

# **Response guided workshops on musical interpretation: Developing a model for participatory instrumental teaching within higher music education**

**Carl Holmgren**

**Luleå University of Technology, Sweden**

## **Abstract**

Earlier research indicates that the conservatoire tradition still influences higher music education. In the context of Western classical music, it has been criticised for unreflected use of the master–apprentice model, e.g., emphasising imitative aspects of one-to-one tuition, favouring technical over interpretive aspects of musicianship, and lack of systematic development of students’ autonomy.

Research on group learning of Western classical music within higher music education has highlighted that although students say that group lessons are valuable, they often do not realise the inherent learning potential. Also, students need instructions for how to prepare (and actually prepare) to be able to contribute actively during lessons.

Studies of text seminars have shown that student activity, quality of response, ownership of learning, and participation on equal terms can increase through using response models. Although growing attention is given to collaborative learning within higher music education, there is a

need to better understand how learning of musical interpretation could be developed using such models.

This paper aims to study how response guided workshops can be arranged to improve piano students' learning of musical interpretation of Western classical music. During autumn 2019, five workshops were conducted with a group of four piano students from the bachelor programme at one institution within higher music education in Sweden. In the response model used, students, one week before the workshop, scanned their scores, audio recorded their performances, described where they were in their interpretational process, and included questions directing the desired response. All participants shared their written response, and students beforehand selected topics to focus on during the workshop.

The produced empirical material consists of:

- scanned scores, audio recorded performances, and written instructions;
- participants' written responses;
- transcriptions of four workshops;
- reflective one-minute papers written at the end of each workshop; and
- the researcher's field notes and reflections.

The preliminary findings indicate the importance of communicative aspects and how a response model is implemented as challenging and changing established educational traditions are complicated. The students showed a limited capacity for verbalising their thoughts about musical interpretation, selecting topics to focus on during workshops, and tended to focus on details.

During the study, the students' understanding of musical interpretation seemed to increase, and

they stated that such workshops should be included in the curriculum. Consequently, further developing such workshops may contribute to increasing student autonomy and responsibility, equal participation, and multivoicedness.

### **Keywords**

musical interpretation, higher music education, Western classical music, prepared response, workshop, peer learning.

### **Introduction**

Earlier research indicates that the conservatoire tradition has been and remains a strong influence within higher music education (Burwell, 2005, 2006; Davidson & Jordan, 2007; Gaunt, 2008, 2009; Gaunt, Creech, Long, & Hallam, 2012; Gaunt & Westerlund, 2013; Holmgren, 2018, in press; Jørgensen, 2000, 2009; Nielsen, 1999). In the context of Western classical music, this tradition has been criticised for unreflected use of the master–apprentice model, e.g., emphasising imitative aspects of one-to-one tuition (Hultberg, 2010; Gaunt, 2009), and lack of systematic development of students’ autonomy (Holmgren, in press; see also Jørgensen, 2000, 2009; Szczepek Reed, 2017). Also, it has been indicated that teachers commonly relate to their own, rather than the student’s, understanding of a particular piece of music and of how it could or should be interpreted (Hultberg, 2008). Thus, instead of developing an individual understanding of musical interpretation, students seem to be expected and able to copy their teachers’ performances (Burwell, 2005; Kvale & Nielsen, 1999/2000), thus achieving “‘defined’ excellence” rather than “‘expansive’” ditto (Carey et al., 2013, p. 362). Consequently, too little attention appears to be given to the areas of what (performative) musical interpretation is, which

interpretational paradigm the learning is taking place in, freedom of interpretation, and students' explorative approach (Holmgren, in press; see also Burnard, 2013; Haddon & Burnard, 2015, 2017).

