

REFLECTIONS ON DIDACTICAL THINKING IN MUSIC EDUCATION: INSIGHTS THROUGH THE COMPARISON OF TWO GERMAN DIDACTICAL CONCEPTS

Joana **GROW**

Hochschule für Musik Theater und Medien Hannover (hmtmh)

Maria Goeppert Mayer Junior Professor and since 2022 Professor for Music Education at the Hannover University of Music Drama and Media. Her research interests include composition pedagogy, gender, language and music and teacher professionalization.

Andreas **LEHMANN-WERMSE**

Hochschule für Musik Theater und Medien Hannover (hmtmh)

Associate Professor at Bremen University and since 2015 Director of the Institute of Music Education Research (ifmpf) at the Hannover University of Music Drama and Media. His research interests include music teaching in class and social justice in music education.

Abstract

The term “Didaktik” is very typical for German music education scholars. Nevertheless, different meanings of the concept “Didaktik” can be found in music education research. It can mean the “analysis of lessons” and be based on theories from Educational Psychology or it also can mean “theory and praxis of teaching and learning”. Since teaching exists in other countries without referring to this construct, we ask, “Why is Didaktik helpful?” We will discuss this topic by looking at two of the most prominent concepts of “Didaktik” currently being advocated in the domain of music education in Germany. We will present two fictitious music lessons that follow these didactic concepts in an idealised form. One lesson is based on the concept of “Produktionsdidaktik” which aims at musical aesthetic experiences (Rolle 1999; Wallbaum 2009, 2000). The other lesson follows the concept called “Aufbauender Musikunterricht” (AMU), which focuses especially on verifiable competence development. Both lessons have the same topic. The differences between the two lessons in terms of musical approaches, methodology or the role of the teacher are discussed. They make the effects of didactical thinking visible.

Keywords: concepts in music education; music education philosophy, didactics, methods.

Résumé

L'idée de «didactique» est très typique des professeurs de musique allemands. Néanmoins, il existe différentes conceptions de la «didactique». Elle peut signifier «l'analyse de l'enseignement» et se fonder sur les théories de la psychologie de l'éducation, mais aussi «la théorie et la pratique de l'enseignement et de l'apprentissage». Comme l'enseignement existe dans d'autres pays sans faire référence à cette construction, nous nous demandons pourquoi la didactique est-elle utile? Nous nous expliquerons en examinant deux des plus importants concepts de «didactique» actuellement préconisés en Allemagne. Nous présenterons deux leçons de musique fictives qui suivent ces concepts didactiques dans leur forme pure. Une leçon est basée sur le concept de «didactique de la production», qui vise les expériences esthétiques de la musique (Rolle 1999; Wallbaum 2009, 2000). L'autre leçon suit le concept d'«enseignement musical progressif», qui vise notamment à développer des compétences vérifiables. Les deux leçons ont le même thème. Les différences entre les deux leçons en termes d'approches musicales, de méthodologie ou de rôle de l'enseignant sont discutées. Ils rendent visibles les effets des conceptions didactiques sous-jacentes.

Mots-clés: concepts en éducation musicale; philosophie de l'éducation musicale; didactiques; méthodes.

Introduction

It seems that the term “Didaktik” is very typical for German music education scholars – so typical that the term (although derived from Greek) has become a foreign word in some parts of international discourse. There have been attempts to explain and relate it to other traditions of thinking about music education (Kertz-Welzel, 2004; Vogt, 2003). However, they were not successful as a way of identifying terms, for instance, in the English-speaking world that would make the German term obsolete. Apparently, the concept of “Didaktik” signifies something that goes beyond what is meant by “philosophy of music education”. Though it may be unclear to many, it is not just a new paradigm. But the confusion surrounding what exactly “Didaktik” in music is, is sparked by the vagueness and ambiguity even in German (Hörmann & Meidel, 2016). For instance, some chairs in German music academies bear the denomination of “Professor für Musikpädagogik” (music pedagogy)¹, others are named “Musikerziehung” (music education), yet others “Musikdidaktik”. One may rightly assume that not all students in music teacher education programmes know by the end of their study what the difference is. Furthermore, things get even more complicated, as there are at least two distinguishable definitions of “Musikdidaktik” even in scholarly literature. Therefore, we will start out with an attempt to describe different notions of “Didaktik”. We will then elaborate on the differences between “Didaktik” and related terms in other countries, before turning to the question: What is the construct good for in music education? If it is possible to teach without any understanding of the term, as is done very well in many countries of the world, why do we need it? We will explain that by referring to two of the most prominent concepts of “Musikdidaktik” currently being advocated in Germany (and in parts: in Austria).

