

## MUSICAL ENGAGEMENT IN ONE-TO-ONE CONTEXTS

*Helena Gaunt, Guadalupe López-Íñiguez<sup>1</sup> and Andrea Creech*

**Citation:**

Gaunt, H., López-Íñiguez, G., & Creech, A. (2021). Musical engagement in one-to-one contexts. In A. Creech, D. Hodges & S. Hallam (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of music psychology in education and the community* (pp. 335–350). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429295362-29>

In musical learning, the concept of apprenticeship is pervasive and has ancient roots (Loges & Lawson, 2012). Indeed, it is inherent across musical cultures and genres, from Western classical music to Indian classical music, from Ghanaian drumming or Indonesian gamelan traditions to jazz (Nettl, 1995; Schippers, 2010). These traditions share characteristics of learning by doing, building expertise on the job and novices learning from working in close proximity to those more experienced, including master players. Musical apprenticeship tends to be scaffolded through stages of development in flexible and holistic ways, in some contexts being more formal and explicit and in others, less formal and more implicit.

One-to-one tuition is a particular focused form of musical apprenticeship. While central to the tradition of Western classical music (Hallam, 1998), it is by no means exclusive to this domain. Through the later 20th century, for example, professional training in jazz has become more formalised and has sometimes adopted one-to-one specialist tuition at its core. Equally, some approaches to popular music tuition have embedded one-to-one interactions, although other approaches have been fundamentally premised on more informal peer learning (e.g., Green, 2002).

Until fairly recently, one-to-one tuition has been relatively little examined in the research literature (Gaunt, 2010). Nevertheless, some of its particular characteristics have been captured iconographically over many centuries, bringing to life some of its notable characteristics. Examples range from vase paintings in ancient Greece depicting a lesson on the double aulos to classic paintings such as Vermeer's *The Music Lesson* from the 17th century. Such iconography clearly points to a detailed and intimate exchange, one that enables deep exploration of embodied skill in the expert–novice interactions. Powerful master–apprentice dynamics are evident, suggesting concentration, imagination and passion involved in music-making and, at times, strong hierarchy that highlights respect afforded to the master's skill and experience and the influence of the master on the pupil. Alongside evidence of great satisfaction and joy, the delicacy and precarity of the interpersonal learning space, underpinned by an inevitable imbalance in expertise and authority, is palpable. These characteristics have

all been researched more thoroughly in the last 20 years (Carey et al., 2013; Creech & Gaunt, 2012; Perkins, 2013).

In spite of one-to-one tuition being pervasive across eras, it has remained very much an informal professional discipline, and it has not been subject to the same kind of professional regulation as other domains within education (Westerlund & Gaunt, in press). Although details of requirements to practice vary across cultural contexts and jurisdictions, specific qualifications are rarely required, and professional frameworks remain relatively informal both in terms of curricula and professional ethical standards. In recent decades, issues of safeguarding young people and a range of other vulnerable groups have taken centre stage. Beyond questions of appropriate pedagogical style, evidence of maltreatment right through to extreme abuse and of manipulation for political ends has come to light (e.g., Baker, 2014; Dudd, 2012; Midgette & McGloe, 2018). More stringent regulation has therefore been put in place, particularly in some publicly funded contexts.

Nevertheless, one-to-one tuition is by no means confined to formal educational settings. It takes place in diverse settings and with diverse groups, from young people to older adults, with those actively pursuing a professional trajectory and equally those solely seeking personal development. Tuition may be situated within individuals' homes as well as in public or private organisations, and increasingly it is taking place remotely through digital platforms. The detailed purpose of lessons can also be widely divergent. Structured assessment frameworks, such as graded exams, provide one clear driver for musical learning, but equally objectives may focus on real-world performances or indeed on nurturing individual discipline, confidence or creativity. Furthermore, just as lesson goals differ, so do learning outcomes (Gaunt & Hallam, 2008).

Given these diverse dimensions of one-to-one tuition, it is perhaps also puzzling that the conduct of one-to-one tuition appears remarkably consistent in some ways. At the most fundamental level, the construction of one-to-one tuition as apprenticeship seems to bring with it a premise that the student performs for the master, who in turn offers critique (Carey & Grant, 2014; Jørgensen, 2000; Schön, 1987). Nevertheless, significant developments in research practice have begun to make important contributions to understanding the complex concept of apprenticeship and its possibilities (Creech, 2012; Gaunt, 2017; López-Íñiguez, 2017).

## **Theoretical framework**

Notwithstanding the ubiquity of the master–apprentice model (e.g., Burwell et al., 2019; Carey et al., 2018; Creech & Gaunt, 2012), in recent years a growing interest in self-directed learning, critical thinking, learner agency and self-regulation, as well as systematic enquiry into how musicians in popular music genres acquire expertise, has led to critical questions relating to how learning is achieved in one-to-one contexts.

For example, the idea of transformative pedagogies (Carey & Grant, 2014; Carey et al., 2018) promotes responsive and differentiated approaches. Within this paradigm, content is clearly contextualised and scaffolded and students construct new understandings, building on prior knowledge. The role of the transformative teacher is to guide and “support students’ personal and professional growth, and to help them develop strong career and life skills” (Carey & Grant, 2016, p. 55). In this vein, learners and teachers have increasingly explored a

continuum of approaches, encompassing hierarchical, facilitative and collaborative pedagogies (Gaunt & Westerlund, 2013).

To explore these differences between directive, teacher-centred approaches and facilitative, learner-centred pedagogies, in this chapter we frame our discussion with a model representing three overarching configurations of teacher, learner and content (Jones, 2005). Finding the ‘teacher-centred’ versus ‘learner-centred’ dichotomy to be too simplistic, Jones developed his model around the idea that teacher, learner and content are aligned in various ways, arguing that the alignment among these three core elements shapes the pedagogical context. Jones identifies “gatekeeper”, “midwife” and “fellow traveller” orientations, each one corresponding with a specific alignment resembling hierarchical, cooperative or more collaborative styles of learning and teaching. Within each of these orientations, two of the three core elements (teacher, learner, content) are closely aligned and the third positioned separately. To understand the three orientations fully requires an analysis of the relationship between the paired elements (i.e., teacher–content; teacher–learner; and learner–content) as well as an exploration of the nature of the space between the paired elements and the third ‘free’ element.

As gatekeeper to knowledge, teacher and content are closely aligned. This top-down, hierarchical approach to learning and teaching has roots in behaviourism; the focus tends to be on the cumulative acquisition of skills and behaviours (Garnett, 2013). With the teacher having responsibility for decisions about what to learn, when to learn it and how to approach the learning – and vested with the authority to admit learners (or alternatively deny entry) to communities of recognised competence – the gatekeeper alignment risks encouraging passive learning focused largely around diagnosis, correction, imitation and repetition. This orientation further reinforces a teacher–learner power relationship in which the value of the content and the value attached to the teacher may become conflated. Jones cautions that it is therefore important that teachers create a space for critical reflection within the space between teacher–content and learner.

