

SOUTHWICK, NATHAN A. D.M.A. An exploration of studio cultures: Perspectives from established teachers of the violin. (2022)  
Directed by Professor Marjorie Bagley and Dr. Rebecca MacLeod. 89 pp.

The purpose of this multi-case qualitative study was to explore how reputable violin professors develop the culture in their violin studios and to describe how those professors manage shared studio time. Data were collected through interviews with six reputable violin professors over Zoom. Data from the interviews were transcribed and then coded for emergent themes. Findings are presented with research relating to the history of studio classes, the training of tertiary-level violin professors, the master/apprentice model, cycles of pedagogy, the socialization of students and the effects of role identity cultivation, the development of studio and classroom culture, healthy group learning, emotional labor, and critical friendship.

Analysis of participant interviews revealed four main themes: (a) the use of socialization outside of studio time to cultivate interpersonal relationships; (b) the use of familial terminology to describe their studio; (c) the use of inherited, cyclical pedagogy, supervised apprenticing, and/or constructed peer mentorship; and (d) the essential role of regular studio class meetings and the use of emotional labor to maintain a positive atmosphere in those classes. Additionally, the culture of a studio and the professor's role in cultivating and maintaining that culture are discussed, as well as ideas for fostering critical friendship, effective studio dialogues, and active socialization of students into roles that will prepare them for lives in music and maximize student success.

AN EXPLORATION OF STUDIO CULTURES: PERSPECTIVES FROM ESTABLISHED  
TEACHERS OF THE VIOLIN

by

Nathan A. Southwick

A Dissertation

Submitted to

the Faculty of The Graduate School at  
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Musical Arts

Greensboro

2022

Approved by

---

Professor Marjorie Bagley  
Committee Co-Chair

---

Dr. Rebecca MacLeod  
Committee Co-Chair

© 2022 Nathan A. Southwick

## DEDICATION

*I am pleased to dedicate this dissertation to all my past and present violin teachers and my past, present, and future violin students. I have had the great honor of studying with consummate musicians and people. To each of you, I owe a little bit of myself. Through your dedication and commitment, I have been blessed not only with a life in music but also with continuous examples of character, compassion, grit, tenacity, and care. My friendships with each of you are precious to me. The examples of personal excellence paired with the artistic integrity you have set for me will continue as part of the long tradition of violin playing and teaching of which we all have been fortunate to be a part. Thank you, Rebecca, Chas, Annie, and Marjorie, for the countless hours of tireless lessons and support, both with and without the violin. To my students, past, present, and future, thank you for engaging with me in a love of the art of violin playing. It is the pleasure of my life to learn alongside each of you.*

## APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation written by Nathan A. Southwick has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Co-Chair

---

Professor Marjorie Bagley

Committee Co-Chair

---

Dr. Rebecca MacLeod

Committee Members

---

Dr. Scott Rawls

---

Dr. Kevin Gerald

February 14, 2022

Date of Acceptance by Committee

February 14, 2022

Date of Final Oral Examination

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I must thank and acknowledge my wonderful family. To my brothers—thank you for your love and companionship through the years. Mom and Dad, your continued belief in my ability and the loving ways that you’ve supported me have buoyed me up more times than I can count. Thank you; I love you.

My undergraduate experience at Utah State University with the Fry Street Quartet was transformative. I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge that I am writing this dissertation in part because of my singular experience as a member of their program and specifically as a student in Rebecca McFaul’s studio. What you have created at Utah State changed my life, and the clarion call for a meaningful life in music gave me the momentum to arrive at this moment.

A special thank you to the studio mates of all the studios of which I have been a part. Thank you for sharing your talents, dedication, victories, and defeats with me. To learn in the company of so many wonderful people and cultivate meaningful connections with others who love the maddening challenge of violining, my life has been enriched beyond description.

A special acknowledgment goes to Dr. Rebecca MacLeod and Professor Marjorie Bagley, who have been my steadfast guides throughout this doctoral program. You both have been so kind, patient, and supportive, even when the world seemed totally upside down. You both are amazing examples of resilience, grit, and true care. Thank you to Dr. Scott Rawls and Dr. Kevin Gerald; it has been a sincere pleasure to work with both of you for the past three years; here’s to many, many more.

To my dear friends David and Andrea, thank you for being my second family. I’ve never felt so at home as during my summers with you in Logan—some of my most meaningful conversations have happened under the shade of your walnut tree (as well as some of the most

hilariously ludicrous). And finally, to Tal: thank you for your love, kindness, support, vulnerability, generosity, and your genuine belief in me. I love you.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose Statement and Rationale .....	3
Research Questions.....	3
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	4
Introduction.....	4
A Brief History of the Violin Studio .....	4
Research on Studio Teachers and Pedagogy .....	7
The Pedagogical Training of Tertiary-Level Violin Instructors .....	7
The Master/Apprentice Model .....	8
Performers as Teachers .....	10
Cycle of Pedagogy .....	12
Studio and Classroom Culture .....	14
Studios in General.....	14
Socialization and the Effects of Role Identity Cultivation .....	15
Benefits and Characteristics of Healthy Group Learning .....	19
Positive Student/Teacher Interactions.....	22
Emotional Labor and Fostering Critical Friendship .....	25
CHAPTER III: METHOD .....	30
Research Method and Design: A Multi-Case Study .....	30
Participants.....	31
Kyung Sun Lee .....	32
Felicia Moye .....	33
Sally O'Reilly .....	34
Ani Schnarch.....	35
Almita Vamos .....	36
Mimi Zweig .....	37
Procedure: Data Collection and Analysis .....	37
Description and Disclosure of Principal Investigator .....	39
Limitations and Delimitations .....	40



CHAPTER IV: RESULTS.....	42
Profiles of Studio Composition, Studio Classes, and Studio Culture .....	43
Studio Composition .....	43
The Studio Class .....	44
Studio Culture .....	47
Emergent Themes .....	48
Socializing Beyond the Studio Class .....	48
Using Familial Terminology to Describe Their Studio .....	50
Cyclical Pedagogy, Supervised Apprenticing, and/or Constructed Peer Mentorship .....	52
Essential Role of Studio Class .....	56
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS .....	59
Relating Results to Research on Studio Learning .....	59
Critical Friendship in the Violin Studio.....	62
Possibilities for Studio Classes .....	65
Pedagogy of Future Teachers .....	69
Conclusion: Studio Culture and Student Success .....	70
REFERENCES .....	72
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS .....	86
APPENDIX B: IRB APPROVAL COVER LETTER.....	87
APPENDIX C: RECRUITMENT EMAIL.....	88
APPENDIX D: RECITAL INFORMATION.....	89

## CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The undergraduate violin studio is a formative place for young violinists. The violin studio provides a group learning environment where interpersonal relationships may be fostered among students and provides a space for the exploration of healthy role identities as future performers and teachers. These formative relationships and the development of healthy identities inform their teaching, performing, and lives for years to come.

What does a healthy and vibrant studio culture look and feel like for students? What role does the cultivation of positive interpersonal dynamic between studio mates play in developing teaching skills, realistic role identities for their future careers, and adjustment to a life in music? More importantly, what is a studio instructors' role in fostering these positive student dynamics? Much research has been done in the study of the music classroom and one-on-one apprentice model instruction; it follows that researching the dynamics of interpersonal relationships within a studio, and the professor's role in cultivating and maintaining these relationships, is imperative.

In this study, I will briefly discuss the history of the violin studio and the evolution of the studio as a group collective with unity, internal organization, and coherence, otherwise known as "entitativity." Additionally, how tertiary-level studio violin teachers are taught and learn to teach (teacher education vs. teacher training), "emotional labor" in the music studio, the cultivation of healthy role identities in music students, and research in the development of healthy studio and classroom culture will also be explored. This historical and contextual understanding of the violin studio will inform our discussions with established teachers of the violin, as they share their perspectives on maximizing student success through their mindful development of studio culture. These discussions will be coded and analyzed to discover possible emergent themes illuminating how established teachers cultivate their studio culture. Additionally, outliers of

interest will be discussed. Suggestions will then be made based on common themes, notable outliers, and research to improve student/teacher relationships and methods for cultivating a studio culture that maximizes student success.

In this study, studio “culture” is defined as the “vibe,” or ‘emotional landscape,’ that teachers and students experience and cultivate. This is a complicated and nuanced term but can range from students who rarely interact to close-knit, highly entitative groups with strong, familial-like bonds. “Critical friendship,” when discussed here, refers to the definition provided by Costa and Kallick (1993):

A critical friend, as the name suggests, is a trusted person who asks provocative questions, provides data to be examined through another lens, and offers critique of a person’s work as a friend. A critical friend takes the time to fully understand the context of the work presented and the outcomes that the person or group is working toward. The friend is an advocate for the success of that work. (pp. 49–50).

Finally, when discussing “socialization,” we will use the definition as quoted by Austin et al. (2012): “Socialization is the process by which an individual acquires the beliefs, values, skills and resources needed to live and participate in society (Handel, 2006; Musolf, 2009)” (p. 67). Specifically, this “society” will be a broad network of music performers and educators.

This study is limited in scope, as each instructor can only speak from their own experience, and a limited number of instructors have been interviewed for this multi-case study. It is also limited in that it is one-sided; discussions with students would add a great deal of complexity to the study and a deeper understanding of the relationship between mindful studio culture cultivation and perceived student success. Teachers also (as will be discussed later) often do not cite themselves as a reason for unhealthy or terminated dyad relations, so any discussion

around comments from instructors needs to be informed of previous research of perceived student success and teacher involvement, as well as reasons for student ‘failure’ or relationships between teachers and students, dissolving.

### **Purpose Statement and Rationale**

The purpose of this study was to explore how reputable violin professors purposefully develop the culture in their violin studios. Furthermore, through interviews with reputable violin professors, I hoped to discover how these teachers maximize student success, cultivate social and emotional learning, and foster wholesome and rewarding undergraduate experiences.

### **Research Questions**

Three broad questions guided this research study:

1. Do reputable violin teachers mindfully create or cultivate a studio culture? If so, how?
2. Are there common themes among these pedagogues?
3. What is the studio teacher’s role in mindfully creating a studio culture that maximizes student success?

## CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### **Introduction**

The studio model, including lesson and studio classes, is nearly ubiquitous in the United States. Yet, few researchers have investigated the numerous elements that impact a healthy and effective studio model. The theoretical framework for this study was informed by music education research and established string pedagogues. In this chapter, I outline the history of the violin studio, studio teacher training, the master-apprentice model, the performer as a teacher, the cycle of pedagogy that occurs within a studio, socialization and role identity, studio and classroom culture, characteristics of healthy group learning, as well emotional labor and fostering critical friendship within the studio. These topics will then inform the results and subsequent emergent themes drawn from the discussions with established violin pedagogues.

### **A Brief History of the Violin Studio**

A historical understanding of the development of the violin studio and studio pedagogy provides important context in understanding current violin studio culture. The violin was traditionally taught using a one-on-one master-apprentice model that formally emerged in the seventeenth century (Boyden et al., 1989). Because of the demanding level of technical skill required to play the violin at a professional level, this apprentice model made sense, especially for those pursuing the highest levels of technical and musical artistry. Traditionally, lessons were private; teachers worked with students individually on repertoire and technique, charting the student's path towards artistic excellence. These spaces were, and continue to be, vulnerable, intense, and personal.

Violin teachers often have many students, and this collection of students is referred to colloquially as a "studio." At the university and conservatory level, this group is well-defined

and clear. Most music schools have multiple violin “studios” led by their respective applied teachers. Violin students identify strongly as a member of so-and-so’s “studio” well after graduation. Teachers exercise varying levels of control over their studio and are identified as the leader of this group of learners.

In addition to the private lesson model, violin teachers also began teaching their students in groups. A famous early example of group instruction paired with individual instruction was Antonio Vivaldi’s teaching the orphans of “la Pieta” (Landon, 1996). Additionally, the famous composer Mendelssohn described the necessity of instrument-specific group learning when describing the curriculum of the Leipzig Conservatory:

By the participation of several in the same lessons and in the same studies, a true musical feeling is awakened and kept fresh among the pupils; it promotes industry, and spurs on to emulation; it is a preservative against one-sidedness of education and taste,—a tendency against which every artist, even in the student years, should be on his guard.

(Sollinger, 1970, as quoted in Deverich, 2006)

Additionally, new conservatories in the United States were modeled after the European system of national conservatories, and group classes became an integral part of the curriculum. Lowell Mason, who studied European conservatory systems and applied his observations to new world institutions, wrote the following about the Leipzig Conservatory:

Objections have been made to the system of instruction in classes at the Leipzig Conservatory, but these are applicable to other studies as well as music. To be sure, where a pupil in a *private lesson* receives the undivided attention of his instructor for the space of an hour, in the *class* he receives only a fraction of the same. But this comparatively trifling evil is more than counterbalanced by the advantages as we have

hinted above. The pupil becomes acquainted with many different styles, sees the beauties and faults of each, and is imperceptively led in this way to the formation of his own.

Again, by being constantly compelled to perform before others, he cannot fail to acquire a degree of confidence, which is beneficial and necessary to every public performer.

*(Dwights Journal of Music, as quoted by Deverich, 2006, p.16)*

The pedagogical advantage of these group classes was also identified early, as described in an Oberlin Conservatory course catalog entry:

Pupils often see defects in a classmate which they do not find in themselves, and are thus enabled to see how the teacher manages and corrects them; so that when, in after years, the same difficulties are seen in their own pupils, they are not at a loss to know how to deal with them. (Skrym, 1962, as quoted in Deverich, 2006, p. 16)

When did students of a particular teacher begin identifying themselves as a group, and what role does this group play in individual learning? This question is hard to answer, but the discussion of a teacher-centered ideology may help clarify why this phenomenon of group psychology exists. Well-known teachers of the violin have traditionally been performers of repute who are then sought after by aspiring young students who wish to be great players themselves. Because of the “celebrity” status of some teachers, students are eager to identify as their students and share comradery with students of the same instructor.

In addition to students wanting to identify themselves with successful teachers, group and studio learning can be traced to the development of the conservatory system, which was later adopted by the university system. Group courses allowed institutions to enroll many more students, a nationalist goal (Deverich, 2006). The creation of group instruction led to our modern understanding of “masterclasses.” Masterclasses feature a master teacher instructing a performer

with other students or members of the community present. A masterclass is fundamentally different from a studio class, or at least it can be. Both the ‘masterclass’ and the ‘studio class’ are descendants of the conservatory system of instrumental group instruction.

Finally, some studios identify more strongly as a group, a phenomenon that is referred to as “entitativity.” Campbell (1958) defines entitativity as “the degree to which a collection of people have “the nature of an entity” (p. 17). Phillips (2021) argued that when groups are highly entitative, assumptions made about one member of the group are often prescribed to the others at a higher rate. This has social ramifications; for example, if you are a member of a studio that strongly identifies with each other (highly entitative), and many members are strong players, outsiders of that group will assume your ability to be higher due to your association.

Through anecdotal experience, I know this to be true. Studio teachers can increase the entitativity of their studios by mindfully cultivating opportunities for students to interact and in the way that they interact with their students. These interactions can be defined as “emotional labor” and will be discussed in depth later.