1. Notions of Didaktik in Music

Elaborating on the term, one inevitably looks at Comenius’ *Didactica magna* (Comenius, 1657/1993). This seminal book sets up the goal of teaching everything to everybody and theoretizes why this is desirable. But at the same time, Comenius also documents how this can be done. That is why Schaller sees Comenius in between a “technology of teaching” and a “theory of education” (Schaller 1995, p. 47). Comenius, however, was not a scholar by profession. He was a teacher and principal, a freelance writer and clergyman, as the professionalisation of teachers – let

alone that of music teachers – was still 200 years away². There were no institutions or (literally) places to consider the ways to teach music. And places were not needed as the content, as well as the methods and purposes of music education, were clear and not to be questioned. Only when these became “worthy” of consideration – because results were poor, preconditions changing and new ideals of education emerging – did space for music education emerge. First in publications about singing at school (like early Pfeiffer & Nägeli, 1810/1986), later in the century in teacher training and finally in the 20th century in tertiary education (Lehmann-Wermser, 2016). On an international scale, the process of academization on the institutional side of becoming “scientific” is going on.

Throughout time, with regard to music, there is a broader definition of Didaktik and a much narrower one. The first one endures in the fact that in German outside music (and physical education and religion) the academic discipline is usually coined *Didaktik* (e.g. “Mathematikdidaktik” or “Deutschdidaktik”). It goes back to the definition in ancient Greek as the “knowledge of teaching”. In music education, Werner Jank has picked up this definition in a popular volume that is often read in music education programs. He calls for an “analysis of lessons”³ (Jank 2005, p. 11) as one of three main areas of *Didaktik* and refers to empirical methods. By doing so, *Didaktik* relies on the theories of Educational Psychology. This mirrors a more recent development where Educational Psychology is of major importance, for instance, in the context of large-scale assessments like PISA or, in a different way, HarmoS in Switzerland. Relying on this discipline and thereby accepting the ground-laying paradigms has influenced the academic discipline music education on an international scale greatly, although the Swiss discourse differs somewhat (Huber et al., 2021). *Didaktik* then can be defined narrowly as “theory and praxis of teaching and learning” (Jank, & Meyer 2002, p. 16) or more detailed: “*Didaktik* deals with the question who should learn what, with whom, where and how, by which means, why and to what end” (p. 16).

The narrow definition of *Didaktik* has its roots in the humanities⁴. Here, *Didaktik* is understood as the theory of

1 Huber (Huber et al., 2021) has pointed at the slightly different use of “Musikpädagogik” in Switzerland as “instrumental pedagogy”; we stick here to the German and Austrian understanding of the word.

2 For the history of the profession cf. Tenorth (2010), with respect to music teachers Gruhn (2003).

3 German publications are translated to English by the authors if not indicated differently.

4 The scholars of German pedagogy of the early 20th century defined their discipline oftentimes in contrast to Psychology and its traditions that are rooted in natural sciences. Pedagogy was understood as “Geisteswissenschaftliche Pädagogik” thus demonstrating the connections to humanities.

the content of formation (“Bildung”). Central to this thinking is consideration of which contents might best serve the teaching of the subject. What should the goals to be achieved be that would serve the individual best? How, from the myriad of possible content, can those that are worthwhile for the future be selected? If *Didaktik*, then, is the scholarly consideration of the content, the method of teaching is subordinate. At times, the relationship between these terms is described as opposites: while *Didaktik* asks for the “what?” in teaching, *Methodik* only asks for the “how?” (Lehmann-Wermser, 2016). In this paper, we follow the broader definition that better connects to discourses in other disciplines.

Before we turn to the question of *Didaktik* in everyday classrooms a short comment seems helpful: if there were centuries before Comenius that did not reflect on it, if there are probably millions of teachers in the world who have not even heard the term – how, then, can they teach? Can they teach *successfully*? We have pointed out that there is a scientific perspective that frames the examination of classroom processes by *Didaktik*, but there is also a normative side to it. What should teaching and learning be like? Every teacher has notions of the ideal teaching and learning. They may not be explicit, they may not even be conscious. They may be crude or contradictory, but they shape lessons in teachers’ planning, conducting and evaluating classroom processes. In centuries prior to industrialization, these processes were unquestioned (as they may be in some societies even today). But as soon as teaching needed justification and the granting of qualifications, systematic thinking about teaching was indispensable. If this was and is done systematically (by professionals with the power to influence these processes), we are talking about didactical models or concepts. In this paper, we stick to the term that is used in music education in Germany: didactical concepts “didaktische Konzeptionen” (Lehmann-Wermser, 2016).

