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Abstract

The thesis presents a study of the ‘relationship’ between teacher and student in one-to-one tuition in UK conservatoire vocal studies education. Predominantly vocationally focused, the teaching of musicians in conservatories is organised around the linking of one student with one principal teacher in an on-going relationship. This pedagogic model has been dominant in conservatoire education, yet has been relatively under-examined. Only recently has it become subject to external evaluation, monitoring and research (Carey et al., 2013; Gaunt, 2011).

Taking an interpretative phenomenological and contextualist approach, the study comprised two strands of investigation. One strand involved in-depth case-studies of teacher-student pairs and data were gathered through video-stimulated reflective interviews. Analysis produced highly nuanced in-depth constructions of the experiential life-worlds of particular dyads. The second strand examined perspectives of individual teachers and students across a wider range of cases and institutions; data were collected through semi-structured interviews.

The study found that qualities of relatedness, power relations and teacher self-reflexivity were key factors in influencing the teaching and learning experience, process and outcomes in one-to-one tuition. I argued for student autonomy and capacity to effect change as both individual and relational achievements. Troubling emotions and relational tensions were discussed as inevitable and indicative of the process of learning, however evidence of a threshold of tolerance beyond which the relationship was experienced as harmful was found.

Findings suggest a need for systematic provisions in conservatories that provide reflexive support, mediation and monitoring, to enable teachers and students to navigate the complexities of the ‘relationship’ that were identified in this pedagogic context.

Inter-disciplinary in approach, this research is situated within the fields of music psychology, music higher education, dynamic psychology and relational psychoanalysis. A relational and intersubjective rendering of findings offers a unique contribution to knowledge in this empirical field.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction and Aims

This thesis presents an empirical qualitative study of the relational dimension of one-to-one tuition in conservatoire vocal studies education. The research seeks to understand the influence of the ‘relationship’ between teacher and student on the experience and process of teaching and learning in this particular context. Inter-disciplinary in approach, the study draws on knowledge and understandings from the fields of music psychology, music higher education, relational psychoanalysis and dynamic psychology. The investigation examines experiences and perceptions of forms of relatedness that emerge within this dyadic pedagogic context, with the aim of understanding how these may enhance and/or disrupt teaching and learning. Drawing on a dynamic relational interpretative lens, the study aims to provide conceptual understandings of the relational system of one-to-one tuition.

In this chapter I discuss the personal and professional impetus for this study, outline the research approach and key questions, provide a preliminary introduction to the empirical context and conservatoire literature and discuss my choice of interpretative approach.

1.2 Biographical Motivation for the Study

Motivation for undertaking this research arose out of personal and professional experience. I am an ‘outsider’ to the conservatoire context and have not been trained as a professional musician; however music making and participation have been autotelic (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997) constants throughout my life. The words ‘enthusiastic’, ‘amateur’ and ‘passion’ capture my relatedness with music. Playing the piano, guitar and oboe and singing have provided valuable sources of private and social enjoyment throughout my life. My discovery of opera and song in the past decade opened up a world of experiencing that had a profound effect on me. I came to know for the first time about my deep love of particular voices. Listening to the voices, interpretations and performances of particular singers evoked emotional responses to music that I had not previously experienced. This fuelled my desire to synthesise my love of music, my fascination with the voice and my professional knowledge of human relationship in this study.
Professional and research interest in ‘one-to-one’ contexts evolved from my engagement in and study of that context throughout my career of the past twenty years in Higher Education as a counselling psychologist, psychotherapist and educator. My clinical role in university counselling services involved providing one-to-one short and long term relationships to individual students and staff to assist them in making sense of difficulties that emerged within and that influenced the learning context. The troubling nature of relationship with others was often a focus of therapeutic exploration. Relationship was frequently recounted as a source of distress, conflict or disturbance. Through the provision of a reflexive space to talk and reflect upon the relational situation, this could often enable revisions in perspective which alleviated emotional distress. This often concomitantly created shifts in the individual’s experiencing of the learning situation.

As a Senior Lecturer responsible for counsellor education in University contexts, I have taught students about therapeutic relationship and theories of relating, and developed interest in the interpersonal and emotional process of teaching and learning. This began to raise questions for me about my own teaching practices and about how students experienced the process of learning. I had developed awareness over several years of teaching that students, who lacked a capacity to tolerate a degree of frustration and pain in learning, could become overwhelmed, inhibited or withdraw in the learning process. This led to my implementation of curriculum developments on a Master’s Degree counsellor training programme that I was leading, of inclusion of theoretical perspectives and experiential learning opportunities that focused on the emotional and relational dimensions of learning. A reflective and conceptual account of the student’s subjective experience of their learning process was included as an assessment to foster integration of theory, experience and reflexivity. This development enabled a framework of understanding and mutual language to emerge between myself and the students that could be called upon during times of distress and conflict in the learning situation. Rather than pain and anxiety becoming signals for avoidance or anger; students and I began to consider such emotions as inevitable and part of the process of learning. This could alleviate the intensity of emotions and conflicts that emerged at times in teaching and learning, as such experiences could be contained and ‘normalised’ through a shared framework of meaning. The current research develops my interest in the vicissitudes of relationship and their influence in pedagogic contexts.
My engagement in one-to-one educational and clinical contexts has been as the provider / practitioner, and as the participant / client / student. The range of positions inhabited at different times (illustrated below in figure 1) has included being both psychotherapist/psychologist and client; clinical supervisor of counsellors and clinical supervisee; academic supervisor for students and research student. Shifting from one role to the other side of the relational divide foregrounded different concerns, experiences and responsibilities. Whichever position I was situated within, my vantage point seemed to afford and occlude certain understandings from coming into view. This study has been shaped by this interest in perspectivism as the current research seeks to understand the relationship between teacher and student from both perspectives, rather than either/or. The methodological approach taken (discussed in chapter four) coheres with that perspectival aim.

![Figure 1: Positioning the Researcher](image)

In terms of my engagement in the one-to-one relationship as a music student, as mentioned earlier this has been at an amateur level and undertaken at different life stages with different instruments. With the eruption of my curiosity about the voice and opera in recent years, I entered into one-to-one weekly vocal training for a period of three years. The experience of grappling with the complexities of trying to use the breath, the body and the voice was exciting, intriguing, frustrating and often baffling. Understanding my difficulties in learning was inevitably subject to the biographical lens of my professional background. The dynamics of the relational world that emerged between myself and the vocal teacher often came into my awareness as I considered whether struggles were entirely my own, shared between us, or related to some aspect.
of the teacher and her methods of teaching. This reflexive process in relation to my own vocal training became the kernel of an idea. I wondered if a dynamic psychological perspective could afford insights into the workings of the one-to-one tuition relationship in conservatoire vocal education that could be of value to a professional community of practice that was different to my own, but that also shared some similarities as will be discussed later.

My interest in the fusion of the arts and therapies has been long-standing and expressed early in my career. Having qualified in a psychodynamic therapeutic modality, I subsequently trained as an Integrative Arts Psychotherapist. The latter recognises the role and value of the imagination, metaphor and the performing and dramatic arts in human meaning making and expression. This project thus evolves from my sense of being energised by work that seeks to traverse the borders of disciplinarity. I am enlivened by the possibility of synthesising psychological knowledge of relationship with the world of conservatoire vocal one-to-one pedagogy; and this study emerges as an outcome of that synthesis.

1.3 Research Approach and Key Questions

In this qualitative empirical investigation I took a contextualist and interpretative phenomenological analytic (Smith & Eatough, 2007) approach as this allowed for the examination and analysis of individuals’ accounts of their lived experiences and frameworks of meaning. Such an epistemological perspective enabled detailed and complex accounts of the perspectives of vocal teachers and students within UK London-based conservatoires to be explored.

The research questions were:

- What significance do teachers and students give to the 'relationship' between them in one-to-one tuition?
- How do qualities and forms of relatedness between teacher and student influence the process, experience and outcomes of teaching and learning?

The study involved two complementary strands of investigation. One strand focused on teacher-student dyads (N=6) within one conservatoire and data was gathered through video-stimulated reflective interviews. This strand afforded depth of analysis of the experiential life worlds of teacher-student pairs and produced rich and highly
nuanced perspectival accounts of the relationship. The second strand investigated the perspectives of individual teachers (N=8) who were drawn from four conservatoires and individual students (N=15) drawn from two conservatoires, and data was gathered through semi-structured interviews. This strand also afforded detailed constructions of experience and perceptions, but the focus here lay on breadth of analysis, looking at themes that were emergent across a wider range of cases and institutional contexts. The methodological approach thus allowed for findings identified within particular dyads in one conservatoire to be considered within the context of a wider range of cases and institutions. A dynamic relational psychological interpretation of findings offers a conceptual understanding and deeper insights into the workings and influence of the relationship in one-to-one tuition.

The paradigmatic approach taken recognizes knowledge as contingent, partial, provisional and intersubjectively constituted. The study is thus underpinned by an assumption that the research narrative and process were co-constructively generated in the relationship between the researcher and the researched. The influence of my biographical presence and the affordances and constraints of my interpretative lens are therefore discussed in the thesis.

Originality of this thesis in terms of contribution to knowledge lies in the synthesis of the following:

- the in-depth interpretative and phenomenologically informed analysis of student and teacher experiences and perceptions of the relationship in one-to-one tuition;
- the 'relational' interpretation of findings that is unique to the extant literature; and
- an 'outsider' researcher perspective to the empirical context of music higher education, coupled with an 'insider' perspective to the study of human relating due to my background as a psychological practitioner.

### 1.4 The Empirical Context: Conservatoire One-to-One Tuition

There are eight conservatoires providing music higher education in the UK (Ford, 2010) and their focus is to develop and prepare musicians for a professional career in performance or composition (Burt, 2004; Mills, 2006; Presland, 2005). Predominantly vocationally focused, the teaching of musicians in conservatoires has been organised
around the linking of one student with one principal instrumental or vocal teacher in an ongoing relationship for the duration of study (Nerland & Hanken, 2002; Nielsen, 2006; Presland, 2005). One-to-one pedagogy has historically been and remains presently a dominant mode of educational delivery of instrumental and vocal teaching of western classical music tradition in the music conservatoire context (Nerland & Hanken, 2002). Despite a long and well-established tradition that has involved large institutional and individual financial investment, this mode of teaching remained unchallenged, unmonitored and under-researched until recent times (Gaunt, 2011; Purser, 2005; Roberts, 2005). The germination of empirical literature that specifically investigated conservatoire one-to-one tuition began in earnest in the 1990s; and although ‘still embryonic’ (Carey, Grant, McWilliam, & Taylor, 2013) a body of research is now evolving. The ever growing demand for evidence based accounts and practice of music pedagogy in conservatoires post 1990’s has pushed at the closed doors of one-to-one tuition (ibid). Changes in cultural practices of higher education, with the pressure of accountability, audit and financial constraint, have brought the investigative lens of research into this relationship (ibid).

Conservatoire one-to-one tuition is typically characterised by weekly teacher–student meetings. The question of interpersonal match between teacher and student is often not considered in establishing one-to-one teaching relationships, despite the suggestion that positively experienced interpersonal processes may underpin learning (Barrett & Gromko, 2007; Whitelock et al., 2008). In its positive aspects, one-to-one tuition has been noted as providing an experience that is interpersonally intimate (Gaunt, 2006; Nerland & Hanken, 2002; Purser, 2005), trusting and special (Gaunt, 2010; Presland, 2005), fulfilling and inspiring (Gaunt, 2005), intense both emotionally and in terms of subject commitment to music (ibid; Nerland & Hanken, 2002; Presland, 2005), and creatively collaborative (Wirtanen & Littleton, 2004). It has been reported as a relationship that can be mutually enhancing, such that students gain in their learning whilst teachers concomitantly experience improvements in their own performance (Mills, 2004). However, in its more troubling aspects the isolation and intensity of the one-to-one learning situation can magnify barriers to learning (Gaunt, 2006), create strain and hurt (Nerland & Hanken, 2002), deteriorate into destructive and damaging interactions (Gaunt, 2005; Persson, 1996b) and have far-reaching effects on a student’s career trajectory (Nerland & Hanken, 2002).

The capacity to create, sustain and manage the interpersonal complexities of a relatively private one-to-one relationship between two adults over a period of years seems to underpin progression in this learning situation. However, most performer-teachers have not been trained in philosophical, conceptual or methodological
approaches to education or to the interpersonal management of long-term one-to-one relationships. The teacher brings musical knowledge, expertise and experience as a performer-musician to the relationship, but may be under-supported and under-resourced to manage the educational and interpersonal dimensions of their role effectively. Indeed, the need for training and consultative structures to support performer-teachers in their work was noted in Gaunt (2006).

1.5 My Interpretative Lens: Why Turn to Relational Psychotherapeutic Ideas?

I have turned to the conceptual landscape of psychotherapeutic knowledge, in particular relational responsibility, relational psychoanalysis and intersubjectivity theory, for an interpretative lens to investigate the relational dimension of vocal one-to-one tuition in the conservatoire context. The application of ideas from psychoanalysis to critique, interrogate and explain processes and phenomena in non-clinical contexts has precedents. Several authors (Bibby, 2011; Britzman, 2009; Lapping, 2011; Murphy & Brown, 2012; Schapiro, 2009) have considered and applied psychoanalytic ideas within social and education research. In the field of music, Clarke (2008) conducted a public lecture series entitled ‘Musical Subjectivities’ where he drew on concepts from psychoanalysis and intersubjectivity to discuss music making processes between musicians, relations between performers and audiences and musical improvisation, and Losseff (2011) applied psychoanalytic concepts to theorise musical interpretation and the relationship between performer / listener and classical musical works. The present study continues along that trajectory of inter-disciplinary exploration.

Previous music higher education researchers have identified similarities between the one-to-one tuition relationship and the one-to-one psychotherapeutic relationship (Gaunt, 2006, 2008; Jørgensen, 2000) and there is some empirical evidence of teachers and students characterising one-to-one tuition as like a counselling relationship (Purser, 2005). Such similarities may include longevity, frequency of meeting, privacy of relationship, financial investment, interpersonal intensity and commitment, exploration and communication of emotion, working towards a synthesis of emotional, cognitive and embodied forms of knowing and supporting the development of the individual’s authentic voice. There are of course limits to such an analogy, since therapeutic and pedagogic relationships have different functions, purposes and aims. However, the areas of commonality suggest that knowledge applied from the field of psychotherapy, where the dynamics of dyadic interactional systems have been extensively explicated, may offer new understandings about the
‘relationship’ in conservatoire one-to-one tuition. The applications and implications of psychoanalysis outside the clinic were discussed in Frosh (2010). He warned of the need for openness to the other discipline and modesty about claims, and also advocated the value of bringing psychoanalysis into other disciplines since it may ‘help open them up or disrupt their own received wisdoms’ (ibid, p. 38). In this regard the approach taken here has the potential to offer unique insights and ask questions of the tradition of conservatoire one-to-one music pedagogy.

This chapter has introduced my biographical motivation and research approach and aims, situated the study in relation to the empirical context, and offered initial reflections on choice of interpretative lens.

1.6 Outline of the Thesis

The structure of the thesis is as follows: Chapter 2 offers a review of literature within the field of conservatoire and music higher instrumental and vocal education, with particular focus on the one-to-one relationship. In Chapter 3, I outline the notion of ‘relational’ through a review of concepts from dynamic psychology, relational responsibility and relational psychoanalysis. Chapter 4 presents the methodological and conceptual approach taken. Presentation of findings from analysis of two case study clusters of teacher-student dyads are detailed in chapters 5 and 6. Chapters 7 and 8 present findings from analysis of individual interviews with teachers and students respectively. In chapter 9, the findings from the whole body of work are discussed and contextualized through dialogue with the conservatoire and relational literatures. Limitations, implications and horizons for future research are discussed in chapter 10. A conclusion brings the thesis to a close in chapter 11.
Chapter 2: Literature Review of One-to-One Tuition and Music Higher Education

2.1 Introduction

This chapter seeks to examine what is known about teacher-student interaction and the nature of the relationship in conservatoire one-to-one vocal and instrumental tuition through a discussion of published writings and empirical works in the field of conservatoire and music higher education. The empirical literature is a recently flourishing area of research that began in earnest since the 1990’s and it has drawn on a range of methodological and epistemological approaches. The latter are indicated in this review along with areas of methodological limitation, to enable areas of vulnerability within the extant research to be understood.

2.2 The Teacher-Student Relationship in Conservatoire Music Education

A conservatoire education appears in the literature as one that is inflected with notions of prestige, quality, talent, competition and elitism (Davies, 2004; Nerland & Hanken, 2002). For a student, gaining admission to a conservatoire is a highly competitive process (Burt-Perkins & Mills, 2009; Mills, 2006) and for a conservatoire teacher, such a position is presented as one of high status and professionally sought after amongst classical musicians (Mills, 2004; Nerland & Hanken, 2002). Conservatoire institutions search for and appoint musicians and performing artists who work at the highest level of their profession (Odam & Bannan, 2005; Purser, 2005). On this premise it has been argued that one-to-one tuition is a relationship founded on mutual dependence and trust, as both teacher and student derive and sustain status from being participant in this elite community of practice (Nerland & Hanken, 2002).

The term ‘performer-teacher’ is used in conservatoire literature (Mills, 2004; Odam & Bannan, 2005) suggesting a duality of professional identities. The binary construction of ‘professional practitioner’ of music versus ‘pedagogue’ is discussed in Nerland and Hanken (2002) who argued that conservatoire teachers frequently identify most strongly with the former as a ‘musician’. Most conservatoire teachers are not trained or qualified as teachers (Odam & Bannan, 2005; Persson, 1996b) and are commonly appointed on the basis of musicianship and performance career, as aforementioned,
rather than pedagogic knowledge (Purser, 2005). Teaching in the music academy thus exists within the tension between values and practices of two different fields: the professional field of music performance and the collaborative higher educational community (Nerland & Hanken, 2002). This tension opens up important questions about whether the skills, knowledge and abilities involved in becoming / being an outstanding performer and musician are similar or different to those involved in becoming / being a 'good' teacher. Being able to communicate artistically and musically with an audience, conductor and co-performers, would seem to be a different process than being able to have awareness of, articulate and communicate embodied, non-conscious, tacit and musical forms of knowing to a student, such that the student can transform those communications into their own unique embodiment and understandings. Indeed the soprano Renée Fleming (2005) reflected on this problematic in relation to vocal teaching in her autobiography:

it’s a miracle that anyone learns how to sing well, given the complexity of the instrument. It’s not surprising, for example, that most great singers do not become great teachers. Some will openly admit that they haven’t a clue how to explain what they do, and some can explain only that, without being able to apply it to other voices (ibid, pp. 59-60)

She alludes here to the different skills involved in becoming a performer versus teacher. The latter appears to involve a capacity to consciously articulate awareness of that which is involved in singing and being able to enable the student to apply such understandings to their own individual voice.

A study by Gaunt (2006) examining teacher and student perceptions of teaching practices and conceptualisations of conservatoire one-to-one instrumental and vocal tuition, revealed a disjuncture between teachers’ understandings of students’ learning needs and teachers’ articulations of teaching practies. She found that although teachers were supportive of students and of the notion of students' having individual unique learning needs, their pedagogic practices were not adaptive to nor responsive to individual student need and did not foster a student-oriented learning environment. This is perhaps reflective of the lack of pedagogic understanding and skill that the comments of Fleming and music education researchers aforementioned (Nerland & Hanken, 2002; Odam & Bannan, 2005; Persson, 1996b; Purser, 2005) highlight. As an outcome of her research, Gaunt (2006) recommended implementation of schemes of professional development to support conservatoire teachers in this regard. Her study was undertaken through semi-structured recorded interviews with instrumental and vocal teachers (N=20) and students (N=20) in one London based conservatoire. Her research will be discussed in more detail below as it provides a map of the empirical
territory of one-to-one tuition and identified themes that have emerged across the literature.