## **Research on Studio Teachers and Pedagogy**

### **The Pedagogical Training of Tertiary-Level Violin Instructors**

There are several characteristics that define the current culture of violin instructors at the tertiary level. Currently, studio violin teachers are often master performers that pursue teaching for a variety of personal reasons. Most studio professors won their position because of their performance abilities, and most do not have formal qualifications for teaching (Burwell, 2005). This master-apprentice model dominates the tertiary music education system and is characterized by a “master” instructing students (apprentices) individually. As Gaunt (2011) said so succinctly, “The power of one-to-one tuition in Higher Music Education is evidenced by its continuing place



at the heart of conservatoire education” (p. 159). These apprentice/students eventually become masters and teachers themselves. According to Daniel and Parkes (2017), “both the quantitative and qualitative data clearly evidence the influence of previous teachers and teaching experiences on the way in which practitioners currently work in the studio” (p. 40). This perpetuates a “cycle of pedagogy” that continues in a purposeful way. Indeed, cyclical pedagogy is celebrated as many students are assigned to create ‘pedagogy’ trees that celebrate the teachers of their teachers. Students trace their violin lineage back to significant figures in violin history, such as Vieuxtemps, Paganini, and Viotti. Practically speaking, however, much of the *how* is unexamined, as most teachers do not have qualifications for teaching and instead are trained performers who teach (Daniel & Parkes, 2017).

### **The Master/Apprentice Model**

The apprentice model continues to dominate the university and conservatory system (Gaunt, 2011). Additionally, students and teachers all agree that it is effective and necessary, if not vital. Some teachers even compared their relationships to their students as a parent/friendship dynamic or even a doctor/patient type dynamic (Gaunt, 2011). Furthermore, Gaunt (2011) clearly demonstrates the ubiquity of the master/apprentice system:

In the training and education of classical musicians in Higher Education, one-to-one tuition has long been accepted as the most effective teaching/learning environment, and continues to be highlighted as central to success (Bloom, 1985; Manturszewska, 1990; Schmidt, 1992; Davidson et al., 1997; Gholson, 1998; Hanken, 2001; Kennell, 2002; Presland, 2005; Purser, 2005; Burt & Mills, 2006; Barrett & Gromko, 2007; Gaunt, 2008, 2009). (as quoted in Gaunt, 2011, p. 160)

Hanken (2016) describes some of the drawbacks of the teacher-dominated system:

We can see how the label itself underlines the understanding that the transmission of knowledge takes place in a vertical line from master/teacher to apprentice/student in a teaching situation, which often takes place one-to-one. The role that peers – the fellow students – can play in one another’s development in a more horizontal line, is often neither articulated nor encouraged. The all-pervasive role of the principal instrument teacher takes over, and this is perhaps illustrated by the fact that students in many cases apply for a place at a music academy because they want to study with a specific teacher; the reputation of the institution itself and of its students is of less importance. (p. 366)

Hanken (2016) continues, arguing that even in group contexts, the one-to-one model dominates:

Some teachers regularly schedule classes where all their students are present, but it is my impression, based on many years of work experience in specialist higher music education that the fellow students normally just observe one another being taught; they are rarely invited to give feedback or to discuss each other’s performances in depth. This impression is supported by Gaunt’s study of instrumental and vocal teachers and their students at a conservatoire (2008), where the few teachers who did organise group lessons reported that they teach these lessons in a masterclass style with relatively little interaction between the students themselves. (p. 366)

I have also shared this experience with some teachers engaging with their studios in group learning, and others modeling shared studio time after a masterclass. This has implications for students who will become teachers themselves. As Fredrickson (2007b) states, “many musicians only encounter private lesson teaching as students themselves in their degree program, where the primary focus is the development of their personal skill as a musician rather than as a teacher”

(p. 327). Additionally, even students who are teaching in some capacity receive little support or feedback. They tend to rely on memories of their own experiences as a student; most are unaware of pedagogical literature or training, and (most surprising) most do not seek out feedback on their teaching (Haddon, 2009).

### **Performers as Teachers**

Carey et al. (2013) described how “the case for arguing the quality of pedagogical practices in the conservatoire [can] no longer rely on the untested but widely held assumption that greater performer—the “maestro performer”—would be *ipso facto* “the maestro teacher” (p. 149). While there are obvious benefits to studying with a master performer, the lack of pedagogical training may hinder student learning. Fredrickson (2007b) took this issue one step further in his summary of the research by Duke (1999-2000), stating that

after reviewing 25 years of inquiry into instructional effectiveness in music, Duke (1999-2000) suggested that not enough empirical evidence existed in the extant literature to connect what teachers did with what students accomplished. His conclusions suggested that more attention be paid to the cause-and-effect nature of music teaching, including the private music lesson setting. (p. 327)

One benefit of being perceived as an “expert” is that students often respond, but the research shows that students respond equally to other non-expertise factors, such as “encouragement, enthusiasm, and the personality teachers bring to the learning environment” (Daniel & Parkes, 2015, p. 61). It is interesting to note that the authors specifically cite the personality that *the teachers bring to the learning environment*, which insinuates personality is not fixed, and that good teachers use emotional labor to bring a specific version of themselves to teaching settings.

Many characteristics of artist-performers are comparable to the traits required of good teachers (Stephens, 1995). Stephens argues that the ability to transfer skills from the role of performer and mold them to the new role of the teacher is possible and worthwhile.

The art of teaching (and teacher-education) is to know what questions to ask, when to stand back, how to encourage and direct pupils without becoming a dominating figure in the classroom, or one who instructs rather than educates. In short, the Teacher needs to be an Artist, just as the Artist has an important role as a Teacher, both reflectively in personal development and in communicating with the ‘audience,’ whoever that may be. (Stephens, 1995, p. 9)

This transition, or pairing, of “artist or teacher” is also demonstrated in the manual “From the Stage to the Studio” by Watkins and Scott (2011). The existence of this book clearly demonstrates that performers are often thrust without training into teaching positions. Carey et al. (2018) argued that “greater professional development opportunities in these areas are made available to one-to-one music teachers” (p. 2). Haddon (2009) posited that over time, teachers’ pedagogy “evolves,” and they can become more effective instructors through “experience and reflection” (p. 57). Additionally, Carey et al. (2018) found that

students require guidance and support to become autonomous and reflective learners, and likewise, that teachers require guidance and support in developing a teaching practice that fosters a transformative approach to teaching and learning. (p. 408)

Teachers who do this work are often met with success, as is demonstrated by Ryan (2021): “It has been suggested that people in mentoring capacities who are self-aware and communicate effectively are likely to experience low student dropout rates (Bearman, Blake-Beard, Hunt, & Crosby, 2007; Kronish, 2004; Philippe & Seiler, 2006; Smoll & Smith, 2006)” (p. 69). In his

study on dyad dissolution, Ryan (2021) also argued for teachers to receive pedagogical instruction:

Studio teachers are usually hired because of their performance expertise, not their teaching record, and it is uncommon for them to study pedagogical practices. As 100% of the teachers thought that the dyad dissolution originated in factors outside themselves, further research might examine the benefits of teacher training for studio teachers. (p. 69)

### **Cycle of Pedagogy**

Haddon (2009) summed up the cyclical nature of violin pedagogy succinctly:

The lack of training and therefore restricted awareness of other possible means of delivering tuition means that the prevalent model of master–apprentice tuition (Jørgensen, 2000) continues by default: such teachers tend to teach in similar ways to their own teachers (Mills & Smith, 2003). Hallam (1998: 241) suggested that this situation is perpetuated by the relative isolation of many instrumental teachers, leading to ‘an inherent conservatism in the instrumental teaching profession which has tended to inhibit innovation and prevent the spread of new ideas.’ (p. 58)

Creech and Hallam (2010) also echoed this sentiment by adding, “Teacher-pupil relationships in the context of instrumental lessons, have been found to be heavily influenced by the teacher’s own life histories, and in particular past relationships with their own teachers (Morgan, 1998)” (p. 404).

This cycle seems to be perpetuated in a somewhat unexamined nature, as was researched by Daniel and Parkes (2015): “There are few studies that explore what music instrument teachers believe are effective characteristics and attributes of their previous teachers and lessons” (p. 52). When teaching is effective, this can be a positive cycle, but by examining productive and

effective teaching methods, teachers can become more mindful and successful educators. When given the opportunity, teachers do engage and evolve their teaching practices through “research and reflective collaborations” (Carey et al., 2018, p. 408).

The cycle can also be interrupted through the mindful development of young teachers. Daniel and Parkes (2015) discussed the lack of research in this arena (that of inherited pedagogical traits). The authors stated,

This article seeks to present preliminary insights into a key problem and gap in the literature, in terms of the lack of empirical research which explores the nature of how many music instrument apprentices, who study under the guidance of a master, often move into a teaching role and therefore arguably adopt many of the characteristics or attributes of their previous teachers and/or experiences. (p. 53)

Gaunt (2011) also examined the training of young teachers and discovered that “although students greatly valued their one-to-one lessons and were developing many instrumental skills, they were not necessarily learning to be able to transfer these skills, for example, to a teaching context” (p. 161).

Fredrickson (2007b) argued that students should be introduced to “teaching as a formal activity that they may someday choose to undertake” (p. 328). This statement does not encourage the role/identity of ‘teacher’ in students, which will be discussed in depth further. Carey et al. (2018) agreed and argued that teachers should receive “support and guidance on how to foster students’ reflective capabilities” (p. 399). The development of students as performers and as educators does not need to be mutually exclusive, and both goals can be pursued in cultivated shared studio time through the mindful creation of critical friendships (Ferm Thorgersen, 2014).

## **Studio and Classroom Culture**

### **Studios in General**

Tubbs (1984) outlined basic requirements that defined a small group as “a collection of individuals who influence one another, derive some satisfaction from maintaining membership in the group, interact for some purpose, assume specialized roles, are dependent on one another, and communicate face to face” (p. 8). In some regards, Gaunt’s (2008) description of how studio teachers managed shared studio time (as a masterclass) doesn’t quite fit with this description, as it really is a collection of individuals observing one-on-one teaching in a public forum with limited interaction. In a study from 2010, Gaunt states, “The peer group was generally perceived more as a fact of life than as a learning resource ...” (Gaunt, 2010, p. 200). Tubbs’s definition requires face-to-face communication and interaction, which is a characteristic of an engaging studio ‘class,’ in which students are invited to “give feedback or to discuss each other’s performances in depth” (as cited in Hanken, 2016, p. 366).

These interactions between students in studio classes are significant, as Lave and Wenger (1991) demonstrated how students learn in interactive group contexts they term “communities of practice” (p. 91).

According to the authors, learning results from participating in social practices more than it results from direct teaching and transfer of knowledge. One learns to become a tailor by participating in the practice in the tailor’s workshop, one learns to become a musician by taking part in the practices of the profession such as ensemble rehearsals, concerts, giving and receiving feedback within a community of fellow musicians, etc. (as quoted by Hanken, 2016, p. 366)

Group learning or even “studio” based learning is not unique or reserved for music students. Princeton University posted a specific document online outlining “Studio Culture” for their architecture studios. The document outlines specific expectations, standards, and a tone for how members of this shared work and learning space are to interact with each other (Princeton University School of Architecture, 2022). In a short blog post, Kopcynski (n.d.) advocated for the transfer of studio-based culture and expectations from other studio-based learning disciplines (such as architecture and graphic design). He suggested that these studio models as a guide for instrumental studio-based learning may be beneficial to tertiary-level music education (Kopcynski, n.d.).

### **Socialization and the Effects of Role Identity Cultivation**

Socialization has been defined as “the process by which an individual acquires the beliefs, values, skills and resources needed to live and participate in society (Handel, 2006; Musolf, 2009)” (as quoted in Austin et al., 2012, p. 67). Bouij (2004) also adds that socialization is both formal and informal, and importantly includes “unconscious influence from the collectivity” (p. 2). Fern Thorgersen (2014) called informal socialization “non-reflected” socialization. The one-to-one private lesson setting, as well as the studio class, significantly determines how students are socialized (Daniel & Parkes, 2015). Primary socialization could be broadly termed in this discussion as “musician” or even “violinist,” with secondary socialization being more specific, such as “violin performer” or “violin teacher.” “Secondary socialization occurs when people enter the workforce or enroll in higher education (Wallace & Wolf, 1999) and begin to adopt the roles and responsibilities of a smaller or more specialized group within the larger culture” (Austin et al., 2012, p. 67).



“Violin performer” or “violin teacher” are examples of role identities perceived by the individual. Bouij (2004) quoted McCall and Simmons (1978) and defined “role identity” as “the character and the role that an individual devises for himself as an occupant of a particular social position” (p. 3). Role identities exist in the mind of the individual, and socialization includes the interactions, environments, and interpretations of meaning that create those role identities both formally and informally, as well as consciously and unconsciously. These informal/formal and conscious/unconscious influences on role identity and socialization are influenced by symbolic interactionism, which can be defined as “the process of interacting with and defining the actions of others.” Symbolic interactionism “is mediated by people’s interpretations of their surroundings and the symbolic meaning derived from their experiences. This process is highly personalized in the sense that two people may draw distinct meanings about a particular occupation from the same situation or experience” (Austin et al., 2012, p. 67).

One may ask why developing healthy and realistic role identities is important for our students. Haddon (2009) discovered that “Instrumental teaching is not a planned career aspiration for many musicians (Gaunt, 2005). It often provides a back-up to other work, and for freelancers, relative stability and security” (p. 57). This information, paired with Burwell’s (2016a) conclusion that “music as a determinant of self-concept was a better predictor of eventual success than relationships with influential others” (p. 467). Austin et al. (2012) found that “career commitment is enhanced when students are able to see themselves as both strong musicians and strong teachers, and when support for music endeavors comes from complementary contexts within and outside of the music school culture” (p. 81) clearly shows the need to cultivate healthy role identities in our students, as well as provide safe opportunities for socialization into roles as educators and performers. Bouij (2004) continued by saying,

“anticipatory socialization in order to develop the skills that a particular coveted role-identity calls for, and how the individual handles that, is crucial. Who we want to be, and who we can be, are questions about negotiating positions, values and so on” (p. 3).

But who do students look to as role models? What social roles do students value more than others, and why?

The researchers discovered that the studio teacher is perceived as the strongest role model for both musicianship and teaching, regardless of whether the student was in a performance or music education program. Teachers and parents both had influence over students when deciding whether or not to pursue a degree in music. When it came to career commitment, teacher and musician identity and social influences played the largest role. The study found that “mutually supportive socialization structures may facilitate the integration of music, teacher and scholar identities among undergraduate music majors.” Additionally, the author suggests (through a study of conservatory students in the UK by Mills 2004) that students with “musician” as their primary role-identity can learn to appreciate and learn music education principles by asserting that these skills *aid in the individuals performance, they would benefit from being a trained teacher*. (Austin et al., 2012, p. 66).

This finding has been echoed in the research by Isbell (2009), who found “parents, school music teachers, private music teachers, and performance centered experiences were all influential in terms of primary socialization and career decision making” (p. 13). As for role models, students most often cited their studio instructors as their musician role model as well as their teacher role model, along with music education faculty. Hargreaves et al. (2007) also stated

that “pupils’ musical identities were strongly interlinked with those of their teachers, as both develop within the same social and educational context” (p. 678).