## **Background**

Research on group learning of Western classical music has identified two important areas for improvement. First, although students say that group lessons are valuable (Hanken, 2015c; Nielsen, Johansen, & Jørgensen, 2018; Rumiantsev, Maas, & Admiraal, 2017), they do not (always) realise the inherent learning potential (Bjøntegaard, 2015a; Hanken, 2015b). Second, students need instructions for how to prepare (and to actually prepare) (Bjøntegaard, 2015b; Hanken, 2015a) to be able to make active contributions (Hanken, 2015a). Thus, there is a need to better understand how teachers can encourage and aid peer learning within higher music education (Hanken, 2016).

### **Response seminars.**

Text seminars have been studied, and models using prepared text-related response been developed to increase activity, learning, and participation on equal terms (Cronqvist & Maurits, 2016; Dysthe, Hertzberg, & Hoel, 2000/2011; Ferm Thorgersen & Wennergren, 2010; Rikandi, Karlsen, & Westerlund, 2010; Wennergren, 2007). Research has shown that formalised structures for how authors ask for response and how it should be given increase students' ownership of both their texts and the seminars, and that the focus tended to change from the specifics to the (more) general (Ferm Thorgersen & Wennergren, 2010; Wennergren, 2007); the quality of response increased as well as the authors' capacity to autonomously revise their texts

(Cronqvist & Maurits, 2016; Dysthe, Hertzberg, & Hoel, 2000/2011; Wennergren, 2007).

Although growing attention is given to collaborative learning within higher music education (Bjøntegaard, 2015a, 2015b; Blom, this volume; Carey & Coutts, 2019; Ferm Thorgersen, 2014; Gaunt & Treacy, 2020; Gaunt & Westerlund, 2013; Hanken, 2015a, 2016; Johansen & Nielsen, 2019; Rumiantsev, Maas, & Admiraal, 2017; Rumiantsev, Admiraal, & van der Rijst, 2020), there is a need to better understand how learning of musical interpretation could be developed using prepared response models.

### **Requirements for a Bachelor of Fine Arts in Sweden.**

Although no specific criteria for music are given, students shall, for a degree of bachelor of fine arts in Sweden, demonstrate abilities such as critically reflecting on artistic approaches; identifying, formulating, and solving artistic and creative problems; presenting and discussing their artistic issues; making assessments informed by relevant artistic, social, and ethical issues; and identifying their need for further knowledge and taking responsibility for their learning (Swedish Code of Statutes [SFS] 1993:100). Consequently, such education must enable these students to develop adequate strategies and skills to achieve these goals.

### **Aim.**

This paper aims to study how response guided workshops can be arranged to improve piano students' learning of musical interpretation of Western classical music.

### **Method**

Participatory action research is in this paper viewed as a research approach where action and reflection appear in an iterative, cyclical process (Cain, 2008; Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Reason,

2006). Knowledge and learning are viewed from a hermeneutical perspective. Thus, the iterative movement between the parts and the whole, and the dialogical and verbal nature of the fusions of horizons (Gadamer, 1960/2013) has affected the study. Consequently, students' verbalisation is viewed as a tool for learning musical interpretation.

### **Participants.**

Participants were a group of four piano students consisting of the total number of students from the second and third year of the bachelor programme at one institution for higher music education in Sweden, and the researcher, who also led the workshops. The participants gave their informed consent, and ethical aspects were discussed multiple times during the study. As a leader or facilitator of the workshops, my knowledge of musical interpretation—as a pianist, experienced teacher, and analyst—was a prerequisite.

The reasons for not including the students' main instrument teacher in this study were twofold. First, to let the researcher remain in control over the situation, as an inclusion could increase the complexity of the relational dynamics. Second, as the study was based on equal participation, it would require that the teacher subscribed to this philosophy and acted accordingly.

### **Disposition of the workshops and description of the response model.**

The workshops, excluding the first focusing on introducing the study, applied the Piteå model (Ferm Thorgersen & Wennergren, 2010), collaboratively developed for PhD and research seminars, as follows:

1. Each workshop (2 hours long) centred around the work with two students' musical interpretations (approximately 45 minutes each).