2.3 Mapping the Empirical Territory: One-to-One Tuition in Conservatoire Education

Gaunt published a composite of related empirical works (Gaunt, 2005, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2011) over the last decade which were interlinked and derived from the body of research undertaken in 2006 (detailed above). As an insider researcher and instrumental teacher in the conservatoire context, she opened up the investigative terrain of the one-to-one tuition in conservatoires at a time when the scope of literature was limited. The key research questions of her 2006 study focused on how one-to-one tuition was conceptualised by teachers and students and what kind of techniques and strategies were linked with effectiveness in teaching and learning. Findings reported on the way that the relationship was characterised, revealed tensions around intimacy and detachment in the relationship, identified power as a significant feature of the relationship, and evidenced that changing teachers was often a complex and troubling process. This will be discussed in more detail now.

The relationship was found to be characterised variously as like parent-child, Dr-patient and friendship relationship. These representations seem to be suggestive of power relations, with the former two indicative of hierarchical relations of power and dependence, and the latter of more equal or horizontal relations of power. The one-to-one relationship was found to be highly valued by students for its provision of an experience that was interpersonally intimate (ibid), trusting and special (Gaunt, 2010) and intense both emotionally and in terms of subject commitment to music (Gaunt, 2005). However, teacher perspectives revealed a struggle around negotiating the tensions of intimacy versus detachment in the relationship (Gaunt, 2011). Diverse opinions about social boundaries of the one-to-one relationship were found; some teachers sought social relationships with students, some had limited social contact and others avoided it (ibid). Student perspectives on one-to-one tuition (Gaunt, 2010) seemed to mirror that of teachers; they also struggled with making sense of social boundaries, and there was a divide between those that enjoyed social relations with teachers, and those that preferred a professional non-socialising relationship.

Gaunt found that dynamics of power between teacher and student had a strong influence within the teaching relationship, but noted that this was largely implicit in her findings; only four of her forty participants were reported as explicitly discussing power and they were all teachers, not students (Gaunt, 2006, 2011). Her role as an ‘insider’
responder may have co-influenced this lack of articulation of a more interrogatory perspective. Indeed, this was critically highlighted in her discussion of limitations of the study (2006). She indicated that participants may have avoided voicing issues that could jeopardise their position due to their awareness of her position as a member of senior management.

The creative process was found to be often teacher-led and dominated, despite teacher aspirations to develop student autonomy. She found a tendency in students to be more passive, over-dependent on teachers for motivation, and to absorb and internalise attitudes to learning of their teachers without questioning (Gaunt, 2010). Her research identified a tendency towards teacher dominance and student passivity in the relationship, but she also found evidence of teacher-student collaboration. Her findings led to her questioning the potential of one-to-one tuition to inhibit the development of students' autonomy. The study did not aim to conceptualise a dynamic psychological understanding of such teacher-student positions of dominance-passivity or of the achievement of autonomy, but the identification of these phenomena led to her call for further research to investigate dynamics of power in this context (Gaunt, 2011).

In relation to the process of changing teachers Gaunt (2010; ibid) found that this was experienced by some students as anxiety provoking, confusing, delayed due to self-doubt, and aroused anxiety about teacher reactions and betrayal of teachers. Dissatisfaction with previous teachers and ‘traumatic experiences’ (Gaunt, 2011) were found in a small number of cases to be linked to change of teacher. She indicated that the exclusivity, intensity and isolation of the one-to-one situation could make troubling teacher-student relationships even more difficult (2006).

Her works thus opened up vital questions about the role of the relationship, power, intimacy and the development of student autonomy/independence, even though the research questions had not specifically focused on the interpersonal relationship per se. It thus established the importance of future research into the relational dimension of one-to-one tuition.

2.4 The Influence of Attachment Styles and Personality Characteristics

A study examining facets of vocal one-to-one tuition in higher education (Serra-Dawa, 2010) explored the role of attachment style and personality characteristics of teacher and student in this relationship. The investigation was undertaken in higher education vocal studies departments in Australia, Canada, Portugal and United Kingdom. The
study involved different phases and a range of methodological approaches, including longitudinal observation of teacher-student dyads, psychological questionnaires to categorise personality traits (NEO PI-R) and attachment style (Adult Attachment Scale), and questionnaires to evaluate expectations and realities of the singing lessons. Findings of the earlier phase indicated that 40% of students (where N = 40) wanted to change teacher with the most cited reasons being interpersonal or relational issues. ‘Technical’ reasons were cited only second. This seemed to suggest that dissatisfaction or difficulties within the relationship were often resolved through a desire to end the relationship (change teacher) and that interpersonal issues could have a strong influence on the experience of learning including on the continued viability of the relationship. Findings from the second phase revealed that attachment styles were influential in determining stability and relational quality of the teaching dyad. The most stable relationships were those where both members of the dyad, were identified as having secure attachment styles; and relationships that were less stable, less communicative and evidenced less pedagogic methodological adaptation were mixed dyads where teacher and student had different attachment styles. This study did not expound a theoretical conceptualisation of the dynamics of the relationship as that had not been an aim, but it drew on the psychodynamic concept of attachment which formulates and articulates styles of relating in individuals. In analysing attachment styles her study had focused on relatively stable characteristics of styles of relating within the individual, and her findings indicated that the pedagogic experience was shaped by and interdependent upon the pairing of the two individuals. The researcher thus called for the matching process between teacher and student to be given greater consideration. Drawing on a one-person psychological framework to categorise personality traits of participants, this revealed teacher dominance as common in dyads. However the study also found some evidence of dyads with inverted roles with student rather than teacher dominance. This seemed to suggest that the relationship might be configured differently according to the two individuals who were brought together in the pairing, and the study thus seemed to open up the territory for further research to examine dynamic, systemic two-person psychological understandings of such relational configurations, as proposed in the current study.

### 2.5 Intimacy, Distance and the Interpersonal Match

In a discussion of institutional and social constructions of the teacher-student relationship in music academies in Norway, two authors (Nerland & Hanken, 2002) talked of the development of interpersonal intimacy and close ties in one-to-one tuition.
The sharing and exposure of personal emotions, viewed as inherent to the study of music, were cited as creating conditions which were likely to foster interpersonal closeness. Such interpersonal intimacy was presented as evoking vulnerability not only in the student but also the teacher. This vulnerability was communicated as constraining student ability to critically evaluate their teachers in one-to-one tuition:

it is clear that both the nature of the subject itself, as well as the way in which the teaching is organised, create favourable conditions for the development of a close and intimate relationship between teacher and student. This makes not only the student, but also the teacher, vulnerable. Criticism can therefore cause a strain in, or at worst, a breakdown of, the relationship (Nerland & Hanken, 2002, p. 181)

This passage raises an interesting paradox since intimacy, which might be considered as creating closeness and thus enhanced possibilities for mutual honesty and self-disclosure, was portrayed here as the very condition which could lead to relationship breakdown. A contradiction seems to emerge and begs questions of this relationship: does interpersonal intimacy or closeness give rise to lack of capacity for honest critical feedback to be voiced? If so, does this imply the impossibility or at least the troubling tension of the co-existence of teacher-student intimacy and criticism in the relationship?

An empirical study examining approaches to instrumental teaching in conservatoires (Purser, 2005) using questionnaire and interviews with male woodwind and brass performer conservatoire teachers (N=6) found that participants struggled with management of tensions in the teaching relationship between intensity, intimacy and interpersonal distance. Teachers were also found to struggle with the need to be honest versus the desire to be liked by students. This might indicate that recognition needs, narcissistic needs and/or relational needs of teachers may exist in a dynamic tension with the pedagogic needs of students. Purser also found some evidence of problems with ‘personal chemistry’ (ibid, p. 292) between teacher and student; and these were linked with teachers resolving such issues through moving students to other teachers. As in Gaunt (2010, 2011) and Serra-Dawa (2010) change of teacher was thus linked with tensions in the interpersonal relationship. Characterisations of the teacher role in Purser’s study included being like a counsellor or a parent to students. These seem to be suggestive of supportive and encouraging roles that also include role-related differentials of power and dependence. The researcher found that teacher participants perceived students as inviting a ‘dictatorial’ teaching approach; the perception of a tendency of positions of teacher dominance-student passivity in the relationship were again emergent. Purser’s paper did not provide a detailed account with regards to methods of data analysis or epistemological perspective, and such
criteria are viewed as important to establishing power of argument and claims in qualitative research (Coyle, 2007; Fossey, Harvey, McDermott, & Davidson, 2002); yet despite that limitation, the paper raised important insights into this relationship. It revealed the significance of the interpersonal relationship in teaching, although this had not been the explicit aim of the research.

A paper by Presland (2005), examining the student perspective of benefits and disadvantages of one-to-one piano tuition in a UK conservatoire used semi-structured interviews with 12 piano students. This study found that the relationship with the professor was characterised as unique, special and intimate and the construct of teacher as ‘friend’ was expressed. Despite this the majority of students favoured a ‘healthy distance’ and ‘personal detachment’ in the relationship and considered extra-musical contact as undesirable. This links to findings from Gaunt (2010) where many students were found to have expressed similar ideas on social contact. Presland communicated that the matching process of students and professors in this conservatoire was carefully considered, where a range of factors including technical proficiency, musical maturity, personal independence, age, nationality, command of language, and personality were taken into account. It is not clear however, how these factors were employed in creating particular pairings since there was no detailed account of the matching process. She noted that requests to change teachers occurred rarely in the piano department in which the research was conducted and there was no indication of changing teachers as troubling. This diverged with findings from Gaunt (2010, 2011), Purser (2005) and Serra-Dawa (2010) on change of teachers. This may reveal the effectiveness of the matching process she identified in her conservatoire, which may have reduced incidence of changing teachers. However, critical evaluation of the paper revealed that there was no detailed account of methods of data analysis (Coyle, 2007) and a wide range of claims and interpretations were not supported by detailed participant extracts. As such linkages between data, findings and interpretations (Fossey et al., 2002) were difficult to evaluate. Despite methodological limitation, this study raised important themes. It also indicated that more in-depth research was required to understand what constitutes a well-functioning dyad and to understand the significance of the teacher-student pairing on learning outcomes.

2.6 Implications of Invisibility of the Instrument for Teaching

Purser’s research (2005) detailed earlier revealed a finding that has particular salience for the current study concerning the invisibility of areas of the body involved in the
teaching of technique (e.g. tongue, embouchure, diaphragm) of brass / wind instruments. This was found to generate difficulties for teachers in assessing students’ technical problems. The complexity of tasks and skills involved in diagnosis and discerning individualised solutions for vocal issues in relation to the invisibility of the instrument was discussed by Fleming (2005) in a chapter on apprenticeship. The involvement and training of involuntary muscles required in vocal production and the lack of initial shared language through which to communicate was viewed by Fleming as a significant ‘barrier’ between teacher and student:

It can take six months to develop a common language between teacher and student. What does she really mean when she says she wants me to have ‘higher resonance’? What does anyone mean by ‘more support’? Someone can tell you that you need to relax, but relax where? Relax what? Oh, and now you want more energy at the same time? When I feel energised I also feel tense. How am I supposed to reconcile those demands? (ibid, p. 60)

Here, Fleming revealed the sense of absurdity and frustration that might be experienced when a student is faced with trying to understand teacher instructions, particularly when the medium through which such instruction is given is the domain of declarative verbal language, yet what needs to be achieved is in the domain of non-declarative embodiment. This seems to create the inevitability of failures of mutual understanding and frustration in the interpersonal relationship, since communication and shared understanding appear as difficult achievements in this situation. This raises questions about how music pedagogy and in particular vocal one-to-one tuition takes account of this phenomenon.

2.7 Student Passivity-Teacher Dominance and the Question of Student Autonomy

There appears to be evidence of and a link made between student passivity, teacher dominance and a question about how this may curtail student autonomy/independence in the literature, but this interconnection is not theoretically or dynamically conceptualised. The research of Gaunt (2010, 2011) and Purser (2005) as discussed earlier had indicated such findings and the works of other researchers revealed similar findings as will now be discussed. In this review of literature I noted that student passivity appeared in studies through linguistic reference to passivity and dependence, with students presented as the initiators or desirers of such a position in relation to their teacher. Teacher dominance was referred to in terms of dominant and controlling attitudes and in more extreme forms, in terms of abusive behaviours. I will now turn to discuss some of those studies.
In a study of the approaches taken by teachers to the development of student independence (Burwell, 2005), lesson interactions were examined with a specific focus on the type of questions used by teachers. Data were collected using video-recordings, questionnaires and interviews, and a descriptive and interpretative case study approach, alongside data quantification, was taken. The project, of which Burwell's 2005 study had been a part, had revealed a relationship between student ability (measured by learning outcomes) and the proportion of time students talked in lessons. Greater verbal participation by the student was linked with enhanced achievement. The study revealed some evidence of student dependence on teachers and of student desire to be directed by teachers and she suggested that students might tend towards being deferential to the expert teacher; i.e. 'sitting at the feet of the master' (ibid, p. 213). The study also revealed that students valued feeling mutually respected and treated 'on the same level' (ibid, p. 212). A tension in one-to-one tuition was identified between teachers taking an instructive versus eliciting mode of interaction. The development of student independence was argued as linked with higher levels of student participation, but the researcher indicated a tendency of teachers and students to fall into interactions in which the student was not pushed to really reflect and question due to teacher style of questioning. Teacher-questions were often either instructive, disguised instructions or rhetorical rather than exploratory, thus by implication counter the development of independence. Teachers' use of exploratory questions was linked with students feeling more confident that their contributions in lessons were respected and supported. She thus argued that a more collaborative and elicitive style of teacher interaction could demand greater student participation and develop student independence as a musician; but she also acknowledged that some students found such interactional style more difficult to respond to than others. Her work seemed to imply that teacher dominance and student passivity/deference were evident in teaching, but that collaborative interactions were also present and advocated as essential to developing student independence.

Evidence of the influence of the interactional field in the teaching relationship on the development of student artistic identities was found in another study. The co-constructed, mediated and negotiated nature of musical identities within the one-to-one relationship was discussed by Wirtanen and Littleton (2004). The researchers talked of musical interpretation as individually, relationally, socially and culturally constituted. Thematic analysis of semi-structured themed interviews with classical solo piano students (N=10) in the Sibelius Academy, Finland, revealed that processes of collaboration and negotiation of meaning between teacher and student acted to support the development of confidence in a student's artistic identities. Equally where a student's desire to explore a particular aspect of musical interpretation was met by a
teacher’s disapproval or rejection of such interpretative possibilities, this was found to lead to loss of confidence and performance ability, and to efforts to conceal particular identities in order to avoid teacher disapproval and interpersonal conflict. The researchers argued that this led to the development of troubled musical identities. This study raises interesting questions about the nature of artistic independence and autonomy, as it found that students did not sequester contested interests or identities, but rather concealed and held onto them. What might thus appear to be an act of student submission to teacher dominance might also be interpreted as its opposite; i.e. as contestation or subversion of teacher dominance and an assertion of independence instead. This study evidenced the significant influence of the intersubjective co-constructed field of relating upon the development of musical confidence and identity in students and revealed that teacher dominance does not necessarily prevent student autonomy or independence of mind, but perhaps excludes or isolates expression of such autonomy to the outside of the relationship. This begins to ask questions of how student independence, repeatedly depicted as an ideal for achievement in the literature, has been conceived and understood.

In a paper by Jørgensen (2000), the author usefully interrogated the nature of the ‘master-apprenticeship relationship’, the dominant historical pedagogic relationship in instrumental instruction. He discussed the Master (teacher) as role model and source of identification for students, who were understood to learn through imitation in this type of model. Questioning if such a model afforded students appropriate opportunities to develop independence and active initiative in learning, he suggested that not all students want independence, freedom and responsibility, rather many want to conform and be passive in the one-to-one relationship. Critical reading of the paper revealed a lack in the following areas: detailed rendering of methods of data sampling, collection and analysis, and substantiation of claims and interpretations through citation of participant verbatim extracts. This opens up questions about validity and power of argument (Fossey et al., 2002) but nevertheless, the research interrogated the question of tradition and dominance of the one-to-one model of teaching at a time when this was relatively uncontested, and Jørgensen’s propositions resonate with the ideas and findings of aforementioned researchers. They also find some agreement with the work of Persson (1996a; 1996b) which will now be reviewed.

**2.8 When Teacher Dominance Becomes Harmful**

The themes of student compliance, conformity and lack of freedom and of teacher control, dominance and intimidation, emerged in Persson’s studies (1996a; 1996b) on
one-to-one instrumental relationships in music higher education. The author used an exploratory narrative case study approach to examine teacher-student interactions and perspectives of the relationship and situated the study in a music department of a British University. Participants were one piano teacher and nine of her students (N=10) (1996a) and one organ performance professor and six of his students (N=7) (1996b). Methods of data collection for both papers included participant observation, informal unstructured interviews and questionnaires.

In the study with the piano teacher (1996a) content analysis of the researcher's observation notes was undertaken. This revealed that the teacher made extensive use of metaphor and imaginative ideas that students appeared to be unable to make use of or found confusing. The incapacity of students to transform the teacher's imaginative communications into their music making was found to give rise to teacher impatience and frustration. Use of pejorative descriptions to talk about students and use of intimidation as part of the teacher's interactional style were identified. Students' criticisms of the teacher included lack of freedom of interpretation, sensitivity, understanding and support. The paper did not aim to nor offer an in depth discussion or conceptualisation of the dynamics of this style of relating, but it highlighted the existence of teacher interactions that involved intimidation and ridicule of students in this context.

Persson's paper examining the lessons of the organ professor revealed evidence of a highly committed, but 'dominant and authoritarian' (1996b, p. 41) teacher. Findings revealed teacher interactions that were offensive, insulting, intimidating, ridiculing and verged on 'abuse' (ibid, p. 41). There was a major divergence in teacher self-perceptions of his behaviours towards students and his students' perceptions of him, suggesting a lack of mutual understanding of the nature of the interpersonal relationship. The researcher expressed discomfort and confusion about students' compliance with and acceptance of such teacher interactions. Several times in this paper, there was iteration on the following disconcerting question for the author - why do students tolerate harsh and insensitive treatment in their training? The researcher argued that intimidation and control by the teacher made the development of student artistic integrity and 'creative independence' (ibid, p. 43) more problematic, thus highlighting the negative impact of extreme dominance and coercive behaviour on learning outcomes. The paper was a-theoretical and thus did not proffer an in-depth understanding of the dynamic workings of such disturbing relational dynamics. As such, his findings seemed to call for further research to develop deeper insights into the perplexing question he posed.
2.9 Mutuality and Collaboration

Several studies, already discussed (Burwell, 2005; Gaunt, 2006; Wirtanen & Littleton, 2004), found evidence of mutuality and collaboration in the one-to-one relationship; this was in addition to the tendency towards teacher dominance-student passivity. Further evidence of the significance of collaborative relating was found in the following research.

A paper by Barrett (2006) using a case study approach drew on ‘eminence studies’ of creativity to examine beliefs, processes and practices of a composer-teacher in individual tuition with composition students (N=3). Methods of data collection included interviews, video-recording and observation of tutorials. Evidence of teacher-student interactions involving creative collaboration, joint purpose and effort and mutual socio-emotional support were found, despite asymmetry in terms of experience, power, skills and knowledge.

In a later joint publication from Barrett (see Barrett & Gromko, 2007) using the same case study approach with similar data collection methods, interactions between a composer-teacher and a graduate student-composer (N=2) were examined. Here there was evidence of reciprocity and mutual motivation; the creative process was presented as developing over time with the student increasingly contributing to dialogue and the teacher encouraging student reflexivity and articulation of intentions and accomplishments. This collaborative mutual interactional style resonates with Burwell’s (2005) findings of greater student participation / talk in lessons leading to enhanced outcomes.