Christopher Wallbaum (2010) has shown the power of concepts by documenting three lessons following different concepts. Picking up a research design that was developed some years earlier (Niessen & Lehmann-Wermser, 2006), Wallbaum interviewed teachers about concepts and planned structures prior to a lesson then recorded the lessons on video before conducting post interviews with teachers and students⁵. In comparison it becomes very

clear how different positions in the field of *Didaktik* lead to very different lessons that will probably lead to different forms of outcome.

2. “Didactic Thinking” in Music Lessons

The relevance of “Didaktik” for the music classroom becomes visible in the way teaching is influenced by didactical concepts. In this paper, we want to show how thinking in didactical concepts changes ways of teaching. The higher goal of music education is always considered in the planning and design. In order to get to the bottom of the differences in music didactic thinking of teachers, they could be interviewed with regard to the planning and implementation of a lesson (see also Niessen, 2006), their lesson plans or videographed lessons could be viewed with different didactic glasses (as in Wallbaum, 2010). However, there would probably be no lessons that are planned and taught completely and exclusively according to a didactic concept. Hence, everyday teaching does not call for knowledge and following of elaborated concepts but rather an awareness of what might be coined “didactic thinking”.

Lesson plans designed by representatives of a music didactic concept are difficult to compare due to the different topics of the lessons, even though they do the most justice to the concepts themselves. That’s why we decided to recreate the situation teachers face when planning lessons. The topic is more or less predetermined by the curriculum. According to their didactic beliefs, they plan a unit/lesson for it.

Thus, we trace two fictional lessons, both following different didactical concepts in their pure form. Saying that we are following a didactical concept in its pure form, of course, is an exaggeration. There is no doubt that, if various teachers followed the same didactical concept, they would create different lessons. Nevertheless, we try to show the potential of looking through glasses of “Didaktik”: on all levels of teaching – objectives put forward, methods applied, personal relationships established and assessment.

We choose two important and mutually challenging concepts. One lesson is based on the concept of “Produktionsdidaktik”, which aims at musical aesthetic experiences (Rolle 1999; Wallbaum, 2000, 2009). The other lesson follows the concept called “Aufbauender Musikunterricht”, which focuses especially on verifiable competence development. The concepts are the prominent ones both in scholarly discourse and in teaching practice. Thus, they

⁵ He later extended the project to international music lessons (Wallbaum, 2018). This material is partly online, it can otherwise be purchased and is highly valuable if one wants to understand various national traditions in music teaching and concepts.

document contradicting but relevant approaches. We follow them in designing two fictitious music lessons to see how concepts shape teaching in preparing, conducting and evaluating. In imagining lessons that way, the differences in teachers' "didactical thinking" is visible.

2.1. Didactic Approaches in Current German Discourse

2.1.1. "Aufbauender Musikunterricht"

The concept of the "Aufbauender Musikunterricht" (henceforth abbreviated AMU) was developed by Werner Jank in collaboration with Johannes Bähr, Stefan Gies and Ortwin Nimczik. The starting point of the development is a perceived material overcrowding and arbitrariness and the need for continuity and consistency. The authors identify three main areas of practice:

- development of musical skills (1);
- diverse music making and music-related activities (creating music) (2);
- development of understanding culture(s) (3).

These three fields of practice are combined in «musical lesson plans» and/or "projects".

Based on the concepts of the American music psychologist Edwin E. Gordon, AMU⁶ places learning in music – and not learning about music – at the centre of music education (Graefe-Hessler & Jank, 2015, p. 219). The development of musical skills (1) (metrical, rhythmical, tonal and vocal competence) will be built up step by step (Jank 2010, p. 5). The central activities in AMU are to make music "Musizieren" and to act referring to music "musikbezogenes Handeln" (2). Making music is the basis for a reflective practice of music "verständige Musikpraxis", aesthetic experience and knowledge about music "musikbezogenes Wissen" (p. 5). Promoting the process of cultural exploration (3) is an important goal of the AMU, but it is not chronologically subordinate, although, it always develops in parallel with the examination of the other two fields of practice.