2. One week before the workshop, the two students scanned their scores, audio recorded their performances, described where they were in their interpretational process of these works (already part of their coursework), included questions directing the desired response, and sent this to all participants.
3. All participants annotated the scanned scores or wrote a text in a separate document and shared their response at a negotiated time and date.
4. The two students beforehand selected topics to focus on during the workshop.
5. Both the prepared written response and workshops intended to develop the students' understanding of musical interpretation, knowledge about interpretational paradigms, freedom of interpretation, explorative approach (Holmgren, in press), and music-related argumentative competence (Rolle, 2013).
6. After each workshop, the form, content, model, and communicational strategies were evaluated to develop the workshops further.

Through such a structure, the definition of musical interpretation as such, how students' musical interpretation could be developed, and the workshops' dispositions were continuously verbalised and negotiated with the students. Thus, striving to achieve a multivoicedness (Dysthe, 1996), accepting and valuing a diversity of opinions and experiences, ultimately furthering equal participation.

Response thus took place both asynchronously during preparation to the workshops and synchronously during them. In preparation, all participants could listen to and study the material sent out multiple times, allowing time for contemplation and reflection not seldom lacking in traditional forms of instrumental education. Furthermore, through formulating instructions

directing the desired response and beforehand selecting topics to focus on during the workshops, the students were forced to thoroughly reflect on their current level of performance and which aspects they would like to improve. Through such preparation, the synchronous response given during the workshops, e.g., in the form of follow-up questions or comments of a musical performance, were based on a more informed understanding of the student's current and desired musical interpretation.

### **Content of the workshops.**

The aims, activities, and materials used in the workshops, as summarised in the table below, were roughly conceptualised from the start of the study based on earlier studies and my ongoing research. However, due to the study's developmental nature, the specific contents of the workshops were adapted to the students' expressed wishes and my understanding of their needs.

**Table 1.** The workshops' aims, activities, and materials.

<b>WS</b>	<b>Aims, activities, and materials</b>
1	Establishing a "communicative space" (Kemmis, 2001, p. 100), introducing the response model, and practicing giving response; recognising the difference between personal interpretation and how a student's specific musical interpretation could be improved, and highlighting the importance of the response relating to the score (including the student's and teacher's annotations) (see description below)
2	Practice using the response model and introducing the students to take responsibility for the workshop itself
3	Addressing students' tendency to focus on details, losing the overview of the global

perspective, through adapting and using the text triangle to the realm of musical interpretation

- 4 Discussing differences between the interpretation of a text and performative musical interpretation (Carlsen & Holm, 2017; Levinson, 1993), highlighting the importance of both internal (i.e., interpretational vision) and external listening (i.e., hearing both one's own and others' performances)
  - 5 Adapting and using the concept of aesthetical argumentation (Rolle, 2013) to develop giving, categorising, and evaluating response, and further a shared metalanguage for talking about both musical interpretation and response
- 

During the first workshop, the students three times got to listen and give response to an audio-recorded student performance of *Prelude and Fugue in B-flat major*, BWV 866 from *The Well-Tempered Clavier*, Book I by Johann Sebastian Bach: first, without the score and not knowing which piece that would be performed; second, with the score; and third, with the score including annotations from both the student and teacher. The piece was selected due to three criteria. First, the two movements are relatively short, and part of a, for pianists, central baroque work. Second, the score contains no instructions regarding dynamics, articulation, and tempo, thus highlighting the need for the performer's interpretation. Third, I had access to both a score (containing annotations from teacher and student) and a recorded performance by a pre-professional student. This level was considered suitable for practising giving response.

## **Production and analysis of empirical material**

During autumn 2019, in total, five workshops (2 hours each, two or three weeks apart) were conducted.

The produced empirical material consists of:

- students' scanned scores, audio recorded performances, and written instructions;
- participants' written responses;
- transcriptions of the verbal dialogue from the video and audio recordings of four workshops (excluding the introductory);
- reflective one-minute papers written by all participants at the end of each workshop (Angelo & Cross, 1993, p. 148–153; Wilson, 1986);
- the researcher's field notes and reflections.