Some researchers have found that, among students in the music school, the role of “performer” was more highly valued than “scholar” or “teacher,” as students were less willing to identify as a “teacher” than as a “performer” (Austin et al., 2012). He continued:

There were no significant musician identity differences that separated music education majors from performance majors. One interpretation is that this finding confirms the tendency of music education majors to aspire to a performer identity before ‘settling’ for a teacher identity. Woodford (2002), for example, has speculated that music education majors identify strongly as performers due to the robust music socialization processes, high social status and recognition for music performance achievement, and the wide variety of skills (including performance skills) involved in music teaching. (p. 80)

Surprisingly though, Fredrickson (2007b) found “... college music majors strongly agreed that it was necessary to have training to become a good teacher, and the idea that a good performer would always be a good teacher was strongly rejected” (p. 340). Fredrickson found that students who take their potential role of teacher seriously were better at it and that attitudes about teaching ability can be changed through study.

This dialectical approach to the socialization of music students as both performers and teachers is a relatively new area of research. “Moreover, the possibility that students might successfully integrate musician and teacher identities or draw on both in a complementary fashion has received little consideration” (Austin et al., 2012, p. 68). Performance students could benefit from education courses and training, based on Hargreaves et al.’s (2007) finding that “education students are more likely to value personal, communication and interpersonal skills

rather specifically musical skills, such as performance and sight reading” (p. 678), which are skills necessary for masterful teaching. The findings of Austin et al. (2012) also support this mixing of programs and socializations for maximizing student success:

it is possible that music education majors and students pursuing a dual major in education and performance are simply more successful than performance majors in achieving an integrated identity that embraces the importance of being both a good musician (performer, conductor or composer) and a good teacher. (p. 80)

Again, the research insinuates that “students who take seriously their potential role of teacher are better at it” (Fredrickson, 2007b).

Providing opportunities through curricula to properly socialize students into healthy role identities that will allow them to be the most successful and dynamic should be the goal of a strong music program. As stated by Sawyer (2006),

I started out talking about group creativity, and I ended up advocating a sociocultural approach to music education. The sociocultural approach requires a reconceptualization of the goals of music education. The classroom is no longer considered the site for the transmission of musical knowledge, but rather a place where children are socialized into musical communities of practice. (p. 163)

### **Benefits and Characteristics of Healthy Group Learning**

The study of group learning in the tertiary music studio is a new area of research, an area for which this study will hopefully add valuable information.

Within higher music education, however, peer learning has only come onto the research agenda in recent years. In a review from 2001, Luce observed, “A scant three articles were identified for this literature review” (p. 24). Between then and 2013, very few

articles were published specifically addressing peer learning in music performance education on a tertiary level (Latukeyfu, 2009; Lebler, 2008).” (as quoted by Hanken, 2016, p. 365)

Since Gaunt and Westerlund’s (2013) “Collaborative Learning in Higher Music Education” was published, the discussion has become more open and varied.

In this extensive anthology, there are more theoretical contributions on collaborative learning in higher music education as well as chapters where practitioners—including principal instrument teachers themselves—describe and discuss their efforts to implement collaborative learning in different ways. (Hanken, 2016, p. 365)

Is group learning in the tertiary violin studio worthwhile? “Daniel (2004) ... noted the considerable benefits to students who receive tuition in a group context: understanding the roles of performer, listener and assessor, developing self-evaluation, gaining increased motivation and a greater range of feedback” (as quoted by Haddon 2009, p. 58). Sawyer (2006) argued that group activity should be the core of music education, not a peripheral tangent to one-on-one teaching where a master imparts knowledge to a student. Group activities encourage socialization not only in the craft of music-making but as a life skill that is transferable to other areas of life. He identified characteristics of effective groups (such as ease of movement to central roles, activities, and groups that allow for different levels of participation, that accommodates varying learning styles, and that is inclusive, allowing all students to engage in a significant and meaningful way).

My focus on group creativity and collaborative improvisation treats music as a communicative activity. Music is a collaborative practice, and improvised group music results in an emergent, unpredictable performance. But many educators teach music as a

solitary activity—practicing fingering and scales for hours, at home alone; studying to learn how to read notated music effortlessly; memorizing a solo piece for recital performance. But if music is a collaborative practice and if communication is central to musical creativity, then our educational methods should emphasize group interaction.

(Sawyer, 2006, p. 161)

In studios where teachers dominate the dialogue, it is important to note that students “will be less inclined to be interested in other students' ways of making, learning, and valuing music” (Ferm Thorgersen, 2014, p. 62).

Teachers can foster safe spaces for dialogue and group learning. Hendricks et al. (2014) list the following suggestions to foster a safe space: “listen and be emotionally present,” “use ability-appropriate and challenging situations (while) focus(ing) on the challenge at hand,” “educate others about creating a safe space, both through words and through modeling,” “be sensitive to the relationship between students’ musicality and their personal life,” and “some instruction must be unconventional” (p. 38).

Modeling as the teacher was an important part of demonstrating to students how to interact appropriately in group environments:

Falchikov (2007) has argued that peer involvement in assessment has the potential to encourage learning and develop assessment skills that will last a lifetime. She also states, however, that peer assessment without modeling or scaffolding has no value added to the student learning, and that if students are merely completing an exercise without understanding the standards or criteria that will help them acquire skills in judgment, they are no better off than in the framework of traditional assessment. (as quoted in Latukefu, 2010, p. 62)

An additional technique that teachers can use when modeling appropriate behavior in group contexts is “fading” of support. “Fading of support (Falchikov, 2007) is where the lecturer gives support to the class through modelling or directing students, but slowly withdraws this level of support and involvement over time” (Latukefu, 2010, p. 65). This “fading of support” can lead to environments of support and understanding between students, where they are socialized into roles as both performers and teachers. This is similar to the findings of Lebler (2008), who observed students working on popular music. “Learners assess themselves relative to their past performances and expectations, and through comparison with both their peers and the performances of the artists who inspire them. They also assess their peers and seek assessment by them” (p. 195).

Haddon (2009) summed up the need for these group learning environments by saying, “If the demand for ‘talented, well-trained, versatile—and qualified—musicians who can teach and lead in a wide range of individual and group learning settings’ (Rogers, 2005, p. 59) is to be met, then prospective music teachers need to experience the range of contexts in which music teaching and learning takes place” (p. 58).

### **Positive Student/Teacher Interactions**

The genesis of a healthy studio culture, and the common denominator of all, is the violin instructor. To study the factors that may aid in cultivating a healthy group dynamic, a short survey of which factors influence a healthy, as well as unhealthy, on-on-one relationship between teachers and students should be explored. These one-on-one relationships are significant and have a high impact, more so than many other dyad relationships that young people foster.

... Williamon and Thompson (2006) found that first-year conservatoire students were most reliant on their one-to-one instrumental teacher for advice with health issues rather

than turning to health professionals. Chesky was concerned that some one-to-one teachers attempted to provide all the answers for a student, about medical and personal issues as well as instrumental and musical ones (Chesky, 2004). (as quoted by Gaunt, 2011, p. 162)

This finding by Chesky highlights the significant and lasting impact studio-based music instructors have on the emotional and even physical well-being of students in their charge. Gaunt (2011) further discussed the impact of these relationships.

The impact of student-teacher relationships is amplified by several particular dimensions of Higher Education: the vulnerability of students in a transitional process from school to adult and professional life, often living away from home for the first time, and from education to the professional world; the pressures of adapting to new cultural contexts for international students; and the expectations of using higher-level processing skills, greater self-responsibility and autonomy in directing work, and effective time-management (Crosling & Webb, 2000; Creech et al., 2008). (as quoted by Gaunt, 2011, p. 160)

Shockingly, as was discussed before, teachers maintain little responsibility for the relationships themselves. When discussing reasons for “dyad dissolution” among music students and their teachers, Ryan (2021) wrote:

[for teachers] The highest rated reasons were “student lack of desire/motivation/effort/goals, student lack of progress, student lack of talent, and different expectations.” For students, the main reason was more personal, and they felt the reasons for the dissolution were in their control. The students listed “Different learning styles, incompatible personalities, different goals, and lack of teacher teaching abilities” as main factors.



Teachers did not share this—most felt that the reasons for dissolution were not their responsibility and didn't think they themselves were the cause of the break. (Ryan, 2021, p. 69)

How do teachers navigate these formative years and responsibilities for students in their studios? There have been studies exploring the issues of these relationships and how teachers position themselves in relation to their students, with a balance between teacher control and responsiveness to students aiding in student efficacy (Creech & Hallam, 2010). In their research, Creech and Hallam (2010) set out a matrix of interpersonal relationships that are determined by control and responsiveness. The authors argued that teachers who are the most fulfilled with their role as teachers exhibit both qualities, which intersect on the matrix as “upperness-lowerness” (control) and “closeness-distance” (responsiveness). It is important to note that healthy interactions can exist anywhere on this matrix.

The article articulates the dilemma between control and responsiveness by saying, a challenge for violin teachers was to strike a balance between fulfilling the teacher role of imparting knowledge and skills whilst maintaining a responsive, co-operative persona. The balance was made more precarious by the fact that violin teachers operate within a domain where the achievement of expertise only comes with much discipline and extensive application, yet where enjoyment is perhaps a key to the motivation to persevere. (Creech & Hallam, 2010, p. 21)

The author argued that a healthy balance of control and responsiveness, as well as providing situations where different types of interaction are appropriate, would positively affect their relationships with students.

Gaunt (2011) further explored this dilemma of closeness/responsiveness. “Common themes emerged here around negotiating a balance between enabling personal dimensions and intimacy to develop, and maintaining detachment, or between focusing on transmitting instrumental/vocal skills and enabling students to develop ...” (p. 165). In an earlier study, the author studied how teachers interact with their students outside of the studio and found that “From the teachers’ point of view, five actively sought social relationships with their students outside the lessons. Seven avoided them if at all possible, and eight socialised with their students occasionally (Gaunt, 2008, pp. 20–21)” (as quoted in Gaunt, 2011, p. 167).

Stephens (1995) further encouraged music teachers to engage with their students in meaningful, relationship-affirming ways:

At the heart of good teaching, therefore, is the central importance of constructive relationships, the ability of a teacher to relate to pupils or students in a non-threatening way. Communication of knowledge is not so important (for that can be obtained from books, computers and other sources), but communication of trust, friendship and belief is fundamental. A detailed knowledge of a subject is not enough: there has to be an ability to energize, motivate and enthuse those for whose education we are in part responsible. (Stephens, 1995, p. 5)

### **Emotional Labor and Fostering Critical Friendship**

Costa and Kallik (1993) have provided a much-cited definition for a critical friend:

A critical friend, as the name suggests, is a trusted person who asks provocative questions, provides data to be examined through another lens, and offers critique of a person’s work as a friend. A critical friend takes the time to fully understand the context

of the work presented and the outcomes that the person or group is working toward. The friend is an advocate for the success of that work. (pp. 49–50)

Teachers can foster critical friendships between members of their studio and model appropriate group behavior through “emotional labor.” Emotional labor has been defined as “the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display ... This labour requires one to induce or suppress feeling in order to sustain the outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others” or “the ability to elicit appropriate emotional responses from others requires a performance in which your own emotions are managed” (Watson & Ward, 2013, p. 2905). Emotional labor has been studied in areas such as service positions (like flight attendants, hotel hosts, etc.) but is applicable to teachers as well, especially when modeling appropriate behavior.

Research has been done finding certain “rules” of friendship, which is critical to our understanding of “critical friends.” Argyle and Henderson (1984) found that friends share news of success with each other, show emotional support, volunteer help in time of need, strive to make him/her happy while in each other’s company, repay debts and favors, trust and confide in the other, stand up for the person in their absence, be tolerant of other friends, don’t criticize in public, keep confidences, don’t be jealous or critical of other relationships, don’t nag, (and) respect privacy. (p. 234)

Critical friendship fundamentally differs from friendship in that a major characteristic of the relationship is critique, which opens people to vulnerability, as critique has negative social associations. This feature of the relationship demands that critical friendship is “formally processed.” “Critical friendship requires formal processing and must begin with trust because critique is often viewed with negative associations. Critique does not equal judgment. According

to Bloom, critique is grouped with evaluation, the highest order of thinking (Bloom et al. 1956)” (as quoted by Costa & Kallick, 1993, p. 50).

“The degree of trust established” is listed as a primary factor in positive critical friendships, as is context and history (Swaffield, 2004, pp. 269–270). Swaffield also emphasized that the development of trust and understanding of context takes time and should not be rushed. The article also observed a study that demonstrated that “critical friendship can be mutual and between peers” but that a clear “demarcation” of roles helps the process continue to be productive and amenable (Swaffield, 2004, p. 272). Additional to trust, understanding of context, and history, Ferm Thorgersen (2014) has written,

According to Handal (1999), that kind of behavior demands a personal relationship of confidence, belief in the competence of the critical friend, expectation of personal integrity, and basic trust in the good intentions of the critical friend. In such settings critique can be expected to encourage understanding rather than induce competition (Colwell, 2005) and thus provide a fruitful approach in higher music education. (p. 61)

Other researchers argued that this tension of critique from critical friendship is a required and beneficial characteristic of the relationship: Gibbs and Angelides (2008) argue that a critical friend lies on the continuum between “total friend” and “total critic” and that the tension is an integral part of a “critical friendship.”

The model critique between critical friends (or the “protocol”) was defined and clearly organized in 1994 by the Annenberg Institute for School Reform as the following:

1) an overview in which the facilitator describes the focus of the session; 2) a presentation of the artifact, observation, or issue by the presenter (who is different from the facilitator) in which the presenter explains what is to be “tuned,” in other words what questions or

concerns should focus the feedback; 3) an opportunity for participants to ask clarifying questions of the presenter; 4) discussion of the artifact or issue during which the presenter remains silent, listening and taking notes; 5) the presenter reflects on the feedback; and 6) the facilitator debriefs the session. Overall the session lasts 35-40 minutes. Participants are directed to give positive or “warm” feedback and constructively critical or “cool” feedback that is focused on the tuning question(s) (the presenter’s questions or concerns stated to focus the feedback). It is also important that the participants give practical and actionable suggestions to accompany their feedback. (Costantino, 2010, pp. 3–4)

Costantino (2010) further personalized the critical friendship protocol for other areas by identifying “tuning questions, presenter silence, actionable suggestions, and facilitated discussions” as “easily adapted” to other contexts.

Ferm Thorgersen (2007) describes the instructor’s role in cultivating critical friendships: There are different roles connected to the teacher as a leader of critical friendship: to be a role model, to confirm and challenge, to step back, and to create a milieu wherein different abilities can be developed—in this case, not least to give and receive response. Accordingly, it becomes crucial for the teacher to respond in an ideal way, to comment on and challenge the ways in which students share experiences and respond to one another, and to offer them possibilities to train their response-giving abilities in more or less structured ways. Finally, the teacher has to create and encourage meetings between students, design functional student groups, and formulate clear goals for development, preferably together with the students. (p. 64)

This “responding in an ideal way” can be defined as “emotional labor.” Teachers use emotional labor or create ‘emotional geographies’ to support critical friendship. In their article about the

emotional labor of recording studio engineers in audio recording studios, Watson and Ward (2013) found that ‘creating the right vibe’ required producers and engineers to manage their own emotions and the emotions of artists and musicians through “performances of *trust* and *tolerance*” (p. 2911). They defined two types of trust: emotive trust (your personal feelings about others) and capacity trust (your belief in another’s ability to do something competently). The authors argued that trust must be gained and maintained, what they call “active trust” (p. 2912). This is directly transferable to teachers in the tertiary music studio.

