience focus group |
| Pedagogy observed at…    | Anniversary Concert | Springtime Winds and Strings | RCO Celebrates |
| ✓                        | ✓                      | ✓                          |
**Being able to See the Whole Orchestra**

“Tonight I had really good seats, I could see members. I could watch when someone was preparing, when a big bang was going to come. Or you could see when all the violinists were in tune, and then it gets layered and layered.” (focus group, “Ramella”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogy observed at…</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniversary Concert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springtime Winds and Strings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Celebrates</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The focus group participants commented that being able to see the orchestra was key to their listening and understanding. Likewise, the arts organisers explained how they arrange the concert hall space available to optimise viewing for the audience including children and families. Links to: Pitts (2005b); Radbourne et al. (2014)

**Being Part of the Musicking**

“Kind of like a unified kind of feeling. Where everyone is really focused and really enjoying the piece” [Raven]

“We listen and come here to bring Happiness and to have a sense of belonging, and togetherness. And I think with an audience and an orchestra music ties that together” (focus group, “Ramella”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogy observed at…</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniversary Concert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springtime Winds and Strings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Celebrates</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links experience of listening to the notion of musicking and that listening is a musical activity that contributes to the musical event. The focus group participants were very articulate in explaining that in listening they are not passive but rather are active and part of the music making. Links to: Musicking – Small (1998)

**Being Part of Something Bigger**

“I think there's something to be so important about being there in that group like we are... but being there with other people who are experiencing the same thing. I just think it's so - so - such an important part of human life.”

(interview, “Ronnie”)

A belief that live music performance is distinct in its quality of experience and brings vital interaction to musical life. Particularly, for RCO it is a way of connecting with and give to their regional community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogy observed at…</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniversary Concert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springtime Winds and Strings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Celebrates</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concretely connected to the experience of listening as being part of the music making and that live musical experience is distinct and has a unique quality from private/individual listening experiences. These experiences contribute something special to learning and meaning-making. Links to: studies on wellbeing and community development in regional contexts (see Brann-Butter, 2014; Duxbury & Campbell, 2009; McHenry, 2009); live listening (L. Bennett, 2014; Cabedo-Mas & Díaz-Gómez, 2013; Radbourne et al., 2014)

**Learning and Understanding Brings Listening Alive**

Pedagogies of listening help listeners to make sense of the music and to construct understanding. These acts bring a new quality to the listening experience.
“Just understanding the orchestra, understanding the sounds. To listen not only for the musicality but what else the music brings... It brings the music alive.” (focus group, “Rachel”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Anniversary Concert</th>
<th>Springtime Winds and Strings</th>
<th>RCO Celebrates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Combining Traditional and Informal Concert Elements

“Whereas in our performances are probably much more informal, and we feel that we don’t try to adopt, we’re trying to present a great performance, we’re not trying to be a completely formal concert” (interview, “Rosabelle”)

The RCO combines traditional concert elements (not clapping between movements of symphonies, standing for conductor and concertmaster) and more informal concert elements (having an MC introduce works, inviting the audience to sing or clap with the orchestra). They do this out of a belief that such an approach connects better with the audience and helps them to make sense of the music more effectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As Dependent on Genre

The committee members explained that the variety of genres of music the orchestra plays means helping audience members to listen in ways consistent with the genre. E.g. listening to jazz – encouraging the audience to applaud after solos; listening to folk music – encouraging the audience to join in singing or clapping; listening to classical music – instructing the audience not to clap between movements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The RCO does this through instructions from the MC, the information in the program notes and presenting a variety of concerts with themes related to the music being played.
As Dependent on Social Atmosphere/Context

“the intensity of the people playing the instruments, knowing the difficulty of it and you’re actually watching it. I think their intensity actually rubs off and makes you listen. Because it is a communal sort of thing listening to a live concert” (focus group, “Raelene”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniversary Concert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springtime Winds and Strings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Celebrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The literature is clear about the effect the social atmosphere has on listening at live performances, and educational literature speaks of the importance of the social aspect of learning. Links to ‘being part of the musicking’ and ‘being part of something bigger’