The preliminary analysis consists of multiple times viewing the recordings and reading the transcriptions and written documentation.

## **Preliminary findings and reflections**

The preliminary findings—primarily based on the researcher's field notes, written reflections, and experiences from the study—are mainly twofold. First, the implementation of response models for instrumental teaching deserves to be investigated more thoroughly, as challenging and changing established educational traditions are difficult. Second, the students showed a limited capacity for both verbalising their thoughts about musical interpretation and selecting topics to focus on, and tended to focus on details.

### **Communicative aspects and implementation of the response model.**

Challenging and changing established educational traditions is central for action research (Reason, 2006). As the organisation of teaching and learning include aspects of power and responsibility (Ferm Thorgersen & Wennergren, 2010), changes might at first create confusion, uncertainty, and make the situation more uncomfortable, when students' and teacher's roles have to change (Gaunt, 2009; Hanken, 2016). These new roles could also expose (new) areas in need of development. In this study, the main issues related to establishing a functioning communication and the implementation of the response model itself. Workshops based on prepared response entail that multiple deadlines are met, both for sending out material and for giving response. Such communication—first, using e-mail and later the university's learning management system—might have significantly differed from the ones the students' were used to in their instrumental tuition. The students' sometimes lacking communication and failure of meeting deadlines could have been interpreted as indicating a less engaged and more sceptical stance towards the study than in the end seemed to be the case.

Lastly, every implementation of a model will be different due to the group's composition and context. Thus, the complex skills that workshop leaders need in handling such settings should not be underestimated. The students expressed that my openness, non-judgmental attitude, and prestigelessness were crucial in establishing a fertile learning environment. For me, it was revealing to consciously alter between the roles of researcher, workshop leader, musician, and teacher, as their interests and rationales differ. Although I strived to have a reflective awareness and carefully monitor my practice, and articulate my choices to the participating students during the study (Kristiansen & Bloch-Poulsen, 2004; Reason, 2006), this could be elaborated in the final report.

### **Students' capacity for verbalisation and selection of topics.**

That the students showed a limited capacity for verbalising their thoughts about musical interpretation is in line with previous research that also has indicated that teachers question how often they explicitly talk about such matters (Holmgren, 2018, in press). Although needing more time for implementation, adapting and using the seven-stage competency model (favouritism, authority, taste relativism, subjectivism, conventionality, aesthetic judgment, and aesthetic discourse) proposed by Rolle (2013 & 2014; Rolle, Knörzer, & Stark, 2015) seemed valuable for strengthening students' music-related argumentative competence. Used as a pedagogical tool, it could potentially help students' develop their giving, categorising, and evaluation of response, and further a shared metalanguage for talking about such aspects.

The students reported that they found it easier to give response than selecting topics to focus on. This could indicate a limited self-awareness, capacity for listening to themselves, and training to autonomously judge response, potentially due to them mainly being used to teachers leading lessons, regardless of format.

That the students tended to focus on details, losing overview of the global perspective (see Hoel, 2000/2001, pp. 29–30), and viewed interpretation as a collection of beautiful passages in contrast to striving for a conception where the parts and the whole interact (Carlsen & Holm, 2017, p. 49) could indicate a cognitive overload (Sweller, 1988). If students lack knowledge of general principles for how interpretations could be formed within a particular interpretative paradigm, the task of viewing the larger picture might be very difficult. After having used an adaptation of the text triangle (Bereiter, 1980; Dysthe, Hertzberg, & Hoel, 2000/2011; Hillocks, 1987), we decided that students' instructions henceforth should include a written description of their

overarching interpretation of the particular piece. Furthermore, the model opened for discussions of interpretational paradigms, freedom of interpretation, and what musical interpretation is or could be (Holmgren, in press), which seemed to be a promising way of addressing a detail-focused approach.