2.10 The Influence of Non-verbal Sensitivity

Turning to the domain of implicit forms of relating, a study of non-verbal communication in one-to-one music performance instruction (Kurkul, 2007) found that teachers with higher levels of non-verbal sensitivity were rated as more effective in delivering lessons, including on rapport, pedagogic skill and instructional competence. The empirical context was a University, and participants were 60 one-to-one music performance teachers and 60 of their non-music major students. Research methods included: researcher lesson observation, video-recording of lesson interactions, the Profile of Nonverbal Sensitivity (PONS) to measure ability to decode nonverbal facial, bodily and vocal tone cues, and a Music Lesson Evaluation Form (MLEF) to evaluate lesson effectiveness. Kurkul found that higher levels of teacher non-verbal sensitivity may enable them to more accurately perceive students’ needs and therefore use such
perceptions to guide instruction. This seems to suggest that teacher capacity to decode and read non-verbal or implicit cues in the relationship was found to be significant in influencing student experience of learning as revealed through their lesson evaluations. The significance of the implicit relational dimension of one-to-one tuition for teaching and learning was thus evidenced.

2.11 A Social Constructionist Perspective of Conservatoire One-to-One Tuition

A theoretical paper from Burwell (2013) examined historical usage and meanings of the terms ‘master’ and ‘apprentice’ in music education literature. The apprenticeship pedagogic model in conservatories and higher education music departments is relatively unique within higher education. Burwell’s review revealed in the literature an elision of terms ‘maestro’, ‘master teacher’, ‘master’, ‘coach’ and ‘teacher’ and that usage of the term apprenticeship was associated with a wide range of themes including: use of demonstration and imitation in instruction, acquisition of experiential knowledge and skills, master as expert and representative of a community of practice, and apprenticeship as a source of learner identity. She discussed the process of imitation of the master as conceptually presented on a continuum in the literature; passive reproduction and direct copying of the master was found to be located at one end, and high levels of student engagement and active participation in a community of practice at the other. Power relations in the apprenticeship were found to be written into the literature in a number of ways: dominance of the master, student desire for a powerful master, abuse of power, power as resource for teaching and critically interrogative perspectives on power in this context. She noted that historical literature made little reference to the emotional and personal commitment of the relationship, and suggested that the affective and intimate dimensions of learning had become more prominent in contemporary writing.

She concluded that the terminology of apprenticeship was frequently referred to, richly textured but also ambiguous and multifarious in definition in music education literature. Her review reflected many of the themes that have been identified thus far in the literature review in this chapter. This would arguably be inevitable since her review examined many of the same texts, albeit from a particular perspective of exploring the usage of particular terms in the literature.

Prior to the emergence of the empirical literature discussed thus far in this review, one writer offered a conceptual framework for understanding the workings of the
interactional system of master-apprentice relationship in the music studio. His work will now be discussed.

2.12 Conceptual Insights: A Route to Conflict Resolution in the Master-Apprentice Relationship

Schön (1987) drew on a case study approach to discuss the interactional system of a master and student in the music studio context. He articulated a conceptual framework that offered a perspectival consideration of the master-apprentice relationship that took account of both teacher and student perceptions of interactions and conceptualised the emergence of interpersonal conflict, impasse and possible routes to resolutions for such problematic situations in the relationship.

He framed the relationship as influenced by western cultural ideologies of independence of mind. Such ideologies were discussed as potentially generating conflicts for students in terms of anxiety about loss of independence, subordination, loss of originality and reproducing the master’s actions through imitation without true feeling and comprehension. However the capacity to surrender control and to become dependent on the authority of the ‘master’ was presented as necessary for students to learn and to subsequently evaluate knowledge once grasped. The author gave an example from the one-to-one studio context of a student who was open enough to temporarily surrender to the view of an authoritative master, without feeling threatened by such surrender. This was in contrast to another student-master relationship where the student refused to surrender and a situation of interpersonal combat developed. Schön described the interactions in this relationship as developing into serial miscommunications that ultimately led to failure to develop convergence of meaning between teacher and student. The lack of mutual understanding and the interlocking dynamic he termed the ‘learning bind’ (ibid, p. 127). This was portrayed as a situation where teacher and student became fixed in an interlocking pattern of interaction ‘playing a kind of game in which they drive each other round in circles’, a ‘game of attack and defense’ (ibid, p. 133). He considered the interactional situation from each of the participants’ perspectives. The student was presented as seeking to defend her own position whilst wanting the teacher’s appreciation, and she did not seek to understand her teacher’s perspective; the teacher simultaneously sought to assert his objectives unilaterally and did not attempt to understand the student’s perspective. Schön argued that both participants perceive such a situation in terms of a ‘win-lose game’ and an exercise of control, and the interaction becomes self-sealing. As such, this inhibits reflection and learning since neither participant is able to risk being open to
the challenge of the other, nor seek information that could lead to a change of perception. Such an impasse prevents the student from learning what is necessary and the teacher from enabling the student to discover that learning.

The resolution to the ‘learning bind’ was presented as possible through a process of not only searching for a convergence of subject based meaning, but also through attempts by both parties to listen to, convey, test, and try to develop understandings of the other’s framing of the interaction in which both are trapped. This he termed ‘reciprocal reflection-in-action’ (ibid, p. 138). This process required of the student the ability to enter a zone of uncertainty and engage in ‘cognitive risktaking’ (ibid, p. 139), and this involved surrender of habitual ways of constructing their understandings. Teacher-student dialogue would require shared reflections upon their interactional and communicative world. He articulated it thus:

student and studio master would have to extend their ladder of reflection, adding to it a “rung” of reflection on their own interaction, their behavioural world, and the theories-in-use by which they create and sustain it (ibid, p. 139)

A diagrammatic representation of ideas derived from Schön is presented in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2: Diagrammatic Representation of Ideas from Schön

It seems that such openness and honesty about the nature of a difficult relationship, where the teacher is in a power position, would require emotional robustness and considerable trust on the part of the student, and mutual commitment from both parties to a collaborative resolution for this to be effective. The potential for student critical feedback to become part of the cycle of ‘attack and defense’ would seem an obvious threat to the process. The potential of such dialogue seems to contrast with Nerland and Hanken’s (2002) suggestion that student criticism may instead cause strain and
relationship breakdown in one-to-one tuition. It seems that there may be a pedagogic conundrum inherent in one-to-one tuition about how interpersonal tensions can be productively navigated. Whilst reciprocal-reflection-in-action was presented by Schön as a route to resolution of the ‘learning bind’, he also acknowledged that such a process would require a strong sense of self and he located responsibility for initiating such reflective processes with the teacher. His ideas and exemplification from the music studio context offered a valuable framework for considering the interactional world of the one-to-one instrumental tuition relationship and proffered ways of understanding the development of and possible resolutions to interpersonal conflict in this context. Although his epistemological perspective was quite different, his ideas align with those from the conceptual world of relational psychoanalysis, which will be highlighted in chapter 3.

2.13 Thinking of Instrumental Tuition as an Interactional System

The idea of the instrumental tuition relationship as an interactional microsystem in which human subjects are both, influencing / determining and reciprocally being influenced / determined by one another was presented in the work of Creech and Hallam (2003). Their paper reviewed literature within the field of music education for children and adolescents, however it is considered here as it put forward a conceptualisation of the workings of the teaching relationship as an interactional communicative system. It is pertinent to the current study since their ideas and findings expand understandings of some of the themes that have been elaborated in this chapter. Moreover, their work drew on systemic thinking and such ideas are integral to intersubjective theory that forms part of the interpretative framework in the current study (to be discussed in the next chapter).

Creech and Hallam’s (2003) literature review considered understandings of parent-teacher-pupil interactions in instrumental music education. They found that interpersonal conflicts in such learning partnerships could lead to disengagement with musical study, and noted a gap in the literature around investigation of possible resolutions to such conflicts. A systems theory approach to the study of the parent-teacher-student communicative system was proposed, and authors suggested that such an approach conceptualised characteristics of each participant, not as intrinsic and isolated to those participants, but instead as emergent properties of the system. This moved away from a one-person psychological perspective, where for example motivation (or lack of) would be understood as an isolated characteristic of the individual teacher or the individual student, and instead considered qualities or
characteristics as emerging in the mutual and reciprocal teacher-student interaction. Such a systemic view of the instrumental tutelage relationship proffered the possibilities of participants becoming agents of change in conflicted situations as there was potential for those involved to reframe expectations, styles of relating and teaching strategies. This could tip the balance towards possibility of conflict resolution and improved prospects of positive musical outcomes, rather than into impasse and termination of the learning situation. This dovetails with the ideas proposed by Schön (1987) above on resolving the learning bind, although the theoretical underpinning is different.

A later empirical paper by Creech (2012) drew upon this systemic theoretical model and examined the influence of interpersonal interaction on teaching and learning of 11 violin teachers and their pupils (aged 10-16). Through quantitative and qualitative methods, in-depth interviews, observations and a cluster analysis of measures of interpersonal control and responsiveness, she found evidence of a range of interpersonal interaction types. Interpersonal relationships that were characterised by highly directive teachers and reticent compliant pupils (categorised as Type 1) were conceptually linked to the teacher dominated, didactic master-apprentice pedagogic model; and dyads characterised by reciprocity and mutual respect, with teachers who were responsive, caring, supportive of autonomous learning and receptive to take in student views (Type 6) were conceptually aligned to a facilitative student-centred model. She found that that highest musical achievement had been found in Type 6 systems. Her findings indicated that particular qualities of relatedness in dyads - more dialogic and reciprocal which involved teacher receptivity to students’ experience, positively influenced learning. This seems to bridge with the findings of Kurkul (2007) who linked higher levels of teacher non-verbal sensitivity with student perceptions of lesson effectiveness, with the work of Barrett and Gromko (Barrett, 2006; Barrett & Gromko, 2007) who found evidence of the benefits of mutuality and collaboration in learning dyads, and with Burwell’s (2005) findings of teachers encouraging greater student verbal participation and use of exploratory modes of questioning as linked with enhanced achievement.

Creech’s work identified and categorised characteristics of the dyad, rather than characteristics of either teacher or student. This focus on the relational system as an influencer of learning proffered a way of conceptualising the pedagogic context and the outcomes of that context as affected by the co-influencing world of experiencing between the participants. Her work brought into focus the significance of the emergent properties or potential of the particular dyadic relationship. By implication it raised questions about the interpersonal match and its role in enhancing or disrupting learning
in one-to-one music education contexts, as previous researchers (Gaunt, 2011; Purser, 2005; Serra-Dawa, 2010) had indicated.

2.14 Summary and Contextualisation of the Current Research Questions

Research literature examining one-to-one pedagogy in conservatoires began to develop in the past two decades. The majority of empirical studies in this field were designed upon research questions that focused on teaching strategy, methods and approaches to one-to-one tuition, rather than on the nature of ‘relationship’ itself. However, the body of research revealed evidence that the relationship between teacher and student has implications for the experience and outcomes of learning in this context. A range of features of the relationship were found to be significant including: power relations, the common occurrence of teacher dominance-student passivity, evidence of collaboration and mutuality, the teacher-student interpersonal match, interpersonal conflict and its negative implications, the tensions of intimacy and detachment and the process of changing teachers. The review revealed methodological limitations for some of the qualitative research papers and this creates both a space and demand for further research to build an evidence base that can strengthen, elaborate and/or contest existing claims.

It is important to note that one-to-one tuition is the central pillar of the student learning experience in the conservatoire and it takes place behind closed doors. Positive and harmful implications of phenomena of the relationship in this pedagogic context were identified in this review and previous researchers have called for further investigation into the relationship. It thus seems critical to ask direct questions about the influence and nature of the ‘relationship’ in this learning situation. The research questions in the current study are formulated thus:

- What significance do teachers and students give to the ‘relationship’ between them in one-to-one tuition?
- How do qualities and forms of relatedness between teacher and student influence the process, experience and outcomes of teaching and learning?

A particular gap in the current state of knowledge was also identified in this review. There are currently no in-depth dynamic psychological or psychoanalytically informed empirical studies or formulations of the workings of the conservatoire one-to-one tuition relationship. Indeed Gaunt spoke of the need to ‘consider the relational aspects of
one-to-one tuition in more detail... drawing on the experience of other fields of one-to-one interaction' (Gaunt, 2011, p. 177). In discussion of her findings she wrote:

the relationship itself may be a pivotal feature in determining the degree of success for the student in learning, and clearly more research is needed to explore student-teacher dyads in conservatoires from psychological and psychodynamic perspectives, in relation to their impact on learning, personal and professional development (ibid, p. 176)

The research approach taken in the current study offers a direct response to this call through provision of a ‘relational psychoanalytic’ and ‘dynamic psychological’ reading of the one-to-one tuition relationship.

The next chapter will provide a review of ‘relational’ concepts from psychotherapeutic literatures. The concepts outlined there will constitute the lens through which I will interpret findings from the current research.
Chapter 3: Literature Review of Relational Concepts within Psychotherapeutic and Psychoanalytic Literature

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an outline and discussion of ‘relational’ concepts as they have emerged within psychotherapeutic and relational psychoanalytic literatures. The chapter enters discussion by positioning the concept within the paradigm of dynamic psychology and then proceeds to an examination of particular ideas from relational responsibility, intersubjectivity and relational psychoanalysis. The term ‘relational’ appeared in the application of social constructionism to psychotherapeutic practices in the work of McNamee and Gergen (1999) who developed a perspective known as ‘relational responsibility’ and it became prominent in the field of psychoanalysis when the term ‘Relational Psychoanalysis’ was first coined by Greenberg and Mitchell (cited in Aron, 1996, p. 13).

3.2 Dynamic Psychology

In the field of psychology the long tradition of categorisation systems including trait and personality theories, motivational typologies and learning styles and the western world assumption of the unified self and of notion of the individual inner psychic world of self became the subject of critique in the latter part of the twentieth century. Such systems of thought were criticised as too rigid, static and limiting to capture the complexity, inconsistencies and self-contradictions of human experiencing (Apter, 2003; Gergen, 2009; McNamee & Gergen, 1999). A dynamic psychology that took account of patterns and dynamics within systems of human interaction and of the socially constructive nature of human communication thus developed. Within that psychological paradigm a relational perspective emerged which is the focus of discussion in this chapter.

3.3 Relational Responsibility

The historical prominence of the discourse of the self and of the focus on the individual as an isolated unit to describe and explain human functioning was critiqued by authors McNamee and Gergen (1999). They argued that the notion of self was born of relationship and that feelings, explanations of intentions and justifications for actions were relational moves which were accompanied by relational implications. Their work
examined the language and discourses of mental life and of relatedness. They argued for relational responsibility and the interactive negotiated nature of mental states and conditions, rather than the latter being framed as properties of the isolated individual. Their work explored the nature of social existence and the situated-ness of the individual within complex networks of relations. The inevitability and ubiquitous nature of conflict, disharmony and failures in mutual understanding in human relationship were discussed. They wrote:

disruptions, annoyances, and even wrenching upheavals within any relationship should not be considered unusual or deeply problematic deviations from the normal… complete harmony is bought at the price of vast suppression (ibid, p. 24)

Periods of harmony, mutual agreement and smooth interchange between individuals were advocated as partial, shifting, temporary and precarious and thus, problems in relationship were to be understood as an ordinary and unavoidable part of human life. They argued that ‘Glitches are the normal order of things’ (ibid, p. 24). Problems and tensions in relationship were similarly not to be thought of as fixed, permanent and unalterable, but rather open to the possibilities of transformation and renegotiation through what they described as ‘relationally responsible inquiry’. So what did this form of inquiry involve?

The authors theorised that through a shifting and altering of an individual’s own position and perspective within a relationally problematic situation, this could bring about a difference in dimensions of relatedness. The passage below captures the way that relations were presented as being recast and re-organised through one individual reconsidering their own claims to identities, positions or emotions. This was understood to invite new possibilities for relating or ‘alternative dances of relationship’ (ibid, p. 27) as they described it.

to talk with a new voice is to invite the other to treat one in a different way; to define oneself differently also defines the other in a new way... to move from the position of authority to questioner, from assured to the ambivalent, or from the angry to the sympathetic invites an alternative identity from the other. To become questioner invites the other’s authority; to be ambivalent opens the way for the other’s ambivalence, and to replace anger with sympathy enables defensiveness to be replaced by good will. If effectively pursued, relationally responsible inquiry has transformative potential for the participants (ibid)

The pursuit of relationally responsible inquiry thus seemed to suggest that in a problematic relational interlocking conflict, the capacity in one individual to reconsider their perspective, to reposition and reorient themselves in their orientation to the other, could open up the possibility of transformation of the interpersonal situation.
This idea was explored in the work of Burkitt (1999) who talked of the shifting, changing and continual reconfiguring of relationships as a generative dance. The author wrote as follows:

> persons in relationships are constantly repositioning themselves like dancers engaged in fluid but patterned formations. In relationships, people are always repositioning themselves in respect of others and also in respect of previous relationships and their outcomes (ibid, p. 75)

Burkitt discussed the rise of blame in negative interactions and suggested that the conditions that enabled such relationship configurations to emerge needed to be brought into view. Thus responsibility was presented as always shared, since all actions were understood to take place within interrelationships and interdependencies, and within the contexts of other actions. Burkitt argued that no action emerged in a ‘mythical rarefied stratosphere above relationships’ (ibid, p. 72).

The intertwining nature of human interactive processes and their constituting and co-constructive nature were highlighted in these writings. The possibility of change and conflict resolution appeared to be captured in this work through the capacity to take account of the relationship and the positions taken up within it, and through a flexibility to generate ‘alternative dances’ rather than become rigidly ossified into one position or perspective.

### 3.4 Relational within Psychoanalysis

Psychoanalysis as a theoretical paradigm arose from investigation into psychological phenomena that occurred in the clinical consulting room where an ‘analyst’ and a ‘patient’ worked together to alleviate psychological suffering in the latter. The early Freudian psychoanalytic methodology involved the analyst interpreting the client’s subjectivity through conducting a metaphoric excavation into the contents of the patient's unconscious mind (Rabin, 1995), and this later shifted to a focus on the analyst interpreting the client’s experience of the analyst’s subjectivity (Aron, 1996, 1999). The focus of analysis and interpretation thus became the interactional nexus (Dunn, 1995), the intersection of the subjectivities of the analyst and the patient (Ogden, 1999), or the ‘realm of the *between*’ (Gergen, 1994, p217, emphasis in the original). The issues inherent in interpreting the experience of another human being also became a focus for relational psychoanalysis. These theories began to recognise the irreducible subjectivity and influence of the analyst on the therapeutic process; that therapeutic outcomes were influenced by qualities of relationship between therapist and client, and that analytic method was not a disembodied transmission of insight or
knowledge but was rather an affectively and intersubjectively imbued process (Aron, 1996; Stolorow, 1997).

The term relational came into the language and discourse of psychoanalysis in the 1980s. This marked a revisioning of psychoanalysis from the classical positivistic, quasi-biological one-person psychology, into a contextual psychology that recognised the bi-directionality and mutually constitutive nature of intersubjective relations and the primacy of relatedness in the making and shaping of human experience (Aron, 1996; Dunn, 1995; Stolorow, Orange, & Atwood, 2001). The ‘Relational Tradition’, a term used by Mitchell and Aron (1999), referred to the coalescing of diverse schools of psychoanalytic thought that shared some common clinical and theoretical sensibilities (Aron, 1996; Ghent, 2002). Central to this tradition was the conceptualisation of the mind as relational, interpersonal, interactional, intersubjectively constituted and socially constructed (Mitchell & Aron, 1999; Stolorow, 1997; Stolorow et al., 2001).