Given the ubiquitous nature of the master-apprentice model, the tentative nature of the “studio” class as a community of learners, and the importance of culture and socialization within the studio, the purpose of this study was to explore how reputable violin professors purposefully develop the culture in their violin studios. The research was guided by three intentionally broad questions:

1. Do reputable violin teachers mindfully create or cultivate a studio culture? If so, how?
2. Are there common themes among these pedagogues?
3. What is the studio teacher’s role in mindfully creating a studio culture that maximizes student success?

Through interviews with reputable violin professors, I hoped to discover how these teachers maximize student success as well as foster wholesome and rewarding undergraduate experiences.

## CHAPTER III: METHOD

In this chapter, the procedures and methods that guided data collection for this research are described and outlined. First, my use of a multi-case study, as well as the purpose and use of this type of qualitative research, are discussed. Participant recruitment methods and the biographies of those selected and subsequently interviewed are included, along with a description of the principal investigator and potential biases. Data collection and data analysis are described in detail. Finally, limitations and delimitations are discussed.

### **Research Method and Design: A Multi-Case Study**

The purpose of this study was to explore how reputable violin professors purposefully develop the culture in their violin studios. Through interviews with reputable violin professors, I hoped to discover how these teachers maximize student success, cultivate social and emotional learning, as well as foster wholesome and rewarding undergraduate experiences.

This qualitative multi-case study examined six well-established violin teachers who were recognized as leading pedagogues of collegiate-level violin students at the time of this study. These teachers were regarded as leaders because of their demonstrated history of student success and were purposefully selected for participation in this study based on their reputation. Qualitative research “explores a social or human problem” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 326). I chose to do a qualitative study due to the ontological assumptions of qualitative research. Because of individually constructed realities, it made sense to interview multiple well-established violin teachers to examine and explore their personal experiences and thus gain a deeper insight into the experiences and individuals being studied. Creswell and Poth (2018) state, “This is how knowledge is known— through the subjective experiences of people” (p. 21).

Additionally, qualitative research is emergent, which allowed me to take advantage of a dynamic, conversational interview during the data collection process.

I specifically chose to operate under the auspices of a qualitative multi-case study for a variety of reasons. First, case studies examine an “individual, a community, a decision process, or an event” that often happens concurrently (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 97). These case studies involve specific groups of people (violin students and instructors) and are ‘bound’ in nature (are defined temporally as shared time spent together). Case studies often also explore groups of individuals that have some type of shared experience, in this case, the experience of learning and teaching the violin.

### **Participants**

Purposive sampling was used in this study. Participants were selected based on their professional reputation and must have taught at or retired from an accredited institution as a full-time instructor of the violin for at least 15 years. Additionally, they must have been generally accepted by the collegiate violin community as instructors that excel in the field as demonstrated through student success, affiliation with institutions of the highest caliber, and/or their demand as instructors at co-curricular summer programs, festivals, institutes, etc.

A list of potential candidates was created using lists of award-winning teachers, through discussion with professional violinists and teachers, and in conjunction with advisors to this dissertation, Dr. Rebecca MacLeod and Professor Marjorie Bagley. Each individual added to the list was researched to determine eligibility based on the aforementioned inclusion criteria. I chose not to interview any teacher with whom I had studied previously to minimize personal bias.



After creating a list of qualified participants, potential subjects were contacted via email using a template, which is provided in Appendix C. Email addresses were procured using publicly displayed contact information from university faculty information websites. Twenty participants were emailed, ten of which present as male and ten of which present as female. Nine potential participants responded (seven female, two male), and six agreed to participate in the study and were subsequently scheduled and interviewed using email correspondence. All participants interviewed were female. These individuals were (in alphabetical order by last name) Kyung Sun Lee, Felicia Moye, Sally O'Reilly, Ani Schnarch, Almita Vamos, and Mimi Zweig.

### **Kyung Sun Lee**

Violinist Kyung Sun Lee captured sixth place in the 1994 Tchaikovsky Competition, a bronze medal in the 1993 Queen Elizabeth Competition, first prizes of the Washington and D'Angelo International Competitions, and third prize in the Montreal International Competition, where she also won the Audience Favorite and the Best Performance of the Commissioned Work prizes.

Subsequent to winning these awards, she enjoyed ever-increasing popularity as a performer. She has received high critical acclaim: "Exceptional tonal suavity and expressive intensity in equal measure," commented *The Strad*. "Godard's 'Concerto Romantique' could not have had a more outstanding soloist than Kyung Sun Lee," proclaimed Harris Goldsmith in the *New York Concert Review*. "Fluidity and grace; pathos and emotion," raved the *Palm Beach Post*. "Lee is the most musical, the most intelligent soloist to have played with the orchestra in quite a while," maintained the *Tuscaloosa News*. "Penetrating clarity, a strong sense of style and a technical supremacy that conquered all difficulties with unruffled ease," announced the *Miami*

Herald. “Beyond superb execution, she conveyed particular Romanticism expertly [in Vieuxtemps’ Concerto No. 5],” remarked Dennis Rooney in *The Strad*.

In addition to her busy schedule as a soloist and chamber musician, Lee is an accomplished teacher and clinician. After becoming Assistant Professor of Violin at the Oberlin Conservatory in the fall of 2001, then Associate Professor at the University of Houston in the fall of 2006, she is currently Professor at Seoul National University since 2009. She taught for two summers at the Aspen Music Festival and has also been involved with the Seattle, Ravinia, and the Marlboro Chamber Music Festivals, the Texas Music Festival, and the Great Mountains Music Festival in Korea. Lee is a former member of the acclaimed KumHo/Asiana String Quartet, with whom she toured worldwide. In recent years she has also been in demand as a judge of violin competitions, including the Joachim International Violin Competition Hannover, Seoul International Competition, and the Tibor Junior International Competition in Sion, Swiss.

Kyung Sun Lee studied at Seoul National University, Peabody Conservatory, and Juilliard. Her teachers have included Nam Yun Kim, Sylvia Rosenberg, Robert Mann, Dorothy Delay, and Hyo Kang. She plays a Joseph Guarnerius violin dating from 1723, and she is the music director of Changwon International Chamber Music Festival and Seoul Virtuosi Chamber Orchestra.

### **Felicia Moye**

Ms. Moye’s career has taken her throughout Europe, Asia, North and South America, and South Africa as a soloist and chamber musician with groups such as the Miami String Quartet, Orpheus, and the St. Paul Chamber Orchestra. She was the first violinist of the Miami String Quartet, with whom she was awarded top prizes at both the Evian and London International String Quartet Competitions. She is a dynamic chamber musician and has performed in

collaboration with the Lincoln Center Chamber Music Society, the Blossom Music festival, the Mostly Mozart Festival in Avery Fischer Hall, and others. She has also served as concertmaster of the Santa Fe Opera, Honolulu Symphony, and as the acting concertmaster of the San Francisco Symphony. Ms. Moye taught previously at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, the Glenn Gould School of the Royal Conservatory of Music, the University of Oklahoma, and at the Juilliard School's pre-college division as the assistant to Ivan Galmian and Margaret Pardee.

### **Sally O'Reilly**

Sally O'Reilly is known throughout the music world as a soloist, chamber musician, and pedagogue. Professor of Violin at the University of Minnesota School of Music in Minneapolis, she studied with Ivan Galamian at Curtis Institute and with Josef Gingold at Indiana University, where she was his assistant. Later she studied with Andre Gertler and Carlo Van Neste in Brussels, where she was a Fulbright Scholar. Her chamber music coaches included Janos Starker, Gyorgy Sebok, Artur Balsam, William Primrose, and Felix Galimir.

Professor O'Reilly's former students are members of the world's major symphony orchestras and hold prominent teaching positions throughout the United States, Asia, and Australia. They have been first prize winners in numerous competitions, including the Vittorio Gui in Florence, Italy, the Tokyo International, Irving Klein International, Music Teachers National Association student competitions, and the Banff String Quartet Competition.

She has held Fulbright Senior Lectureships to teach in South America and has been visiting professor of violin in China, Austria, Ireland, Germany, Israel, Central America, Canada, Korea, and the Czech Republic.

Professor O'Reilly has been a frequent member of adjudication panels for the National Endowment for the Arts, the Fulbright Commission, Chamber Music America, ASTA, and

MTNA. Her many pedagogical publications for Kjos Music Company are distributed internationally.

### **Ani Schnarch**

Romanian-Israeli-British violinist, winner of the prestigious Francois Shapira, Israel, and Mozart Memorial Prizes, England, Ani Schnarch is internationally regarded as one of the most exciting and versatile violinists of her generation. Born in Bucharest, Romania, Ani started performing at the age of seven. In 1974 she moved to Israel and continued her studies with Felix Andrievsky at the Samuel Rubin Music Academy, Tel Aviv University, with whom she also studied later at the Royal College of Music, London.

Among Ani Schnarch's recital performances have been a highly acclaimed programme of Bartok and Ysaye at the South Bank and her Wigmore Hall debut in 1989, where she was invited to return numerous times. Ani has broadcast for radio and television and on the web in Austria, France, Germany, Israel, Norway, Romania, Russia, the US, and on BBC3, including a unique series of all Bartok's works for violin and piano. In concerto, Ani has appeared with major orchestras worldwide and at the main venues in England, France, Israel, Italy, Norway, Romania, Spain, the USA, Russia, and the Far East. She has played at the Bath, Bergen, Bowdoin, Lake District, Moscow, and Windsor Festivals, to mention but a few.

In addition to her busy concert schedule, Ani is in great demand as a professor of violin at the Royal College of Music, London, gives masterclasses in Europe, the USA, Canada, China, Singapore, Israel, and Japan, and has been a Juror of numerous International Violin Competitions. She is one of the founders and faculty member of the internationally renowned Keshet Eilon Violin Mastercourse, Israel, and the Artistic Director of New Virtuosi Mastercourse

and Festivals in the UK and Italy. In recognition of her services to music, in 2019, Ani Schnarch was awarded a Fellowship of the Royal College of Music, London.

### **Almita Vamos**

Almita Vamos is a graduate of the Juilliard School, where she studied with Mischa Mischakoff and Louis Persinger. Almita Vamos has won the Presidential Award for Excellence in Teaching six times, the ASTA Distinguished Teacher of the Year Award, and has been featured on “Sunday Morning” CBS and in the New York Times best-selling book, *Battle Hymn of a Tiger Mom* by Amy Chua.

Mrs. Vamos has served on the violin faculty of Western Illinois University, University of Minnesota, the Oberlin Conservatory, and Northwestern University. Mrs. Vamos is currently on the faculty of the Music Institute of Chicago, is an Artist Teacher at the Chicago College of Performing Arts at Roosevelt University, and spends summers teaching at the Chautauqua Summer Music Institute and Aspen Music Festival. Mrs. Vamos’s students have won top prizes in many national competitions including Klein, Stuhlborg, Johannsen, Corpus Christi, Kingsville; and international competitions including Tchaikovsky, Carl Flesch, Menuhin, Bach (Leipzig), Szigeti, Kreisler, Neilsen, Paganini, and Montreal. Her students play in many orchestras, including the New York Philharmonic, Boston Symphony, St. Louis Symphony, San Francisco Symphony, Los Angeles Philharmonic, National Symphony, Minnesota Orchestra, Hong Kong Philharmonic, Oslo Philharmonic, and many others.

She was a member of the Lydian Trio and the Antioch Quartet and has recorded under Coronet and Rizzoli labels. She has concertized throughout North, Central, and South America, Europe, and Asia. Her recitals in New York won praise from the New York Times and Herald Tribune. She won the Concert Artist Guild Award, among many other prizes, and has performed

recitals at the 92nd Street Y, Town Hall, and Carnegie Recital Hall. She continues to perform as a soloist and chamber musician in America and abroad. She also has given and continues to give masterclasses in the US, Europe, and Asia. Mrs. Vamos and her husband have recently commissioned and recorded works for violin and viola by living composers in Chicago.

### **Mimi Zweig**

Mimi Zweig is professor of music in violin at the Indiana University Jacobs School of Music and director of the Indiana University String Academy. She joined the Jacobs School of Music faculty in 1976.

Zweig studied with Louis Krasner, Samuel Kissel, Raphael Bronstein, and Tadeusz Wroński. She has been a member of the Syracuse Symphony, American Symphony under Leopold Stokowski, and Indianapolis Symphony. She has developed pre-college string programs across the United States since 1972.

Zweig has given master classes and pedagogy workshops in the United States, Mexico, Canada, Israel, Japan, Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, and throughout Europe. Her innovative web-based teaching tool, Mimi Zweig StringPedagogy.com, is accessed worldwide.

American Public Television released the Emmy-nominated documentary *Circling Around—The Violin Virtuosi*, featuring IU String Academy students, in spring 2006.

In 2019, Zweig was the recipient of the American String Teachers Association Artist Teacher Award. Her students have won numerous competitions and teach and perform worldwide.

### **Procedure: Data Collection and Analysis**

Each participant was interviewed online using Zoom. The interviews were recorded using the Zoom record feature and then archived in a secure server via an online cloud. Interviews

were scheduled for one hour, and, when requested, a list of questions was provided to each participant before the interview. The semi-structured interviews were conversational and emergent. All questions were open-ended and additional thoughts were shared and explored as they came up naturally in conversation. The complete list of questions is available in Appendix A. The list included questions such as, “Describe your studio and how it functions. How do you organize lessons and studio classes at your institution? (Is it large? small? How many undergraduates versus graduates?)” and “How do you organize communal studio time? What types of things do you do during your studio classes? Is it similar to a studio recital, masterclass, public lesson, discussion?”

Transcriptions of these interviews were created using an online transcription service called “Trint.” These transcriptions were then reviewed for accuracy and edited by the principal investigator. The transcriptions were memoed, coded using in-vivo coding (to better capture an emic perspective of the interviewees), and finally member-checked. The memoed and coded transcriptions were reviewed by an external auditor. Disagreements in coding were discussed and resolved collaboratively before emergent themes were identified. It is important to note that in this study, I was not seeking an absolute truth; rather, I was analyzing the thoughts and statements of individuals about their perspectives on teaching. As Stenbacka (2001) stated, “the concept of reliability is even misleading in qualitative research. If a qualitative study is discussed with reliability as a criterion, the consequence is rather that the study is no good” (p. 552).

Emergent themes and significant deviations in values or ideas regarding studio culture or purpose were noted and organized. These emergent themes were discussed and analyzed among the principal investigator and outside auditor, and transcripts were then reviewed again with themes in mind.