Lastly, during the workshops, the students tended to start from the beginning of their pieces and continue phrase by phrase. This tendency might be understood as analogous to the writing practice of “what happens next” (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1986), i.e., a dialogue where one person’s line determines the other’s answer. Such processes are additive, associative, and unable to handle overarching plans and large-scale rhetorical awareness. Although the resulting constructions have local coherence, they lack global and thematic dittoes (Evensen, 1990; Hoel, 2000/2001). The students may also be influenced by their (earlier) teachers’ practice of (mainly) commenting on details, potentially as a response to direct, specific questions. Teachers’ tendency to focus on details, and not explicitly make students aware of the relationship of the details and the whole, has been stated as problematic (Chronister, 2005, pp. 10–18 & 21–22).

## **Implications**

Although the preliminary findings and reflections articulated above do not draw from the whole empirical material, they should nonetheless both be valuable in the development of further research and the organisation of instrumental teaching in higher music education. During the study, the students’ understanding of musical interpretation and the function of response seemed to increase, and they stated that such workshops should be included in the curriculum. Consequently, further developing such workshops may contribute to increasing student

autonomy and responsibility, equal participation, and multivoicedness, i.e., opening for a diversity of opinions and experiences within instrumental teaching in higher music education.

## References

- Angelo, T. A. & Cross, K. P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bereiter, C. (1980). Development in writing. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing* (pp. 73–93). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bjøntegaard, B. J. (2015a). A combination of one-to-one teaching and small group teaching in higher music education in Norway – A good model for teaching? *British Journal of Music Education*, (1), 23–36.
- Bjøntegaard, B. J. (2015b). *Instrumental group tuition at conservatoire level: A project involving instrumental teachers and students at the Norwegian Academy of music*. Oslo: NMH-publikasjoner.
- Burnard, P. (Ed.) (2013). *Developing creativities in higher music education: International perspectives and practices*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Burwell, K. (2005). A degree of independence: Teachers' approaches to instrumental tuition in a university college. *British Journal of Music Education*, 22(3), 199–215.
- Burwell, K. (2006). On musicians and singers: An investigation of different approaches taken by vocal and instrumental teachers in higher education. *Music Education Research*, 8(3), 331–347.

- Carey, G. M., Bridgstock, R., Taylor, P., McWilliam, E., & Grant, C. (2013). Characterising one-to-one conservatoire teaching: Some implications of a quantitative analysis. *Music Education Research, 15*(3), 357–368.
- Carey, G. & Coutts, L. (2019). Preparing students for effective and autonomous learning through a transformative critical response process. In P. D. Pike (Ed.), *The Musician's Career Lifespan: Proceedings of the 22nd International Seminar of the ISME Commission on the Education of the Professional Musician* (pp. 171–189).
- Carlsen, M. & Holm, H. (2017). *Å tolke musikk [To interpret music]*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Cain, T. (2008). The characteristics of action research in music education. *British Journal of Music Education, 25*(3), 283–313.
- Carr, W. & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research*. London: Falmer Press.
- Chronister, R. (2005). Eight fallacies and eight basic principles of education. In E. Darling (Ed.), *A piano teacher's legacy: Selected writings* (pp. 7–27). Kingston: The Frances Clark Center for Keyboard Pedagogy.
- Cronqvist, M. & Maurits, A. (Eds.) (2016). *Det goda seminariet: Forskarseminariet som lärandemiljö och kollegialt rum* [The useful seminar: The research seminar as a learning environment and collegial room]. Göteborg: Makadam.
- Davidson, J. W. & Jordan, N. (2007). “Private teaching, private learning”: An exploration of music instrument learning in the private studio, junior and senior conservatoires. In L. Bresler (Ed.), *International handbook of research in arts education* (pp. 729–744). Dordrecht: Springer.