Thus, good lessons that introduce musical forms include making music and singing. Singing is seen as a foundation for the development of musical competence

and is therefore particularly important. Expressing oneself by means of one's own body and, as the most fundamental form of this, by means of one's voice lie at the beginning of the music making process. Only melodies that can be sung will be played on instruments (Graefe-Hessler & Jank, 2019).

Furthermore, the topic of singing leads to further aims like taking care of the voice, increasing singing abilities and singing songs with good intonation (Jank, 2010). To do so, tonal competencies in terms of music audition – i.e., thinking in music – will be trained: nobody can make meaningful music if they do not hear what they are playing or singing inside their heads first (Jank, 2010). After singing, the second aim of the lesson(s) is to play parts of songs on instruments (e.g., Orff-instruments). Playing on instruments is one of the eight dimensions of learning music in the AMU. Several of these dimensions should be touched upon in one lesson (Jank, 2010). Students need to sing a melody before playing it using instruments.

If students sing and play the song, there will be further learning objectives. The historical and cultural background of the song should be understood. By then, the students should be able to recognise the song's form/structure in other songs and also to discover new forms/structures.

2.1.2. Process-production didactics/aesthetical experiences

The process-product didactics according to Wallbaum (2000, 2009) aims to enable students to experience musically-fulfilled practice and thus enabling musical aesthetic experiences (Wallbaum, 2009). This practice is significant as it stimulates learning and educational processes. Thus, students will experience such practices in such a way that they incorporate the aesthetic way of approaching the world into their future way of life (Wallbaum, 2005, 2009).

Which production becomes the subject of music lessons is decided by the concrete situation (Wallbaum, 2009). Necessary musical-technical knowledge and skills are then acquired. Whether a product is perceived as aesthetic, however, is not dependent on certain stylistic means and production techniques. Whether an aesthetic product is successful is decided by the direct environment.

Aesthetic practice requires aesthetic perception. There are three basic forms of aesthetic perception that should be enabled:

6 Kaiser (2016) notes that the term which may be best translated in bottom up music lessons is somewhat misleading as *all* teaching claims to work bottom up to make students reach the objectives. However, the internal structure with consecutive elements distinguishes the concept from other current concepts.

- contemplative perception (1) is based on purely sensual attraction;
- corresponsive perception (2) focuses on expression. It is about the question of how a certain product fits a certain attitude towards life. This perception brings each individual person into play (or repels them);
- imaginative perception (3) is interested in new perspectives. It actively constructs possible meanings and interpretations (Wallbaum, 2009).

The lessons' formal structure of songs theme "forms of songs" seems to be reproducible by listening to several songs. However, it is conceivable that the students do not match the products and, consequently, no aesthetic perception is achieved. Works of art can also remain as documents of aesthetic experiences that people of other times/cultures have had when producing/enjoying them (Wallbaum, 2009). In order to avoid this problem, the students themselves (with the support of the teacher) should create a product that meets their corresponding aesthetic interests (Wallbaum).

The aim of producing an aesthetically attractive product constantly stimulates students to engage in an aesthetic practice throughout the entire production process. This increases the likelihood of a fulfilling aesthetic experience. Since they create the song as a group, there will be the possibility of arguing aesthetically about its nature (Wallbaum, 2001).

For didactical reasons, creating a song is not so much the aim of the lesson as it is about the way to achieve an aesthetic experience. Aims concerning composing can rarely be specified when planning the lesson. It is more about the knowledge the students ask for while composing. Thus, the aims are subject-, not object-orientated. Nevertheless, some parts of the lessons will focus on compo-

sition techniques. Furthermore, the composed song needs to be sung adequately.

Although both concepts acknowledge aesthetical experience as a category of possible aims, only Wallbaum (2001) focuses on it entirely. In his concept, it is more important for students to experience what Wallbaum calls "musically-satisfying practice" ("erfüllte Musikpraxis") than to generate concrete musical learning outcomes. In AMU, this idea is turned around. Musical skills are at the beginning of the learning process, as they appear to be the starting point and prerequisite for being able to have aesthetic experiences in what way or under which circumstances students are able to make aesthetic experience is not mentioned at all.

3. Two Fictitious Lessons

We plan lessons for Year 5. In the field "Form and Structure", the curriculum⁷ requires students to be taught how to understand and describe musical sections, repetitions and variations⁸. For the lesson to be planned, we want students to describe the form of songs (Niedersächsisches Kerncurriculum, 2017). To make the different conceptual ideas visible, we do not limit the lessons description to 45 minutes.