Evolving and gaining ascendancy in the United States (Mills, 2005), ideas from the lineage of psychoanalytic thought gathered into a wave of relational thinking and two approaches in particular, Sullivan’s (1953) American based interpersonal psychiatry and British based object relations theory, became central to this movement. Relational ideas were shaped by interdisciplinary exchange and wider historical and cultural transformations and key influences included: intersubjectivity theory, social constructionism, postmodernism, feminism, political theory, gender studies, perspectivism, and dynamic systems theories (Aron, 1996; Mitchell & Aron, 1999; Rabin, 1995; Stolorow, 1997). The contours of key epistemological approaches within those other disciplines, for example the commitment to deconstructing absolutist narratives, the interrogation of binaries and the understanding of knowledge as partial and contextually constructed, was sculpted into this approach (Aron, 1996).

The stream of relational psychoanalytic ideas did not merge into a unified system of thought (Ghent, 2002; Mills, 2005; Mitchell & Aron, 1999), rather theorists within the tradition argued for distinct emphases, priorities and metaphors, and advocated different definitions even for the same term (see 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 for discussions on divergent definitions of ‘intersubjectivity’). The coexistence of contradictions in their midst was understood as reflecting differing vantage points. With variance in perspectives, a community of practice emerged in debate and dialogue around what was known as a ‘relational way of thinking’ (Ghent, 2002).

---

1 See Gomez (1998) for overview of object relations theory and key psychoanalytic writers within that tradition.
Having sketched relational psychoanalysis onto the historical map, key ideas and concepts will now be outlined.

### 3.4.1 Intersubjectivity Theory: Dynamic, Dyadic, Intersubjective Systems

Within relational psychoanalysis, intersubjectivity was broadly defined by intersubjectivity theorists (Stolorow et al., 2001) as the relational contexts in which all experience takes form. They argued that their perspective was different to an interpersonal theory since its focus was not predominantly on analysis of behavioural interaction; instead they located their perspective within phenomenological field theory and dynamic systems theory as their work sought to understand the interweaving of worlds of experiencing (ibid, p. 475). The notion of a dynamic, dyadic, intersubjective system (Stolorow, 1997) was put forward to theorise the interplay of two subjective worlds within the one-to-one therapeutic relationship. Dynamic systems theory (Thelen & Smith, 1994) had a key influence on the development of psychoanalytic intersubjectivity theory. Ideas from the former became central to the latter; such ideas from dynamic systems theory included:

- order and patterns emerge out of complex living systems,
- emergent qualities or phenomena cannot be predicted from the characteristics of the individual elements in the system,
- whatever emerges within and from the system is totally different from the elements that constitute the system itself, and
- change within a dynamic complex living system arises through periods of disorganisation and disturbance within the system. Loss of stability and coherence provide the process through which the system can work its way to discovering and exploring new, stable patterns.

These ideas were recast within the intersubjective frame and gave rise to the following: the notion that psychological phenomena and experience were not constituted from isolated intrapsychic mechanisms or fixed structures, but instead were created and emergent at the interface of reciprocally interacting worlds of experience. The emergent potential of the relationship was understood to be more than and different to the personalities and subjectivities of the two individual participants. Theory of therapeutic and personal change was presented as arising out of unpredictable disturbance and disorganisation within the relationship, and this could lead to potential new experiences and ways of being in the relationship. Change was understood to be possible and sustainable only if the two participants in the relationship could tolerate
and contain painful affect states that accompany periods of destabilisation in the relationship (Stolorow, 1997).

With some similarity to Stolorow’s ideas, intersubjectivity was articulated in the work of infancy researcher Stern (1998, 2004) as a basic condition of mind and relationships. Stern also discussed the emergent properties of complex dynamic systems to theorize processes of therapeutic change (as detailed below). His theories, derived from observations and analysis of infant-caregiver interactive systems, conceptualised intersubjectivity as occurring all the time in any dyad. He articulated the co-influencing nature of dyadic human interactional systems, writing that ‘two minds create intersubjectivity. But equally, intersubjectivity shapes the two minds’ (Stern, 2004, p. 78). His theory emphasised the place and role of the intrapsychic and the intersubjective, rather than either/or. The intersubjective field was defined by Stern as the:

domain of feelings, thoughts, and knowledge that two (or more) people share about the nature of their current relationship. Not only is this intersubjective domain shared, but the sharing also is validated between them, implicitly or explicitly. (ibid, p. 243)

It was thus presented as both a declarative (explicit) and non-declarative (implicit) field of shared experiencing and knowing that emerged between individuals in relationship.

3.4.1.i Implicit Relational Knowing

Stern (1998) used the terms ‘implicit relational knowing’ and ‘schemes of ways of being-with-another’ to describe the non-declarative, implicit understandings that develop in interactive processes with specific other human beings and these were articulated as part of the intersubjective field. The endless myriad of interactive processes and moments of being in relationship with a specific other were framed as creating familiar canons of moments of life (ibid) within the specific relational context. Implicit relational knowing, he described as a repertoire of affect patterns, motor procedures, relational expectations and patterns of thinking that develop within a specific relational context, and this knowing was articulated as largely non conscious, but not unconscious in the psychodynamic sense of repressed (ibid; Stern, 2004).

3.4.1.ii Now Moments and Moments of Meeting

Stern argued that such implicit relational knowing afforded the individual an understanding of how the relationship was expected to move along moment by moment, and it was only when the ‘normal, canonical way of doing business together’ (Stern, 1998, p. 304) was destabilised by an unexpected, unpredicted emergent property of the relationship that the possibility of a new intersubjective context was
offered. Such moments in the dyadic relationship, termed ‘now moments’ (ibid), involved both individuals encountering the unfamiliar within their intersubjective relational field. He likened this interactional phenomena to a ‘moment of truth’, as such moments were likely to be experienced as affectively charged, difficult, challenging, anxiety provoking, and important for the immediate and long-term future of the relationship (ibid). He argued that ‘now moments’ required a unique, authentic genuine response, that was non formulaic and non-habitual from both partners in the dyad, a kind of improvisational response that involved risk. Mutual recognition of this moment by both parties was required, in order that a new intersubjective shared state could come into being. Such relational moments were referred to as a ‘moment of meeting’. A ‘now moment’ could thus present an emergent point in the relationship that could offer the possibility of positive permanent change in the relationship in the form of a ‘moment of meeting’. This had resonance with the idea of change in Stolorow’s (1997) work discussed above. Stern also argued that now moments that were not transformed into moments of meeting, could have serious consequences for the relationship. In the context of a therapeutic dyad, he argued that part of the intersubjective terrain would become closed off, giving rise to a sense of a kind of ‘no-go area’ in relating. This could ultimately lead to the continued existence of the relationship being put into serious question (Stern, 1998).

3.4.2 Intersubjectivity: Dialectic between Mutual Recognition and Complementarity

Contrasting with the previous authors, Benjamin (1999) and Aron (2000, 2006) argued for intersubjectivity as a developmental progression and a capacity that is intermittently and repeatedly created, destroyed and re-created, rather than as a condition of all relating. Intersubjectivity was defined by these authors as a capacity to navigate the dialectical tension between relations of complementarity and of mutual recognition. This perspective will now be outlined.

3.4.2.i Complementarity and Impasse

Benjamin (1999) theorised power relations within dyadic relationships and discussed the way in which human relationships intermittently, repeatedly and inevitably fall and habituate into binary oppositional dynamics: what she termed ‘complementarity’. I will outline this concept now.

In complementary binary relations, one party in a relationship asserts their will, point of view, meaning, reality or need; the other person reacts by taking up a complementary (that is, polar opposite) position (Aron, 2006; ibid). A complementary structure of
relating begins to organise the relationship into a power struggle of submission–dominance, ‘doer - done-to’, victim-persecutor, powerful-powerless, active-passive, authoritarian-deferential and so on. It is as if the position of one person in the dyad co-determines the position of the other. The relational experience is one of a tug-of-war; with each person feeling relationally pushed, pulled, pressured or nudged into position by the other.

An impasse in complementary binary relations emerges when both people in the relationship become locked into a fixed pattern of oppositional relating where each person is unable to recognise the subjectivity of the other. When the interlocking system of binary relating becomes rigid, ossified and permanent, the stalemate of an impasse arises. The more one person locks into a singular position, the more rigidly the other becomes locked into their opposing, complementary, binary opposition (Aron, 2006). The complementary structure can oscillate, allowing roles to be reversed, but the structuring of the relationship around the polarities of power becomes fixed and unalterable in the impasse (ibid; Benjamin, 1999). So for example, an individual in a dyadic relationship who feels persecuted by the other may flip into the position of becoming or being experienced as the persecutor. Thus, the binary structuring of positions in the relationship becomes inflexible and intransigent, but the positions may be reversed. Neither individual is the sole guardian or claimant of one position. Aron spoke of the consequences of the interlocking relational configuration as follows:

it is when individuals get locked into narrowly defined roles with limited interactional options that they stop thinking in action. (Aron, 2000, p. 680)

Aron proposed that when a therapeutic relationship becomes fixed in complementarity this heralds the beginnings of a therapeutic impasse (a stalemate) that seriously limits the potential of the relationship (Aron, 2006). Ongoing complementarity in a relationship stifles thinking, freedom, fluidity, playfulness and unpredictability because the cycle of power struggle dominates. Only through the dissolution of such permanently fixed binary power relations can intermittent entry into intersubjectivity and mutual recognition become possible (ibid; Benjamin, 1999). The route to mutual recognition as framed in this theory is through the creation of what is known as ‘the third’ (Aron, 2006; Benjamin, 2009).

3.4.2.ii ‘The Third’ in Intersubjectivity

Through having the capacity to step out of the relational configurations of power struggle where one person is defined in binary opposition to the other, a third position, a space for thinking and reflecting upon the complementary relational dynamic, opens up. This third point, achievable through self-reflexivity, transcends the binary positions
of powerful-powerless, doer–done-to, dominant-submissive relations in intersubjective space, and it is through the creation of the third position that the possibilities of the development of new forms of relating may arise. This was termed 'the third' (ibid).

Aron (2000) explained that self-reflexivity, also described as the reflexive function of mind, was a capacity to manage the dialectical tension between experiencing oneself as a subject and of reflecting upon and thinking about oneself as an object. This was presented as involving both an observational mode of self and an experiencing mode of self. The observational mode of self, involved taking a view of oneself as if from outside looking upon oneself as an object of thought; it thus involved cognition. The experiencing mode of self, occurred in the immersion and immediacy of the present moment as a subject, as an experiencing emotional being. The capacity for self-reflexivity was thus theorised as integrating thought and affect, mind and body. Importantly the capacity to manage the tension of shifting smoothly between experiencing and observational modes of self, allowed for the emergence of a triangular relation of: self, the other and the other’s view of the self. He wrote of self-reflexivity that it:

> involves the mediation of the self-as-subject with self-as-object, the "I" and the "me," the verbal and the bodily selves, the other-as-subject, and the other-as-object. (ibid, p. 684)

It was through this self-reflexive capacity in a therapist to be able to think about their own reactions and positioning within a power struggle (i.e. through creation of ‘the third’), that the relationship could open up to the possibilities of negotiated collaboration. Self-reflexivity could thus prevent a pattern of submission–domination becoming permanently fixed (See Figure 3 below for a diagrammatic representation of ideas relating to creation of 'The Third' in a therapeutic dyad)
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**Figure 3: Diagrammatic Representation of 'The Third'**
These ideas find resonance with ideas discussed earlier, including the concepts of relational responsible inquiry and the generative dance which involve repositioning and reconfigurations of relational positions in order to afford the possibility of transformation of conflicted interpersonal situations, and with Schön’s (1987) notion of the route out of the impasse of the ‘learning bind’ as achievable through the process of ‘reciprocal reflection-in-action’.

3.4.2.iii Intersubjectivity and Mutual Recognition

Benjamin (1999) argued that in dyadic relationships, intersubjectivity referred specifically to the zone of experience where the other was recognized as having a separate and equivalent centre of self. It involved mutual recognition which was manifest in the capacity to sustain and balance the contradiction between asserting one’s own subjectivity (e.g. needs, feelings, wishes, desires, demands), whilst also recognising the subjectivity of the other, particularly when their reality, need or will was contrary to one’s own (ibid). Aron (1996) argued that mutuality of recognition of separate subjectivities, subject-subject relating, coexisted in a dynamic tension with subject-object relating. Mutual recognition was thus not a stable and once and for all achievement in dyads, but rather was achievable periodically and intermittently and coexisted with the inevitable repeated collapse into complementary binary relations. He articulated mutuality of recognition as essentially recognition of each other’s autonomy:

For mutuality of recognition to exist in a relationship, there must be two participants who feel themselves to be autonomous people capable of agreement and disagreement. (ibid, p. 151)

Mutuality and intersubjective negotiation were thus not to imply an absence of discord or conflict in relationships, rather they would enable the possibility of the recognition and co-existence of conflicting viewpoints in dyadic relations (ibid, p. 157). This echoes with McNamee and Gergen’s (1999) proposition of the inevitability of conflict, disharmony and failures in mutual understanding in human relating.

3.4.2.iv Autonomy: Deconstructing the Binary of Separation and Relatedness

A concept termed ‘dynamic autonomy’, referred to by Aron in his discussions of mutual recognition, was offered by Keller and defined as:

a product of relatedness with others as well as of separation from them. Dynamic autonomy develops not only from a sense of competence and effectance, but also out of a sense of continuity and reciprocity of feeling in formative interpersonal experience. (Aron, 1996, p. 151)
This notion of autonomy was valuable as it sought to deconstruct the binary oppositions of autonomy versus connection that had emerged in psychological literature. It seemed to give rise to a notion of autonomy or independence as emerging out of or through relatedness. Furthermore it brought into question the idea of autonomy as a static stable property or achievement of the isolated individual and offered a relational co-constructive framing of this achievement.

Having discussed the concept of intersubjectivity, this chapter draws to a close with a final area of consideration - the tension between intimacy and isolation.

**3.4.3 The Tension of Intimacy and Isolation**

According to a relational paradigm, inherent to human relating is the encounter and negotiation of the tension between the desire to be known and not known by the other, and to know and not know about the other (Aron, 1996). These contradictory desires were articulated as follows:

> We each have an essential, built-in desire for contact with the other... which includes two distinct aspects: the desire to know the other and the desire to be known by the other... I would emphasize the wish to reveal oneself to the other as well as the longing to find the essence of the other... In addition to these two complementary wishes – to know and be known – there is a contrasting set of wishes and needs. There is a strong desire to avoid contact with the other, to be hidden, protected, left alone. (ibid, p. 234)

Human relationship is thus presented as plagued by this paradox of opposing and competing desires. This raises inescapable questions and unavoidable anxieties about being in relationship with another. For example, when and how to be or not to be intimate or detached? How close is too close and how distant, too distant? When does intimacy become intrusion? When does distance become abandonment? When does closeness become claustrophobic? When does detachment become unbearable disconnection? And so on. Such questions would be framed in a relational paradigm as inevitable to being in relationship.

**3.4 Summary**

This chapter has discussed the notion of relational within the field of psychotherapeutic literatures. Positioned within a dynamic contextual psychological paradigm, concepts from relational responsibility and relational psychoanalysis were outlined. Divergence and convergence of meanings between different conceptual frameworks were highlighted. This conceptual landscape has been outlined as it provides an approach to analysing the interactive, dynamic and conflicted nature of dyadic relationships. The theories articulate understandings of patterns and forms of relatedness in human
interactive systems. As such this chapter has provided key ideas that will constitute the interpretative lens through which I will examine the relational dimension of one-to-one vocal tuition relationships.

The next chapter is dedicated to an account of the methodological and epistemological approach taken in this study.
Chapter 4: Methodology

4.1 Introduction

This chapter begins with an introduction to epistemological stance and methodological approach taken, followed by an overview of methodological design and preliminary comments about analytic approaches employed. Detailed descriptions and critical reflections on methods of data collection and analysis are then presented. A brief outline of how findings will be presented in this thesis then follows. Finally critical reflections on my role as an ‘outsider’ researcher and on issues of validity are addressed towards the end of the chapter.

4.2 Epistemological Stance and Methodological Approach

A contextualist and interpretative phenomenological epistemological position is taken in this study. A contextualist perspective differs from an essentialist positivist approach that argues for one reality that exists ‘out there’ in the world that can be examined or observed objectively as if isolated from the researcher (Madill, Jordan, & Shirley, 2000; Shaw, 2010). Rather, contextualism understands knowledge as local, provisional, partial, context dependent and socially and intersubjectively constituted (Coyle, 2007; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; Shaw, 2010). Paradigms of social constructionism and symbolic interactionism are relevant to the study as they seek to understand a situation from the perspective of the actors, and to explain how social actors recognise, produce and reproduce social actions and how they come to share an intersubjective understanding of particular situations (Schwandt, 2001). Sitting between essentialism and constructionism, contextualism recognises the way that individuals make meaning of experience, and that such meanings are mediated and shaped through interaction with the social and contextual environment (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Larkin, Watts, & Clifton, 2006).

Turning to interpretative phenomenology; phenomenology is concerned philosophically with lived experience and the phenomenological stance taken focuses on participant’s individual concerns, cares, experiences and cognitive and affective reactions. The interpretative stance contextualises claims within social and contextual environments, and endeavours to understand the mutually constitutive relationship between ‘person’ and ‘world’ drawing on a psychological framework (Larkin et al., 2006; Smith, 2004;
Smith, 2011a). In this regard the psychological framework employed in this study is a dynamic relational psychotherapeutic perspective and its epistemological underpinnings cohere with those discussed above (see chapter 3 for details of epistemological influences of that framework).

Below I provide an overview of methodological design, introductory overview of each strand of investigation and a rationale for the methodological design.

### 4.2.1 Overview of Methodological Design

The methodological design of this study involved two strands of investigation (see figure 4 below) which were undertaken concurrently.

#### 4.2.1.i In-Depth Case Studies Overview

One strand, entitled ‘In-Depth Case Studies’, involved the in-depth analysis of teacher-student dyads within two clusters. This approach provided highly detailed, nuanced and rich descriptions of idiosyncratic individual experiences and perceptions. Aims of this strand were:

- To understand how a teacher and student experienced, perceived and made sense of qualities, patterns and forms of relatedness that emerged within their particular dyadic relationship

---

Figure 4: Methodological Design
To understand how forms of interpersonal relatedness in teaching dyads were experienced and perceived as influencing teaching and learning

Data was gathered (discussed in detail in section 4.3.3.ii) through video-recording of lesson interactions and video-stimulated reflective interviews. Interview data was subjected to interpretative phenomenological analysis (I.P.A.) which sought to provide an evocation of the particularity of the experiential life-worlds of participants (Smith, 2004) within the context of their particular teacher-student pairing. This approach enabled highly detailed examination of the shifting, complex, dynamic, partial and contradictory nature of participant accounting for experience. Analysis of data allowed for identification of themes and sub-themes within individual accounts that were salient to the aims of this strand. Through triangulation of teacher and student perspectives within a dyad, this allowed for analysis of points of convergence and divergence of experience, perception and meaning making between co-participants within a specific relationship. Analysis of convergence and divergence of themes across dyads within a cluster, and across clusters was undertaken to develop understandings of individual experience and perception of forms of relatedness as emergent within different dyadic contexts. A relational interpretative reading of the data is offered. The case study clusters were situated within one conservatoire, conservatoire ‘A’.