Similar to the gatekeeper orientation (Jones, 2005) and inspired by the framework of implicit theories<sup>2</sup> in the psychology of education (e.g., Pozo et al., 2006; Scheuer et al., 2009), Pozo and colleagues (2020) explain that a hierarchical and *externalist* (Pramling, 1983) relationship between music teacher, student and content (including musical instrument) is strongly linked to the way in which we conceptualise teaching and learning. These authors argue that music teachers and students within traditional, master–apprentice settings hold a ‘direct conception’ of teaching and learning that has a strong influence on instructional practices. As these conceptualisations are acquired implicitly, teachers and students have difficulties in changing what they do in lessons, thus perpetuating the centuries-old model of musical knowledge acquisition.

A midwife orientation, in contrast, places the learner and the content in close alignment, with the teacher’s role being to guide the learner–content interactions. The midwife teacher is therefore facilitative, providing ‘scaffolding’ focused around learning outcomes. This orientation can be traced to cognitive theories of learning; learning is defined as the construction of new understandings rather than the transmission and acquisition of behaviours (Garnett, 2013). The focus on scaffolding is reminiscent of instructional scaffolding in music teaching and learning, discussed in Byrne (2005) and based on Vygotsky’s (1978) four stages of modelling, scaffolding, coaching and fading. Advocates of cognitivist pedagogies argue that

learning can be more meaningful and potentially transferable to other contexts when learners connect new understandings with prior knowledge, adding that guided “discovery” is likely to be more relevant and memorable than knowledge gained through transmission-style pedagogies (Yilmaz, 2011).

Jones cautions that the midwife orientation differs from learner-centred pedagogies in some fundamental ways. First, the teacher retains responsibility for identifying what is to be learned and plans the activities that frame that learning. However, this directive function is disguised in a pedagogical approach whereby activities allow the learners to ‘discover’ the material for themselves. In this vein, teachers guide (rather than direct) and scaffold learning in differentiated ways. Therefore, the learning outcomes may be defined in a hierarchical manner, but the learning processes are cooperative and responsive to learner needs. A risk in the midwife orientation is that learners perceive they are being asked to ‘reinvent the wheel’, becoming frustrated when they detect that time could be used more efficiently were the teacher to share information or model behaviours directly. Nevertheless, the midwife orientation can provide the conditions within which learners become actively engaged in the development of expertise and criticality in relation to the material.

Finally, the fellow traveller orientation may be conceptualised as collaborative, as the learner and teacher are closely aligned in egalitarian relationships, together pursuing and constructing new knowledge that may include unintended learning outcomes. As fellow travellers, learners and teachers together engage in critical thinking and exploration of content, each contributing ideas and sharing leadership. Like the midwife orientation, the fellow traveller orientation is concerned with *how* we know more than *what* we know. In this sense, the fellow traveller may be conceptualised as a transformative approach (contrasting with an informational approach – see Chapter 11, this volume), whereby learning involves change that is achieved through reflection, exploration and dialogue (Kegan, 2009). However, while this alignment provides the conditions within which criticality and student-centred learning may flourish, there is nevertheless a risk that learning may become unfocused, core content may be overlooked and the relevance of what is being learned may become obscure.

The three alignments thus have distinctive theoretical roots and consequently frame learning and teaching in different ways. As Jones highlights, these need not be fixed or deterministic; expert pedagogy may involve a fluid interplay between the three broad orientations. Within different contexts, or serving diverse purposes, the three elements (teacher, learner, content) may be variously aligned, while the three orientations (gatekeeper, midwife, fellow traveller) may intersect with task dimensions (e.g., planning and structuring learning) and interpersonal facets (e.g., emotional responses, relationships) of learning in flexible ways.

Pozo and colleagues (2006, 2020) add a ‘constructive’ conception of teaching and learning which could be understood as a higher-order combination of the midwife and fellow traveller orientations (Jones, 2005). Here, learning is constructed collaboratively and could be described as a ‘meeting of minds’ (Olson & Bruner, 1996). Students learn experientially (Pramling, 1996), becoming more autonomous, agentic and self-regulated as they assume control of learning. Beyond answering the *what* and *how* of knowing, constructive teachers and students specifically focus on the *why* and *for what* of knowing.<sup>3</sup> Thus, processes (cognitive, metacognitive, motivational) and conditions of learning (dialogical interactions, pedagogical activities) are aligned with the personal intentions of the student, avoiding unfocused learning.

## Contexts

This section introduces examples of investigations concerned with diverse one-to-one contexts for music learning across the lifespan. Whereas literature is scarce for some of the age groups – particularly concerning the early years, where we have purposely pushed the boundaries to suggest a new perspective on the early foundations of our conceptions of music teaching and learning – the reported research as we reach tertiary education increases exponentially. Most of the literature focuses on Western institutions where classical music repertoires are learned, but contexts with diverse repertoires and practices have also been taken into consideration.

Summarising the studies is no mean task; we do not try to be exhaustive, but rather offer an overview of research concerned with one-to-one learning and teaching that aligns in various degrees with the theoretical models proposed. Looking across the range of available research literature indicates that notwithstanding a persistent gravitation towards particular pedagogical orientations, a plurality of learning views exists among instrumental and vocal teachers (e.g., López-Íñiguez et al., 2014). In this spirit, we recognise that real-life teaching and learning is complex and is not adequately represented by a pedagogical typology, but frameworks such as the ones described here can serve as reflective tools for exploring flexible practices.

### *Early years*

To the best of our knowledge, case studies of newborns, infants, toddlers or small children up to 7 years old involved in one-to-one music instruction are rather scarce. However, we suggest that some examples of early music-making may be interpreted as one-to-one contexts of musical learning and teaching in the earlier years of life.

First, in the field of developmental psychology of music, the sung language between caretaker and baby – infant-directed singing or “motherese” – (Cirelli et al., 2020; Nakata & Trehub, 2011; Trehub & Trainor, 1998) could be considered to some extent as a one-to-one learning activity. In this case, the singing contributes to emotional connection and the musical enculturation of the newborn and, therefore, may be of apparently unintentional educational value. These musical communications are both directive and interactive; while the parent or caregiver may take the role of gatekeeper in initiating singing, choosing songs based on their own experience and so on, both infant and adult may then communicate musically in a fellow traveller fashion that is exploratory and reciprocal. An interpretation of such baby–caretaker interaction within a family or clan as one-to-one music tuition relates to the psychological perspective proposed by Tomasello (2009) that acknowledges human beings as a species in which individuals attempt to educate others.