We would like to contrast the two lessons and their connections to the concepts in a table – being fully aware that there is a danger of oversimplifying things and losing important nuances. However, it may help to understand the idea, especially for those who are not familiar with the German discourse.

⁷ In Germany, all federal states have their own curricula. We chose the curriculum of Lower Saxony. The topic discussed, however, can be found in the other curricula, too.

⁸ The Curriculum of Lower Saxony bears itself tracks of didactic concepts although they are not made explicit and somewhat contradictory.

Table 1 Basis properties of two fictitious music lessons

	AMU	Process-Product-Didactics
Year/students	Year 5 (secondary school)	
Topic	Singing "Rock my soul"	Perceiving "Rock my soul" and composing a corresponding song
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn about the structure of the song • Discerning steps on a scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn about the structure of the song • Using the form as a pattern to compose own songs
Evaluation*	Within the German school system, evaluation is not a key concern. There are theoretical considerations responsible for that but also special features of the German school system (Lehmann-Wermser, 2019).	

3.1. Level of Methodology

Both lessons pursue a practical, action-oriented approach to learning about musical forms. We are going one step further in our fictitious music lessons and thinking about the methods used in both lessons. We do so for both concepts, although there are only few concrete formulations of teaching methods in production didactics (Hahn, 2015; Hess, 2015). Like most didactic concepts, this concept too remains deliberately abstract. The concrete creative and reflective implementation of a concept in the planning of lessons requires good knowledge of both students and class (Niessen, 2016). Particularly, in terms of building musical skills, "AMU" has been broken down to the level of textbooks and lesson plans (Jank & Schmidt-Oberländer, 2010).

3.1.1. "Aufbauender Musikunterricht"

The subject of the lesson is the song "Rock my soul in the bosom of Abraham". A specific musical difficulty in bars 1-8 of this song is the fourth. Even though only two fourths actually occur, they are made prominent by the fact that the *c* and the *f* are frequently repeated as the fundamental tone of the tonic and subdominant, respectively. In the publication "Step by Step", which is AMU-based in Grades 5 and 6, fourths are said to be the fourth step when achieving tonal competencies. Thus, this song is a good example of how to combine learning tonal competencies via patterns and then using them in a song. The two practical fields of "AMU" "building musical skills" and "making/creating music" can be combined within this song. Furthermore, the song is a good example of how to include the third field of "unlocking culture". The students can learn about a traditional African American spiritual. They possibly get insights and learn about situations the song is used in and about its musical-cultural context.

Figure 1 *Spiritual: Rock my soul in the bosom of Abraham. Traditional Afro-American Spiritual*



Jank and Schmidt-Oberländer (2010) demand that singing be directly connected to caring for and training the voice. In each lesson to be sung, there needs to be a sequence of three to five minutes for warming up the voice. The voice training shall contain exercises for body activation, relaxation, posture, breathing and feeling of resonance. To motivate the students, these exercises can be integrated into short stories.

Next, tonal competencies will be trained via singing patterns. This lesson will focus on fourths, which are one of the seven elements/modules. Thus, little segments of melodies with *c*, *f*, *g* and *a* taken from the song can be part of pattern training in preparation for learning the entire song at a later point in time.

The musical pattern will be trained in different steps. The teacher uses solmization to address the notes. First, the students listen to the pattern and imitate it. If the students have become sufficiently acquainted with the pattern, they can play it on basic instruments like the xylophone so that the pitch is being visualized.

The students can make use of some of these learned patterns to accompany their own singing. In a second step, students can create new patterns with the given four tones instrumentally and/or vocally. In a third step, students learn to read the pattern they can already sing. Sound always has to be prior to sight (Graefe-Hessler & Jank, 2019). To find the different parts of the song on the staff later, it can be helpful to learn reading/recognising the first bar-pattern of every section of the song. The continuous training of practical music-making skills aims at the acquisition of an inner tonal imagination that provides the basis for musical understanding, i.e., audition (Jank & Schmidt-Oberländer, 2010).

After tonal training, the teacher teaches the students the song. He or she sings parts of the song, which the students then have to repeat. As soon as the students have learned a whole part of the song, the teacher comes back to the pattern they just learned to accompany it. The three different parts of the song will be accompanied using different instruments. The teacher will organise and instruct the students to make music.