Links to: Back (2007); Boal-Palheiros and Hargreaves (2001); Born (2013); Crozier (1997); Hargreaves and North (1997); Regelski (2006)

As Helping People to Use More of their Brain

The participants spoke about their experiences and understandings that listening to music intentionally and in a focussed way not only brings about understanding of music but also is a positive activity for the brain contributing to wellness and mental alertness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniversary Concert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springtime Winds and Strings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Celebrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to: research on psychology of listening – see E. F. Clarke (2012); Edwin Gordon (1971); Hargreaves and North (1997); Nuenfeldt (2007) Research on wellbeing and mindfulness - Ballantyne et al. (2014); McHenry (2009)

Making Elements or Aspects of the Music Explicit

“It's an opportunity to listen out for something you otherwise might not have” (interview, “Rosario”)

Helping audiences to know what to listen for, what is most important to hear to make sense of the music. Directed learning or making conscious what is otherwise implicit in the experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniversary Concert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springtime Winds and Strings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Celebrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to: practices of Paul Rissmann (see ABC Radio, 2015; Melbourne Symphony Orchestra, 2015; Philharmonia Orchestra London UK, 2010); Richard Gill (see Adorno et al., 2002; Centre;, 2019; Westlake, 2018); Victor Craven (see Craven, 2009a, 2009b; Craven, 2019); literature on music appreciation and learning (Copland, 1988; J. D. Kramer, 1988; Levinson, 2009a)

Children’s Concerts

Concerts designed specifically for children and with families in mind. Features shorter repertoire selections, adjusted seating in the concert hall,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniversary Concert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springtime Winds and Strings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Celebrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children’s concerts not observed during this research but have been observed by RCO in the past.

MC/animateur, shorter concert duration. RCO has produced concerts for children also associated with intentional teaching in local schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comfort</th>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by...</th>
<th>Physical comfort links: Beranek (2015); Kronenburg (2010); Sigurjónsson (2010b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“helping the audience to feel comfortable and to know what the rules are or to know what the behaviours are” (interview, “Rosario”)</td>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Social comfort links: Burland and Pitts (2012); Cabedo-Mas and Díaz-Gómez (2013); O’Sullivan (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering not only the physical comfort of listeners (temperature, chairs, lighting, audio quality), but also the social comfort of audience members.</td>
<td>Audience focus group</td>
<td>Also links to listening as social, learning as social, and creating an informal environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
<th>Anniversary Concert</th>
<th>Springtime Winds and Strings</th>
<th>RCO Celebrates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert Hall Rituals</th>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by...</th>
<th>Links to: Burland and Pitts (2014); McParland (2009); Pitts (2014); Wagener (2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Often audiences don’t know specific things about what to do during a symphony. Like it is traditional not to clap in between movements. It doesn’t always happen. However, to help we do make explicit instructions and I think leading by example helps too” (interview, “Ronnie”)</td>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Links to tacit and explicit; informal and formal concert elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It’s a great thing that community orchestras do ...it’s a sort of a safe ground. A training ground for the audience to learn what to do, what not to do at a concert sort of thing.” (focus group, “Randy”)</td>
<td>Audience focus group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledging that the concert hall as an institution has rules and rituals that audiences may or may not understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
<th>Anniversary Concert</th>
<th>Springtime Winds and Strings</th>
<th>RCO Celebrates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engaging the Listener</th>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by...</th>
<th>The RCO is invested in knowing and being part of their local regional community beyond wanting good ticket sales. They work hard to help their audiences to understand music, to be active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“It’s certainly engagement. We want people to be invested in us. We don’t want them to just sit there and, you know, sit there in their chairs. We</td>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
want to meet them, and we want to talk to them, and we want them to know us as people. We want to know them as people. We’re absolutely wanting them to know a bit more about music.” (interview, “Ronnie”)

### Explicit vs. Tacit Information

**“I don't know whether that's okay or not.”** (focus group, “Raine”)


(interview, “Rosario”)

Questioning how audiences know the ‘rules’ and behaviours expected of them at concert hall performances, and what orchestras can do to help audiences to know these often-tacit rules by making them explicit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td>Anniversary Concert Springtime Winds and Strings RCO Celebrates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Connected with issues of audience comfort, engaging the listener, concert hall rituals and combining traditional and informal concert elements.