Continuing with children aged 4–7 years, Sorlí and colleagues (2020) adopted a cognitive perspective in their study of intuitive musicality. The facilitator engaged the children in implicit and spontaneous one-to-one learning activities intended to support metacognition and awareness of the embodied expression of musical concepts (e.g., piano = soft; fast = happy). The children were asked to communicate different emotions to their baby toys through singing. When taking the role of parents of their ‘babies’, the children changed the musical parameters of their spontaneous songs according to the emotion they wanted to express to their toys. Within these role-play musical encounters, the children demonstrated clear pedagogical

intentions and intuitive musicality; for example, selecting specific songs and changing the musical parameters in order to help their baby-toys to sleep, relax, be fearless or be happy.

These results relate to the work of Wellman (1990), who proposes that children aged 3–7 already possess a representational theory of mind and an intention for desired outcomes, expressed as intention or desire to represent a direct copy of the world generally and more specifically the immediate learning contexts in which they interact. Furthermore, it is believed that humans are the only species to have a ‘mentalist’ capacity, as already in the earlier years we continuously assess what others lack, through some sort of pedagogical instinct (Premack & Premack, 1996). In this vein, children’s theory of mind is strongly associated with their conceptions of teaching (Strauss et al., 2002), which tend to be a kind of (naïve) behaviourism as found in the gatekeeper orientation described in the framework. Thus, this example of small children and toy-baby emotional connection through singing represents a case of clear educational intention, a ‘learned behaviour’.

### *Primary school age group*

In their psychological studies on classical music training in Spain, López-Íñiguez and colleagues (2014) examined the conceptions of and instructional practices of string instrument teachers and their influence on musical comprehension of their young students aged 7 and 12 (López-Íñiguez & Pozo, 2014a, 2014b). A clear difference was found between the responses by those students exposed to one-to-one instrumental teachers holding a direct conception of learning (master–apprentice approach) and those holding a constructive conception (dialogic and collaborative interaction). For instance, regardless of the type of instrument, child’s age or years of their teachers’ professional experience, the children studying with direct teachers preferred more content- and teacher-centred approaches to learning, emphasising the importance of rote learning practice and extrinsic motivation by means of external rewards and error avoidance when reproducing musical scores. In contrast, children ascribed to the constructive group favoured reflective, metacognitive and self-regulated practice, artistic agency and autonomy, student-oriented processes and intrinsic motivation. Not only did these students describe the teaching model they were more familiar with, but they also approached the learning of canonic music in completely different ways (reproductive versus expressive and holistic).

The authors set out to describe in depth what a constructive teacher actually does in practice at elementary levels of music instruction. Adopting a validated system for analysing one-to-one instruction in music contexts (e.g., Pozo et al., 2020), they carried out a ‘good’ or ‘better’ practices case study in Finland, focused on the dialogical interaction of a cello teacher identified to hold a constructive conception of learning in relation to her 7-year-old student (López-Íñiguez & Pozo, 2016). The teacher and student consistently focused on the student’s learning processes, fostering conditions that enabled her learning and achieving long-lasting, student-driven, transferable learning outcomes. Their relationship was grounded within a friendly environment with the possibility for digressions and breaks, where errors were used for reflection and musical material was related to the child’s interests. The student was rarely stopped by the teacher when making mistakes, the teacher modelled very little, and they both talked extensively about *what*, *how* and *why* to learn.

Using a similar approach, Méndez and Pozo (2020) carried out a descriptive case study concerned with the composition practices of an 8-year-old female student in home-based individual lessons. They aimed to understand the student's self-regulation strategies, demonstrated in her ways of processing the symbolic material on musical scores when composing in complex and creative ways. The study indicated that complex learning strategies aligned with constructive practices were promoted with a pedagogical approach that began with the expression of the student-composer rather than with traditional music notation. In addition, while working with expressive and holistic aspects of the music, the student became familiar with symbolic and analytical concepts and techniques employed in composing, as a top-down strategy. This differs from more traditional ways of approaching the creation of new works, which start from the notation and do not necessarily include structural, aesthetic or expressive aspects of the music at elementary levels.

In the Swedish context, Rostvall and West (2003) also videorecorded the lessons of 11 wind and guitar teachers and their 21 students. Several of these teachers expressed strong support for the existence of 'talent' among certain students. The teachers studied in this research focused exclusively on their students' learning the symbolic material of the scores, without any reference to, for example, melodic phrasing. There was no presence of dialogical interaction in the lesson studio (described as a "black box", p. 214); rather, the teachers retained control of questioning and assessing and even ridiculed the students if they started talking in the lessons.

Earlier studies have also explored how children learn in one-to-one instrumental or vocal settings. However, these investigations have mainly focused on selected aspects of the lesson structure, such as the proportion of verbal/musical production and type of reinforcement and relevance of corrections (e.g., Costa-Giomi et al., 2005; Duke & Henninger, 1998; Kostka, 1984; Siebenaler, 1997; Speer, 1994), instructional effectiveness (Duke, 1999/2000) and the possible environmental and personal reasons for student dropout (e.g., Pitts et al., 2000). The instructional practices described in these studies could be framed within the gatekeeper model and a direct conception of teaching and learning, as the main features identified were the modelling and verbal preponderance of the teacher, the student seeking the teacher's approval and instructions and the constant diagnoses, corrections and even penalisations of errors issued by teachers.

### *Young people – pre professional training*

Prior to the 2000s, many of the studies concerned with formal pre-professional training dealt with individual components of one-to-one lessons, such as isolated technical aspects of performance or time devoted to playing and talking – thus considerably fragmenting studio teaching into small pieces of a puzzle which is arguably much more complex (e.g., Cowden, 1972; Duke et al., 1997; Gillespie, 1988; Jensen, 1990; Smith, 1987). Whether it responds to the design and methodologies employed, or the particular characteristics of Western instrumental and vocal instruction patterns around that period, the majority of this literature aligns with the gatekeeper orientation.

At the turn of the millennium, studies began to emerge that investigated a wider spectrum of details observed in instrumental learning. For example, McPhee (2011) studied secondary school age students learning brass and strings with their early-career teachers. The research focused particularly on the teaching strategies used when working on musical expression and

how the students responded to and understood them. While the teachers adopted a traditional master–apprentice model, many used scaffolding to help their students understand the expressive qualities of their playing and the learning strategies needed. The authors recommended working creatively and in constructive ways with students in order to support expressive playing prior to higher education. Notwithstanding the authors’ descriptions of these lessons as constructive, the results indicate that they were more closely aligned with the midwife approach, as scaffolding in itself would need other metacognitive (e.g., planning and monitoring appropriate learning strategies) and motivational (e.g., meaningful learning tasks, intrinsic motives, personal interests) processes in order to qualify as the constructive approach identified in the system for analysing one-to-one instruction in music contexts.