4.2.1.ii Individual Interviews Overview

The other strand entitled ‘Individual Interviews’ involved the collection of two sets of data through semi-structured interviews conducted with individual teachers (N=8) from 4 conservatoires and individual students (N=15) from 2 conservatoires. Aims of this strand were:

- To understand what teachers and students perceived as significant about the ‘relationship’ in one-to-one tuition
- To understand how qualities and forms of interpersonal relatedness between teacher and student were experienced and perceived as influencing teaching and learning

Convergence and divergence of meanings, claims, experiences and phenomena were examined through a phenomenologically informed thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This approach, also afforded rich detailed accounts and interpretations. However the level of detail of textual analysis and attention to nuance and contradiction within single accounts was inevitably constrained by the larger number of participants in this strand of the study, and this contributed to the decision to undertake a thematic analysis rather than an I.P.A. with these data sets.
4.2.1.iii Rationale for Methodological Design

The methodological design allowed for the production of rich complex and nuanced detailed constructions, derived from the dyads in the case study strand, to be understood and situated within the context of a larger number of individual cases, derived from the individual interviews. The choice of I.P.A. for the case study strand allowed for depth of analysis and perspectival insights into the dynamic workings of particular dyadic relationships that were situated within one specific institutional context. The thematic analysis of the individual interviews strand, whilst also offering rich and detailed constructions of experience and perceptions, aimed for breadth of analysis, across a wider group of teachers and students and across conservatoire institutional contexts. This second strand enabled identification of convergence and divergence of themes within groups (of teachers and of students) and between groups.

The analytic methods thus share epistemological underpinnings but the decision to employ two different methodologies took account of the difference in approach to depth versus breadth in analysis. The two strands are complementary and allow for the question of ‘typicality’ (Fossey et al., 2002) of the case study findings to be considered since the design affords the possibility of contextualising the unique idiosyncratic findings from case study participants within a wider collective of concerns and experiences and contexts.

I will now provide an initial commentary on both analytic approaches before entering into detailed discussions of procedures of data collection and analysis.

4.2.2 Preliminary Comments on Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis

Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (I.P.A.), a qualitative research methodology, was developed in the field of psychology by Smith (1996) and since then a corpus of empirical work has evolved which is situated in particular within the field of health psychology (Cassidy, Reynolds, Naylor, & De Souza, 2011). The approach seeks to reveal the meaning of an individual’s experience of specified phenomena through attending to experiential accounts that are grounded in the everyday life-world of the individual (ibid). This methodology is idiographic in approach; this refers to the study of ‘individual’ persons as they engage with specific situations or events in their lives (Larkin et al., 2006).

Theoretical origins of I.P.A. derive from writings of 20th century philosophers including Husserl, Heidegger, Gadamer and Schleiermacher. Their theories of interpretation (hermeneutics), phenomenology and idiography are central tenets of I.P.A. (Cassidy et
al., 2011; ibid). Heidegger’s notion of ‘dasein’, or ‘there being’ understands the individual as always a ‘person-in-context’. The individual is viewed as constituted by relatedness to the world and cannot be understood nor exist in isolation from a contextual world (Larkin et al., 2006). As Cassidy et al. (2011) describe it:

Heidegger’s position was that human existence is utterly and indissolubly bound up in the world, a world of people, things, language, relationships, and culture (ibid, p. 265)

Inherent to I.P.A. methodology are the assumptions that there is no direct access to the experience of another human being and that the researcher is not seeking to uncover an essential truth or ‘reality’ about the lived experience of participants. Rather the researcher is engaged in interpretation: a ‘double hermeneutic’. Interpretative activity is undertaken by the researcher bringing their own ways of making sense to the participant’s experience, and the participant is concurrently seeking to make sense of their own experience (Smith, 2011a). The focus on ‘sense making’ places mentation at the heart of this approach (Smith, 2004). The influence of the researcher, their methods, theoretical constructions and biography, are acknowledged as both structuring the encounter with participants and shaping the analytic account that emerges (Larkin et al., 2006). Cassidy et al. (2011) elucidate:

what is captured of another’s experience using IPA will always be indicative and provisional rather than absolute and definitive because the researchers themselves, however hard they try, cannot completely escape the contextual basis of their own experience (ibid, p. 266)

With these assumptions inherent to the approach, a sensitive, empathic and responsive researcher attitude to the subject matter is viewed as critical (Larkin et al., 2006) in order to aim at capturing and reflecting closely participants’ perspectives, albeit within these constraints.

Analysis in I.P.A. involves in-depth close reading of participant’s talk and since it is linguistically based it is dependent upon participants’ abilities to articulate thoughts and feelings adequately (Chamberlain, 2011). Different to discursive constructionist approaches which seek to examine language and the social and cultural contexts, practices and conditions that create, sustain and obscure particular meanings or experiences (Braun & Clarke, 2006), I.P.A. instead assumes a link between language and experience:

there is a chain of connection between embodied experience, talk about that experience and a participant’s making sense of, and emotional reaction to, that experience (Smith, 2011a, p. 10)
As an idiographic approach, this involves examination of individual cases in depth and detail and through cross case analysis there is a search for convergence and divergence of themes (Coyle, 2007; Smith, 2004). This enables the individual account to be situated within collective accounts so that the existence of patterns of experience and meaning can be identified. The method does not seek to measure incidence or answer questions of causality.

Concerns with identity and self, attention to bodily feeling within lived experience and to perceptions of the body in illness have been areas of particular focus in I.P.A. research (Smith, 2011a; Smith & Eatough, 2007). I.P.A.’s particular attention to embodiment makes this approach apposite to the current study which examines the experiences of singers, and this is reflected in the methodological choice of I.P.A. for a study that examined opera choristers’ professional identities (Oakland, 2010; Oakland, MacDonald, & Flowers, 2013). The voice was articulated in that research as inseparable to embodiment and sense of self for professional singers and the term the ‘embodied voice’ was used. An evocative description of the intertwined nature of voice and identity for opera singers was offered in Oakland’s thesis:

> The voice is never absent from the body and unlike an external musical instrument it grows with the body and dies with the body. Consequently, the voice is an essential part of a singer’s identity. (2010, p. 29)

I.P.A. thus offers an appropriate methodological approach to analyse data from the in-depth case studies of vocal teacher-student dyads since it attends to experience, emotion, meaning making, embodiment and perception and is particularly appropriate for the analysis of small samples (Smith, 2004).

### 4.2.3 Preliminary Comments on Thematic Analysis

Thematic Analysis is a qualitative method of analysis used widely in psychology for identifying and analysing patterns within data. Discussions and suggestions proposed in Braun and Clarke (2006) for employing thematic analysis in psychological research were drawn upon in this study. Theoretically flexible, this method has and can be used within a range of epistemological positions - essentialist, constructionist or contextualist, depending on the purpose and aims of the research (ibid). A phenomenologically informed contextualist approach was taken in this study, as this was congruent with the aims and enabled analysis of experiences, meanings and realities of participants, whilst acknowledging the ways that broader context impinged on and influenced particular meanings. The method allowed for patterns of meaning and experience to be identified within and across individual accounts, and within and across the group of teachers and group of students.
4.3 Procedures of Data Collection

4.3.1 Recruitment and Samples

Recruitment of participants took place through purposive, self-selected and snow-ball sampling. Recruitment activities included:

- Contacting senior academic and faculty staff listed on websites of all London based conservatoires via email inviting participation
- Placing hard copy advertisements on noticeboards in these institutions (see Appendix 1 for example)
- Making contacts via collegiate contacts of staff within my institute of study
- snow-ball sampling through participants

Two conservatoires facilitated institutional access and ethics approval specific to one institution (named Conservatoire ‘A’) was required in addition to approval from my institute of study; this was undertaken and granted (detailed discussion of ethics appears in section 4.3.2).

Inclusion criteria for teacher participation were:

- Currently engaged in vocal teaching in a UK conservatoire
- Currently engaged in one-to-one tuition of vocal students
- Fluent in English language

Inclusion criteria for student participation were:

- Currently studying voice as principal instrument in a conservatoire in the UK
- Currently being taught voice in a one-to-one context
- Undergraduate or postgraduate
- Fluent in English language

A pre-interview questionnaire seeking information on demographic variables (see appendix 2 for student sample), an ethics informed consent form (see appendix 3) and an information sheet about project aims (see appendices 4A and 4B for examples used) were sent via email in advance of interviews.

Time and space for all interviews were negotiated by email with participants and these took place within institutional contexts in most cases. A small number of interviews were conducted at the homes of teacher participants; all student interviews were conducted in teaching studios or spaces connected to the student's institution.
The samples across the two strands (case studies and individual interviews) were of a teacher-student ratio of approximately 1:2. This afforded a sense of symmetry, although such quantifiable measures are not required in qualitative research.

Having outlined common features to both strands of investigation, aspects that were strand-specific are now outlined.

4.3.1.i In-Depth Case Studies: Recruitment and Sample

Due to issues of access as an ‘outsider’ researcher it proved difficult to recruit teachers directly to the In-depth Case Studies strand. This may have been due to issues pertaining to the degree of commitment that was perceived as involved extending over a period of weeks, and/or concerns about exposure, trust and allowing a stranger to record lessons with students. As a result recruitment of teachers was undertaken initially to the individual interview strand (see section 4.3.1.ii below), since this involved a one-off interview only. All teachers who participated in the individual interviews were asked about willingness to participate in the in-depth case studies; six out of ten teachers expressed interest. Ultimately however only two teachers took part; recruitment to this strand of investigation was determined by factors including availability, room issues, exam pressures, illness of potential co-participating students and time constraints.

Student selection for participation in the case studies was determined by the case study teachers. Each teacher was asked to select students to take part with them (see figures 5 and 6 below for demographic profile of teacher-student clusters). These clusters were situated within conservatoire ‘A’ (name of institution removed for anonymity) and pseudonyms have been given to these participants (for purposes of anonymity).

A letter of participation was sent independently to teachers and students who agreed to take part in the case studies. It advised on the nature of participation, highlighting that involvement would include lesson observations, video-recording of a lesson and an interview with me.
Issues pertaining to teacher selection of student participants are acknowledged. As an educator myself, I was aware from experiences of peer teaching observation and external audit that performance anxiety and desires to be perceived positively may shape decisions about which classes / students I might prefer to be observed with during teaching. This links with the notion that individuals may ‘distort’ information and present socially desirable versions of stories or self (Oppenheim, 1992) in the process of participating in research. I sought to empathise with the teacher participants and to make transparent potential concerns of being witnessed in the teaching process by an outsider, acknowledging that data captured was inevitably partial, time and context-dependent and mediated and influenced by me and the research process. I talked with both teachers about the aims of the research - to understand both positive and troubling relationships and their implications for learning. They were then asked to consider inviting student participation which might reflect that spectrum of relational experiencing.

There is a potential for teacher authority to assert influence on students’ decisions to participate. The desire to seek a teacher’s approval or concerns about negative consequences for refusal to participate, are in potential in such a methodology. I attempted to address this with both teachers and students through providing information and communications independently to each individual participant, and by reiterating the importance of freedom not to participate without consequence. I also offered to meet with students separately from their teachers (with their teachers knowledge) prior to participation with the aim of offering an independent space to discuss the project and any concerns; however none of the students took this offer up. Once the project was underway, I noticed that students were particularly willing, responsive to and intrigued by the research process. Each of them expressed positive reactions post participation including: enjoying time to reflect on their learning relationship, valuing the opportunity to observe themselves in lessons on DVD and finding a third presence in the studio added a valued performance perspective to lessons.

**4.3.1.ii Individual Interviews: Recruitment and Samples**

Sample sizes in the individual interview strand of the study were determined by: restricted access to participants as an ‘outsider’, data saturation where no new themes emerged or added complexity to the findings, and capacity of a lone researcher to manage a large complex qualitative data set within the timeframe of the study.
Teacher Interviews

Ten teachers took part in individual interviews; however as indicated earlier two teachers were recruited from this sample to the case study strand. Their data have therefore been excluded from this data set to allow findings from this strand of the study to be analysed as a separate and discrete body of information. Sample size was thus N=8.

The detailed demographic profile of this sample of participants appears in appendix 5. Summary information is as follows:

- Gender: 6 female, 2 male.
- Age: Minimum 32 years, maximum 64 years.
- Self-identified Voice Type: 3 Soprano, 1 Mezzo-soprano/Soprano, 2 Mezzo-soprano, 1 Tenor, 1 Baritone.
- All spoke English as first language.
- Ethnicity: 7 White (UK) and 1 White (Other).

Student Interviews

Fifteen students took part in individual interviews. None of these students were part of the case studies. The detailed demographic profile of student participants in this sample appears in appendix 6.

Summary information about the sample:

- Gender: 10 female, 5 male.
- Age: Minimum 21 years, maximum 40 years, average 26 years.
- Level of Study: 3 Undergraduate, 12 Postgraduate.
- Self-identified Voice Type: 8 Soprano, 2 Mezzo-Soprano, 3 Tenors, 1 Baritone and 1 Bass-baritone.
- Ethnicity: 1 Asian (Other), 11 White (UK), 2 White (Other), 1 White (UK/Other).
- English Language: 12 as a first language; 2 as second language; 1 did not indicate.
- Institution of Study: 4 at Conservatoire ‘A’; 11 at Conservatoire ‘B’.
4.3.2 Ethical Issues

Ethical approval for the project was sought and granted through the Institute of Education. Ethical conduct of the researcher and research process were ensured through adhering to the Code of Ethics and Conduct of the British Psychological Society (2009).

Prior to beginning interviews in both strands of the study, participants were asked to read the information sheet in my presence so that they were clear about participation and could raise questions. I discussed my responsibilities to data management and to safeguarding the well-being of the participant. I offered a debriefing or referral for support should unforeseen reactions arise from the research process. Participants were advised that they were free to decline to participate without consequence, free to decline to answer any questions and/or to indicate if they wished to remove their data from the project up to the point that it was transcribed. They were also advised that extracts of data from interviews would be utilised in anonymised form in the report of findings. Participants signed consent forms. All interviews were digitally voice recorded and transcribed. Names of individuals, institutions and countries of origin of participants from overseas, were removed in order to reduce likelihood of recognition in a small community of practice.

4.3.2.i Ethical Considerations Specific to Case Studies

The well-being of participants was paramount in relation to considering the potential implications of one person discussing their perceptions, experiences, and feelings about another person with whom they were currently engaged in a one-to-one tuition relationship. This issue was discussed with each participant at the start of their interview so that they could make informed decisions about what they revealed. I explained that information gathered in the interview would not be disclosed to the co-participant during the study in order to respect the immediate on-going life world of the relationship. I also explained that it would not be possible to guarantee that their comments would not be recognisable by their co-participant in future publication/s since the data gathered were to be analysed in relation to pairings and extracts would appear in the final report. Participants were made aware that at least two years would elapse between data gathering and submission/public availability of the thesis. This ameliorated the possibility of negatively influencing the immediate life of the teaching relationship.
4.3.3 Methods of Data Gathering

Methods of data collection for each strand of investigation will be outlined shortly; but first I will foreground my general approach to interviews as both strands of the study involved conducting in-depth interviews.

4.3.3.i Approach to In-Depth Interviewing

Due to the intention to seek highly detailed information about participants’ experiences, feelings, thoughts and unique concerns about the teaching relationship, an in-depth interviewing method was utilised. This provided a means of establishing participants’ perspectives on their experiences as expressed in their own words (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). It allowed for issues to be clarified with participants (a form of verification) and for the interpretative process to begin in relationship with the participant where interpretations and ideas could be tested dialogically (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Such an approach further allowed for recognition and analysis of the ‘episodic, complex, and ambivalent realities’ (ibid, p. 283) of human beings and this was pertinent to research seeking to garner insights into the complexities of human relating.

I thought of the research interview as a relational encounter (Bodone, 2005; Bradbury & Lichtenstein, 2000). Seeking to encourage participants to share intimate and personal stories with me - a stranger, I sought to create an atmosphere that was supportive and permissive (Oppenhein, 1992), respectful (Elliott, Fischer, & Rennie, 1999) and permeated by curiosity (Cohen & Manion, 1994). The ‘core conditions’ (Rogers, 1957) of humanistic psychology - empathy, congruence and a non-judging / accepting presence were important as such relational conditions are understood to foster the development of rapport (Fontana & Frey, 2005; Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). Such an attitudinal stance seeks to assure participants of the value of what they have to say about a subject in the context of their lives, and aims to facilitate the provision of rich detailed experiential accounts (Smith & Eatough, 2007).

4.3.3.ii Procedures Specific to In-Depth Case Studies

I undertook the following data collection processes in the In-Depth Case Studies strand of the research (see figure 7).

![Figure 7: Data Collection Process in In-Depth Case Studies](image-url)
Lesson Observations without Camcorder

Two lesson observations, with each teacher-student pair, were conducted by me without a camcorder (total of eight lesson observations). This allowed for mutual familiarisation to reduce impact of stranger anxiety. On arrival into the studio spaces, both teachers introduced me to their students and invited me to position myself wherever I wished throughout lessons. I felt that I was a welcome guest in their world throughout my engagement with these teachers in the research. Initial social exchanges were light hearted and humorous amongst all involved, and once lessons began, I remained silent and became a ‘discrete presence’ (Serra-Dawa, 2010). At times, however, both teachers involved me briefly in interactions during lessons, thus my presence was clearly recognised and felt by all parties involved.

Video Recording of Lesson Interactions

A video recording of a third lesson of each teacher-student pair was undertaken. There are variations in methods and rationales provided for data collection using video-recording in the extant music education research literature. For example, researcher absence from the lesson and use of stand-alone camcorder was advocated as reducing disturbance of usual teacher-student interactional flow (Zhukov, 2012), participant-control of camcorder in the presence of researcher was articulated as reducing impact of participants’ modifying behaviour (Barrett, 2006; Barrett & Gromko, 2007), and multiple camcorders were utilised and focused on different participants with the researcher present to observe (Kurkul, 2007). I noted from my experience of the lesson observations that some lessons involved extensive teacher and student movement around the territory of the studio. Serra-Dawa (2010), in her research on the conservatoire vocal teacher-student relationship, found similarly and she took the approach of being present and in control of the camera in order to reduce the possibility of significant data loss that can occur with a stand-alone camera (ibid). This study followed her precedent.

Video-Stimulated Reflective Interviews

Video data from the teacher-student lesson interactions were utilised in video-stimulated reflective interviews conducted independently with each member of the teaching dyad. These interviews were digitally audio-recorded. Conducting separate interviews with each participant in a dyad was designed to support the eliciting of independent individualised in-depth perspectives on the relationship, without the influence of the co-participant. This reduced the likelihood of student deference to or compliance with their teacher’s perspective, and potentially vice versa.
Video-stimulated reflection in interviews was utilised in research exploring beliefs about
gender interactions in music lessons in school education (Rowe, 2008). Rowe
discussed the prevalence of video-stimulated recall in educational research and
teacher professional development. She highlighted that use of video for ‘reflection’ not
only for ‘recall’ offered a valuable means in research for participants to watch, consider,
reflect on and develop their thoughts about concerns that were salient to the research
aims. Her approach was drawn upon in this study, in addition to the notion of interviews
taking the form of ‘reflective “interactive conversations”’ (Minichiello et al. cited in Barrett
& Gromko, 2007).

In the interview, the participant was invited to initially talk freely to me about their
relationship with the co-participant, with relatively minimal interviewer intervention.
After initial discussion, an excerpt derived from video data of the lesson was shown on
a laptop with sound audible through small speakers. After watching the excerpt, the
participant was encouraged to reflect on interactions in the video data and to consider
these interactions in relation to more generalised feelings about and experiences of
that relationship across its entire duration. Participants were encouraged to elaborate
on emerging thoughts or directions of interest, rather than stay focused only on the
video interactions. A list of potential prompt questions enabled focus to be maintained
on the relationship (see appendix 7). The same process was repeated later in the
interview with a second video-excerpt. Both participants in the dyad thus observed
identical moments of interactional phenomena in their relationship as a stimulus to
discussion of their experience of that relationship.