There are conflicting issues between wanting to present concerts with all the traditions and rituals of concert halls, yet also wanting to make concert relevant and accessible to audiences.

Links to research by: L. Bennett (2014); Burland and Pitts (2014); Pitts (2014); Wagener (2012)

### Familiarity

**“the more familiar you become the more you enjoy something… then you can look for the pattern in it, or the instruments and stuff”** (focus group, “Raelene”)

“Familiarity is always one thing. We might find music that is fun to play, it’s got awesome points in it, we the orchestra all love it, but if the audience doesn’t know it, they clap half enthusiastically at the end… If you know those songs and then you were there you’re going to have a much better experience of it when you’re actually hearing it.” (interview, “Rosabelle”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td>Anniversary Concert Springtime Winds and Strings RCO Celebrates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The arts organisers spoke about how they try to balance and select repertoire that will not only challenge the orchestra members, but also will appeal to their audiences. They spoke about how they select music with a theme in mind, how they select music that may be outside the comfort zone of listeners and balance these choices with more well-known works.

Links to: Lin (2008); R. Rogers (1998); Suthers (1993); Weber (2000)
Familiarity of repertoire as an element of the listening experience that explicitly enhances accessibility to learning and engagement.

Feeling Included
“The audience helps you to listen, the audience sort of cues each other too.” (focus group, “Ramella”)
“It becomes inclusive when [we are at RCO concerts], you get to join in” [Raine]
“Kind of like a unified kind of feeling. Where everyone is really focused and really enjoying the piece… I think it allows you to express the enjoyment too” (focus group, “Raven”)

Making efforts to include the audience as part of the performance, to encourage active participation, and to acknowledge the ways the audience includes each other in the performance.

Pedagogy Identified by:
- Arts organiser interviewees
- Audience focus group

Pedagogy observed at:
- Anniversary Concert
- Springtime Winds and Strings
- RCO Celebrates

There are studies which link the role of the audience and inclusiveness in terms of programming and marketing terms, however in relation to education this is something under researched.

There are clear links between community involvement in regional spaces and studies on wellness and lifelong learning. See works by McHenry (2009); Radbourne (2003); Scollen (2008); Terracini (2007). Links with having human connection; listening and learning as social

Hospitality and Learning Conversations
Hospitality is a major part of RCO’s practice and concerts be it tea and coffee during the interval or full meals with the audience. During these times the musicians and audience members mingle and talk with each other, and it is an important time where learning conversations take place.

Pedagogy Identified by:
- Arts organiser interviewees
- Audience focus group

Pedagogy observed at:
- Anniversary Concert
- Springtime Winds and Strings
- RCO Celebrates

The best research on learning conversations in informal contexts is found in museum education research see: Allen (2002); Knutson (2002); Trofanienko and Segall (2014).

Other research on learning conversations includes: Leinhardt et al. (2002); Leinhardt and Knutson (2004); Waldron (2013)

Human Connection
“The orchestra is especially important for those people that might not have many opportunities to

Pedagogy Identified by:
- Arts organiser interviewees
- Audience focus group

Links to listening and learning as social; feeling included; engaging the listener
get out, or not go out that much, they can go out and they can connect with their friends. It’s a social thing for them, social connection, not just connecting with the orchestra, but connecting with their friends.” (interview, “Rosabelle”)

**Interval**

Interval is an important time for the RCO and the ways that they engage their audiences and listeners. Part of their practice involves hospitality and mingling with the audience, and other times interval is a time used to display items linked to the theme of the concert, to showcase smaller ensembles, to introduce listeners to the instruments of the orchestra or give audience members a trial of instruments.

**The layout of the Concert Hall**

The RCO arts organisers explained that the layout of the concert hall is important not only for the orchestra, but also for the audience and how they are able to engage with the listening. Likewise, the audience members explained how being able to see improved their listening experience and that being close to the orchestra enhanced their engagement.