- Dysthe, O. (1996). The multivoiced classroom: Interaction of writing and classroom discourse. *Written Communication*, 13(3), 385–425.
- Dysthe, O., Hertzberg, F., & Hoel, T. L. (2011). *Skriva för att lära: Skrivande i högre utbildning* [Writing to learn: Writing within higher education] (2nd ed.). (A. Andersson, Trans.). Lund: Studentlitteratur. (Original work published 2000)
- Evensen, L. S. (1990). *What do the structures mean? Developing argumentative student writing*. Report No. 2 in the publication series from the project SKRIVE-PUFF – The DEVEL Project, UNIT.
- Ferm Thorgersen, C. (2014). Learning among critical friends in the instrumental setting. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 32(2), 60–67.
- Ferm Thorgersen, C. & Wennergren, A.-C. (2010). How to challenge seminar traditions in an academic community. In C. Ferm Thorgersen & S. Karlsen (Eds.), *Music, education and innovation: Festschrift for Sture Brändström* (pp. 145–164). Luleå: Luleå tekniska universitet.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (2013). *Truth and method* (J. Weinsheimer and D. G. Marshall, Trans.). London: Bloomsbury Academic. (Original work published 1960)
- Gaunt, H. (2008). One-to-one tuition in a conservatoire: The perceptions of instrumental and vocal teachers. *Psychology of Music*, 36(2), 215–245.
- Gaunt, H. (2009). One-to-one tuition in a conservatoire: The perceptions of instrumental and vocal students. *Psychology of Music*, 38(2), 178–208.
- Gaunt, H., Creech, A., Long, M., & Hallam, S. (2012). Supporting conservatoire students towards professional integration: One-to-one tuition and the potential of mentoring. *Music Education Research*, 14(1), 25–43.

- Gaunt, H. & Treacy, D. S. (2020). Ensemble practices in the arts: A reflective matrix to enhance team work and collaborative learning in higher education. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 19(4), 419–444.
- Gaunt, H. & Westerlund, H. (2013). Prelude: The case for collaborative learning in higher music education. In H. Gaunt & H. Westerlund (Eds.), *Collaborative learning in higher music education* (pp. 1–9). Farnham: Ashgate.
- Haddon, E. & Burnard, P. (Eds.) (2015). *Activating diverse musical creativities: Teaching and learning in higher music education*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Haddon, E. & Burnard, P. (Eds.) (2017). *Creative teaching for creative learning in higher music education*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hanken, I. M. (Ed.). (2015a). *Learning together: Trialling group tuition as a supplement to one-to-one principal instrument tuition*. Oslo: NMH Publications.
- Hanken, I. M. (2015b). Listening and learning in a master class. *Music Education Research*, 17(4), 453–464.
- Hanken, I. M. (2015c). Summary: What have we learnt? In I. M. Hanken (Ed.), *Learning together: Trialling group tuition as a supplement to one-to-one principal instrument tuition* (pp. 69–74). Oslo: NMH Publications.
- Hanken, I. M. (2016). Peer learning in specialist higher music education. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 15(3–4), 364–375.
- Hillocks, George, Jr. (1987). Synthesis of research on teaching writing. *Educational Leadership*, 44(8), 71–82.

- Hoel, T. L. (2001). *Skriva och samtala: Lärande genom responsgrupper* [Writing and discussing: Learning in response groups] (S. Andersson, Trans.). Lund: Studentlitteratur. (Original work published 2000)
- Holmgren, C. (2018). A philosophic poetic inquiry of three aspects of interpretation within music education research: An autoethnodrama in four acts. *European Journal of Philosophy in Arts Education*, 3(1), 7–86.
- Holmgren, C. (in press). The conditions for learning musical interpretation in one-to-one piano tuition in higher music education. *Nordic Research in Music Education*.
- Hultberg, C. (2008). Instrumental students' strategies for finding interpretations: Complexity and individual variety. *Psychology of Music*, 36(1), 7–23.
- Hultberg, C. K. (2010). *Vem äger lärandet?* [Who owns the learning?] (Report). Retrieved from [https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/22000/1/gupea\\_2077\\_22000\\_1.pdf](https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/22000/1/gupea_2077_22000_1.pdf).
- Johansen, G. G. & Nielsen, S. G. (2019). The practicing workshop: A development project. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1–9.
- Jørgensen, H. (2000). Student learning in higher instrumental education: Who is responsible? *British Journal of Music Education*, 17(1), 67–77.
- Jørgensen, H. (2009). *Research into higher music education: An overview from a quality improvement perspective*. Oslo: Novus Press.
- Kemmis, S. (2001). Exploring the relevance of critical theory for action research: Emancipatory action research in the footsteps of Jürgen Habermas. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 91–102). London: SAGE.