Selection of Video-data Extracts

Purposive event sampling of video-data was considered but rejected on the basis of
having undertaken a verification check. I had selected an interaction from video data of
a lesson which I perceived as involving moments of teacher anger and student anxiety.
This sample was observed by a professional colleague (a psychotherapist and
professional pianist) who was recruited for the purpose of undertaking this verification
check. Perceptions of intensity of teacher anger were found to significantly differ
between us. Time sampling was therefore chosen to remove the influence of my
perceptions determining what constituted ‘meaningful events’. My approach followed
Rowe (2008) who used time-sampling in her video-stimulated discussion interviews.

Time samples extracted from the video-data were as follows:

First sample: Duration of sample - 2 minutes
Start and end times: 10 minutes to 12 minutes into recording.

Second sample: Duration - 4 minutes
Start and end time: 30 to 34 minutes into the recording.
Use of time sampling of video-data allowed for interactions to be captured at different stages of a lesson, with the first being relatively early in a lesson, and the second emerging half way through the one hour lesson. This approach is understood to increase the likelihood of variation in types of teacher-student interaction being observable and to reduce likelihood of a whole time sample being exclusively music-making without conversational interaction (ibid).

**Critical Comments on the Methodology of the In-Depth Case Studies**

The presence of a camera and a researcher in lessons is likely to influence interactional encounter between teacher and student. Indeed Jody talked of initially feeling she had to push herself harder in my presence, Marcus expressed feeling familiar with a third person present as his lessons had recently been observed for a performance project, and Connie and Hannah independently talked of enjoying the heightened performance atmosphere created by my additional presence. Clearly my presence was felt. In response to this issue, the qualitative researcher’s personal and political values, history, biography, subject positions and humanity are understood as potentially shaping and co-constructing interview interactions and research interpretations (Burr, 2007; Elliott et al., 1999; Fontana & Frey, 2005) and in I.P.A. specifically, interpretations are recognised as co-constructed and influenced by the ‘biographical presence’ (Smith, 2004) of the researcher. The aim of this study was not to analyse interactions per se, or directly, but rather to capture interactions as a means of presenting them back to participants for observation and reflection. The interview approach encouraged participant discussion about their perceptions of how the interactions reflected typical or atypical behaviours within the life of the teaching dyad. As such it focused on meaning making, experiencing and on identifying patterns of relatedness across time in a relationship rather than analysis of only one interactional moment. With this understanding, the methodological influence on data construction is acknowledged.

The most common method of data collection in studies employing I.P.A. is the semi-structured interview and thus this study deviated from that norm. However Smith (2004) and Larkin et al. (2006) have advocated pushing the boundaries of the methodology and encouraged creative approaches as long as the focus remained with the individual phenomenological account. The use of video-stimulated reflective interview in the current study has been responsive to that call.
4.3.3.iii  Procedures Specific to the Individual Interview Strand

The interviews with individual teachers and students were conducted by me through use of a semi-structured interview method. These varied in length between 41 and 72 minutes (teacher interviews) and 34 and 64 minutes (student interviews). The interview method provided a general structure to maintain focus around the key research questions, whilst affording opportunities for flexibility, improvisation and the possibility of capturing and following up on that which could not be anticipated (Barbour & Schostak, 2008; Smith, 2004).

An initial pilot schedule (see Appendix 8) of potential questions/topics for discussion was drawn up, derived from my research focus and from having engaged in an initial review of literature (Barbour & Schostak, 2008). Question effectiveness was tested through three pilot interviews with graduates of conservatoires; these interview data are not included in the study. Arising from wisdom of being in dialogue with interview participants (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009) this revealed that revisions to questions were required to increase effectiveness in relation to eliciting information salient to the research aims. Final iterations of individual interview schedules appear in appendix 9 (for teachers) and appendix 10 (for students).

4.4  Approach to Data Analysis

As mentioned earlier, the methods of analysis employed in the two strands of the study were:

- I.P.A. for the in-depth case studies
- Phenomenologically informed thematic analysis for the individual interviews.

The analytic methods involved areas of common procedural process, shared epistemological underpinnings and involved identification of themes and patterns of meaning / experience within and across cases. Indeed, I.P.A. is based on thematic analysis (Cassidy et al., 2011); I therefore outline below procedures I followed for the thematic analysis first as these were employed in and were common to both strands of data analysis (see section 4.4.1). The processes, degree of detail of textual analysis and levels of interpretative mode that were additional to the I.P.A. of Case Study data and that differentiated that from the thematic analysis are subsequently outlined in section 4.4.2.
4.4.1 Procedures for Analysis that were Common to both the Thematic Analysis and I.P.A.

Transcripts from audio-recorded interviews with teachers and students were subjected to thematic analysis which was shaped by phases outlined in Braun and Clarke (2006). Analytic guidance on developing codes / themes in I.P.A. (Cassidy et al., 2011; Larkin et al., 2006) was drawn upon due to the phenomenological focus of both analyses. Key phases of analysis (left hand column) with detailed descriptions of processes I undertook in relation to each phase (second column) are listed in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Phases of Thematic Analysis (Braun &amp; Clarke, 2006)</th>
<th>Description of Processes Undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Familiarising yourself with your data             | a. Post-interview: made initial notes of key phrases, ideas, metaphors and themes that seemed significant to participants.  
b. Transcription of audio data.  
c. Reading and re-reading of transcripts  
d. Noted initial impressions, reflections, reactions, free associations to the reading process. |
| 2. Generating initial codes                           | a. Initial coding of transcripts (using computer software package NVivo to support this process).  
b. Moved away from NVivo to making notes on hard copies of transcripts. Rationale: experienced the fracturing of data through use of technology as alienating me from the human experience of the interview.  
c. On hard copy of transcripts noted: key words, key objects of concern, phrases, metaphors, associations, ideas, and idiosyncratic features of speech, emotions, thoughts and behaviours. Also noted linguistic features including laughter, repetitions, exclamations, pauses and emphasis (see Appendix 11 for a sample of a section of annotated transcript).  
d. Undertook ‘Cumulative coding’ (establishing patterns of meaning within one transcript) and ‘Integrative coding’ (patterns of meaning across each data set of transcripts) (Larkin et al., 2006)  
e. Developed a list of initial codes for each data set (see Appendix 12 for initial list for Individual Teacher Interviews). |
| 3. Searching for themes                               | Collated codes into a list of potential themes |
4. Reviewing themes

Identification of key themes and sub-themes. Iterative process of checking themes reflected closely the coded data extracts and worked in relation to capturing key aspects of each data set.

5. Defining and Naming Themes

a. Multiple iterations of themes and sub-themes. Refining and reorganising themes on hard copy and through use of software package ‘mindmap’ (see Appendix 13 for range of examples at different stages).

b. Generating clear names and defining features of each theme.

c. Excluding themes that were not of strong enough significance to the research question or appeared to lack substantial evidence.

d. Re-listened to selection of sound files against transcripts to revitalise data as connection between textual data and the human being who had communicated an individual story felt disrupted through the analytic process.

e. Returned to use of NVivo to assist with coding of transcripts (see Appendix 14 for sample of a coded transcript using NVivo)

6. Producing the report of findings

Use of NVivo to assist with extraction of vivid and compelling examples of participant talk that illustrated each theme clearly (Robson, 2002) - See appendix 15 for sample of extracts relating to one sub-theme. Used extracts to substantiate themes in the narrative account of findings (see chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8).

Provided a psychological conceptual analysis of the themes in the report of findings, thus moving beyond description.

Table 1: Key Phases of Thematic Analyses

4.4.1.i What Constitutes a Theme?

The question of what constitutes a theme in a data set is discussed in Braun and Clarke (2006). They suggest a determining factor should be the ‘keyness’ of a theme in capturing something of significance in relation to the research question and they query themes being determined solely on prevalence across cases. This allows for marginal voices (i.e. an occurrence of an instance of a theme in a small number or even a single case) to be given equal significance to majority voices (where occurrences of themes appear across the majority of cases) since the significance to the research question is a priority. In this study ‘keyness’ in the thematic analyses of both strands was established through an iterative process, through identification of both ‘prevalence’ of a theme across cases and through capturing that which appeared to be particularly
meaningful or highly salient to understanding the nature of the relationship in one-to-one vocal tuition even when this was identifiable in only one account. My interpretation of what appeared as ‘key’ in the data was influenced by the following:

- the degree of emotional charge / significance that was conveyed by a participant as they communicated their concerns / experiences,
- the degree of insight that the theme might offer to understanding the workings of the relationship in this pedagogic context,
- the avoidance of providing a wide range of banal and predictable descriptions of facets of the relationship,
- my professional experience of listening to individuals (teachers and students) talk about the teaching/learning relationships in clinical interviews,
- my clinical experience of identifying and interpreting what might be of significance to an individual in their ‘talk’ about relational situations,
- my epistemological, conceptual and methodological influences that are embedded in my clinical approach to understanding relatedness,
- my engagement with empirical literature on conservatoire one-to-one tuition which had foregrounded particular phenomena and themes.

The analytic process involved movement from description of data to interpretation; to include theorising the significance of themes and broader implications and meanings in the report of findings in chapters 5-8. Themes were analysed at a semantic level, i.e. looking at the explicit and surface meanings of the data, due to the phenomenological and contextualist epistemological assumption that language reflects meaning and experience (ibid).

Having discussed that which was common to both data analyses, I will now turn to procedures that were additional and specific to the I.P.A. of the In-Depth Case Study Data.

### 4.4.2 Procedures Specific to IPA of In-Depth Case Study Data

The phases outlined for the thematic analysis above were employed in the I.P.A of data transcripts that were derived from audio recordings of the video-stimulated reflective interviews in the in-depth case study strand of this research. Several highly detailed accounts of approaches to the analytic process using I.P.A. (Cassidy et al., 2011; Gee, 2011; Jonathan A. Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009) were drawn upon to shape my approach here. Features of this I.P.A. that were methodologically additional to the processes indicated in section 4.4.1 were as follows.
A higher level of detailed analysis and discussion in the report of findings (in chapters 5 and 6) was given to revealing and unravelling subtleties and contradictions within individual accounts (Smith, 1996). Much greater significance was given to detailed and nuanced analysis of linguistic characteristics of speech including metaphors, repetitions, emphases, exclamations, laughter, temporal referents and shifts in a text. Identification of what Smith (2011b) referred to as ‘gems’ was used to establish some of the key and sub-themes, and these reflect the vivid nature of the participants’ speech. Gems are short passages of text or single utterances that shine out or play a pivotal role in understanding the experience of the individual, the phenomena, the transcript and/or the data as a whole, and capture something of significance that reaches beyond the small part of the transcript that the text represents (ibid).

4.4.2.1 Approach to Interpretation in I.P.A.

Social psychology and identity theories have been the dominant means of conceptualising and situating I.P.A. interpretations, and there is evidence of a small number of psychodynamic and relational interpretations, albeit limited in I.P.A. empirical literature. In relation to this, analysis drawing on psychodynamic literature has been critiqued by Smith (2004). He argued for inductive analysis where claims and interpretations were grounded in close readings of the text, supported by what the participant discussed elsewhere during their interview and informed by a psychological interest, but without being influenced by pre-existing formal theoretical position. His critique seemed to be levelled specifically at psychodynamically influenced I.P.A. researchers and not at those drawing on social psychology and identity theories. Why this is so is not quite clear, since the latter perspectives are also pre-existing formal theoretical frameworks. Indeed Smith had himself (1999) drawn on the relational writings of Mead and on psychoanalytic concepts to theorise the notion of a relational self in women’s preparation for motherhood in an IPA study of his own. Thus despite his critique, he nevertheless had employed psychodynamic theory in his own I.P.A. and he acknowledged that some psychodynamically informed studies did include analyses that were based on close textual reading and a foregrounding of the participant account.

Smith’s critique has been borne in mind in my approach to I.P.A. in this study due to my choice of a psychodynamic relational theoretical interpretative lens. I have stayed close to and foregrounded the participant’s account in the report of case study findings (in chapters 5 and 6) through presentation and close discussion of verbatim extracts which substantiate all themes/sub-themes. I have clearly demarcated the distance between the text and the higher level of theoretical interpretation (Smith, 2004) by indicating and sequencing the mode of interpretative reading. Interpretative levels
employed include: a) descriptive phenomenological readings that convey empathic understandings of the experience and b) critical interpretative interrogative readings (Cassidy et al., 2011). Such interpretative stances link respectively to the ‘hermeneutics of empathy’ and the ‘hermeneutics of suspicion’ (Larkin et al., 2006). Critical interrogative interpretations involved more speculative and questioning accounts of the data and were influenced by the psychodynamic relational interpretative perspective. Critical interpretations are understood to lead to readings that participants may themselves be unable or even unwilling to accept or acknowledge (Smith, 2004) and these emerge from a higher degree of interpretative work and abstraction. The consideration of both interpretative stances is understood to provide a more complete understanding of the participant’s lived experience. In the report of findings in chapters 5 and 6, phenomenological / empathic interpretations of participant extracts are presented first, followed by critical interrogative and relationally informed readings.

Critical Evaluation of I.P.A.

Areas of contention in I.P.A. have emerged with regards to interpretation and data analysis. Chamberlain (2011) interrogated the ongoing codification and ‘prescriptive mandating of method’ that has become widely accepted within I.P.A. and advocated that researchers take risks and develop more heuristic and creative approaches. Smith had argued many years prior that his methodological steps to I.P.A. had been offered as support to novice researchers in the approach and were indicative; never intended as prescriptive. He had clearly stated that his guidelines for data collection and analysis were precisely that: guiding, suggestive, flexible and open to researchers to develop (Smith, 2004).

Regarding interpretation, Chamberlain critiqued the need for researchers to articulate prevalence of themes across data sets (for example, the number of participants who had articulated a theme), since that was viewed as leading towards a situation where themes would only be considered ‘worthwhile’ or valid if quantifiably common in the data. The idiographic emphasis and the value of a lone voice that articulates something of profound meaning and implication for the research question was instead highlighted and this is consonant with Braun and Clarke’s (2006) position on the value of marginal voices versus prevalence in conducting thematic analysis (as discussed earlier).

In the I.P.A. of data from the case studies I have drawn upon suggestions from Smith (2004) and as mentioned earlier from other researchers employing I.P.A. (Cassidy et al., 2011; Gee, 2011; Smith et al., 2009) to guide my analytic strategy. My approach to data interpretation has also been inspired by Chamberlain’s call for researchers to take
risks with ‘strong’ interpretation being derived from the researcher and from their informed insights from theoretical and other empirical research. To that end, the relational intersubjective interpretations of data are drawn from my theoretical and professional biographical influence and this perspective offers a unique contribution to empirical literature in conservatoire one-to-one tuition. Furthermore, the triangulation of findings from either side of a dyadic relationship affords the possibility of understanding divergence and convergence of individual perspectives on the experience and meaning making within their particular relationship. This offers insights into the interconnection or relational interweave of worlds of experiencing and meaning making. As such, the approach to I.P.A. taken in this study presents a creative methodological elaboration within I.P.A. empirical literature.

4.5 Presentation of Findings

Findings from the In-Depth Case Study Strand are presented in chapters 5 and 6 and from the Individual Interviews strand in chapters 7 and 8. Where there are citations of verbatim extracts from participant accounts the following apply:

- [...] empty square brackets indicate editorial elision where short pieces of text, single utterances, sub-vocalisations or single words were removed which have not altered meaning;
- ... indicates pause in speech;
- Underlined text indicates participant’s emphasis.

4.5.1 Presentation of Findings from the Case Study Clusters

The report of findings from the case study clusters are presented as follows: Chapter 5 presents Cluster 1 – Jody, Marcus and Antonia; Chapter 6 presents Cluster 2 – Connie, Hannah and Lara. Within each chapter, narrative accounts are presented for each dyad in turn. A title had been given to each dyadic pair which captures the key theme of the pairing. The account is structured through presentation of all themes and sub-themes for the first dyad, followed by the same procedure for the second dyad. Within the account for each dyad, key themes that were identified across the dyad about their relationship are presented from each of the participant’s perspectives in turn. Sub-themes are indicated in relation to each key theme; these reveal the individual perspective of first the teacher, followed by the student’s perspective. After themes from one dyad have been presented, a brief discussion of triangulation of their perspectives is offered. The same narrative structure is then followed for the second dyad in a cluster.
Following that narrative of findings from both dyads in a cluster, there is a preliminary discussion and summary of findings of that cluster at the end of each case study chapter. That discussion highlights convergence and divergence of perspectives and themes within each dyad and across the dyads in the cluster. Further detailed discussion of the case studies which highlights convergence and divergence of themes across the clusters and in relation to the findings from the individual interviews is provided in the main discussion chapter (see Chapter 9).

4.6 An ‘Outsider’ to the Empirical Context

As an ‘outsider’ to the research context and with no prior connections to the field of inquiry, I encountered continuous struggles with access to participants and orchestration of practical arrangements. Advantages to being an ‘insider’ researcher to the conservatoire context have been expressed by several authors (Ford, 2010; Gaunt, 2006; Persson, 1996b); these include ease of access to participants, arranging interview venues, time efficiency, fitting research activities around daily working life, and ability to establish rapport and credibility with participants due to shared professional understandings. In relation to practical and organisational issues, my experience was indeed one of navigating an obstacle course.

In relation to rapport and credibility however, I found that once engaged with participants my professional background as a psychotherapist / psychologist afforded particular skills and knowledge in conducting interviews. Researchers have been critiqued as often lacking in training, conceptual understanding and tacit knowledge of the subject matter of interviewing. The knowledge produced in a study, which is derived from the interview process, is thus potentially diminished by such a lack (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). The psychotherapist is presented as an exemplar of a professional role where training in and learning the art and practise of interview skills is fundamental to and part of daily professional life (ibid). My professional life spent in facilitating individuals in talking about intimate and sensitive subjects and experiences of being in relationship after meeting with me for only brief and specified periods of time, seemed to be facilitative of conducting these research interviews. Further discussion of the influence of my researcher position is provided in Chapter 10 in explication of limitations of the study.
4.7 Validity

Sensitivity to context and commitment (Yardley, 2008) and familiarisation with the study context (Fossey et al., 2002) are understood as important measures of validity and quality in qualitative research. These criteria include demonstration of prolonged in-depth engagement with the research topic and development of familiarity with the participants and the empirical context. Due to my lack of familiarity with context as an ‘outsider’, as discussed above, I addressed this through immersing myself in the empirical field through wide-ranging activities (see Appendix 16 for list of activities) which were additional to the data collection processes already outlined in this chapter. The methodology for the in-depth case studies also involved contact with participants over a period of weeks. This thus allowed for development of deeper insights into the participant’s life-world and avoided the pitfalls of ‘tourist interviewing’ (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 299). The latter is a critical term used to refer to researchers who engage in all-too brief encounters with participants, capture snapshots of conversations and attempt to use information to try to say something of interest on a subject (ibid). My in-depth prolonged engagement in the empirical context I would therefore argue allowed me to develop and demonstrate appropriate levels of sensitivity and familiarisation to context.

Yardley (2008) and Coyle (2007) indicate that measures of quality and validity for qualitative researchers also include:

1. Reporting of detailed and transparent accounts of methods of data collection and analysis;
2. Reflexive discussion of methods used;
3. Consideration of the ‘speaking position’ of the researcher;
4. Triangulation of perspectives and/or methods to enrich understanding of a phenomenon by viewing it from different perspectives

In this chapter, in relation to these criteria, I have provided a detailed outline and critical reflexive evaluation of methods of data sampling, collection and analysis. I aimed to offer transparency in my approach by detailing procedures in depth. Critical discussion of ethical issues, including power relations between teacher-student in relation to co-participation, was undertaken. A critical discussion of IPA was offered to indicate its appropriateness to the aims of the current study, to highlight its philosophical origins and to reveal areas of contention. As an ‘outsider’ researcher, limitations and potentials of my ‘speaking position’ were unearthed and this is further discussed throughout the thesis. In relation to the fourth point above, the design offered a means...
of triangulation in a range of ways, including in relation to methods and participant perspectives. Use of two methodological approaches to data collection and analysis offered a means of triangulating and considering findings from each strand in relation to the other; the in-depth case studies allowed for triangulation of perspectives within and across dyads.