The interpersonal context has also been a focus of research concerned with one-to-one instrumental learning. For example, Creech (2009, 2012) explored how learning outcomes, encompassing musical attainment as well as motivation, self-efficacy and love of music, were influenced by interpersonal interactions in one-to-one violin lessons with pupils aged between 8 and 16 years. Learning was conceptualised as an emergent property of the interpersonal dynamic among teachers, pupils and their parents. Creech developed a typology representing teacher–pupil–parent trios that differed according to the ways in which ‘control’ and ‘responsiveness’ were articulated among the three constituents. Overall, the most positive learning outcomes were found among those who were classified as the ‘harmonious trio’, characterised by teachers who offered strong leadership yet were also highly responsive and differentiated in their practice. Furthermore, ‘responsive leadership’ in some cases seemed to influence musical attainment even more than the number of hours of weekly practice (Creech, 2010). Highly directive teachers were found to engage most often in scaffolding, while the most responsive teachers encouraged dialogue with pupils and provided more feedback attributed to specific strategies or efforts. Crucially, some teachers adjusted their interaction style (with potential for positive implications with regard to the learning outcomes) in flexible ways, while others seemed to be more wedded to a ‘one size fits all’ approach.

Studies involving one-to-one learning since 2000 have been advocating for research within more diverse locations. Thus, in addition to formal contexts where musical scores are used extensively, within informal one-to-one contexts without notation, a similar polarity of reproduction or co-construction in the learning modes can be found. For example, Casas-Mas and colleagues studied the cognitive and emotional learning processes as well as the psychological processes and conditions underpinning one-to-one guitar learning in informal Flamenco gypsy communities (Casas-Mas, 2018), non-formal jazz contexts (Casas-Mas, Montero & Pozo, 2015) and formal classical guitar learning settings (Casas-Mas, 2013) in pre-professional stages.

From these diverse groups, in the classical and Flamenco learning cultures, the musical piece – whether written or not – was treated as a fixed learning objective for the learner. Here, Flamenco learners studied from the perspective of gestures communication in one-to-one traditional contexts (‘maestro’ and apprentice). However, in the case of jazzists, the authors identified that the end product of instruction was not necessarily the reproduction of a predefined musical piece, but rather could be more open and creative, with the final result dependent on the performer(s) or improviser(s) (Casas-Mas, Pozo & Scheuer, 2015).



### *Young adults – professional training*

Prior to the 2000s, research concerned with one-to-one contexts for professional music training has encompassed pioneering observational studies in formal and informal (private tuition) Western contexts (e.g., Abeles, 1975; Gipson, 1978; Hepler, 1986; Persson, 1996). Much of the research in formal higher education after that dealt with the practice behaviours of highly experienced tertiary teachers who had limited training in instrumental pedagogy but were excellent performers (e.g., Purser, 2005). Overall, during the last two decades, several of the studies in higher education one-to-one contexts revealed that the dominant pedagogical framework for applied music instruction was the master–apprentice model (Burwell, 2005; Hays et al., 2000; Jørgensen, 2000), the main aspect examined within that model being the training of performance (Carey et al., 2013; Nerland, 2007; Perkins, 2013).

Young and colleagues (2003) researched the teaching and learning characteristics among 10 Australian instrumental teachers and their students, using questionnaires, observations and interviews. This study highlighted the importance of technical mastery of the instrument and the acquisition of mechanical abilities, where the main learning process identified was that of imitating the teachers. Also, in Australia, Zhukov (2006, 2013) pointed towards the predominance within higher music education of intense teacher modelling, general verbal instructions and praise during studio lessons. More recently, Burwell (2020) carried out a single-case qualitative study with a saxophone teacher, which showed the strong presence of authoritative discourses in the one-to-one instrumental music tuition in higher education.

The intensity of one-to-one professional training has been highlighted from numerous perspectives in recent years (Burwell, 2011; Gaunt & Hallam, 2008, 2010; Kennell, 2002). This has particularly served to indicate the importance of ‘fit’ or shared understanding between teacher and student about the purpose of this kind of tuition, the role of specific objectives at different times and according to the individual, and the responsibilities on both sides to facilitate the emergent learning (Carey & Grant, 2016; Collens & Creech, 2013; Gaunt, 2017; Wirtanen & Littleton, 2004). The complexity of the interpersonal space and ways in which learning may be scaffolded effectively through it in different ways have become increasingly evident, and equally the potential for one-to-one tuition to be problematic for both student and teacher has been clarified.

Similarly, tertiary education case studies have investigated psychological violence in one-to-one music settings within the Argentinian context. For instance, Musumeci (2001) interviewed six families, exploring why some siblings within the same family achieved musical excellence while others dropped out or showed a lower level of proficiency. The results indicated that studying a musical instrument could be linked to psychological ‘ill-being’. This was explained by teaching and administrative practices in music conservatoires that support the notion of ‘talent’, leading to pressure from the parents on the siblings who show less proficiency and fostering feelings of hopelessness among those deemed less talented as well as tensions with the siblings considered talented. Students depicted as less talented described their first relationships with music teachers at conservatoires in the early years as a ‘constant crying’ experience. The presence of this type of teaching–learning environment was also observed by the author in the context of solfège (Musumeci, 2005) and instrumental exams in higher music education (Musumeci, 2008), where similar features of power abuse and unethical behaviours were highlighted during interviews by both students and expert musicians. The author, thus,

coined the terms “humanly compatible” and “non-humanly compatible” music education – which can be linked to the traditional and constructive approaches.

Beyond the traditional European model of one-to-one instruction, we find the narrative study by Rakena and colleagues (2015) with indigenous and minority students in New Zealand (Māori and Pasifika) on their experiences of one-to-one studies within conservatoires. This study revealed that diverse issues of power were enacted in the music teaching studio, mostly represented by teachers using complex language that students could not comprehend, teachers undervaluing the minority and indigenous students’ cultural backgrounds and students feeling excluded by the regular codes of participation of others previously involved in such learning culture.

### *Adults – independent adults learning in the community and older adults with more complex needs*

While acknowledging some limited research concerned with professional learners (e.g., Collens, 2015), we focus here on independent adults learning in diverse communities and older adults with more complex needs. For instance, in the context of adult learning in the piano studio, Coutts (2019), a proponent of ‘transformative’ pedagogies, has recently focused on empowering adults towards self-directedness in their learning, adopting a collaborative approach similar to the fellow traveller model. Here, the researcher is aware of the negative emotions that adult learners typically bring to lessons due to a history of being neglected as musically capable learners or due to physical constraints arising because of age-related biological factors. Thus, she prepared an optimal non-judgemental classroom environment that facilitated discussion and collaboration.