**Listening for Specific Instruments/ Learning about Timbres of Instruments**

“Just understanding the orchestra, understanding the sounds. To listen not only for the musicality but what else the music brings” (focus group, “Rachel”)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by…</th>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anniversary Concert</td>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Audience focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springtime Winds and Strings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Celebrates</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

See Abercrombie and Longhurst (1998); Dewey (1963); London et al. (2011); Odendaal et al. (2013)

Connected to engaging the audience, learning conversations, hospitality, creating the social atmosphere

Links to: Dobson and Sloboda (2014); Kindelan (2010); Knutson (2002); Lave and Wenger (1991); Leinhardt et al. (2002); Leinhardt and Knutson (2004)


The area of drama theatre semiotics may be a particularly useful framework for theorising this space.

Links to: Back (2007); Burton-Hill (2018a); Dura (2002); Regelski (2006)
### Preparing for a Concert

“I was prepared to go to the concert, I was prepared to listen differently and knowing what he was doing.” (focus group, “Raelene”)

“I look at the program notes and read the program before listening to the ensemble or the piece” (focus group, “Randy”)

Audience members prepare (or don’t prepare) for concerts in many different ways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy observed at…</td>
<td>Anniversary Concert</td>
<td>Springtime Winds and Strings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all audience members explained a need to prepare for concerts. The reason for this is uncertain but it seemed to have something to do with their preferred ways of listening.

### Listening with Eyes, Ears and Heart

“We hear with our eyes with our heart, your eyes, you know that it’s like that Chinese character.” (focus group, “Raine”)

Listening is a multi-sensory, multi-dimensional and differentiated experience. Thus learning must not only value the cognisant factors, but also emotional, embodied, social and communal elements of the experience. Links to: E. F. Clarke (2005); Dewey (1963, 1980); Edwin Gordon (1971); Hutchinson (2009)

### Making All Parts Audible

RCO not only utilises the physical space of the concert hall acoustics but also electric amplification. Particularly this is important to balance the sound of the orchestra given the large woodwind and brass sections RCO has.

Having all parts audible is important for listening and quality of listening experience. However, it is also important in terms of the physical layout of the space (link).

### Metacognition in Listening

Helping the audience to think about their listening and understanding so that it brings further insight, learning and rigour to the experience.

Links to: the psychology of listening (see Dibben, 2012; Sloboda, 1985); cognitive pedagogies of listening (see Trehub et al., 1997; Umemoto, 1997)
### Open Rehearsals

Times when the orchestra allows an audience to observe rehearsals so that they might get a better insight into the music and the orchestra.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by...</th>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Audience focus group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Particularly for this community, there are interpersonal relationships between family and close friends which bring people in close contact with the orchestra.

### Opportunities to Mingle

“We don’t have a green room for our musicians, we’re not kept separate from them we’re not. There’s no hierarchy and I suppose that would make it more accessible. More human”

(interview, “Rosabelle”)

The RCO designs their concerts and programs with time to talk with the audience and connect with the community explicitly in mind. Be it before the concert, during interval or intentionally choosing to leave packing up for a half hour after the concert. Often these opportunities to mingle involve the orchestra members with their instruments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by...</th>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Audience focus group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beyond facilitating opportunities for social learning, these times to mix with the audience also break down barriers between musician and listener, audience and orchestral music. Learning conversations is a helpful framework to consider how this time is pedagogically useful.

Links to listening and learning as social; feeling included; engaging the listener

See Abercrombie and Longhurst (1998); Dewey (1963); London et al. (2011); Odendaal et al. (2013)

### Finding Patterns in the Music

Helping listeners to recognise the patterns in music (be it structural, melodic, harmonic, rhythmic) gives a way into understanding the music and making meaning from the listening experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by...</th>
<th>Pedagogy observed at...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts organiser interviewees</td>
<td>Audience focus group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a cognitive approach to music listening and education.