- Kristiansen, M. & Bloch-Poulsen, J. (2004). Self-referentiality as a power mechanism: Towards dialogic action research. *Action Research*, 2(4), 371–388.
- Kvale, S. & Nielsen, K. (2000). Landskap för lärande [Landscape for learning] (B. Nilsson and J. Retzlaff, Trans.). In K. Nielsen and S. Kvale (Eds.), *Mästarlära. Lärande som social praxis* [The master teacher. Learning as social practice] (pp. 235–256). Lund: Studentlitteratur. (Original work published 1999)
- Levinson, J. (1993). Performative vs. critical interpretation in music. In M. Krausz (Ed.), *The interpretation of music: Philosophical essays* (pp. 33–66). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nielsen, K. N. (1999). *Musical apprenticeship: Learning at the academy of music as socially situated* (Doctoral thesis, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark). Risskov: Psykologisk Institut, Aarhus Universitet.
- Nielsen, S. G., Johansen, G. G., & Jørgensen, H. (2018). Peer learning in instrumental practicing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1–8.
- Reason, P. (2006). Choice and quality in action research practice. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 15(2), 187–203.
- Rikandi, I., Karlsen, S., & Westerlund, H. (2010). Bridging practices in Nordic music education doctoral programmes: Theorising and evaluating the Finnish application of the Piteå model. In C. Ferm Thorgersen & S. Karlsen (Eds.), *Music, education and innovation: Festschrift for Sture Brändström* (pp. 165–187). Luleå: Luleå tekniska universitet.
- Rolle, C. (2013). Argumentation skills in the music classroom: A quest for theory. In A. de Vugt & I. Malmberg (Eds.), *European perspectives on music education 2: Artistry* (pp. 137–150). Wien: Helbling.

- Rolle, C. (2014). Ästhetischer Streit als Medium des Musikunterrichts – zur Bedeutung des argumentierenden Sprechens über Musik für ästhetische Bildung. *Art Education Research*, 5(9), 1–8.
- Rolle, C., Knörzer, L., & Stark, R. (2015). Music-related aesthetic argumentation: Confronting a theoretical model with empirical data. *Nordic Research in Music Education, Yearbook*, 16, 315–326.
- Rumiantsev, T., Admiraal, W., & van der Rijst, R. (2020). Conservatoire leaders' observations and perceptions on curriculum reform. *British Journal of Music Education*, 37(1), 29–41.
- Rumiantsev, T. W., Maas, A. & Admiraal, W. (2017). Collaborative learning in two vocal conservatoire courses. *Music Education Research*, 19(4), 371–383.
- Scardamalia, M. & Bereiter, C. (1986). Research on written composition. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 778–803). New York, NY: Macmillan Education.
- SFS [Swedish Code of Statutes] 1993:1003. The higher education ordinance 1993:100. Stockholm: Ministry of Education and Research.
- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285.
- Szczepek Reed, B. (2017). Creating space for learner autonomy: An interactional perspective. *Classroom Discourse*, 8(2), 175–190.
- Wennergren, A.-C. (2007). Seminarier baserade på skriftlig respons [Seminars based on written response]. In S. Matre & T. L. Hoel (Eds.), *Skrive for nåtid og framtid: Skrivning og rettleiing i høgre utdanning* [Writing for the present and future: Writing and guidance in higher education] (Vol. 2, pp. 125–137). Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag.

Wilson, R. C. (1986). Improving faculty teaching: Effective use of student evaluations and consultants. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 57(2), 196–211.