In the United Kingdom, Taylor (2010a, 2010b; see also Taylor & Hallam, 2008) investigated the personal growth, musical motivation and identity construction of older amateur students engaged in one-to-one piano education, either attending regular one-to-one music lessons or masterclasses with experts. These situations enhanced a type of democratic learning different from the master–apprentice approach, which had a positive impact on their wellbeing and confidence as well as on their enjoyment with peers in group-setting performances and learning contexts. Similar sorts of outcomes were reported for older amateur piano students in the United States (Jutras, 2006). In addition, Perkins and colleagues (2015) studied the learning acquired by students who were enrolled in higher music education while teaching older people to play musical instruments in a 10-week educational programme, Rhythm for Life. Results indicated not only the development of transformative, pedagogical skills and knowledge of the students in charge of educating others, but also a positive, meaningful learning experience for both younger and older pupils.

To conclude this section, we highlight that the majority of research concerned with older learners has focused on the health and wellbeing benefits (see Chapters 3 and 5) of music participation in groups and that there is a need for research that both acknowledges and explores the pedagogical processes that may underpin lifelong instrumental learning within one-to-one contexts.

## Conclusion

In this chapter, we have illuminated the ways in which one-to-one tuition in music takes place both across the lifespan and within diverse contexts in terms of purpose and stage of musical development. Unifying characteristics appear to be an experienced practitioner working with more of a novice through a detailed and embodied practice, where the novice essentially learns by doing through scaffolded stages and the exchange is intensified by the intimate nature of the interpersonal learning space. These unifying characteristics have most often been conceptualised in terms of apprenticeship.

As a professional practice, one-to-one tuition remains remarkably unsystematised and unregulated. Nevertheless, traditions of apprenticeship, underpinned by largely tacit principles and values, have tended to play a central role in influencing much practice. Looking across a wide range of contexts and example practices in this chapter has served to highlight the importance of critical reflection on apprenticeship and its theoretical foundations in order to respond to the particularities of different contexts and their priorities and to shape teaching interactions effectively. Furthermore, the range of research identified in our analysis suggests that there may be significant potential for dialogue and exchange between different one-to-one situations and that shared understanding may usefully be developed through this in relation to apprenticeship and its potential to be nuanced for contemporary practices.

From this perspective, it has been important to us to push the boundaries about what may be understood as one-to-one tuition in early years work. It is apparent that these early interactions are critical to individual musical and wider development, will often be informed by the adult's experiences of one-to-one tuition and, equally, may impact on later experiences of learning an instrument or singing in one-to-one contexts. Further research is undoubtedly needed in this field, and as research methods expand and deepen for early years research generally, this looks to be increasingly feasible for one-to-one musical interactions.

In terms of developing the field of one-to-one tuition, through both research and the reflective development of practice, we suggest that a framework such as that proposed by Jones offers invaluable structure. Easily accessible and broad in scope, it also problematises some terminology that has frequently been used, such as 'learner-centred teaching' which may be valuable as a loose label but remains largely undefined. Jones' framework opens a space for examining complexities within the teaching interactions, and it promotes a more nuanced and dynamic understanding of alignments between teacher, student and content, and their multiple layers. Furthermore, this is a framework that invites critical questions about purpose, learning outcomes and motivation within one-to-one tuition, adding this into the specifics of what is taught and how in any particular context.

Overall, the growing body of research on one-to-one tuition and its spread across the lifespan and diverse contexts brings to the fore how issues of purpose and values – the *why* and *for what* questions – are as fundamental to the coherence and success of these practices as the detailed materials and processes used at any time. The recognition of this balance between *why*, *what* and *how* may represent something of a shift for some practices of one-to-one tuition. It seems to have potential to assist a movement away from more fixed approaches (perhaps particularly those with an exclusively gatekeeper stance) to more agile approaches with constructivist strategies that seek transformative outcomes according to context and which are, therefore, more likely to develop a fluid mix of Jones' different

alignments, as was developed by Pozo and colleagues (2006, 2020), for example. As a result, further research may usefully extend and deepen understanding of the purpose and value of one-to-one tuition across the lifespan, connecting this to theoretical foundations such as Jones' framework.

In addition, there is limited research concerned with the role of one-to-one tuition within professional musicians' career development post initial training (López-Íñiguez & Bennett, 2020). Anecdotally, it is widely understood that many professional singers continue to engage with one-to-one tuition, whereas instrumentalists are much less likely to do so; the latter are more likely to continue their development informally through peer-to-peer interactions on the job. Much remains to be explored in terms of the relationship between such professional development and professional success, sustainable career development and personal wellbeing. Lastly, it is clear that the extensive presence of one-to-one tuition in music and the growing body of research in this field has insights that may be relevant to other fields, both within education and in other professional learning spheres, such as mentoring and coaching. It will, therefore, be valuable to give further consideration to the ways in which these insights from music education may be communicated more broadly and connected to interdisciplinary research initiatives.

### Reflective questions

1. In what ways may a framework such as Jones' gatekeeper, midwife and fellow traveller orientations be used to stimulate reflection and the development of practice for instrumental/vocal teachers in different settings?
2. In what ways does context influence the articulation of pedagogical purpose and approaches in one-to-one teaching and learning?
3. What specific forms of learning may the one-to-one context particularly (and potentially) enable?

### Notes

[1](#)This work was partly supported by the Academy of Finland under Grant 315378 awarded to the second author, and the Center for Educational Research and Academic Development in the Arts (CERADA) at the University of the Arts Helsinki.

[2](#)These are cognitive beliefs that people hold on *what* learning is, *how* we can learn better, and *why* and *for what* it should happen in certain ways. These beliefs, ideas or conceptions are usually acquired unconsciously, without effort or intention, through our various interactions (and perceptions of regularity) with the social world around us. They are rather complex, embodied and difficult to modify, change or remove, and they guide our actions.

[3](#)The constructive conception approach introduced here is close to the constructivism defended in instructional science. It is positioned within the triple epistemology of knowledge, as it not only answers to the goals, results (*what*) and processes (*how*) of knowing but also looks at the acquisition of knowledge as a search for personal meanings (*why*) as well as at the preservation, promotion and regeneration of artistic knowledge and the creation of artistic experiences, always respecting the tradition of each artistic discipline, but aiming to transcend it (*for what*).