4.8 Summary

In this chapter I have outlined the epistemological stance and methodological approach to the study. A detailed critical and reflexive account of the two strands of data collection and analysis in the project was presented. Interrogative questions of methods were posed and explored and issues of validity in this qualitative study have been discussed.

The next chapter is the first of two chapters that present findings from the In-Depth Case Studies.
Chapter 5: Findings from Case Study Cluster 1

5.1 Introduction

The chapter presents findings from Case Study Cluster 1 – Jody, Marcus and Antonia. Themes and sub-themes from the cluster appear in tables 2 and 3 (presented overleaf). As outlined in the Methodology Chapter (section 4.5.1), the narrative account is presented in dyadic order of perspectives from Jody and Marcus first, followed by Jody and Antonia. Each key theme with associated sub-themes is presented first from the teacher perspective, then student perspective. Following presentation of themes from each dyad, there is brief discussion of triangulation of teacher and student perspectives. At the end of the chapter I discuss findings from the cluster and highlight points of convergence and divergence within and across the dyads.

5.2 Brief Introduction to Participants

A diagrammatic profile of these participants appeared in the methodology chapter (see figure 5, section 4.3.1.i). Jody taught in conservatoire ‘A’ only, described current professional identities as including principal study/private singing teacher, a working singer and mentor. She identified her voice type as high soprano. She was white, aged forty-two and from an English speaking country abroad. I experienced her as friendly and informal, highly supportive of the research process, committed to her teaching and able to laugh at her-self and situations readily. Marcus, a white, British, twenty year old man, identified his voice type as baritone-lyric and he had been studying with Jody for one and a half years. I experienced him as thoughtful, courteous and considerate throughout. I noticed in lesson observations that he rarely moved from his position in the room unless invited to by Jody; any approach between them was teacher-instigated. Antonia, a twenty four year old woman, identified her voice type as soprano-lyric. She was from a southern European country; English was not her first language although she was fluent. She had been a student with Jody for two years. I experienced her as confident and assertive and noticed that she approached Jody and the piano frequently during lessons that I had observed. Both students were second year undergraduates in conservatoire ‘A’.

2 She had an active performing career as a chorister in an opera house
3 Marcus was the youngest participant in this study
Tables of Themes & Sub-themes for Cluster 1

### Jody & Marcus: A Struggle for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jody's Perspective</th>
<th>Marcus's Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Resistance’</td>
<td>‘Barrier to Change’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Challenge: ‘Tough Love’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/pace</td>
<td>Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Authoritarian’</td>
<td>‘Power Relations’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘On a Level’</td>
<td>‘Force of Nature’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchical but Collaborative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Themes for Dyad - Jody & Marcus

### Jody & Antonia: Supporting the Student in Charge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jody's Perspective</th>
<th>Antonia’s Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>Rapport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly but Not Friends Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Bringing About Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Challenge: ‘Friendly, but Hard’ Directness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal but Hierarchical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Themes for Dyad - Jody & Antonia
5.3 Jody and Marcus: A Struggle for Change

The narrative of this dyad is entitled ‘a struggle for change’ as two key themes were identified from analysis of data from this pair: ‘trouble with change’ and ‘power relations’. The relationship appeared to be experienced as a struggle, both in relation to effecting change in the student’s singing and within the interpersonal dynamics. Key-sub-themes themes will now be examined.

5.3.1 Trouble with Change

Jody’s Perspective

Two brief extracts from Jody’s interview conveyed her positive feelings about her work with Marcus:

`we work really well together and he’s becoming increasingly reflective this year`
`
lovely easy rapport`

This gave a sense of Jody’s experience with Marcus as one characterised by enjoyment and ease. However this co-existed with a narrative of her feeling emotionally troubled by the slow pace of change that she perceived in the student’s learning. She spoke of ‘a big change’ that was required in Marcus’s singing and explained: ‘it’s beautiful in this lovely embryonic teenage way, but he’s got to do more now’. She required of the student ‘more manly’, robust, expressive and less restrained singing. Three sub-themes were identified in her account of the trouble with change: resistance, challenge and s/pace; these are now discussed.

‘Resistance’

Jody’s interview revealed that she perceived a stasis in the student’s learning. She spoke of him as ‘treading water’ and talked of his ‘resistance’ to change. The passage below presents her reaction to having watched the first video-excerpt of her lesson with Marcus. Video-interactions included her impatient reactions towards Marcus whilst he was struggling to sing due to an obstruction in his throat:

I perceive him to have a tendency to resist things that are a bit difficult or uncomfortable and to take a while to move forward, I think I probably almost had a response of ‘Come on, get over it, you are using this to stop doing what we are doing’ [...] I have a sort of, I’m aware of him putting obstacles just in a very urbane, charming way, but having a tendency to put obstacles in the way of making change [...] over a longer story arc, my, my feeling that he does that may
have influenced my response in that instance, but I think that that was unfair, I think I pushed him too hard at that point.

Empathic interpretation of this passage revealed Jody’s perception of the student as resistant to change; he was portrayed as putting ‘obstacles in the way of making change’. Temporal reference to the ‘longer story arc’ of their relationship indicated this framework of meaning had developed over time and was not only related to the observed video-interactions. Her words ‘Come on, get over it’ seemed suggestive of impatient intolerance, but this emotional reaction was questioned by Jody. She revealed thoughts about her reactions in terms of unfairness to the student and relational interpretation might consider this act of self-questioning as a capacity for self-reflexivity (Aron, 2000). In this regard, there seemed to be a shift between experiencing mode of self, i.e. feelings of irritation, and an observational mode of self, i.e. cognitive reflection on her reactions, in addition to consideration of the student’s perspective of her, i.e. was she ‘unfair’ to him? These three aspects constitute defining features of Aron’s notion of self-reflexivity.

Further evidence of Jody’s reflexive questioning of her frustration in response to struggling to bring about change in Marcus was evident in her response to watching the second video-data extract of their lesson. Video-interactions included her initial praising of the student; then her emotional tone changed as she raised her voice in a harsh manner and hammered out an accompaniment on the piano with intensity, increased volume and energy. She spoke as follows after watching this video excerpt:

he really wants to progress and I really want him to progress. And I can see, on a sort of physiological level what needs to occur, but I, I uhm, I wish I had, I suppose I just, I shouldn't be frustrated, but I wish I had a magic wand and could just get him to just do it, you know, and, and uhm, ‘Why am I not patient? I don't know why I'm not patient’. I don't think, you know, when I look at that I feel like I am not being patient.

Empathic reading suggested that Jody had a cognitive understanding of the change that needed to occur in his music making and the extract revealed that both she and Marcus were perceived as motivated for change; both want progress. However she appeared to be troubled by her incapacity to enable the student to bring about the necessary physiological change. The phrase ‘I wish I had a magic wand’ might be suggestive of a sense of powerlessness as there was a call to super-natural powers (‘magic’) to resolve this difficulty. Jody was evidently troubled by her impatience with the student as the circling self-interrogation around the question ‘Why am I not patient?’ seemed to suggest.
The next sub-theme identified in Jody’s account in relation to trouble with change was that of challenge.

**Challenge**

Challenge of the student was revealed as a potential and desired way of resolving the perceived resistance to change, but such challenge was associated with conflicted feelings, as will now be discussed.

Jody communicated her desire to confront Marcus’s resistance and talked of a recent episode where she had challenged him. This evoked concerns that she had been too forceful, but the challenge was perceived as having significant transformative effects on his music making:

I feel what I need to do is just go ‘ba-bum’ [vigorous voice raising] but I don’t really want to do that, so then I just get [sub-vocalisation sucking sound and tensing of body posture]. It’s a sort of feeling of, uhm *what is it the feeling?* Uhm. I guess it is just frustration. I can’t quite, yeah. Yeah, I just don’t think its very kind? It’s not very. You know all those things I don’t like about it. But, I, I, and I also don’t really know whether I, you know, even in a theoretical way, whether I think there is a place for it. And I think that’s quite confronting, for me […] I don’t really want to do it, and so if it appears to have worked on this occasion in the last couple of weeks […] I suppose maybe there is a way of doing it where I can be really frank but not exert a sort of, so much of a feeling that there’s quite a lot of power, behind it. Uhm, but I’m not completely convinced that that would have done the trick. I think it was, unfortunately, the fact that he did stay awake most of the night and really consider pushing himself in a different way that probably meant that he did take a much bigger step.

There was a lot happening in this passage. Empathic interpretation suggested that Jody seemed to have felt the need to forcefully challenge the student in order to breakthrough his ‘resistance’. This is linguistically expressed through a loud and explosive vocalisation ‘ba-bum!’ Sub-vocalisations and physical tensing of the body, in addition to linguistic reference to ‘I don’t really want to do that’ indicated that she was conflicted about the impulse to be forceful and confrontational. Self-restraint of this desire however seemed to give rise to ‘frustration’; there was a sense of having to contain herself or reign in the force of feeling. Concern for the student was communicated in relation to her sense of exertion of ‘quite a lot of power’ and the querying of her challenge as potentially unkind or questionable. Despite her questions about use of challenge, this had however delivered transformative effects; the student was described as having taken ‘a much bigger step’. This tension seemed to be perplexing as it seemed as if Jody questioned whether the end was justified by the means.
Relational interpretation revealed a shift between experiencing mode of self, i.e.
experiencing frustration and desires to be forceful / exert power, and an observational
mode of self where Jody appeared to reflect cognitively upon her reactions and
considered their possible impact on the student. This can be theorised in terms of
capacity for self-reflexivity and to create ‘the Third’ (Aron, 2006; Benjamin, 2009) as
this involves the ability to open up one’s consideration of the other’s view of the self.

Such episodes of interpersonal challenge might be critically interpreted through an
intersubjective lens as an emergence of unpredictable disequilibrium in relationship
(Stolorow, 1997). The concept of a ‘now moment’ (Stern, 1998) seems applicable since
such moments emerge in the intersubjective field when habitual ways of relating are
destabilised in a dyad. Such moments are experienced as affectively charged, difficult
and challenging, and understood to proffer the possibility of change. Looking at Jody’s
account, her challenge was perceived as destabilising and affectively charged for
Marcus, as it was recounted as having kept him awake all night. This is suggestive of
anxiety, and this was felt to provoke change in his performance. Although effective,
Jody was however troubled by being so challenging. This was perhaps due to
challenge being both an enactment of under-lying frustration and motivated by the
pedagogic need of the student. Jody’s concerns may also have been linked to her
perceptions of Marcus as an individual who was ‘un-contentious at all times’ (as
expressed elsewhere in the interview). She said of him:

My sense is that he’s so, just sort of, wanting the relationship to be positive, one
that he, he wouldn’t really dream of dissent

This suggested a perception of Marcus as conflict averse and anxious to maintain
relational harmony. As such, this might arguably have intensified Jody’s anxieties
about being confrontational, since such challenge would be perceived in this dyadic
context as generating more anxiety / distress for this particular student, than perhaps
for other students who may be less conflict averse.

The next sub-theme captured Jody’s thoughts and feelings about giving space and
about pace of change with Marcus.

S/pace

Jody revealed in relation to her perception of Marcus as resistant, that she also
considered alternative ways of resolving this issue:

I’ve got this dual thing running, which is ‘give him space, give him time to take the
steps, give him the encouragement, give him the tools, talk about the process but
give him the time'; and on the other hand, if things start to overtake and the
expectation of the institution is that his progress will be at a certain rate and it’s
not. And he’s come in sort of, seemingly one of the best people in the year […]
that then, becomes a problem for his self-image about what kind of singer he is
and what his outlook is […] So I do sometimes struggle to know whether,
whether to allow someone a bit of time or, or, or whether to try harder in some
way to achieve a speedier change.

Repetitions in speech ‘give him… give him… give him… give him’ seemed to suggest
Jody’s commitment to trying to afford the student space and time to learn at his pace.
However the shadow of wider contextual forces broke into the narrative; institutional
expectations of rate of progress were cast as stalking their relationship and this was
perceived by Jody as potentially having a negative influence on Marcus’s sense of self
as a singer. Jody seemed to feel caught between being a servant of two masters; one
the student’s need for time and space to learn at his pace, and the other, the
institutional demands for progress to be evidenced at a particular rate. This seemed to
generate pressure to push ‘harder’, i.e. to agitate rather than wait for change.

Further evidence of this struggle appeared elsewhere in her interview:

I have been working a lot with trying to give more space but at the same time,
sometimes a student like that, I feel like, sometimes I just want to put a rocket
under him really [laughed]

The juxtaposition of Jody’s actions and aims versus her desire was clearly illuminated.
The tension between giving space and using confrontational force was reiterated. Use
of an explosive metaphor ‘I just want to put a rocket under him’ echoed the earlier
mentioned explosive vocalisation ‘ba-bum’ that was associated with talk of challenge.
Such metaphors seemed to reveal intensity of frustration and the degree of force that
she perceived as necessary to provoke change in this student, but her laughter in the
interview seemed to act to diffuse intensity of feeling. I sensed that this teacher was
able to laugh at and reflect on the force of her own feelings, rather than act without
regard or thought for the student’s experience.

Having outlined Jody’s narrative in relation to trouble with change, it was evident that
her struggle was felt both in the interpersonal relationship with Marcus, and intra-
personally in relation to her own conflicted feelings, thoughts and beliefs about her
teaching practices.

I will turn now to Marcus’s perspective on the Trouble with Change.
Marcus described his relationship with Jody as ‘comforting’, ‘reassuring’, ‘relaxed’, ‘well-humoured’ and ‘patient’ and this gave a sense of a positively experienced relational climate. He spoke of his work with Jody as:

very exciting, and especially I mean especially if things are going well of course, but even when things are going badly you know you’re learning at the time and, uhm yeah so stressful but exciting

This passage revealed enthusiasm and excitement co-existed with the experience of stress that was evoked by more troubling times in learning. The troubling nature of change revealed three sub-themes in his account; these were Barrier to Change, Challenge: ‘Tough Love’, and Space.

**Barrier to Change**

The first two extracts from Marcus introduce his perception of his difficulties with bringing about change.

very early on in our work together […] she was just, kind of, getting me to kind of push through a barrier that I’d kind of built up for myself of my own expectations

When I first started learning with her, I was always a bit tentative […] I would think that I was giving all that I could. And I thought that maybe Jody was being a bit unreasonable in wanting more. Whether it be physicality or expression

Empathic interpretation suggested that Marcus framed his difficulties as self-constructed, and both he and his teacher were presented as pushing through his obstruction. The second passage revealed a self-perception that he had a tendency towards being tentative, which may be critically interpreted as indicative of a stable characteristic of his style of relating. He revealed that he had perceived himself as giving maximum effort in trying to effect changes that Jody required of him, and had perceived his teacher as unreasonable in her demands for more. Temporal reference to their early relationship placed these struggles in the past rather than the present. The next extract revealed a shift in Marcus’s perception of Jody’s ‘pushing’ in their current relationship:

now we’ve kind of built up a rapport, I think now I know when she pushes me, I can, I physically can do more, it’s just whether I, kind of, let myself do more and so I know that she is pushing me for a good reason

There was a shift in sense making evident here; Jody’s demands were now understood as for ‘good reason’ rather than ‘unreasonable’. Interestingly, the pattern of interaction
was perceived as unaltered as Jody was still presented as ‘pushing’ him, and the construal of his difficulty with effecting physical change continued to be framed as under his control. In this regard, he narrated his understanding of his difficulty in terms of granting self-permission, ‘whether I, kind of, let myself do more’. This seemed to suggest a sense of ownership or agency in relation to the issue and a location of control of the ‘problem’ within himself.

**Challenge: ‘Tough Love’**

Analysis of data from Marcus’s interview revealed a prominent theme regarding his experience of Jody’s style of challenge; he experienced this as a form of ‘tough love’:

- **Marcus:** In the heat of the moment if can seem like she is just being tough […] and she is asking too much […] but

- **Paula:** So it’s quite tough sometimes, in the heat of the moment it can be tough?

- **Marcus:** Yeah, uhm, but I mean ‘tough love’ always is

The phrase ‘tough love’ was called upon by Marcus on ten occasions in his interview to describe Jody’s way of relating with him. Such repetition seemed to suggest that this was a pervasive pattern of relating within the dyad, since it was reiterated with frequency by the student. The fusion of these two words was evocative; ‘tough’ and ‘love’ were synthesised together. This might suggest that his experience of Jody was often difficult and hard to cope with, but that he also felt cared for in such interactions. After all, she was not merely characterised as ‘tough’. His mention of ‘heat of the moment’ suggested intensity, affective charge and pressure in their interactions when he felt subject to her ‘tough’ relational style.

The next sub-theme is space.

**Space**

I asked Marcus in his interview about key moments in their relationship and the following extracts arose:

- actually having a bit of time apart was a bit of a turning point

- a bit of time for me to, not experiment, but just work out exactly, exactly what she wanted, and exactly how to apply it to my instrument […] and to kind of internalise what she wanted
Space, time alone and separation from Jody were identified by Marcus as offering a turning point in learning. This afforded him time to make sense of ('internalise') Jody’s teaching in relation to his own embodiment. Another extract offers further elaboration:

much like if you’re learning a script for a play. It’s all very well sitting down and, kind of, reading the script over and over again; but actually, uhm I, I certainly find that it’s time away from that, that means that it just gradually sinks in

Marcus’s use of the metaphor of learning a script seemed to act to conceal and reveal the tensions he experienced with Jody. The metaphor conveyed a sense of discipline, constraint, demand and repetition, as revealed in the phrases ‘it’s all very well sitting down’ and ‘reading over and over again’, and this was juxtaposed with a sense of freedom (associated with ‘time away’ from his teacher) that allowed for gradual emergence of his own understanding. A critical interpretation might suggest that separation from his teacher was experienced as a key moment due to the interactional field with Jody being experienced by this student as overwhelming. Thus space may act to allow for expression of autonomy and agency that he perhaps found difficult to relationally achieve with this particular teacher.

I will turn now to the next key theme that emerged in both accounts – power relations.

5.3.2 Power Relations

Jody’s Perspective ➢

Two sub-themes were identified in Jody’s account, ‘Being Authoritarian’ and ‘On a Level’. The first of these will now be discussed.

‘Authoritarian’

This brief passage captured Jody talking about her recent interactions with Marcus and her feelings about being authoritarian.

I don’t really agree with a really authoritarian. It was slightly authoritarian. It was like ‘I’m going to tell you the way it is, and you’re just going to have to listen.’

Her use of the term ‘authoritarian’ and her display of how she might talk to Marcus, i.e. ‘I’m going to tell you the way it is’ was suggestive of her experiencing herself as exerting considerable power over the student in a sort of dictatorial manner. However, such power relations did not appear to sit comfortably with Jody:

although I can do it very easily […] I don’t like exercising that kind of, what feels like a kind of quite powerful persona. […] I don’t generally approve of that as a way of teaching and I don’t really enjoy, I don’t want to be that bossy, I don’t
want to be that, that uhm, uhm pushy. Yeah, I don’t, I’d rather that we arrived somewhere together […] So I think that is probably the frustration 

Reading this passage from an empathic stance, Jody revealed that she viewed herself as able to exercise power / force quite ‘easily’. This might therefore be understood as a relatively stable characteristic of her way of relating. However she was conflicted about this aspect of her relating. Linguistic repetitions of ‘I don’t… I don’t… I don’t…’ (up to six times) perhaps revealed the extent of her desire for a different form of relatedness. Disapproval of her dominance over the student was communicated, and the desire to be collaborative, i.e. to ‘arrive somewhere together’ was expressed. However the tension between that which she found easy or habitual - exercising power, being ‘bossy’ and ‘pushy’, versus her desire to be collaborative seemed to give rise to frustration. There appeared to be a struggle as she was unable to be in relationship with him in the way that she would like to be. This could be relationally interpreted as signifying a collapse into complementarity (Benjamin, 1999) since she experienced a repeated pull towards binary positions that patterned their relating of teacher dominance–student passivity.