### **Description and Disclosure of Principal Investigator**

My interest in the topic of studio culture stems first from my experience as a violin student in many studios. I attended Utah State University, an undergraduate-only program, for my Bachelors of Music Degree. There, I studied with Rebecca McFaul and the Fry Street Quartet. During my time at Utah State, I studied abroad at the Gustav Mahler Conservatory in Klagenfurt, Austria, with Brian Finlayson for a semester. After graduating from Utah State, I moved to Boulder, Colorado, where I was head teaching assistant to Charles Wetherbee for a Master of Music degree in Violin Performance and Pedagogy. After finishing my degree in Colorado, I moved to Texas, where I studied as the head teaching assistant with Annie Chalex Boyle. At the time of writing this dissertation, I was a teaching assistant to Marjorie Bagley in my terminal degree at the University of North Carolina Greensboro. While studying with these professors, each managed their studio relationships and time very differently; I found the way that this dynamic changes the experience of the students in their studios fascinating. I have great respect for each of these teachers and consider myself lucky to have studied and worked alongside each of them.

As I look to the future and seriously consider my role as a studio teacher and leader, I wanted to explore how other teachers manage their studio time, so I could know how best to manage relationships in my own studio, as well as provide this important information to other studio teachers wanting mindfully to craft the best experience possible for their students. My personal bias is that studio culture is very important, and I approached this research with that perspective.

I am obviously influenced by my experiences with my teachers, and my interest in this topic really stems from wanting every student to have the best possible experience and a desire to



understand what that experience looks like in the high-functioning studios of well-regarded teachers. In order to best mitigate any personal bias, I chose to exclude any teacher with whom I had studied for a degree program or had worked regularly in a long-term capacity. With some teachers, such as Sally O'Reilly, Ani Schnarch, and Felicia Moye, I have had lessons in a short-term festival or trial capacity (none more than three weeks consecutively). Afterward, I maintained a professional relationship with these teachers and am grateful for their interest and involvement in this study, as well as in this field of research. I met Mimi Zweig through a weekend-long workshop that she conducted in conjunction with the Duke String School in the school year of 2019-2020, but I have never studied with her in a private or studio setting. I had never met or spoken with Almita Vamos or Kyung Sun Lee prior to this study.

### **Limitations and Delimitations**

This study examined the experiences and perspectives of a limited number of classical violin pedagogues in regards to their studio dynamic and culture. This study did not take into account the experience of the students in their studios, or specifically their individual one-on-one relationships with their students. It also did not represent the culture or tradition of teaching of other studio-based learning environments or even the learning traditions of other instruments or styles of playing. Additionally, the results of this study are not necessarily applicable to all students, studios, or pedagogues and could potentially be different if a different group of participants had been interviewed. The goal of this research was to discover how these six violin professors managed their studio time and to use that information as a catalyst for further inquiry into the research area of group learning in studio-based instructional environments. Further research is needed to understand the impact of studio culture on the experience, learning, and success of students, as well as how leading pedagogues of other instruments or styles relate,

manage, or perceive the culture of their studios. Studio teachers and music educators may find the results of this research apropos to other research topics involving studio-based or group learning.

## CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore how reputable violin professors purposefully develop the culture in their violin studios. Through interviews with reputable violin professors, I hoped to discover how these teachers maximize student success, cultivate social and emotional learning, as well as foster wholesome and rewarding undergraduate experiences. A significant part of determining how violin professors develop the culture in their violin studios was to discuss how they engaged with their studios during shared studio time. While exploring this shared studio time, it became clear that participants partially used this shared studio time to teach their students how to teach. Analysis of the interviews with the six participants revealed four common themes: (a) the use of socialization outside of studio time to cultivate interpersonal relationships; (b) the use of familial terminology to describe their studio; (c) the use of inherited, cyclical pedagogy, supervised apprenticing, and/or constructed peer mentorship; and (d) the essential role of regular studio class meetings and the use of emotional labor to maintain a positive atmosphere in those classes.

Each participant provided basic profiles of their studios, past and present, their perception and understanding of the culture of their studio(s), as well as their current use, type, and expectation of group learning (for those participants still actively teaching at universities or conservatories). These profiles varied widely for several reasons. Some participants taught at large, public universities (i.e., the University of Minnesota, Indiana University, University of Houston) while others taught at elite conservatories (i.e., the Royal College of Music) during the time of this study. Schools of music in different regions of the world have different curricula, and the participants' experiences as learners varied widely based on where they were trained as well as with whom they had studied.

Many of the participants openly shared information about their personal experiences as learners, including their experiences with peers who had studied with the same teacher. As previous research has shown, the way musicians teach is intimately tied to how they were taught, and in some ways, this manifests in the use and style of group learning that the participants used in their own studios now as teachers.

### **Profiles of Studio Composition, Studio Classes, and Studio Culture**

#### **Studio Composition**

At the time of interviews, each participant taught a mix of undergraduate and graduate students, with two of the participants also teaching “institute” or “pre-college” students in addition to their collegiate studios. These studios (university versus pre-college) were managed separately and distinctly in both participant cases. In the studios composed of university students, each teacher taught a balance of undergraduate and graduate students. This ratio of graduates to undergraduates was curated, with some participants working to maintain a close to 50/50 ratio of graduates to undergraduates, while others preferred a larger undergraduate population with a few graduate students.

All but one violin professor was working with doctoral-level performance students at the time of the interviews. Ani Schnarch, who teaches at the Royal College of Music in London, was not teaching any DMA students as the conservatory does not offer that degree. She does occasionally work with Ph.D. students; however, this degree is heavily research-based and outside her scope of intensive, performance-based students.

In the case of Mimi Zweig, she also has all degrees/levels of students, with there usually being more undergraduate students in the mix. Kyung Sun Lee, alternatively, works to maintain a studio of 50/50 graduate versus undergraduate students in her studio at Seoul National

University. This is similar to Sally O'Reilly, who also works to maintain a balance between graduate and undergraduate at the University of Minnesota.

### **The Studio Class**

In the interviews, the participants used different terminology to describe their shared studio time, colloquially called a “studio class” in the United States. The semantics of this shared time is worth exploring, as the terminology used may help illuminate the priorities of the research participants for their classes and for their students meeting in those classes. Additionally, there was a great range in the frequency of class meetings, durations, and content within the class.

Participants whose teaching was based primarily within the United States (Felicia Moye, Sally O'Reilly, Almita Vamos, and Mimi Zweig) all held weekly studio classes, which was expected of them by their employers (all of which were universities). Some of these universities made the classes a part of the curriculum, with students enrolling in a distinct, required “studio class” for credit. In one case, students were required to register for a non-credit “studio class.” Studio class varied in names with titles such as “studio class,” “repertoire class,” or “performance class.” Other participants were expected to teach a weekly studio class as part of their private teaching load without a separate course in which students would register, while still others had a distinct course in which students could register, but not as a required part of the curricula. Kyung Sun Lee (in South Korea) and Ani Schnarch (in the United Kingdom) both taught occasional studio classes. Both instructors held classes as performance opportunities for their students. Professor Schnarch held classes twice a semester and only once in the final term because of exams; additional classes were scheduled at the discretion of the instructor. At the time of her interview, Kyung Sun Lee stated that studio classes were scheduled based on “need,”

as studio classes at Seoul National University were not required. Additionally, she purposefully limited the number of studio classes to mitigate costs to her students, as they were required to pay for pianists to perform with them in the classes. She also noted that she was required to teach weekly studio classes when she worked in the United States (at the University of Houston and previously at Oberlin College). Each of the participants made it clear that they required their students to attend these classes, regardless of the disparate registration arrangements of the institutions.

In a few cases, participants separated the students in their studio into classes based on their level in school (first year, second year, etc.) or by graduate/undergraduate classification. These smaller, more distinct studio classes were in addition to the studio-wide class, not actually replacing the studio-wide class entirely. Additionally, some schools of music required larger performance classes, sometimes called “string area” (a weekly performance class for all string students), or classes based on the level of the student in school, such as a “sophomore performance hour,” which included students from various teachers and disciplines.

Participants described what happened during their studio classes and how they managed this shared time with their students. In all cases, the classes functioned as a performance opportunity for students. Some participants described it as a chance for a “superb performance” or that the class is “like a concert.” Some teachers had students perform works “in their entirety,” with piano, while others strove to have all their students perform what they had prepared, even if it was just a few pages of music, to “get the experience of performing” regularly in a “safe place.” One participant wanted her students “performing as often as possible to be prepared for whatever they need to be prepared for,” with another saying the class functions as a preparation for big performances. Another participant characterized playing for your peers as one of the

toughest performance opportunities stating, “if you can play for your peers, you can play in front of anybody.”

In addition to using the class as a performance opportunity, some of the participants mindfully used their class as an opportunity to observe their students providing feedback and critiquing performance. Some teachers had their students give comments to be sure the listeners were “active during the performance,” while others had students give comments because “teaching makes you a better player.” In many instances, performers would then “try again” or “practice” (in the class, in front of their peers) based on comments or suggestions made by peers or the teacher. The students giving comments were characterized as “supportive, not injurious,” and the participants encouraged their students to share “what they like and what they think could be better and how they could make it better.” In a few instances, comments were not required or even necessarily expected. In one instance, the participant noted that they did not expect freshmen to make comments until they were comfortable, found their voice, and had been adequately socialized into the studio culture.

Often, the comments by the study participants insinuated that the onus of the studio class was focused on improving the *playing* of both the student performing and the student providing feedback, not on the improvement of the student providing feedback *as a future teacher*. In two cases, the participants made it clear that the studio class functioned as a “workshop” space. Students were encouraged to ask questions when performing or when observing a peer perform. One of these participants even used extra studio time (and occasionally prioritized time) to work on scales as a group. For these participants, the class functioned as a “safe gathering place,” with the participant mindfully using studio class as a tool to allow students a space to talk to each other, hang out, bring them closer together, and get to know each other. One participant even

held the studio class in their home and made food for the students to enjoy after the class had ended. The participant noted that “students like to come.”

### **Studio Culture**

During the interviews, participants were asked to describe their current studio culture, the different types of relationships between students in their studio, as well as how that has changed over time. This question obviously had limitations, as the participants interacted with their studio as the leader, and each maintained a personal relationship with each individual student. However, it was worthwhile to hear how they perceive the culture among their students and how they feel that culture influences student success and learning. Additionally, none of the participants had written expectations of interpersonal behavior between members of their studios.

All of the participants characterized their studio as a supportive, friendly place. One said it had “a very friendly atmosphere,” with another saying that the students in their studio were “really close and extremely supportive.” When asked if there was ever any tension, participants responded that “it just doesn’t exist.” A participant spoke of their students, saying, “They know each other so well.” A different participant noted that their students “just understood” interpersonal expectations within the studio, while another worked to create a studio that was inclusive, genial, and collegial with a culture of care. This participant characterized their studio as having “a real family feel.” One participant said their studio was characterized by constructive criticism and positive attitudes. Another said their students were careful not to offend others, and they were appreciative of the support from each other and the effort their peers were making in performance.

Some participants attributed the “friendly atmosphere” in their studio to themselves. One participant described their studio as “naturally supportive” because “I don’t seem to attract catty



students.” Another participant shared that they believed they attracted a certain type of student, and subsequently, their students get along because of “shared affinity.” This participant believed that shared affinity was created through shared goals and experiences, leading to positive interpersonal relationships and friendships.

In some instances, participants shared experiences involving studio dissonance and competitiveness. None of the participants actively fostered competitiveness; one specifically mentioned that they strove for a non-competitive studio. Other participants mentioned that competitiveness happened naturally, sometimes as a necessary product of the culture of music-making and that it had a purpose and function within the studio. One participant mentioned that they had experiences of studio dissonance that was a product of jealousy from the perceived extra attention they were giving other students. The participant mentioned that this jealous mindset is fixed and that some students come with jealous temperaments. This participant shared that in moments of studio dissonance, they have found it best not to get involved, with another participant stating that they “let the (studio) dynamic run its own course.”

### **Emergent Themes**

#### **Socializing Beyond the Studio Class**

The participants all discussed socializing with the members of their studio as a group outside of the standard studio class as a way of building relationships and “esprit de corps.” This manifested in a variety of ways, including connecting online (especially during the COVID-19 pandemic), social gatherings in public and private spaces, as well as performing together in various ways. Some participants also discussed how they assigned students in their studios to work together on various projects and tasks to enhance student learning and the effectiveness of their own teaching.

Five of the six participants shared that they have social get-togethers (described as “parties,” “celebrations,” and “get-togethers”). Of these five, four would do scheduled, regular parties at least once per year. The description of these get-togethers ranged from “social dinners” to “blow-out parties.” One participant noted, “I want them [their students] to be friends, and we’ll do a party for our studios once or twice a year just to get together.” Some described studio boat rides, taking their students to dinners and classical music concerts, and celebrating by going out together after a faculty or student performance or recital.

In addition to social get-togethers and outings, some participants described using studio performances as a way of building studio relationships and improving studio culture. Some of these performances were based on a specific composer. For example, one participant described having a “Kreisler Abend” where every member of their studio would perform a work by Fritz Kreisler, and then “everybody played ‘Liebesleid’ together, and I accompanied them.” Another participant described doing “project” recitals, where (for example) the members of their studio would perform all of the Bach “Sonatas and Partitas,” with each member contributing a movement or two or together performing a collection of Mozart sonatas for violin and piano. One participant specifically mentioned that their greatest mentor did these studio performances, and they find them imperative in their own experience.

Many of the participants also described online platforms that their students used to engage with each other. Interestingly, in each case, the participant was clear that they themselves were not involved in these online communities. One participant shared, “They [their students] have their own Facebook page. I’m not part of that Facebook page, which is kind of like the parent not wanting to interfere with anything that’s going on ... They’re really close and extremely supportive.” In one instance, the students of one participant have an online group

where they share edited sheet music (for bowings and fingerings) as well as other technical and pedagogical information. Another participant noted that their students maintain a Facebook group of current and past students.

Some participants shared unique ways in which they engage with their studios in meaningful, community-building ways. One made it a priority to take every member of their studio (that they referred to as “kids”) to lunch at least once a year. Another participant created a recital space in their home for their students (and other students at their institution) to use for their degree recitals, with a celebratory party taking place immediately after the performance in their home. The participant shared, “I actually had a recital hall in my home, and so a lot of students would give their recitals in my home ... it was a small living room, and I had a little baby grand Steinway M, and yeah, it was fun.” Similarly, a separate participant held studio classes in their home and provided food for the members of their studio after. Another participant created chamber music ensembles out of members of her studio, some of which would stay together for their entire university experience.

### **Using Familial Terminology to Describe Their Studio**

Four of the six participants used terminology throughout the interview that directly or indirectly compared their students to their “children” or their “family.” This sense of closeness seemed inherent in the way many of the participants discussed their studio culture, not necessarily the product of a cultivated familial dynamic, and extended to the terminology the participants used when describing members of their studio. One participant spoke casually about their students, referring to them as their “kids” and stating that there was a “real family feel in the studio ... I’d like to pat myself on the back because I would encourage that,” while another spoke in depth about the familial bonds they have cultivated with their students, literally inviting

them into their family. In any case, the sense of “family” within the way they conceived of their studio was consistent.

In one instance, a participant called their students their “musical children” and compared the way they both tried to emulate and change the way they were taught to play the violin to the way they were raised and subsequently have raised their biological children. They continued,

I taught my children, and I educated them in a very dissimilar way from which I was brought up. And, of course, the core ideas are there. But the expression is different ... the students are our musical children. And there are things that I do not teach my students because I found that they are not unuseful, but they are professionally unlivable.