## Suggestions for further reading

- Creech, A., & Gaunt, H. (2012). The changing face of individual instrumental tuition: Value, purpose and potential. In G. McPherson & G. Welch (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of music education* (pp. 694–711). Oxford University Press.
- Polifonia Working Group for Instrumental and Vocal Music Teacher Training. (2010). *Instrumental and vocal teacher education: European Perspectives*. Association Européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen. [www.aec-music.eu/userfiles/File/aec-handbook-instrumental-vocal-teacher-education-european-perspectives-en.pdf](http://www.aec-music.eu/userfiles/File/aec-handbook-instrumental-vocal-teacher-education-european-perspectives-en.pdf)
- Jones, G. (2005). *Gatekeepers, midwives and fellow travellers: The craft and artistry of the adult educator*. Mary Ward Centre.
- López-Íñiguez, G. (2017). *Promoting constructivist instrumental music education as a mechanism for pedagogical equality. Toolkit for instrumental music teachers in Finland* [Green paper]. ArtsEqual Research Initiative, University of the Arts. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.21656.08963>

## References

- Abeles, H. F. (1975). Students perceptions of characteristics of effective applied music instructors. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 23(2), 147–154. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3345287>
- Baker, G. (2014). *El Sistema: Orchestrating Venezuela's youth*. Oxford University Press.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051705006601>
- Burwell, K. (2011). *Studio-based instrumental learning*. Ashgate.
- Burwell, K. (2020). Authoritative discourse in advanced studio lessons. Advance online publication. *Musicae Scientiae*, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1029864919896085>
- Burwell, K., Carey, G., & Bennett, D. (2019). Isolation in studio music teaching: The secret garden. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 18(4), 372–394. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022217736581>
- Byrne, C. (2005). Pedagogical communication in the music classroom. In D. Miell, R. MacDonald, & D. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Musical communication* (pp. 301–319). Oxford University Press.
- Carey, G., Coutts, L., Grant, C., Harrison, S., & Dwyer, R. (2018). Enhancing learning and teaching in the tertiary music studio through reflection and collaboration. *Music Education Research*, 20(4), 399–411. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2017.1409204>
- Carey, G., & Grant, C. (2014, July 15–18). Teachers of instruments or teachers as instruments? From transfer to transformative approaches to one-to-one pedagogy. In G. Carruthers (Ed.), *Relevance and reform in the education of professional musicians, Proceedings of the 20th International Seminar of the ISME Commission on the Education of the Professional Musician* (pp. 42–54). International Society for Music Education.
- Carey, G., & Grant, C. (2016). Enacting transformative pedagogy in the music studio: A case study of responsive, relational teaching. In E. K. M. Chong (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 21st International Seminar of the ISME Commission on the Education of the Professional Musician* (pp. 54–63). International Society for Music Education.

- Carey, G., Grant, C., McWilliam, E., & Taylor, P. (2013). One-to-one pedagogy: Developing a protocol for illuminating the nature of teaching in the conservatoire. *International Journal of Music Education*, 31(2), 148–159. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761413483077>
- Casas-Mas, A. (2013). Culturas de aprendizaje musical: Concepciones, procesos y prácticas en clásico, flamenco y jazz [Doctoral dissertation, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid]. Biblos-e Archivo Repositorio Institucional UAM. <https://repositorio.uam.es/handle/10486/14310>
- Casas-Mas, A. (2018). Developing an approach to the Flamenco learning-teaching culture: An innovative (traditional) learning. In B.-W. Leung (Ed.), *Traditional musics in the modern world: Transmission, evolution, and challenges* (pp. 25–39). Springer.
- Casas-Mas, A., Montero, I., & Pozo, J. I. (2015). Discourse on practice of a semi-professional jazz guitarist: A case study of constructive musical learning. *Journal of the International Association for the Study of Popular Music, IASPM@Journal*, 5(1), 54–80. [https://iaspmjournal.net/index.php/IASPM\\_Journal/article/view/722/pdf\\_20](https://iaspmjournal.net/index.php/IASPM_Journal/article/view/722/pdf_20)
- Casas-Mas, A., Pozo, J. I., & Scheuer, N. (2015). Musical learning and teaching conceptions as sociocultural productions in classical, Flamenco, and jazz cultures. *Journal of CrossCultural Psychology*, 46(9), 1191–1225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022115603124>
- Cirelli, L. K., Jurewicz, Z. B., & Trehub, S. E. (2020). Effects of maternal singing style on mother–infant arousal and behavior. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 32(7), 1213–1220.
- Collens, P. (2015). The relational dimension of one-to-one tuition: Conservatoire vocal studies education [Doctoral dissertation]. University College London Institute of Education. <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10021728>
- Collens, P., & Creech, A. (2013). Intersubjectivity in collaborative learning in one-to-one contexts. In H. Gaunt & H. Westerlund (Eds.), *Collaborative learning in higher music education* (pp. 151–164). Ashgate.
- Costa-Giomi, E., Flowers, P. J., & Sasaki, W. (2005). Piano lessons of beginning students who persist or drop out: Teacher behavior, student behavior, and lesson progress. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 53(3), 234–247. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002242940505300305>
- Coutts, L. (2019). Empowering students to take ownership of their learning: Lessons from one piano teacher’s experiences with transformative pedagogy. *International Journal of Music Education*, 37(3), 493–507. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761418810287>
- Cowden, R. L. (1972). A comparison of first and third position approaches to violin instruction. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 20(4), 505–509. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3343811>
- Creech, A. (2009). Teacher-parent-pupil trios: A typology of interpersonal interaction in the context of learning a musical instrument. *Musicae Scientiae*, 13(2), 163–182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/102986490901300208>
- Creech, A. (2010, August 23–27). *The role of interpersonal interaction in supporting progression in instrumental learning* [Paper presentation]. International Conference on Music Perception and Cognition, Seattle, Washington, WA, United States.
- Creech, A. (2012). Interpersonal behaviour in one-to-one instrumental lessons: An observational analysis. *British Journal of Music Education*, 29(3), 387–407. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026505171200006X>
- Dudt, S. (2012). From Seoul to Bonn: A journey through international and European music education policies. In C. Harrison & S. Hennessy (Eds.), *Listen out: International*