Links to: Diaz (2013); Gold et al. (2013); E. Gordon (1980)
Pedagogies for Helping Audiences to ‘Know the Rules’

“Each piece is different, has different requirements from the audience. I suppose that the rules for listening to those different styles of music is actually quite discreet and quite different.” (interview, “Rosario”)

The RCO takes several different approaches to helping audiences to understand the specific listening context of different genres they play. Sometimes they establish the expectation through the formality of the event, or other times it is made explicit through the program or announcements by the MC.

Links to: G. Crawford et al. (2014b); Small (1996); Wagener (2012)

Portable and Flexible Ensembles

“For us it has to be portable. The orchestra it’s quite a challenge to organise a concert but we work with the spaces, we have our trailer that fits all the percussion gear and stands and it’s our job to service the whole [of the area]... we are an orchestra that goes to the people, not one that always asks people to come to us” (interview, “Rosario”)

The RCO is an orchestra that plays at many different venues during their concert season. They are committed to serving their region and giving everyone access to concerts.

There are studies which link the benefits of regional arts and community development with wellbeing, lifelong learning and community sustainability which are mirrored in this data from RCO.

Links to: Kay (2000); McHenry (2009); Radbourne (2003); Terracini (2007)

RCO is involved in visiting towns across their region locally, but also touring and partnering with other music groups in even more remote communities.

Program Notes

Information written in a small handout given to the audience members. Usually at RCO program notes will include the title and composers/arrangers of the pieces being played, acknowledge anyone who may have donated the score and local businesses who support the orchestra through sponsorship.

Some focus group members explained that the program notes are helpful to them and that they read this information very closely. While others explained that they rarely examine the program notes except to see ‘what’s next’. In the case of RCO where programs are more of a list of information, the MC often gives further information to guide the listening.
Recognising Different Ways of Listening to Different Genres of Music
RCO concerts feature a broad collection of music styles and genres from classical, to jazz and to movie/musical themes.

The focus group participants identified that the way they listen to different pieces in the program changed according to the style of music being played. Some found jazz more difficult to listen to and understand, while others found the rhythms and catchy tunes to help them make sense of the music.

There is a concrete need in pedagogies of listening to acknowledge the differentiated nature of listening and knowing and ensure that pedagogies cater as much as possible to this diversity, rather than replicating ‘valuable’ ways of knowing.

Refocussing the Audience
The RCO is aware that listening is a concentrated activity and specifically designs programs with breaks, tension relievers and direction which help the audience refocus to listen again.

Explanations by the arts organisers noted that the interval or a change in the style of repertoire can be a helpful tension breaker/reliever after large works such as full symphonies.

At other times I observed that they used the MC to direct the audience’s attention to the next work and to focus their collective attention.

Repertoire Choice
“If you want the audience to listen to something you’ve got to pick something where they’re going to hear it” (interview, “Ronnie”)

“We play a lot of medleys; they seem to be good for giving people a little bit of everything” (interview, “Ronnie”)

The selection of repertoire and balancing the program is an important part of RCO’s pedagogic practice.

Setting Expectations
Pedagogy Identified by…

The committee members explained that there is a fine balance to strike between what the orchestra will find challenging, what the audience will enjoy, and what they can do as an art organisation to expose people to new music.

They also noted that familiarity is an important part of programming.

Links to work on audience development and programming see Lin (2008); R. Rogers (1998); Wainwright (2014)
“It’s about setting expectations as well as setting up an informal environment. It helps the audience to also know what’s going to happen rather than just letting the orchestra know. This is part of helping educate an audience as to what the expectations are of them for an evening as well.” (interview, “Rosabelle”)

The RCO works hard to make sure that many of the implicit rituals and etiquettes associated with the concert hall are not secrets to the audience.

There is a careful balance between the idea of helping the audience and ‘telling’ the audience. This requires special consideration of what is considered as education and teaching which needs further examination. The arts organisers members also explained that their ‘regular audience’ is also helpful in coaching the audience and making leading by behaviour example. Linked to other pedagogies: Pedagogies for helping the audience to ‘know the rules’; human connection; tacit vs. explicit; social learning.