Next, the moment has come to speak about the form of the song. The students can be told that songs are always structured in different parts. They will recognise the parts of this song.

Thus, talking about music is placed on a fundament that arises from musical action experience and listening experience (Jank & Schmidt-Oberländer, 2010). After that, they can find the form parts in the staff of the song. Now, the class can run through their song repertoire. They analyse the forms that structure those songs.

3.1.2. Process-production didactics/aesthetical experiences

In production didactics, composing a song is used for teaching students about structures of songs. Thus, in this lesson, students are asked to argue aesthetically about how different parts of a song will be created, referring to their experience and not just to formal or technical properties.

The production of musical products requires musical-technical knowledge and skills. However, a production didactic that aims primarily at enabling aesthetic experiences should not take its starting point in specific production techniques (that affect different parts of a song) but, rather, in the concrete initial situation (Wallbaum, 2009), i.e., the classroom setting. Which instruments are available and can be played by the students? What is the students' motivation for creating the song? Is there a possibility to perform it for others? One famous example by Wallbaum is the so-called "Klassen-Song" – a kind of hymn to their present learning group, a song the students can identify with. To create such a song, the interests of all students involved must be taken into account. Thus, aesthetic perception and communication are repeatedly required.

The task of creating a song helps the students to get into aesthetic perception and communication. First, the students will agree on the musical genre and style for the song. To this end, the teacher will play several songs in different genres and styles. Aesthetic experiences are not style-bound (Wallbaum, 2009).

The decision on genre and style is neither primarily a matter of fulfilling rules nor of stylistic or moral correctness. Instead, it is a matter of contemplative, corresponding and/or imaginative aesthetic attractiveness (Wallbaum, 2009). The students communicate and discuss songs' attraction to them, their personal musical taste and song construction. Reference is always made to the music: the songs listened to and the song to be created remain the subject of discussion. In this discussion, the students are asked to refer to each other. Expressions always experience approval and/or opposition (Rolle & Wallbaum, 2011). Since the

students have to refer to both their own and other students' perceptions and judgements, in the course of this production phase there will always be a new aesthetic realization of the perception by means of many, constantly varied intermediate products (Wallbaum). This training in communication and behaviour in dealing with aesthetic phenomena offers the students best prospects of gaining fulfilled aesthetic perceptions and aesthetic experiences (Wallbaum). As a last step, students choose a genre/style for their "Klassen-Song" that makes it possible for students to have an aesthetical experience. Furthermore, there will be a first discussion about topics of the song. Afterwards, the students are asked to listen to several songs and to subdivide them into parts. The students are asked to think about the effects of the different parts. They discuss ways of composing these effects. Here, too, the students are involved in an 'aesthetic dispute'. Next, students are asked to discuss the different parts of their song. The topics are organised in different parts. The different parts are characterised and the effect each part has will be described. After that, the different parts of the songs can be created by different groups of students.

To create the different parts of the songs, the teacher might offer some chord sequences and rhythmical patterns that are typical for the style chosen. These suggestions are supposed to make it easier for students to get started in their creative activities, but they are by no means binding. The success of an aesthetic product (its aesthetic functioning in terms of perception) does not depend on the use of certain stylistic devices or production techniques (Wallbaum, 2009).

After the groups have started working on the composition a little further, teachers are not to interrupt their flow. While working on their part of the song, students need to communicate about the chord structures to be used, about alternative versions, etc. Thus, there will be lots of possibilities to argue aesthetically. In playing the draft versions, students may join elements of musical aesthetically practices. Verbalising by the teacher often disturbs the concentration on this process (Rolle & Wallbaum, 2011).

When the groups have gathered the initial results, they will present them to their classmates. Again, there is a possibility for aesthetical communication. The students need to decide whether the different parts of the song fit together and whether the effects they wanted to achieve work in combining the parts. Then, they need to agree about which revisions are required.

The concluding presentation once again presents two differently accentuated situations of aesthetic practice: on the one hand, and first of all, the perceptual processes during the presentation or performance, and on the other hand the reactions to the presentation which may open up new perspectives on the product (Wallbaum, 2001).

3.2 Role of the Teacher

With AMU-based teaching, the teacher makes him/herself indispensable. The teacher is the focus of the lesson. He*she decides about the next learning steps, enables (and prevents) learning. He*she is the expert and musical role model when singing or playing instruments. The students need to follow his*her tempo. They are dependent on his*her musical input, differentiation and support. There is no group work or other form of work; the students do not need to work independently.