When describing how they establish appropriate studio behavior, a participant shared, “It’s like I raised my children, they saw my behavior, and they behave that way.” In some instances, the participants noted that they tried to do what their “musical parent” did well while avoiding the things their teacher did that they thought were harmful.

In another interview, the participant referred to the network of past and present students as their “family.” In the interview, they mentioned that even when their students meet abroad or in the future at other institutions or when pursuing advanced degrees elsewhere, there is a feeling of camaraderie and affinity that exists having studied with the same teacher at some point, even if it wasn’t simultaneously. This participant took pride in knowing that their students, past and present, will support and look out for one another.

One teacher, who characterized themselves as “very laid back and casual” with their students, created familial bonds in lasting ways. In addition to referring to their students as their “kids,” referring to themselves as the “parent” of the group, and comparing their students to their children, this participant prioritized caring for their students (which are viewed as life-long)

beyond just teaching the violin. This included helping when they were in financial distress or in interpersonal straits with family or friends. On multiple occasions, the participant had students that came from abroad live with them (which they no longer allow), two of which became future in-laws. In those situations, the participant noted that students were only allowed to live with them if they came from abroad or were in bad family situations. Another participant shared that they had also, at one point, lived with their violin teacher and that they were not only like a parent to them but their actual legal guardian.

These discussions demonstrated the uniqueness and depth of the interpersonal relationships that can and do exist between violin instructors and their students, as well as between students of a shared violin instructor. When managed, these relationships can enhance student learning and provide an environment where critical friendship can flourish.

### **Cyclical Pedagogy, Supervised Apprenticing, and/or Constructed Peer Mentorship**

When discussing ways in which the participants (and their students) engaged with members of their studio outside of private lesson times and the studio class, an interesting theme emerged. Teaching the violin has been characterized by the master/teacher apprentice model for hundreds of years and continues today, but it also appears, based on the accounts of the participants, that learning *how* to teach can exist in a constructed way. Five of the six participants described ways in which they have their students work with each other, but each scenario was within specific parameters and always under the auspices (in some way) of the studio teacher. The level of autonomy granted to the ‘student-teacher,’ in this context, varied between participants.

Multiple participants shared that university and conservatory music training is weighted towards solo performance, to the detriment of other modes of playing and of teaching, but that

they worked to provide ways in which they could teach their students how to teach within this model. When asked why they felt the need to provide students with these opportunities, one participant shared that teaching made you a better player and that she had been taught by her coach and teacher, quoting them as saying, “(he) always used to say that he always amazed himself at how many of his own problems he solved by giving lessons! It would be like, ‘Oh, yeah!’” While this does put priority on teaching, it still appears that the purpose for teaching is to help the student be a better player, with the purpose of teaching to solve “many of (their) own problems.”

One way in which participants had students engage with each other in a pedagogical context was a system of constructed peer mentorship. Participants would have students work with a peer on a piece of music or technical exercise in which the ‘student teacher’ had just worked on with the studio teacher. The participants explained their reasoning for constructing this mentorship scheme. Two participants mentioned that this setup was partly practical and that having students turn around and teach what they had just been taught by their studio teacher saved them time. One participant mentioned that this worked well, especially when students were learning very difficult pieces; having a student that had worked on the piece with them teach a peer gave the peer a “head start” and saved the studio teacher time and having to repeat themselves with a new student. The participant shared, “When I have a student who plays it [referring to a difficult piece] really well if they are still around when somebody else in the studio asks for it ... I always will have the student who has performed it give lessons because that helps both of them.” Another participant noted that when they have a student that needs additional help, they will have a more advanced student work with the weaker student on a specific skill or technique because it helps the advanced student’s understanding of the technique

while also aiding the weaker student's playing ability. The participant also would have the weaker student 'teach' the more advanced student because when they "verbalize what they've been taught," they learn more thoroughly.

Another common way in which many of the participants had their students work with each other (outside of the studio class) was in duos or small groups focusing on technical work, specifically scales and etudes. Two participants specifically discussed how they would assign two students to work together on scales, stating that they would help each other hear things and hold each other accountable to practice them. In another scenario, a participant described how they use a mentorship program to methodically progress each of their students through their codified technical regimens. When asked what their assistants worked on with their students, they responded, "mostly technique ... scales and etudes. They go through a graded list of etudes." More advanced students were assigned to work with younger students, but exclusively on scales and technique, with indirect supervision from the participant. The participant would have these advanced students teach younger students, but then the younger student would perform the technical exercise or scale for the participant in their lesson as a way for the participant to check what was being taught and the effectiveness of the teaching.

At the time of the interviews, many of the participants worked with teaching assistants, and the ways that they engaged and spoke of their teaching assistants varied. Five of the participants had teaching assistants, and all of them mentioned that they use their teaching assistants to aid in teaching undergraduates. In every case, the participants noted that they had directed their assistants to work on technique with the undergraduate students, with one stating that their assistant "took care of a lot of the technical things." Lessons with teaching assistants were normally in addition to the lessons taught by the participants, with one participant noting

that they “co-taught” with their assistant, with both giving lessons every week. In one instance, the participant employed a professional assistant that is not a student because they felt they could really trust this person. In a separate instance, a participant noted of their assistant: “I respect him so much that I let him teach some of my students.” Before this assistant, the participant did not have students work together because they “never felt that I could totally trust.”

This element of trust was one that came up in conversation during multiple interviews and is worth exploring. One element that arose with multiple participants was the perceived need for students to be at a certain level before they should begin teaching. This “performer as teacher” model has been the standard of high-level, collegiate teaching. One participant mentioned that teachers “must be good players that can teach set up, bow strokes, shifting, vibrato ... all of which comes through their own private lessons.” When asked about the purpose of teacher training, one mentioned that it was not necessary and depends not on who you want to teach but “more likely, depends who you will need to teach.” Another mentioned that teacher training is not required but that once a person knows how to play, it makes knowledge transfer easier by saving time and sharing information.

The colloquialism “those who cannot do, teach” was discussed with three of the six participants. One participant noted that you must be a good performer to teach but that being a good performer does not make you a great teacher. Another participant said the opposite, stating that you do not need to be a great performer to be a great teacher. In another instance, I asked, “Do you think the saying ‘those who can’t do, teach’ is not necessarily true? ... (and) to add on top of that, do you think that ‘those who do the best, can teach the best?’” They responded, “but some of the people who play the best are dreadful teachers.” I countered with, “Do you feel like there are teachers who teach the best that are dreadful players?” and the participant responded



first with, “I don’t know,” and then continued by sharing that it depended “on why they were not good players.” In some ways, this paradigm rarifies teachers to the highest level, requiring them to be the best players but without guaranteeing that they are even decent teachers.

### **Essential Role of Studio Class**

As part of the interview process, participants were asked to discuss their undergraduate experience and how they felt they related to their peers and their teachers. Surprisingly, half of the participants reported that they never had undergraduate studio classes, two reported that they had occasional classes (two or three times a semester), and only one reported that they had regular studio classes and that they were every other week. This participant was the only one to report ever giving feedback as a student in those classes. The others, when they had a studio class, it functioned as a masterclass or a performance. One participant mentioned that their teacher only held classes when “students were ready to do it.” Additionally, three participants shared that they did not know other students who took lessons from their teachers, and two participants shared that they knew other students who took lessons from their teachers because of chance or school association.

Regardless of their experiences as learners, four of the six participants held weekly studio classes, with the other two holding multiple studio classes throughout the semester. Not only do they prioritize having these classes, but participants also shared their thoughts on the essential nature of these classes. One participant shared, saying, “(I) can’t envision teaching a younger person without that group experience,” and that a studio class guided by a teacher and paired with pedagogy courses is “extremely useful” and helps students become “not surprisingly, really good teachers.” Another shared saying that maintaining and requiring a studio class where students give comments is “vital” because “students need to get over their fear of talking about

playing, and they will have to teach and explain things one day themselves,” adding that studio classes are the best place to teach students how to teach. In addition to teaching students how to teach, a participant noted that the classes are worthwhile because students “absorb some things from other students.” In one instance, a participant shared that they learned from their mother (a well-regarded music teacher) that using group lessons was a way to create an “esprit de corps” and then shared that this was confirmed by their graduate teacher in their terminal degree. They stated, “I just always thought that if my students feel confident with each other, are able to trust each other, they will learn at least as much from each other as they do from me.”

Beyond sharing their thoughts on the importance of the studio class, many participants also shared the emotional labor that they put into maintaining a studio class with a positive culture. One participant shared that the teacher’s role in creating a positive environment and fostering a healthy group learning situation is leading and mentoring by examples of correct responses towards critique and interpersonal behavior. Another participant shared that they moderated their classes and that when a rogue comment was made, they would immediately correct the issue, be it an incorrect comment about technique or a comment that was “out of line.” They shared that bad attitudes or cruelty in responses were never tolerated and were corrected in the moment. A participant shared that one needs “so many inner resources in order to make a lively lesson,” but continued, saying that the emotional labor was necessary to maintain a positive learning environment. Another said of studio classes that teachers “have to extend a little bit,” with another stating that the higher expectations of interpersonal behavior you have for your class, “the more you’re going to get out of your studio.”

One participant shared how their expectation and experience with studio classes have changed over time, particularly in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Before the pandemic,

this participant limited the number of studio classes to mitigate cost (for piano collaborators) and travel time for their students. Due to the limitations of the COVID-19 pandemic, this participant switched to online studio classes, which made the use of pianists and the issue of travel time obsolete. The classes switched from a performance-based class that happened a few times a semester to a regular workshop-based class. The participant noted that this is a change that they will maintain and continue to use in their studio teaching.

When taking together their experiences as a learner the way they prioritize studio classes now, the understanding and acceptance of the work it takes to maintain a positive learning environment, as well as how their use of studio classes has changed over time, it is clear that the participants view studio classes as imperative to the learning experience of their students, both as players and future teachers.

## CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore how reputable violin professors purposefully develop the culture in their violin studios. Analysis of the interviews with the six participants revealed four common themes: (a) the use of socialization outside of studio time to cultivate interpersonal relationships; (b) the use of familial terminology to describe their studio (c) the use of inherited, cyclical pedagogy, supervised apprenticing, and/or constructed peer mentorship; and (d) the essential role of regular studio class meetings and the use of emotional labor to maintain a positive atmosphere in those classes. This chapter will relate these findings to previous studies on group learning, the pedagogy of teachers, cycles of pedagogy, the socialization of students, as well as ways of developing studio culture and fostering critical friendship through emotional labor and the directed use of positive interaction.

The violin studio class, and other versions of shared studio time, can make a significant impact on the violin student's experience in higher education. This group dynamic varies greatly from institution to institution (and even between different studios at the same institution), and mindful cultivation of the culture of this group can aid in student performance, development of their skills as future teachers, and deepen lifelong connections.

### **Relating Results to Research on Studio Learning**

The definition of a small group, as provided by Tubbs (1984), is in sync with the participants' description of their university studios. Gaunt (2008) described shared studio time as having limited interpersonal interaction, which for the majority of the participants was not the case as they reported weekly studio classes. Some participants cultivated their studios more than others, effectively creating "communities of practice," with the belief that their students can

learn from participating in social practices just as much, if not more, than resulting from direct teaching and knowledge transfer (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

The participants in this study demonstrated and described the cyclical nature of violin pedagogy as has been discussed in previous research related to studio learning (Creech & Hallam 2010; Daniel & Parkes, 2015; Gaunt, 2011; Haddon, 2009; Hanken, 2016; Jørgensen, 2000; Mills & Smith, 2003). Their use of closely supervised peer mentorship, which, in some instances, was only allowed in situations where trust had been established, demonstrates the control with which information is transferred in the master-apprentice model (Fredrickson, 2007a; Gaunt, 2011; Haddon, 2009; Hanken, 2016).

Interestingly, in the case of studio classes, many teachers did not simply do what their teachers did, as was argued by many scholars studying master-apprentice tuition (Daniel & Parkes, 2017; Hallam, 1998; Jørgensen, 2000; Mills & Smith, 2003). Instead, many of the participants spoke of their mindful use of studio classes as a place to work with their students, create camaraderie, and mindfully cultivate their student's abilities as teachers, as opposed to their experiences as learners, which was characterized by masterclass-style studio classes, a phenomenon of studio learning which has been observed by other studies of group learning in a master-apprentice environment (Gaunt, 2008, 2010; Hanken, 2016; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Additionally, participants discussed their relationships with members of their studios (and members of their studios to each other) in terms of "family," which is consistent with Gaunt's (2011) study, which compared teachers' relationships with students to a parent/child dynamic or even a doctor/patient dynamic.

In terms of socialization, some participants discussed using studio classes as a laboratory for students to learn how to teach while also being a place for high-level performance. As has

been researched, teachers are one of the largest influences and role models in the socialization of students (Austin et al., 2012; Hargreaves et al., 2007; Isbell, 2009). By championing the role of teachers, the phenomenon of the role of “performer” being more highly valued can be challenged, and the active development of teachers is supported without perceived social inferiority (Austin et al., 2012). Fredrickson (2007b) found that students who take their role as a teacher seriously are subsequently better teachers. Some participants used the studio class mindfully to encourage their students to take their role of teacher more seriously.

Gaunt (2011), as well as Creech and Hallam (2010), describe the dilemma of closeness/responsiveness in studio teachers. Creech and Hallam (2010) created a matrix of interpersonal relationships that are determined by control and responsiveness. The authors argue that teacher/student relationships exist on a matrix of “upperness-lowerness” (control) and “closeness-distance” (responsiveness). Participants in this study fell in a variety of places on this matrix, based on their self-reported relationship with students and the control, which they insinuated exhibiting based on their use of teaching assistants, student input in studio classes, and their reported relationships with their students. One participant described this “balance between fulfilling the teacher role... whilst maintaining a responsive, cooperative persona” (Creech & Hallam, 2010, p. 418) by saying, “I’m not one of them, but I’m certainly on their team.”

Participants in this study argued for the efficacy, necessity, and continued use of group learning in the tertiary music studio, as has been researched and studied by many scholars (Daniel, 2008; Gaunt & Westerlund, 2013; Hanken, 2016; Latukefu, 2009; Lebler, 2008; Luce, 2001; Sawyer, 2006). Some participants noted that by having open dialogue within their studio classes, their students were able to understand issues of their own playing while also

strengthening listening and assessing skills, as was also described and observed by Daniel (2008).

Based on the definition provided by Costa and Kallik (1993), studio mates in a highly-entitative studio (as was described by most of the participants) fit the definition of a “critical friend.” By cultivating critical friendship through extra-curricular activities, participants were able to create mutually supportive yet critical “communities of practice.” Participants discussed the emotional labor of maintaining a group studio and modeling appropriate responses and behavior, which matches with the description provided by Watson and Ward (2013), which states, “the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display ... This labour requires one to induce or suppress feeling in order to sustain the outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others” (p. 2905). Ideas and suggestions taken from the participants, as well as from previous research, for cultivating critical friendship in the context of a violin studio will be discussed below.