See H. S. Becker (1984); Burland and Pitts (2012); Davidson (1997); Dewey (1963); Small (1998); Tobais (2003); Wagener (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anniversary Concert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springtime Winds and Strings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Celebrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sharing Passion**

“We are we’re happy to share our instruments with audiences and let them have a play. Even if it’s not a kids concert it might just be well you’re here and you’re really interested and that’s exciting and I want to share my passion with you. I don’t know if that’s a tool for teaching, but I think it helps” (interview, “Rosabelle”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anniversary Concert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springtime Winds and Strings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Celebrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Showing Instruments**

The RCO regularly uses interval and before the concert to allow listeners to have a closer look at the instruments. At children’s concerts they also set up instruments which are ok for children to have a play with.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anniversary Concert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springtime Winds and Strings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Celebrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Speaking to the Audience**

This work is not an overly formal event but rather a naturally occurring space as the musicians warm up outside the venue as the audience arrives. Linked to other pedagogies including – sharing my passion; learning conversations; engaging the audience; listening for instruments/learning about instrument sounds; interval; social learning.

The arts organisers members explained how similar experiences were important in their own musical development and learning.
RCO performs concerts both with and without an MC. There is a careful balance between instruction and music, the formality of the concert hall and adapting to the audience’s needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy observed at…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anniversary Concert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springtime Winds and Strings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Celebrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the audience members and the arts organisers spoke about how important the MC is in helping the audience to understand, but also not being prescriptive or teacher-authoritative over the audience.

Connected to other pedagogies – program notes, informal environment, social engagement.

Links to: Craven (2019); Deane (2013); McParland (2009); Rissmann (n.d.)

### Teaching and Learning Conversations

“you’d never have that if you went to [a professional concert hall]” (interview, “Rosabelle”)

Informal interpersonal conversations where learning is enabled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anniversary Concert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springtime Winds and Strings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Celebrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to: Showing instruments, sharing passion, opportunities to mingle, interval, social learning, children’s concerts, combining traditional and informal concert elements.

Teaching and learning conversations happen both between musician and listener, and between audience members. This close, personal learning appears to have a significant impact particularly for people related to the musicians of the orchestra.

Links to: R. Crawford (2017); Leinhardt et al. (2002)

### Theming Concerts

RCO regularly selects themes for their concerts which are not only reinforced in the music selected, but also in decoration, in what the musicians wear, in the food served and printed materials (e.g. tickets, programs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anniversary Concert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springtime Winds and Strings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Celebrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As yet, there is limited research on how theming can help with pedagogies of listening, though there may be some guidance to be taken from literature on programming in audience development.

Link to: A. Brown (2004); Kindelan (2010)

### Visual Elements that Help Focus Listening

“Visual things that help you focus on the start. The conductor raising their hands,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Identified by…</th>
<th>Arts organiser interviewees</th>
<th>Audience focus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RCO uses various visual cues to focus and provide information to the audience including media presentations choreographed to the music, slideshow photographs, and ceremony (e.g. the last post, soldiers in formation). The arts
“the dimming of the concert hall”  
(focus group, “Randy”)

“[we use] visual information during some of our music, which I think is important to direct [the audience’s attention] to what is important – videos, multimedia, ceremonies and the like”  
(interview, “Ronnie”)

Organisers explained that these visual elements are included for the sole purpose of helping the audience to listen for the most important information or to reinforce the theme of concerts. Links to: The layout of the concert hall; theming concerts; engaging the listener. See work by ABC Radio (2015); Craven (2009b, 2019); Melbourne Symphony Orchestra (2015)

Visual and Projected Images

“the media presentations are important. Suddenly you feel more of a connection. You feel like you’re actually listening to what’s happening.”  
(interview, “Ronnie”)

Linked to visual elements that help focus listening.