Teaching on behalf of the production didactics, the role of the teacher changes. He*she sees him*herself as a learning companion. He*She brings in his*her own skills as an expert when needed and desired. His*her own aesthetics must be set aside. The students are asked to work very independently, for example in groups.

Furthermore, it is the teachers' task to assess the function of student statements and, if necessary, to ensure in an appropriate way that communication in the classroom takes the form of aesthetic debate (Rolle & Wallbaum, 2011).

The teacher's resignation puts the classroom in a symmetrical communication situation that facilitates and stimulates aesthetic perception, judgement and argument (Rolle & Wallbaum, 2011).

Conclusion

Designing fictitious music lessons reveals that the aims and methods in teaching are dependent on the didactical concept a teacher may follow. When educating future music teachers, we need to make sure that they do not only get to know the different didactical concepts but that they also learn to think in these concepts. For example, they can plan the "same" lesson based on different concepts. They need to watch music lessons and discuss which concept the teacher might follow. This is not a matter of committing oneself to one or the other concept, or of realizing this in its "pure form". Furthermore, it is not about knowledge of different didactic concepts – even if knowledge is important and influences the teaching process. Own experiences in teaching, in which didactic conceptions function as a means of reflection, also increase the chance that ideas from conceptions will be permanently transferred into the individual concept of teachers since we know that teachers follow their individual concepts on what and how to teach which are rarely influenced by didactical concepts taught at university (Niessen, 2016). Moreover, they are influenced by the concepts we faced when we went to school. Thus, we need to reflect on them, too. Finally, it is about improving didactic thinking and teaching.

References

- Comenius, J. A. (1993). *Grosse Didaktik* (8th ed.). Klett-Cotta. (Original work published 1657)
- Graefe-Hessler, D., & Jank, W. (2015). Primacanta – Ein Erfahrungsbericht nach fünf Projektjahren. In S. Schmid (Ed.), *Musikunterricht(en) im 21. Jahrhundert. Begegnungen – Einblicke – Visionen* (pp. 219–225). Wissner.
- Graefe-Hessler, D., Jank, W., & Marke, A. (Eds.). (2019). *Primacanta – Jedem Kind seine Stimme! Aufbauender Musikunterricht in der Grundschule*. Helbling.
- Gruhn, W. (2003). *Geschichte der Musikerziehung. Eine Kultur – und Sozialgeschichte vom Gesangunterricht der Aufklärungspädagogik zu ästhetisch-kultureller Bildung* (2nd rev. ed.). Wolke.
- Hahn, J. (2015). Produktion eines Klassensongs. Schülerorientierung als Gegenstand und Ziel eines Unterrichtsprojektes. In D. Barth, O. Nimczik, & M. Pabst-Krueger (Eds.), *Horizonte öffnen. Kongressband BMU-Musikunterricht 2* (pp. 154–159). BMU Musikverlag.
- Heß, F. (2015). Muster, Formen und Strukturen. Methoden und Potenziale des Musikerfindens in der Schule. *Musikunterricht aktuell*, 2, 4–9.
- Hörmann, S., & Meidel, E. (2016). Orientierung im Begriffsdschungel: Terminologische und fachstrukturelle Perspektiven zur Profilierung der Musikpädagogik und Musikdidaktik. In B. Clausen, A. Cvetko, S. Hörmann, M. Krause-Benz, & S. Kruse-Weber (Eds.), *Grundlagentexte Wissenschaftlicher Musikpädagogik: Begriffe, Positionen, Perspektiven im systematischen Fokus* (1st ed., pp. 11–68). Waxmann.
- Huber, J., Camp, M.-A., Blanchard, O., Chatelain, S., Joliat, F., Steiner, R., & Zurmühle, J. (Eds.). (2021). *Kulturen der Schulmusik in der Schweiz. Les cultures de l'enseignement musical à l'école en Suisse*. Chronos.
- Jank, W. (Ed.). (2005). *Musikdidaktik. Praxishandbuch für die Sekundarstufe I und II*. Cornelsen Scriptor.
- Jank, W., & Meyer, H. (2002). *Didaktische Modelle*. Cornelsen Scriptor.
- Jank, W., & Schmidt-Oberländer, G. (2010). *Music step by step. Aufbauender Musikunterricht in der Sekundarstufe I. Lehrerhandbuch*. Helbling.
- Kaiser, H. J. (2016). Aufbauender Musikunterricht. In A. Lehmann-Wermser (Ed.), *Musikdidaktische Konzeptionen. Ein Studienbuch* (pp. 65–82). Wissner.
- Kertz-Welzel, A. (2004). Didaktik of Music: A German concept and its comparison to American music pedagogy. *International Journal of Music Education*, 22(3), 277–286.
- Lehmann-Wermser, A. (2016). Rahmung. In A. Lehmann-Wermser (Ed.), *Musikdidaktische Konzeptionen. Ein Studienbuch* (pp. 13–29). Wissner.
- Lehmann-Wermser, A. (2019). Assessment in German music education. In T. Brophy (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of assessment policy and practice in music education* (pp. 233–251). Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190248093.001.0001>
- Lehmann-Wermser, A. (Ed.). (2016). *Musikdidaktische Konzeptionen. Ein Studienbuch*. Augsburg: Wißner.
- Lehmann-Wermser, & A. Niessen, A. (2004). Die Gegenüberstellung von Theorie und Praxis als irreführende Perspektive in der (Musik-) pädagogik. In H. J. Kaiser (Ed.), *Musikpädagogische Forschung in Deutschland. Dimensionen und Strategien* (pp. 131–162). Die Blaue Eule.
- Niedersächsisches Kultusministerium (2017). *Kerncurriculum für das Gymnasium. Schuljahrgänge 5–10*. Hannover.
- Niessen, A. (2006). Zum Verhältnis von Individualkonzeptionen und (musik-) didaktischen Konzeptionen. In Andreas Lehmann-Wermser (Ed.), *Musikdidaktische Konzeptionen. Ein Studienbuch* (pp. 145–156). BoD.
- Niessen, A., & Lehmann-Wermser, A. (2006). Musikunterricht im Spiegel mehrperspektivischer Sinnzuschreibungen. In N. Knolle (Ed.), *Lehr- und Lernforschung in der Musikpädagogik* (pp. 239–252). Die Blaue Eule.