- perspectives on music education* (pp. 126–137).  
 Matlock. [www.emcimc.org/fileadmin/7\\_Cultural\\_Policy/listen\\_out\\_excerpt\\_dudt.pdf](http://www.emcimc.org/fileadmin/7_Cultural_Policy/listen_out_excerpt_dudt.pdf)
- Duke, R. A. (1999/2000). Measure of instructional effectiveness in music research. *Bulletin for the Council of Research in Music Education*, 143, 1–48. [www.jstor.org/stable/40319011](http://www.jstor.org/stable/40319011)
- Duke, R. A., Flowers, P. T., & Wolfe, D. E. (1997). Children who study piano with excellent teachers in the United States. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 132, 51–84. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ592302>
- Duke, R. A., & Henninger, J. C. (1998). Effects of verbal corrections on student attitude and performance. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 46(4), 482–495. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3345345>
- Garnett, J. (2013). Beyond a constructivist curriculum: A critique of competing paradigms in music education. *British Journal of Music Education*, 30(2), 161–175. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051712000575>
- Gaunt, H. (2010). One-to-one tuition in a conservatoire: The perceptions of instrumental and vocal students. *Psychology of Music*, 38(2), 178–208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735609339467>
- Gaunt, H. (2017). Apprenticeship and empowerment: The role of one-to-one lessons. In J. Rink, H. Gaunt, & A. Williamon (Eds.), *Musicians in the making: Pathways to creative performance* (pp. 28–56). Oxford University Press.
- Gaunt, H., & Hallam, S. (2008). Individuality in the learning of musical skills. In S. Hallam, I. Cross, & M. Thaut (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of music psychology* (pp. 274–284). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199298457.013.0026>
- Gaunt, H., & Westerlund, H. (2013). *Collaborative learning in higher music education*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315572642>
- Gillespie, R. (1988). Identification of factors for evaluating upper string instrument spiccato bowing and a comparison of two instructional approaches. *Dialogue in Instrumental Music Education*, 12(1), 21–33. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3345394>
- Gipson, R. C. (1978). *An observational analysis of wind instrument private lessons* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Pennsylvania State University.
- Green, L. (2002). *How popular musicians learn: A way ahead for music education*. Ashgate.
- Hallam, S. (1998). *Instrumental teaching*. Heinemann.
- Hays, T., Minichiello, V., & Wright, P. (2000). Mentorship: The meaning of the relationship for musicians. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 15(3), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X0001500102>
- Hepler, L. E. (1986). *The measurement of teacher/student interaction in private music lessons and its relation to teacher field dependence/field independence* [Doctoral Dissertation]. Case Western Reserve University, ProQuest.
- Jensen, L. L. (1990). A comparison of initial violin bow hold approaches in undergraduate string technique classes, including assessments of the influence of baseline ratings of subjects' finger dexterity and mental image of bow hold. *Dialogue in Instrumental Music Education*, 14(1), 10–30.
- Jones, G. (2005). *Gatekeepers, midwives and fellow travellers: The craft and artistry of the adult educator*. Mary Ward Centre.
- Jørgensen, H. (2000). Student learning in higher instrumental education: Who is responsible? *British Journal of Music Education*, 17(1), 67–77. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051700000164>
- Jutras, P. (2006). The benefits of adult piano study as self-reported by selected adult piano students. *The Journal of Research in Music Education*, 54(2), 97–110.



- Kegan, R. (2009). What “form” transforms? A constructive-developmental approach to transformative learning. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists – in their own words* (pp. 35–52). Routledge.
- Kennell, R. (2002). Systematic research in studio instruction in music. In R. Colwell & D. Richardson (Eds.), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 243–256). Oxford University Press.
- Kostka, M. J. (1984). An investigation of reinforcements, time use, and student attentiveness in piano lessons. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 32(2), 113–122. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3344978>
- Loges, N., & Lawson, C. (2012). The teaching of performance. In C. Lawson & R. Stowell (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of musical performance* (pp. 135–168). Cambridge University Press.
- López-Íñiguez, G. (2017). *Promoting constructivist instrumental music education as a mechanism for pedagogical equality. Toolkit for instrumental music teachers in Finland* [Green paper]. ArtsEqual Research Initiative, University of the Arts. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.21656.08963>
- López-Íñiguez, G., & Bennett, D. (2020). A lifespan perspective on multi-professional musicians: Does music education prepare classical musicians for their careers? *Music Education Research*, 22(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2019.1703925>
- López-Íñiguez, G., & Pozo, J. I. (2014a). Like teacher, like student? Conceptions of children from traditional and constructive teachers regarding the teaching and learning of string instruments. *Cognition and Instruction*, 32(3), 219–252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2014.918132>
- López-Íñiguez, G., & Pozo, J. I. (2014b). The influence of teachers’ conceptions on their students’ learning: Children’s understanding of sheet music. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(2), 311–328. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12026>
- López-Íñiguez, G., & Pozo, J. I. (2016). Analysis of constructive practice in instrumental music education: Case study with an expert cello teacher. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 60, 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.08.002>
- López-Íñiguez, G., Pozo, J. I., & de Dios, M. J. (2014). The older, the wiser? Profiles of string instrument teachers with different experience according to their conceptions of teaching, learning, and evaluation. *Psychology of Music*, 42(2), 157–176. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735612463772>
- McPhee, E. A. (2011). Finding the muse: Teaching musical expression to adolescents in the one-to-one studio environment. *International Journal of Music Education*, 29(4), 333–346. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761411421084>
- Méndez, E., & Pozo, J. I. (2020). Aprender música componiendo: Redescribiendo las metas expresivas al escribirlas [Learning music by composing: Redescribing expressive goals on writing them]. In J. I. Pozo, M. P. Pérez-Echeverría, J. A. Torrado, & G. López-Íñiguez (Eds.), *Aprender y enseñar música: Un enfoque centrado en el alumno* [Teaching and learning music: A student-centred approach] (pp. 273–289). Morata.
- Midgett, A., & McGloe, P. (2018, July 29). Classical music: Harassment on a grand scale #MeToo and classical music. *The Washington Post*, E1.
- Musumeci, O. (2001). Diferentes niveles de logro en hermanos que tocan el mismo instrumento [Different levels of achievement in siblings who play the same instrument]. *Actas de la Primera Reunión Anual de SACCoM*. [www.sacom.org.ar/2001\\_reunion1/actas/Musumeci/Musumeci.htm](http://www.sacom.org.ar/2001_reunion1/actas/Musumeci/Musumeci.htm)
- Musumeci, O. (2005, 22–23 September). Hacia una educación auditiva humanamente compatible. ¿Sufriste mucho con mi dictado? [Towards a humanly compatible