### **Critical Friendship in the Violin Studio**

When the participants were asked to describe the culture of their studio, many commented on the friendliness of their students. One said, “it has a very friendly atmosphere,” another, “a real family feel,” and yet another, “really close and extremely supportive.” How did these top-level teachers, with consistent records of success as pedagogues, create or curate an environment that allowed for this friendliness to develop? One participant attributed it to a “shared affinity” that was created through shared goals and experiences, which is common among all the violin studios examined in discussion. Others mindfully socialize with their students to create a spirit of camaraderie among their students. This “esprit de corps” was

common among all the studios studied, and the participants attribute the success of their students in part to the group of which they are a part.

How then, as violin teachers, can we cultivate this environment in our own studios? How can we do it most effectively, and what would that look like? I believe that, at varying levels and extents, these teachers were engaging with a version of Costa and Kallick's (1993) protocol of "critical friendship." The authors define a "critical friend" as

a trusted person who asks provocative questions, provides data to be examined through another lens, and offers critique of a person's work as a friend. A critical friend takes the time to fully understand the context of the work presented and the outcomes that the person or group is working toward. The friend is an advocate for the success of that work. (p. 50)

We can assume that studio mates understand the context of learning how to play the violin, and those who do not can be appropriately socialized through their first few semesters of school. We can also assume that studio peers also are aware of the desired outcomes towards which their peers are working. How, then, do we create students who trust, ask provocative questions, and advocate for the success of their peers as friends? Even more importantly, what is a "friend" in this context?

According to Argyle and Henderson (1984), friends share news of success with each other, show emotional support, volunteer help in time of need, strive to make him/her happy while in each other's company, repay debts and favors, trust and confide in the other, stand up for the person in their absence, be tolerant of other friends, don't criticize in public, keep confidences, don't be jealous or critical of other relationships, don't nag, (and) respect privacy. (p. 231)



In some instances, mutual interests and goals are enough to create a sense of friendship, as was described by some of the participants. In other circumstances, a “code of conduct” or a document outlining the excellence expected (based on the definition of a friend above) of interpersonal behavior with studio mates may be of help. None of the participants described using these tools.

Based on the findings of this study, a studio teacher can cultivate an environment where their students display these characteristics towards each other through modeling and emotional labor, socializing out of classrooms, and creating a sense of “family.” Participants described using parties and social get-togethers as a way of building rapport with each other, as well as creating a sense of trust. It is important that during these events, studio teachers maintain a clear demarcation of roles (Swaffield, 2004) as this is imperative to the success of critical friendship. First, the role of teacher/student should be clear and set, as was demonstrated by a participant noting, “I’m not one of them, but I’m certainly on their team,” with “one of them” being a student in this case. This demarcation of roles is also important when students are giving and receiving critique in the context of a studio class. Additionally, parties could be thrown for specific celebrations (such as a graduation party for graduating seniors or a post-recital outing), as this is a characteristic of friendship (sharing news of success).

Another method in which participants had students interact with each other outside of studio classes was shared performances. Studio recitals, themed concerts, and studio “projects” were all types of performances that participants described their studios doing together, which built friendship and trust, as well as allowed a tangible way for students to advocate for the success of their studio mates. By working together towards a shared goal, camaraderie and trust can be built in a studio.

Additionally, some participants described taking their studios to dinners or to concerts as a group. These can be powerful tools, as students can observe great musicians together with their teacher, creating a stronger sense of shared purpose and goals.

Finally, another way in which teachers of the violin can cultivate an environment where critical friendship can flourish is using online platforms. Many of the participants described different ways that their studio members engage with each other online. This ranged from Facebook groups to shared Google drives. In an era where so much of what we do is now virtual, this could be a strong tool for creating a stronger sense of entitativity when studio mates are physically apart. In the era of zoom, having a virtual way to engage with each other socially outside of a studio class may be helpful in maintaining a supportive, friendly studio culture.

These activities and resources can cultivate relationships, friendships, trust, and a stronger sense of entitativity among studios that leads to an environment where students can safely be critical of each other and thus benefit the most from each other.

### **Possibilities for Studio Classes**

Each participant in this study used a “studio class” (of varying titles) to bring their students together to perform and listen for and to each other. Participants used the class in a variety of ways, with some opting for a performance-based class, while others made it a workshop to explore many ideas and technical issues surrounding violin playing. Regardless of the form the class took, participants agreed that having a positive studio culture aided in making the class a worthwhile pursuit.

When pairing the thoughts of the participants with previous research surrounding group learning and critical friendship, a number of ideas for how the class could function and be of most benefit to students. The assumption must be made that critical friendship has been fostered

and that there exists within the studio a spirit of friendship, camaraderie, and trust, as described by the participants. The ways in which this can be cultivated have been discussed above.

First, regardless of the requirements of the institution, studio violin teachers at the tertiary level would benefit from holding weekly studio classes with all of their private students. Many participants already did this, and those who did not cited specific roadblocks to being able to hold a weekly group class. In some instances, this class can be included as part of the “lesson credit” or a separate class in which students could register. Regardless, students can and should be expected to attend weekly to support their peers and colleagues.

In these classes, students should be expected to perform. This was common among all participants-their students would perform for each other in their studio classes. Some participants preferred that students only play in studio class when they are ready to perform something at their highest level, which holds merit. However, allowing students to perform “less than perfect” music gives other students the opportunities to provide insights, practice techniques, and to watch their instructor teach someone while they themselves are not holding the instrument. Perhaps some classes could be termed strictly “performance classes” where others could be “workshop classes,” where works “in progress” are not only allowed but welcomed and celebrated as part of the studio learning process.

Next, some participants would use studio class as a time to work specifically on technique. Having an occasional “scale class” or “technique class” can be transformative for a studio. Not only would it motivate students to practice their scales continually, but it also would be a way of working on a specific technique, such as vibrato or spiccato, in a shared, open space with students asking questions and making comments together. In this environment, learning is deepened for all.

When viewing a violin studio class in the context of the critical friends protocol, as defined by Costantino (2010), a number of things must be established for a maximized benefit to all. First, the role of each person in the room at any given time must be clear. The teacher's role is that of facilitator, whereas the student presenting music (in various levels of completion) is the presenter. All others then take the role of participants. After the teacher describes the particular focus of the studio class (be it a performance class, technical class, or "workshop"), a "presenter," or the student performing, shares what they are to present (play) and "tunes" the participants (focusing their feedback on specific issues or topics). Participants, or studio mates, are then encouraged to ask questions of both the facilitator and the presenter. Once the student has finished playing, discussion among participants takes place, during which the presenter is silent but listens and takes notes. Next, the student reflects, and the teacher debriefs the session.

A hypothetical scenario could be as follows:

Professor Green has been working with their students to foster a friendly, courteous environment for their students. They just hosted a semester "kick-off" studio party where they watched their favorite recordings of violin concertos online and had a meal together. The students are chatty and excited to see each other and to hear each other play. Today is their first studio class. As the students filter in, each gets their violin out and ready to play. Professor Green greets the class and shares that today is a workshop, and all students will play parts of pieces they have been working on for feedback and help from their peers. Professor Green determines that Robin, a sophomore music education major, will play first. Robin has been working for a few weeks on a classical violin concerto. Robin stands in front of the studio and shares that they have had a terrible time playing in tune and that the clarity of sixteenth notes isn't what they are hoping for yet. Robin

shares a few practice techniques they have used and what has helped. Robin then plays the first two pages of the concerto before Professor Green signals for them to stop. The professor turns to Robin's studio mates and asks what they thought of the performance, with each member giving "warm" feedback, things they liked and thought Robin had done well, while also providing "cool," constructive feedback and thoughts that they think may help with Robin's self-described intonation and sixteenth note clarity issues. Professor Green interjects when suggestions go a bit awry or when they want more clarity from the studio mates in their comments. Robin takes notes and listens attentively. When their peers have shared their thoughts, Robin is given a chance to ask clarifying questions and to try a few ideas shared by their peers. Finally, Professor Green shares final thoughts and comments, wrapping up and clarifying comments from Robin's peers and adding some of their own. Robin then takes a seat, applauded by their studio mates, and the next student begins their performance.

The role of the professor in this scenario is twofold. First, the professor must provide clear and concise feedback to the performer to aid in their development on the instrument. However, and just as significantly, the professor is the chaperone of comments from the studio mates and can guide the development of the participants (those listening to the performer) as critical listeners that are able to give constructive, helpful feedback as teachers. Regardless of the specific role the teacher is playing at any moment, they must continually create a safe space and "educate others about creating a safe space, both through words and through modeling" (Hendricks et al., 2014, p. 38). As was shared previously, "At the heart of good teaching, therefore, is the central importance of constructive relationships, the ability of a teacher to relate

to pupils or students in a non-threatening way. Communication of knowledge is not so important ... but communication of trust, friendship and belief is fundamental” (Stephens, 1995, p. 5).

### **Pedagogy of Future Teachers**

After reviewing the literature and having had discussions with participants in this study, a section on the pedagogy of teachers seemed appropriate. As most music majors, regardless of the degree program, will be teachers in some capacity, purposefully training all students of a violin studio to be future teachers is wise. By socializing all students into the role of studio or classroom teacher, we equip future musicians with transferrable and employable skills. The one-to-one private lesson and the studio class play a significant role in student socialization (Daniel & Parkes, 2015), as well as the general culture of a studio through “non-reflected socialization” (Ferm Thorgersen, 2014, p. 66). Additionally, by championing the role of the teacher, students will become better teachers instead of becoming a teacher by necessity (Gaunt, 2008). Austin et al. (2012) found that “career commitment is enhanced when students are able to see themselves as both strong musicians and strong teachers” (p. 81).

Because the studio teacher is one of the strongest role models for music students (Austin et al., 2012), the onus for preparing students to teach and socializing them into that role falls to them. This can be done in a variety of ways. First, studio classes, like the scenario listed above, are a treasure trove of pedagogical opportunities. This environment provides teachers an opportunity to see their students teach and to provide immediate feedback. Not only does it allow a studio teacher to observe their students teach, but it also is a place for students to observe their peers teaching.

Additionally, many participants in this study used constructed, controlled ways to teach their students how to teach. By using teaching assistants to teach and by pairing students together

to work together, students can learn to teach each other and learn from each other. Peer mentorship in the form of inherited pedagogy (student “A” teaches something they learned from the studio teacher to a student “B”) can be a powerful way of reinforcing what was taught to student “A” while also teaching something new to student “B.”

Fredrickson (2007a) found that students who take their potential role of teacher seriously are better at teaching and that college majors strongly agreed that it is necessary to be trained in order to be a good teacher. Studio teachers, students’ most significant mentors and role models, can make this possible by prioritizing teaching their students how to teach through the use of studio classes, peer mentorship, teaching assistants, and active socialization of their students into the role of teacher.

### **Conclusion: Studio Culture and Student Success**

As teachers of the violin, we all hope and strive for our students to be as successful and happy as possible while also tangibly preparing our students for lives and careers in music today. While there is so much that goes into becoming a great teacher of the violin, a significant part of the learning experience for a student exists in the relationships they foster with their teacher and their peers in the studio. By knowing, celebrating, and harnessing this information, studio teachers can provide their students with more opportunities for growth both as performers and teachers.

Healthy studios are a treasure trove of opportunity for violin teachers. Within this group, students can learn to become teachers and performers while making lifelong, meaningful connections with their peers. By hosting get-togethers, performing together, and meeting together regularly, a spirit of friendship and support can be cultivated. A weekly studio class that is characterized by critical friendship, a mutual love for the art of music-making and learning,

and openness of spirit can be a transformative space for many future musicians and pedagogues.

As teachers, we can simultaneously demand the highest level of artistry and personal integrity from our students. Additionally, by having students that implicitly trust each other work together, both are edified, and the experience of all is improved.

Music has always been about connection, and this connection can begin in the studio with the purposeful cultivation and emotional labor of a caring teacher. When studios become a place of inclusivity and support, the group can co-arise together. As one of my teachers once said, “Visceral, evocative, challenging, beautiful: music expands our human experience and connects us through empathy and purpose.”



## REFERENCES

- Allsup, R. E. (2003). Mutual learning and democratic action in instrumental music education. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 51(1), 24–37. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3345646>
- Argyle, M., & Henderson, M. (1984). The rules of friendship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 1(2), 211–237. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407584012005>
- Austin, J. R., Isbell, D. S., & Russell, J. A. (2012). A multi-institution exploration of secondary socialization and occupational identity among undergraduate music majors. *Psychology of Music*, 40(1), 66–83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735610381886>
- Baker, C. M. (2005). *The influence of violin schools on prominent violinists/teachers in the United States*. Florida State University.  
<https://fsu.digital.flvc.org/islandora/object/fsu:169151/datastream/PDF/view>
- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 248–287. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90022-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90022-L)
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
- Berthelot, J. (2017). *Institution-Specific Music and Sense of Belonging of Undergraduate College Students*. 141.
- Bjøntegaard, B. J. (2015). 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*, 32(1), 23–36. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026505171400014X>

- Bloom, B. S., & Sosniak, L. A. (Eds.). (1985). *Developing talent in young people* (1st ed). Ballantine Books.
- Bouij, C. (2004). Two theoretical perspectives on the socialization of music teachers. *Action, Criticism, & Theory for Music Education*, 3(3), 1–14.
- Boyden, C., Schwarz, B., Woodward, A., Marx, K., & Slatford, R. (1989). *The new grove violin family*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Burr, V. (2015). *Social constructionism* (3rd ed.). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- 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. (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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14613800600957479>
- Burwell, K. (2012). *Studio-based instrumental learning*. Ashgate.
- Burwell, K. (2016a). “She did miracles for me”: An investigation of dissonant studio practices in higher education music. *Psychology of Music*, 44(3), 466–480.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735615576263>
- Burwell, K. (2016b). Dissonance in the studio: An exploration of tensions within the apprenticeship setting in higher education music. *International Journal of Music Education*, 34(4), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761415574124>

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>

Campbell, D. T. (1958). Common fate, similarity, and other indices of the status of aggregates of persons as social entities. *Behavioral Science*, 3(1), 14–25.

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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2013.824954>

Carey, G. M., & Grant, C. F. (2014). *Teachers of instruments, or teachers as instruments? From transfer to transformative approaches to one-to-one pedagogy*. 2014 ISME CEPROM: Relevance and Reform in the Education of Professional Musicians. <https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au/handle/10072/66451>

Carey, G. M., & Grant, C. F. (2015). Teacher and student perspectives on one-to-one pedagogy: Practices and possibilities. *British Journal of Music Education*, 32(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051714000084>

Carey, G. M., & Grant, C. F. (2016). Enacting transformative pedagogy in the music studio: A case study of responsive, relational teaching. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Seminar of the ISME Commission on the Education of the Professional Musician* (pp. 54–63).

- Carey, G. M., 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. M., 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>
- Clemmons, J. (2009). The importance of being earnest: Rapport in the applied studio. *College Music Symposium*, 49/50(2009/2010), 257–264. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41225251>
- Costa, A. L., & Kallick, B. (1993). Through the lens of a critical friend. *Educational Leadership*, 51(2), 49–51.
- Costantino, T. (2010). The critical friends group: A strategy for developing intellectual community in doctoral education. *Inquiry in Education*, 1(2), 13.
- Covington, M. V. (1998). *The will to learn: A guide for motivating young people*. Cambridge University Press.
- Creech, A., & Hallam, S. (2010). Interpersonal interaction within the violin teaching studio: The influence of interpersonal dynamics on outcomes for teachers. *Psychology of Music*, 38(4), 403–421. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735609351913>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.