Watching the Conductor

“I love watching the conductor and learning - watching her signals and trying to work out what she’s saying and counting the beat. Yes, it's just interesting... But unless you learn music or are conducted by a conductor there's nowhere that teaches you [what it means] It's all about the playing and the performing isn't it? It's not about an audience really.”  
(interview, “Ronnie”)

Both the audience and the arts organisers spoke about how watching the conductor is part of their listening and understanding in the concert hall. They explained how they take behavioural cues from the conductor, know what is happening and to understand the music performance. Link to: Burland and Pitts (2014); Jola, Ehrenberg, and Reynolds (2012); Royal Scottish National Orchestra ; RTÉ National Symphony Orchestra (2010)

Meta-Analysis:

- Total number of pedagogies identified in MCO data ................................................................. 45
- Pedagogies identified by committee members only ................................................................. 3
- Pedagogies identified by audience members only ................................................................. 4
- Pedagogies identified by both audience focus groups and arts organisers ............................. 38
- Categorisation of pedagogies of listening reported in data according to recorded experience
  *note some pedagogies fit into more than one category
  - Cognitive .................................................................................................................. 11
  - Affective ..................................................................................................................... 7
  - Embodied ................................................................................................................... 19
  - Orchestra directed ..................................................................................................... 25
  - Individually implemented ......................................................................................... 13
    - Within these categories, some research participants reported that these pedagogies of listening directly related to their…
      - Enjoyment of listening ......................................................................................... 5
      - Appreciation of the music ................................................................................... 4
      - Learning the etiquette of listening/being an audience member .............................. 11
      - Improved their attention to the listening .............................................................. 19
APPENDIX L- Pedagogies of Listening Observed at the Three Orchestras

Organised according to the qualities in pedagogies of listening presented in chapter 7
- social-relational

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy of Listening</th>
<th>MCO</th>
<th>PSO</th>
<th>RCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presenter/animateur speaking during concerts</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: avoiding jargon, using humour</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The social space of the concert hall</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: not having a green room</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience participation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: engaging the listener, interacting with the audience</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auslan/Using sign language</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching the conductor</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: conducting the audience</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicians showing expression while performing</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling welcome and comfortable</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including:</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalisation in classical music</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: player profiles published in programs</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling included and viewing listening as participatory</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting a musician/interviewing musicians</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: opportunities to mingle with the audience, showing instruments</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modelling listening strategies</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning conversations</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: peer to peer teaching and learning, sharing passion for orchestral music</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance replicating historical contexts</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre and post-concert talks</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making concert hall rituals explicit</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: teaching audience etiquette, helping the audience to ‘know the rules’</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a personal connection with a player</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality and learning conversations</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- physical space and visual technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy of Listening</th>
<th>MCO</th>
<th>PSO</th>
<th>RCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial considerations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to see the whole orchestra</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: being able to anticipate the music and highlighting aspects of the orchestra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout and set up of the concert hall</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: distractions in the concert hall space, music stand height, theming concerts, visual and physical displays</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimming the lights</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching interactions</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: interacting with the audience at interval, watching the conductor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity of the audience to the orchestra</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: venue as pedagogical, not having a green room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theming</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: uniforms, visual displays, decorations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auslan/Using sign language</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: gesture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature lighting</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: dimming the lights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing the musician enjoy themselves</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: musicians showing expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual pedagogies – images and projections</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: providing online concerts and recordings, videos introducing the music, digital program notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching interactions</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: watching the conductor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual of the venue as pedagogical</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: player profiles published in the program, accessing program prior to concert, revisiting the concert using the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- thinking, feeling and embodied knowing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy of Listening</th>
<th>Observed at…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking into knowing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiences independently researching and revisiting music after concerts</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: accessing recordings, programs, listener preparation for concerts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program writing; avoiding jargon</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging listening boundaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: Demystifying classical music, making links to popular music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing about…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: composers, musical structures, social-historical context, technical terminology, learning about instruments</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to what is important/Directing the listener’s attention</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling into Knowing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing the musicians enjoy themselves during performance/watching interactions</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling welcome and comfortable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience participation during the concert</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of unity with the music and other listeners</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling a part of something bigger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalisation pedagogies (empathy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: openly admitting mistakes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: feeling included, conducting the audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating an emotional connection to the music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional responses to listening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: closing eyes to listen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching listening as embodied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: listening with heart, eyes and ears; sharing passion for music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritual and etiquettes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: comfort- helping the audience to know the rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>