- auditive education. Did you suffer a lot with my dictation?]. In F. Shifres (Ed.), *Actas de las Primeras Jornadas de Educación Auditiva*, Universidad Nacional de La Plata.
- Musumeci, O. (2008). Dos exámenes (uno ficticio), dos entrevistas (una fallida) y varias víctimas: violencia académica en un Conservatorio y la representatividad y legitimidad de la investigación [Two exams (one fictitious), two interviews (one failed) and various victims: Academic violence in a conservatory and the representation and legitimacy of the research]. In M. Espejo (Ed.), *Primer encuentro internacional de investigación en música, memorias* (pp. 138–159). UPTC.
- Nakata, T., & Trehub, S. E. (2011). Expressive timing and dynamics in infant-directed and non-infant-directed singing. *Psychomusicology: Music, mind and brain*, 21(1–2), 45–53.
- Nerland, M. (2007). One-to-one teaching as cultural practice: Two case studies from an academy of music. *Music Education Research*, 9(3), 399–416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14613800701587761>
- Nettl, B. (1995). *Heartlands excursions: Ethnomusicological reflections on schools of music*. University of Illinois Press.
- Olson, D. R., & Bruner, J. S. (1996). Folk psychology and folk pedagogy. In D. R. Olson & N. Torrance (Eds.), *Handbook of education and human development: New models of learning, teaching and schooling* (pp. 9–27). Blackwell.
- Perkins, R. (2013). Hierarchies and learning in the conservatoire: Exploring what students learn through the lens of Bourdieu. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 35(2), 197–212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X13508060>
- Perkins, R., Aufegger, L., & Williamon, A. (2015). Learning through teaching: Exploring what conservatoire students learn from teaching beginner older adults. *International Journal of Music Education*, 33(1), 80–90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761414531544>
- Persson, R. (1996). Brilliant performers as teachers: A case study of commonsense teaching in a conservatory setting. *International Journal of Music Education*, 28(1), 25–36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/025576149602800103>
- Pitts, S., Davidson, J., & McPherson, G. (2000). Models of success and failure in instrumental learning: Case studies of young players in the first 20 months of learning. *Bulletin of the Council of Research in Music Education*, 146, 51–69. [www.jstor.org/stable/40319033?seq=1](http://www.jstor.org/stable/40319033?seq=1)
- Pozo, J. I., Pérez-Echeverría, M. P., Torrado, J. A., & López-Íñiguez, G. (Eds.). (2020). *Aprender y enseñar música: Un enfoque centrado en el alumnado* [Learning and teaching music. A student-centred approach]. Morata.
- Pozo, J. I., Scheuer, N., Pérez Echeverría, M. P., Mateos, M., Martín, E., & de la Cruz, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Nuevas formas de pensar la enseñanza y el aprendizaje: Las concepciones de profesores y alumnos* [New ways of thinking about teaching and learning: The views of teachers and students]. Graó.
- Pramling, I. (1983). *The child's conception of learning*. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Pramling, I. (1996). Understanding and empowering the child as a learner. In D. R. Olson & N. Torrance (Eds.), *The handbook of education and human development* (pp. 565–592). Blackwell.
- Premack, D., & Premack, A. J. (1996). Why animals lack pedagogy and some cultures have more of it than others. In D. R. Olson (Ed.), *The handbook of education and human development: New models of learning, teaching and schooling* (pp. 302–323). Blackwell.

- Purser, D. (2005). Performers as teachers: Exploring the teaching approaches of instrumental teachers in conservatoires. *British Journal of Music Education*, 22(3), 287–298. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051705006546>
- Rakena, T. O., Airini, A., & Brown, D. (2015). Success for all: Eroding the culture of power in the one-to-one teaching and learning context. *International Journal of Music Education*, 34(3), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761415590365>
- Rostvall, A. L., & West, T. (2003). Analysis of interaction and learning in instrumental teaching. *Music Education Research*, 5(3), 213–226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461380032000126319>
- Scheuer, N., de la Cruz, M., Pozo, J. I., Echenique, M., & Márquez, M. S. (2009). Kindergarten and primary school children's implicit theories of learning to write. *Research Papers in Education*, 24(3), 265–285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671520902928903>
- Schippers, H. (2010). *Facing the music: Shaping music education from a global perspective*. Oxford University Press.
- Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. Jossey-Bass.
- Siebenaler, D. J. (1997). Analysis of teacher-student interactions in the piano lessons of adults and children. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45(1), 6–20. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3345462>
- Smith, C. M. (1987). The effect of finger placement markers on the development of intonation accuracy in fourth and fifth-grade beginning string students. *Dialogue in Music Education*, 11(2), 71–77.
- Sorlí, A., Pozo, J. I., & Torrado, J. A. (2020). La iniciación temprana al aprendizaje musical: Los pequeños también son músicos [Early initiation to music learning: Little children are musicians too]. In J. I. Pozo, M. P. Pérez-Echeverría, J. A. Torrado, & G. López-Íñiguez (Eds.), *Aprender y enseñar música: Un enfoque centrado en el alumno* [Teaching and learning music: A student-centred approach] (pp. 205–219). Morata.
- Speer, D. R. (1994). An analysis of sequential patterns of instruction in piano lessons. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 42(1), 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3345333>
- Strauss, S., Ziv, M., & Stein, A. (2002). Teaching as a natural cognition and its relation to preschoolers' developing theory of mind. *Cognitive Development*, 17(3–4), 1473–1487. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2014\(02\)00128-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2014(02)00128-4)
- Taylor, A. (2010a). Older amateur keyboard players learning for self-fulfilment. *Psychology of Music*, 39(3), 345–363. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735610376262>
- Taylor, A. (2010b). Participation in a master class: Experiences of older amateur pianists. *Music Education Research*, 12(2), 187–204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14613801003746576>
- Taylor, A., & Hallam, S. (2008). Understanding what it means for older students to learn basic musical skills on a keyboard instrument. *Music Education Research*, 10(2), 285–306. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14613800802079148>
- Tomasello, M. (2009). *Why we cooperate*. MIT Press.
- Trehub, S. E., & Trainor, L. (1998). Singing to infants: Lullabies and playsongs. In C. Rovee-Collier, L. P. Lipsitt, & H. Hayne (Eds.), *Advances in infancy research* (Vol. 12; pp. 43–77). Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Wellman, H. M. (1990). *The child's theory of mind*. MIT Press.
- Westerlund, H., & Gaunt, H. (in press). Invitation. In H. Westerlund & H. Gaunt (Eds.), *Expanding professionalism in music and higher music education: A changing game*. Routledge.

- Wirtanen, S., & Littleton, K. (2004). Collaboration, conflict and the musical identity work of solo-piano students: The significance of the student-teacher relationship. In D. Miell & K. Littleton (Eds.), *Collaborative creativity: Contemporary perspectives* (pp. 26–39). Free Association Books.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Yilmaz, K. (2011). The cognitive perspective on learning: Its theoretical underpinnings and implications for classroom practices. *Clearing House*, 84(5), 204–212. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2011.568989>
- Young, V., Burwell, K., & Pickup, D. (2003). Areas of study and teaching strategies in instrumental teaching: A case study research project. *Music Education Research*, 5(2), 139–155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461380032000085522>
- Zhukov, K. (2006). Gender issues in instrumental music teaching in Australian conservatoriums. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 26(1), 22–36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X060260010501>
- Zhukov, K. (2013). Interpersonal interactions in instrumental lessons: Teacher/student verbal and non-verbal behaviours. *Psychology of Music*, 41(4), 466–483. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735611430434>