Pfeiffer, M. T., & Nägeli, H. G. (1986). *Gesangsbildungslehre nach Pestalozzischen Grundsätzen*. Frankfurt (Zürich). (Original work published 1810)

Rolle, C. (1999). *Musikalisch-ästhetische Bildung. Über die Bedeutung ästhetischer Erfahrung für musikalische Bildungsprozesse*. Bosse.

Rolle, C., & Wallbaum, C. (2011). Ästhetischer Streit im Musikunterricht. Didaktische und methodische Überlegungen zu Unterrichtsgesprächen über Musik. In J. Kirschenmann, C. Richter, & K. H. Spinner (Eds.), *Reden über Kunst. Fachdidaktisches Forschungssymposium in Literatur, Kunst und Musik* (pp. 507–535). Kopaed.

Schaller, K. (1995). Die Didaktik des Johann Amos Comenius zwischen Unterrichtstechnologie und Bildungstheorie. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, 33, 47–60.

Tenorth, H.-E. (2010). *Geschichte der Erziehung. Einführung in die Grundzüge ihrer neuzeitlichen Entwicklung* (5th ed.). Juventa Verlag.

Vogt, J. (2003). Philosophy – Music Education – Curriculum. Some casual remarks on some basic concepts. In T. A. Regelski, W. Bowman, & D. A. Coan (Eds.), *Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education*. 2(1), 1–25.

Wallbaum, C. (2001). Zur Funktion ästhetischer Produkte bei der produktionsdidaktischen Gestaltung musikalischer Erfahrungssituationen In M. von Schoenebeck (Ed.), *Vom Umgang des Faches Musikpädagogik mit seiner Geschichte*. Arbeitskreis musikpädagogische Forschung (pp. 245–260). Die Blaue Eule.

Wallbaum, C. (2005). Relationale Schulmusik – Eine eigene musikalische Praxis und Kunst. *Diskussion Musikpädagogik*, 26, 4–17.

Wallbaum, C. (2009). *Produktionsdidaktik im Musikunterricht. Perspektiven zur Gestaltung ästhetischer Erfahrungssituationen*. Qucosa.

Wallbaum, C. (Ed.). (2010). *Perspektiven der Musikdidaktik. Drei Schulstunden im Licht der Theorien*. Georg Olms Verlag.

Wallbaum, C. (Ed.). (2018). *Comparing international music lessons on video*. Georg Olms Verlag.
<https://doi.org/10.7203/LEEME.42.13698>