- Crosling, G. M., & Webb, G. (Eds.). (2002). *Supporting student learning: Case studies, experience & practice from higher education*. Kogan Page; Stylus Pub.
- Daniel, R. (2008). *Group piano playing: An alternative strategy for the tertiary teaching of piano*. VDM Verlag Dr. Mueller.
- Daniel, R., & Parkes, K. A. (2015). The apprentice to master journey: Exploring tertiary music instrument teachers' reflections on their experiences as learners. *Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 4(3), 52–63.
- Daniel, R., & Parkes, K. A. (2017). Music instrument teachers in higher education: An investigation of the key influences on how they teach in the studio. *The International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 29, 33–46.
- Daniel, R., & Parkes, K. A. (2019). Applied music studio teachers in higher education: Evidence of learner-centred teaching. *Music Education Research*, 21(3), 269–281.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2019.1598345>
- Davidson, J. W., & Good, J. M. M. (2002). Social and musical co-ordination between members of a string quartet: An exploratory study. *Psychology of Music*, 30(2), 186–201.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735602302005>
- de Bruin, L. R., Williamson, P., & Wilson, E. (2020). Apprenticing the jazz performer through ensemble collaboration: A qualitative enquiry. *International Journal of Music Education*, 38(2), 208–225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761419887209>

- Deverich, R. K. (2006). *How did they learn? An overview of violin pedagogy with an emphasis on amateur violinists*. [https://www.academia.edu/42225722/History\\_of\\_violin\\_pedagogy](https://www.academia.edu/42225722/History_of_violin_pedagogy)
- Edgar, S., Kelly-McHale, J., Rawlings, J., & Lautzenheiser, T. (2017a). *Music education and social emotional learning: The heart of teaching music*.
- Ferm Thorgersen, C. (2014). Learning among critical friends in the instrumental setting. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 32(2), 60–67.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/8755123314521032>
- Fredrickson, W. E. (2007a). Perceptions of college-level music performance majors teaching applied music lessons to young students. *International Journal of Music Education*, 25(1), 72–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761407074893>
- Fredrickson, W. E. (2007b). Music majors' attitudes toward private lesson teaching after graduation: A replication and extension. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 55(4), 326–343. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429408317514>
- Fredrickson, W. E., Geringer, J. M., & Pope, D. A. (2013). Attitudes of string teachers and performers toward preparation for and teaching of private lessons. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 61(2), 217–232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429413485245>
- Gaunt, H. (2008). One-to-one tuition in a conservatoire: The perceptions of instrumental and vocal teachers. *Psychology of Music - PSYCHOL MUSIC*, 36, 215–245.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735607080827>

- Gaunt, H. (2010). One-to-one tuition in a conservatoire: The perceptions of instrumental and vocal students. *Psychology of Music - PSYCHOL MUSIC*, 38, 178–208.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735609339467>
- Gaunt, H. (2011). Understanding the one-to-one relationship in instrumental/vocal tuition in Higher Education: Comparing student and teacher perceptions. *British Journal of Music Education*, 28(2), 159–179. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051711000052>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2012.657166>
- Gaunt, H., & Westerlund, H. (Eds.). (2013). *Collaborative learning in higher music education*. Ashgate.
- Gholson, S. A. (1998). Proximal positioning: A strategy of practice in violin pedagogy. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 46(4), 535–545.
- Gibbs, P., & Angelides, P. (2008). Understanding friendship between critical friends. *Improving Schools*, 11(3), 213–225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480208097002>
- Haddon, E. (2009). Instrumental and vocal teaching: How do music students learn to teach? *British Journal of Music Education*, 26(1), 57–70.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051708008279>
- Hallam, S. (1998). The predictors of achievement and dropout in instrumental tuition. *Psychology of Music*, 26(2), 116–132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735698262002>

- Hanken, I. M. (2016). Peer learning in specialist higher music education. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 15(3–4), 364–375. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022216647389>
- Hargreaves, D. J., Purves, R. M., Welch, G. F., & Marshall, N. A. (2007). Developing identities and attitudes in musicians and classroom music teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(3), 665–682. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709906X154676>
- Harrison, J. (2013). *Musical citizens: String teachers' perceptions of citizenship education in the private studio*. Library and Archives Canada = Bibliothèque et Archives Canada.
- Hawkes, M. E. (2018). *The practical application of psychological skills training for musicians: An exploratory multi-method study*. 469.
- Hays, T., Minichiello, V., & Wright, P. (2000). Mentorship: the meaning of the relationship for musicians. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 15(1), 3–14.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X0001500102>
- Hendricks, K. S. (2018). *Compassionate music teaching: A framework for motivation and engagement in the 21st century*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hendricks, K. S., Smith, T. D., & Stanuch, J. (2014). Creating safe spaces for music learning. *Music Educators Journal*, 101(1), 35–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0027432114540337>
- Hochschild, A. R. (2012). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling* (Reprint). University of California Press.
- Horsburgh, M. (1999). Quality Monitoring in Higher Education: The impact on student learning. *Quality in Higher Education*, 5(1), 9–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1353832990050102>



- Howard, V. A. (1982). *Artistry, The Work of Artists*. Hackett Pub. Co.
- Isbell, D. (2009). The Socialization of Undergraduate Music Majors in the United States. *Music Education Research International*, 3, 16.
- Johnson, C., & Lamothe, V. C. (Eds.). (2018). *Pedagogy development for teaching online music*. IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-5109-6>
- Jorgensen, E. R. (2008). *The art of teaching music*. Indiana University Press.
- 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>
- Karcher, M. J., Davis, C., & Powell, B. (2002). The effects of developmental mentoring on connectedness and academic achievement. *School Community Journal*, 12(2), 35–50.
- Kopcynski, H. (n.d.). *Application of studio culture in university schools of music*.  
<https://iteach.msu.edu/iteachmsu/groups/iteachmsu/stories/1048>
- Kupers, W. E., Van Geert, P., & Rijksuniversiteit Groningen. (2014). *Socially situated learning in individual music lessons*.
- Landon, H. C. R. (1996). *Vivaldi: Voice of the baroque*. University of Chicago Press.
- Latukefu, L. (2009). Peer learning and reflection: Strategies developed by vocal students in a transforming tertiary setting. *International Journal of Music Education*, 27(2), 128–142.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761409102320>

Latukefu, L. (2010). Peer assessment in tertiary level singing: Changing and shaping culture through social interaction. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 32(1), 61–73.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X10370091>

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.

Lebler, D. (2008). Popular music pedagogy: Peer learning in practice. *Music Education Research*, 10(2), 193–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14613800802079056>

Lebler, D., Carey, G., & Harrison, S. D. (Eds.). (2015). *Assessment in music education: From policy to practice*. Springer.

Luce, D. W. (2001). Collaborative learning in music education: A review of the literature. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 19(2), 20–25.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/87551233010190020105>

Lysaker, M. Y. (2020). Creating a judgment-free environment: Strategies for the classroom, ensemble, and applied studio. *American String Teacher*, 70(2), 39–41.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0003131320909132>

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Sage.

McPhail, G. J. (2010). Crossing boundaries: Sharing concepts of music teaching from classroom to studio. *Music Education Research*, 12(1), 33–45.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14613800903568296>

- Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 1997(74), 5–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.7401>
- Mills, J. (2002). Conservatoire students' perceptions of the characteristics of effective instrumental and vocal tuition. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 78–82.
- Mills, J., & Smith, J. (2003). Teachers' beliefs about effective instrumental teaching in schools and higher education. *British Journal of Music Education*, 20(1), 5–27. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051702005260>
- Mills, J. (2004). Working in music: Becoming a performer-teacher. *Music Education Research*, 6(3), 245–261. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461380042000281712>
- Mills, J. (2006). Performing and teaching: The beliefs and experience of music students as instrumental teachers. *Psychology of Music*, 34(3), 372–390. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735606064843>
- Nielsen, S. G., Johansen, G. G., & Jørgensen, H. (2018). Peer learning in instrumental practicing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 339. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00339>
- Otchere, E. D. (2015). Music teaching and the process of enculturation: A cultural dilemma. *British Journal of Music Education*, 32(3), 291–297. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051715000352>
- Phillips, B. (2021). Entitativity and implicit measures of social cognition. *Mind & Language*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mila.12350>

Presland, C. (2005). Conservatoire student and instrumental professor: The student perspective on a complex relationship. *British Journal of Music Education*, 22(3), 237–248.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051705006558>

Princeton University School of Architecture. (2022). *Studio culture*.

<https://soa.princeton.edu/content/studio-culture>

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>

Rink, J., Gaunt, H., & Williamon, A. (Eds.). (2017). *Musicians in the making: Pathways to creative performance*. Oxford University Press.

Ryan, G. (2021). Complicating factors in studio teaching dynamics: Dyad dissolution in post-secondary music studios. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 43(1), 59–73.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X19871079>

Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.). Sage.

Sawyer, R. K. (2003). *Group creativity: Music, theater, collaboration*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sawyer, R. K. (2006). Group creativity: Musical performance and collaboration. *Psychology of Music*, 34(2), 148–165. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735606061850>

Schunk, D. H., & Greene, J. A. (Eds.). (2018). *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance* (2nd ed.). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

- Sedikides, C., Schopler, J., & Insko, C. A. (Eds.). (1998). *Intergroup cognition and intergroup behavior*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Skyrm, R. D. (1962). *Oberlin conservatory: A century of musical growth and influence* (Unpublished dissertation, University of Southern California).
- Stenbacka, C. (2001). Qualitative research requires quality concepts of its own. *Management Decision*, 39(7), 551–556. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM00000000005801>
- Stephens, J. (1995). Artist or teacher? *International Journal of Music Education*, 25(1), 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/025576149502500101z>
- Suzuki, S. (1983). *Nurtured by love: The classical approach to talent education* (2nd ed). Suzuki Method International: Summy-Birchard.
- Swaffield, S. (2004). Critical friends: Supporting leadership, improving learning. *Improving Schools*, 7(3), 267–278. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480204049340>
- Teven, J. J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). The relationship of perceived teacher caring with student learning and teacher evaluation. *Communication Education*, 46(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634529709379069>
- Tubbs, S. L. (1984). *A systems approach to small group interaction*. Addison-Wesley.
- Watkins, C., & Scott, L. (2011). *From the stage to the studio: How fine musicians become great teachers*. Oxford University Press.

- Watson, A., & Ward, J. (2013). Creating the right ‘vibe’: Emotional labour and musical performance in the recording studio. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 45(12), 2904–2918. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a45619>
- Wenger-Trayner, É. (2008). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity* (18th printing). Cambridge University Press.
- West, T., & Rostvall, A.-L. (2003). A study of interaction and learning in instrumental teaching. *International Journal of Music Education*, 40(1), 16–27.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/025576140304000103>
- Wright, R. (2012). Music education and social transformation: Building social capital through music. *The Canadian Music Educator*, 53(3), 12–13.  
<https://www.proquest.com/openview/9927bfef97c73070cd526f997d7093be/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=45770>
- Zhukov, K. (2012). Teaching strategies and gender in higher education instrumental studios. *International Journal of Music Education*, 30(1), 32–45.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761411431392>

## APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Describe your studio and how it functions. How do you organize lessons and studio classes at your institution? (Is it large? Small? How many undergraduates vs. graduates?)
2. Do you have a weekly group class with all of your students? If so, what is it called? Is it a required course? Is it taken for credit?
3. How do you organize communal studio time? What types of things do you do during your studio classes? Is it similar to a studio recital, masterclass, public lesson, discussion?
4. Do you have studio performances? How do they manifest?
5. Do you assign your students group work? If so, how does that manifest?
6. How has the culture and how you structure your studio changed over time?
7. Do you have “studio expectations” that are clearly defined and shared in regard to interpersonal student behavior and interactions? What are they?
8. How would you describe the culture of your current studio? Describe the types of relationships between the students among your studio. Would you say your students are friendly or supportive of each other? Why or why not?
9. Describe your undergraduate experience and how you feel you related to your peers who also took lessons from your instructor. Did your instructor do anything to cultivate interpersonal relationships between yourself and/or students in your studio?
10. What type of culture do you try to create among your students? Do you actively foster relationships? How?

## APPENDIX B: IRB APPROVAL COVER LETTER

Date: 6-22-2021

IRB #: IRB-FY21-52

Title: An Exploration of Studio Cultures: Perspectives from Established Teachers of the Violin

Creation Date: 4-13-2021

End Date:

Status: **Approved**

Principal Investigator: Nathan Southwick

Review Board: UNC-Greensboro IRB

Sponsor:

### Study History

Submission Type	Initial	Review Type	Exempt	Decision	<b>Exempt</b>
-----------------	---------	-------------	--------	----------	---------------

### Key Study Contacts

Member	Rebecca Macleod	Role	Co-Principal Investigator	Contact	rbmacleo@uncg.edu
Member	Nathan Southwick	Role	Principal Investigator	Contact	nasouthw@uncg.edu
Member	Nathan Southwick	Role	Primary Contact	Contact	nasouthw@uncg.edu



## APPENDIX C: RECRUITMENT EMAIL

Dear XX,

My name is Nathan Southwick, and I am a doctoral violin student at the University of North Carolina - Greensboro. You are receiving this invitation because you are a teacher of the violin that is highly regarded in our community, you have established a career for yourself as a pedagogue, and you teach at an accredited institution. I would like to invite you to participate in my qualitative dissertation study, “An Exploration of Studio Cultures: Perspectives from Established Teachers of the Violin,” which will explore the mindful cultivation of studio dynamic and culture between students in your studio. Participation in this study will involve an interview conducted virtually through zoom, lasting approximately one hour, with the possibility of a follow-up meeting if necessary or desired and mutually agreed upon. Participation is totally voluntary, and you can choose to stop participating at any time.

If you have any questions about this study or your potential role in this research, please don't hesitate to contact me at [nasouthw@uncg.edu](mailto:nasouthw@uncg.edu).

Thank you for your time and consideration!

All my best,

Nathan Southwick

## APPENDIX D: RECITAL INFORMATION

- I. Solo Recital: Saturday, October 3, 2020, 7:30 p.m., Tew Recital Hall. *Violin Sonata No. 21 in E minor, KV 304* (W.A. Mozart); *Sonata No. 1, BWV 1001* (J.S. Bach); *Romance for Violin and Piano, Op. 23* (Amy Beach); *Violin Sonata No. 3 in C minor, Op. 45* (Edvard Grieg).
- II. Solo Recital: Saturday, April 24, 2021, 7:30 p.m., Tew Recital Hall. *Sonate pour violon et piano en sol mineur, L. 140* (Claude Debussy); *Capricci: for Violin og Bratsj* (Bjarne Brustad); *Polish Caprice for Solo Violin* (Grażyna Bacewicz); *Suite Italienne* (Igor Stravinsky).
- III. Solo Recital: Wednesday, April 14, 2022, 7:30 p.m., Organ Recital Hall. *Birds in Warped Time II* (Somei Satoh); *Aalap and Tarana* (Kala Ramnath); *Suite for Violin and Piano* (William Grant Still); *Tzigane* (Maurice Ravel); *Nobody Knows the Trouble I See* (arr. Maud Powell); *Inventions for Two Fiddles* (Evan Price).