The next extract offered insight into Jody’s understanding of her tough pushy interactional teaching style:

in the past […] I would have just pushed really hard […] because I was more, I think I was taught, you know that thing about I was taught like that for a lot of my time as a student, I was really pushed […] as a singer, by a, yeah, […] the modelling that I had was sort of, quite grumpy, tough

This passage revealed her own history of learning with a ‘grumpy, tough’ teacher who ‘pushed’ her. The notion of the past relational experience as influencing her present relating was invoked. Interrogative work might suggest Jody struggled with an intra-psychic conflict around being forceful, as she re-enacted the relational positions of her own past experience in the present. Taking up the position of tough forceful teacher to Marcus, the student was then relationally pushed into the position that she had once suffered herself, and thus she experienced a conflict.

‘On a Level’

Despite the pull towards being ‘authoritarian’ with Marcus, her interview revealed a desire and attempts to break down the formality of power positions between teacher and student; to bring them ‘on a level’.

when I was a more formal teacher, I would stay at the piano and if he was staying away, then that would be the distance. Now I have become much more into breaking that distance down […] because it’s very ‘you’ve got a big grand piano'
I do feel that works quite well with someone like Marcus, just to, just to kind of be more on a level and, you know, break down that formality.

Jody introduced the notion of territory and proximity in the relationship as meaningful in this passage. Staying with the ‘big grand piano’ (her emphasis) seemed to be symbolically associated with maintenance of formality and distance in teacher-student relations. A conscious shift in teaching approach was revealed, as she sought in the present to ‘be more on a level’ with Marcus. This evoked a sense of a horizontal plain, of teacher and student inhabiting power relations on a level, rather than a sense of the vertical power-over relations of her authoritarian style. This resonates with earlier comments about her wanting a more collaborative sense of togetherness in her teaching.

Further evidence of this theme arose as she referred to an exchange of humour that had taken place in the lesson that I had video-recorded. She had joked with Marcus about herself and the opera chorus at her work spitting and being disgusting during performance and explained:

I would do that quite consciously because I know he, it would relax him, and make us feel like we’re both colleagues together and we’re all disgusting. You know that’s a kind of a, a leveller.

The desire to be on a level was once again expressed here and she conveyed a commitment to trying to bring about more equal, collaborative or collegiate styles of relating. This was intentional and aimed at easing his difficulties in learning (relaxing him).

A relational interpretative reading might suggest that this was further evidence of self-reflexivity (Aron, 2000) as Jody was able to consider the relationship interactions from a third perspective, taking into account herself, the student and the student’s needs in relation to her. She appeared to have reflected upon and made conscious use of interpersonal proximity, territory and humour with the student in order to attempt to facilitate his experience of their relationship. It is also possible to interpret this through the notion of ‘relationally responsible inquiry’ (McNamee & Gergen, 1999) where her shifting of relational position sought to bring about different forms of relatedness between them or ‘alternative dances of relationship’ (ibid). Rather than become stuck in the binary of forceful authoritarian teacher versus passive acquiescent student, her shifting of positions can be understood to invite an alternative possibility in the student’s positioning.
Marcus’s Perspective ➢

Marcus’s account revealed two sub-themes under power relations: ‘Force of Nature’ and ‘Hierarchical but Friendly’.

‘Force of Nature’

Having watched the second video-data excerpt where Jody had raised her voice and hammered on the piano in his lesson, Marcus described Jody’s interactions:

Marcus: It's kind of a bit of a force of nature really. It's uhm

Paula: Is that characteristic of your interactions or is that unusual to

Marcus: No, no, no that’s was uhm very typical actually

His metaphor ‘a force of nature’ could be considered as a ‘gem’ (Smith, 2011b) since it stood out in his account and revealed so much about his experience of Jody. Extemporising with this turn of phrase, Jody seemed to appear in Marcus’s life world as a ‘force’ that was not mechanical, systematic or contained, but rather as a ‘force of nature’ - uncontained, unpredictable, to be weathered or perhaps to be reckoned with. Such forceful relating by his teacher was experienced as patterning their interactions, since he clearly stated it was ‘very typical’. This clearly mirrored Jody’s own self-perception of being forceful, authoritarian and pushy.

Marcus’s thoughts about how he reacted to Jody’s forcefulness were revealed here:

Paula: Do you sometimes give a ‘force of nature’ back?

Marcus: Uhm uhm... Usually not actually [...] just because it’s how I am. And I’m sure, I'm sure she has pupils who do, not backlash, but kind of meet her force of nature with their own, but uh [...] to an extent it's the way I am and I also think, it means that you, if I was to kind of give as good as I got [...] actually then that would probably upset, upset the balance between teacher and pupil

Marcus indicated that his lack of retort to Jody’s force was part of his way of being in the world, ‘it’s how I am’. This could be interpreted as revealing a relatively stable characteristic of his relational style – he did not react with equal force, but rather was more reticent or self-contained as an individual. He called on the words ‘backlash’ and ‘give as good as I got’ which were suggestive of fighting back, retaliation or forceful counter-reactions. However, he revealed that such reactions towards his teacher would trouble him as they were imagined as potentially disturbing the ‘balance’ of their relationship. His account thus revealed evidence of anxiety about interpersonal discord.
Hierarchical but Collaborative

In his interview Marcus discussed his beliefs about the need for hierarchical relations with his teacher:

I think there should always be a, kind of, hierarchy of teacher-pupil; but I think the two extremes can, kind of, meet each other to an extent, which I feel is when a teacher and a pupil work best together. Uhm because otherwise if there is too much of a divide then, there is no collaboration, it really is the teacher telling the pupil what to do and the pupil doing it. Whereas I always think there should be some room for, kind of, discussion and humour as well. And you can’t have as much humour when there is as much of a divide.

This passage conveyed thoughts about teacher-student collaboration and power differentials; a ‘hierarchy’ between teacher and student was perceived as essential to Marcus. However an extreme ‘divide’ or gradient of power was depicted as inhibiting ‘collaboration’ and ‘humour’. Another extract offered further evidence of his experience of hierarchical relations:

the hierarchy is kind of maintained, if you like, because there is a distance, but then she’ll come over to me, uhm which is, you know, very kind of reassuring, comforting […] and personal, which is nice

Empathic hermeneutics suggest that Marcus accepted hierarchical relations with Jody, and his teacher’s initiatives of approach towards him in the teaching studio were felt to be emotionally soothing. His words ‘reassuring’, ‘comforting’ and ‘personal’ suggested that such moments of interpersonal proximity were felt to be supportive.

5.3.3 Triangulation of Perspectives: Jody ➔ < Marcus

Analysis of findings from this dyad revealed conflicted feelings and shifting understandings in both accounts as their narratives were unravelled. Triangulation of findings suggested convergence of teacher and student perspectives around change being experienced as a troubling process in this dyad. Both revealed a shared framing of the difficulties in learning as a barrier / obstacle to change that resided within the student. They both shared the perception of a pattern in their relating of Jody pushing and being forceful with Marcus, and both revealed a sense that her demands or challenge may be experienced as ‘unreasonable’ (Marcus) or unfair (Jody) at times. Teacher and student independently employed the same linguistic descriptors, ‘tough’ and ‘pushing’, to refer to her interational style. Despite difficulties within the dyad, there was evidence of the student feeling cared for, supported, sharing humour with his teacher and of excitement and enjoyment in the relationship. Jody’s toughness seemed to be counterbalanced by a sense of care; it was ‘tough love’, not just ‘tough’.
This can be relationally conceptualised in terms of teacher capacity for self-reflexivity (Aron, 2000) which I would propose features in the student’s experience of feeling cared for. In this regard, her capacity to think about the student from his perspective, not only from her own reactive positioning may be part of the phenomenon of the experience of care. Although her forcefulness was clearly identified in both accounts, it seemed that the student was able to tolerate such interactions. As such this may have been related to her capacity to consider his subjectivity in the relationship and to mediate the tension between her emotional reactions and her consideration of these reactions from her own and the other’s perspective.

Their accounts also showed significant divergence in understandings of resolutions to the resistance / obstacles in learning. Jody’s account conveyed a kind of epistemological commitment to student centred learning (i.e. allowing space and time for student led pace of learning) but revealed doubt about its true efficacy in bringing about change in this student. She seemed to struggle to believe in the student’s capacity to lead the process or pace of change, and ultimately seemed to feel the need push for change through confrontation. Conversely Marcus experienced space and time alone as critical to his ability to integrate knowledge. Over the duration of the relationship, the student conveyed that he had become more accepting of his teacher’s confrontational interactional style, shifting from viewing it as ‘unreasonable’ to ‘with good reason’. The student’s need for space and the teacher’s demanding pursuit of him could be relationally interpreted as a habitual collapse into complementarity (Benjamin, 1999). As such, positions of pursuer-pursued, pushing-resisting seemed to frequently configure relating in this dyad. Such a ‘generative dance’ (Burkitt, 1999) would thus be considered as co-created.

Power relations were revealed in both accounts to habituate to binary positions of teacher authority / dominance – student passivity / acquiescence. This offered further support for the idea of a repeated collapse into complementarity (Benjamin, 1999). Findings revealed complexity here, as there was evidence of Jody’s conflicted feelings about being positioned as authoritarian / forceful and of her employing strategies and expressing a desire for more horizontal collaborative teacher-student relations. Findings from Marcus mirrored his teacher’s perceptions; he perceived her as forceful and also desired and experienced at times a more collaborative albeit hierarchical relationship with Jody.

Triangulation of findings also indicated that teacher and student shared intersubjective knowledge of Marcus as conflict averse and revealed the positive effects of Jody reducing proximity in the studio with Marcus in order to foster positive relational
conditions. There was convergence of meaning around the significance of humour; Jody's account revealed this was consciously engendered in their interactions to modulate the effects of formality and distance in power relations and to support Marcus in feeling more at ease, and Marcus’s account evidenced that humour was felt to emerge where hierarchical relations were less polarised.

I will now turn to present findings from the next dyad in this cluster.

5.4 Jody and Antonia: Supporting the Student in Charge

The title given to this teacher-student pair, ‘supporting the student in charge’, captured a key relational theme of this dyad. This student was experienced as leading and authoritative in the relationship and this was linked with a perception of progress in learning. Key themes in the dyad were ‘rapport’, ‘bringing about change’ and ‘power relations.’

5.4.1 Rapport

Jody’s Perspective

Rapport

The short extract that follows was derived from Jody’s response to watching the first video excerpt of her lesson with Antonia:

she has a lot of humour about her own uhm, obstructions - when she gets stuck, she can also laugh about it afterwards [...] I find it very easy to work with her, even when things are difficult, we, our rapport, she trusts me and I trust her and I feel we understand what’s going on.

Empathic reading indicated that Jody experienced this relationship in terms of a sense of ease, rapport and trust. Antonia was viewed as experiencing ‘obstructions’ in learning at times, but her capacity for humour was perceived by Jody as allowing for difficulties to be weathered more easily. This relationship was communicated as involving mutuality, as trust was conveyed as both given and received: ‘she trusts me and I trust her’.

Antonia’s Perspective

Analysis of Antonia’s account revealed two sub-themes under the theme of rapport, ‘Friendly but not Friends’ and ‘Care’.
**Friendly, but Not Friends**

The following extract encapsulated the first sub-theme:

> she’s my teacher and I am a student, it is a friendly relationship but it’s not a friendship relationship [...] If, if if that makes sense, we’re not, we’re not friends, but we are friends in a way, we’re friendly student and teacher but I rate her as my teacher, and I know she rates me as the student [...] which is important for me, it keeps, it keeps things easier to also make the point when they need to be made.

The significance of a friendly rapport with Jody was conveyed, and the student also highlighted the import of role related differences. There was a teasing apart of the difference between being friendly versus being friends, as indicated through the unwrapping of this idea in several ways. The ‘point’ which may ‘need to be made’, referred to at the end of this passage, seemed to allude to a sense that difficult interactions may be inevitable at some stage in their relationship; thus some degree of emotional separation from Jody (friendly, but not friends) seemed to be important to cope with such periods. A sense of high mutual regard was expressed in the passage and this mirrored Jody’s perception of mutuality in their relating. Antonia’s phrase: ‘I rate her [...] and I know she rates me’ seemed to mirror her teacher’s phrase: ‘she trusts me and I trust her’.

**Care**

Antonia’s perception of Jody as a caring teacher was conveyed in her interview.

> she would care how you are, how you doing, how you getting along with things [short digression] she cares for the whole not just what happens in that hour, in her classroom [...] She is aware that there is more things going on

Empathic interpretation revealed that Antonia experienced this teacher as caring, not only within the confines of the studio or even within the parameters of their particular relationship, but ‘for the whole’ as she put it.

**5.4.2 Bringing About Change**

I will now turn to discuss the theme of ‘Bringing about Change’ that was identified in this dyad in terms of a sense of progress.
Jody’s Perspective ➢

Progress

Jody revealed that she perceived Antonia as making impressive strides in musical development, as captured in the following extract:

she did this amazing leap [...] an amazing leap in interpretive commitment. And I was not part of that - she did that. She just came along and with it, that class were 'Oh my God!' You know. And, and in some ways stunning everybody with this extraordinary, you know, driving everyone to tears.

Empathic textual analysis suggested that Jody was profoundly impressed and moved by the student’s progress. Capacity to bring about change was characterised as an ‘amazing leap’, not a slow gradual process. Repetitions of the word ‘amazing… amazing’ evoke a sense of astonishment and referents to the emotional reactions of others act to emphasise. A collective perspective, ‘the class’, was drawn upon; these others were depicted as stunned by reactions of awe and admiration. The invocation of an exclamatory collective voice ‘Oh my God!’ acts to heighten the significance of Antonia’s progress. Student progress was rendered in this text as emotionally affecting others - ‘driving’ them ‘to tears’. Student progress was communicated by Jody as independently earned by Antonia, as she stated ‘I was not part of that – she did that’. This might indicate a link between progress and student independence.

Responsibility

Antonia was perceived by Jody as a student who took considerable responsibility in the one-to-one relationship and this was linked with progress:

she’s really continually interrogating herself about what she believes in and what kind of singer she wants to be and she, she really, she, she’s very reflective and very much using our relationship as a, as a resource for her learning but that she’s also doing it. She’s putting it together. She, she’s really uhm, mentally in a place where she’s ready to take responsibility and ready to, to, to be really active in her learning.

The text revealed Jody’s perception of this student as reflexive and taking a strong ‘active’ lead in their relationship. There was acknowledgment of the significance of the relational context that Jody provided for the student’s development, referred to as a ‘resource for her learning’. However, there was strong emphasis on this student’s high degree of responsibility and agency revealed in phrases such as ‘She’s putting it together’, ‘ready to take responsibility’, and ‘really active’.
The next passage was derived from Jody’s response to watching one of the video excerpts of their lesson interactions:

See I’m being quite lazy. I’m sitting there. Usually I would have got up and, but because she is so close - I don’t bother (Laughs) […] it doesn’t seem to create a problem but I am being quite lazy […] I suppose, quite seriously, […] because she’s so responsive and so, taking, so much responsibility and all that - I probably do need to watch out that I don’t get a bit lazy, you know. But I, but I mean, I mean, I think it’s not a real problem, but I should really have stood up and demonstrated that rather than just sort of slummacked around on the piano seat.

Empathic reading of this passage suggested that Jody perceived herself as becoming passive in response to the highly responsible and responsive stance of Antonia. The highly active position of this student was emphasised through iterations of this: ‘she is so close… so responsive… so much responsibility’. In contrast, Jody reiterated the word ‘lazy’ three times in this passage to describe herself. Her behaviour in the video interaction was treated to a self-caricature as she painted herself as ‘sitting there’, ‘slummacked around’, as a lackadaisical teacher. Her reiteration of this as unproblematic might indicate a sense that it was genuinely insignificant to her overall sense of their working relationship. An interrogative interpretation might however ask if the teacher did in fact experience some uncertainty or self-judgement since the self-caricature was at odds with her self-account as authoritarian and pushy in the previous dyad. A relational interpretative reading could posit that within this dyad the relationship intermittently collapsed into complementarity along the binary positions of student dominance-teacher passivity.

Two extracts from elsewhere in Jody’s interview offered further evidence of her sense of this relational configuration. She said of Antonia:

I mean she is right there, you know. I don’t need to. I’m not - There’s no, there’s no pushing at all required

it’s really very rarely the right approach with Antonia because she’s already thrashing herself. She doesn’t need me to thrash her, you know [laughter]

These comments revealed that Jody was not experiencing herself as pushing in this dyad, indeed there was ‘no pushing at all required’, no need to ‘thrash’, since Antonia was presented as already inhabiting that position. A relational reading might argue that the dynamic of this relationship nudged Jody into a position that was less familiar to her. The position of being passive seemed to sit in contrast to the dominant, bossy, authoritative style of relating that she had indicated was quite familiar and easy to her in the previous dyad.
Antonia’s account revealed two sub-themes under the key theme of bringing about change, these were ‘Challenge: Friendly, but hard’ and ‘Directness’.

**Challenge: ‘Friendly, but hard’**

In the following two extracts Antonia revealed how she experienced Jody and the process of change.

> there will be days that she’s like ‘OK, so you reached this level now so now it’s stable this thing, so now I can be more picky [...]’. So you realise, oh so there is a change. And then for a while it will be like [...] sort of friendly, but hard, friendly, but hard, and then one day, it’s like ‘oh ok’ you’ve reached, sort of, which makes you realise ‘ok so she sees evolution as well in me’. (Laughs).

She is persistent, very persistent, and very picky

These passages suggested that Antonia experienced Jody as demanding, persevering and caring. This was conveyed through use of language; Jody was depicted as ‘picky’, ‘persistent’ and ‘friendly, but hard’. The latter phrase seemed to reveal that Jody was experienced as challenging but supportive. Achievement of progress, indicated in her words ‘evolution’ and ‘change’, seemed to be experienced as gradual and emergent after periods of difficult but supportive work with Jody, as indicated in her phrase ‘friendly, but hard’.

**Directness**

The next passages open up the sub-theme of directness in this relationship. The first extract revealed Antonia’s self-perception and the second, her perception of Jody.

> I can be perceived like rude sometimes, and I’m not trying [...] I’m not trying to be, I think it is because I’m very direct, uhm it’s how we are there, we are very direct, but people don’t take it badly [laughs]

Antonia revealed she viewed herself as ‘very direct’ and emphasised the word very on second iteration. Her cultural background and southern European cultural norms of relating were conveyed in the interview as influencing her direct manner and she revealed that peer students in the English conservatoire environment often misunderstood this as indicative of rudeness. Her use of the plural noun: ‘we are very direct’ was a referent to people of her cultural background. She also viewed Jody as sharing this direct style of relating:

> for me it is important to be told what is expected and, and, and the straight is the best, because then you will tackle it. If people make too many turns to tell
you something, you, you sometimes will get lost in the beginning of the turn, and you won’t get the real point, what they tried to tell you. I think Jody is very straight forward.

The metaphor of a circuitous path being navigated in order to try to get to ‘the real point’ was revealing. This student preferred direct honest feedback, ‘the straight is the best’ and this was linked with being able to address ‘problems’ in learning. The next extract provided further evidence of Antonia’s perception and valuing of Jody’s capacity to give honest direct critique:

She won’t say something good to tell you something bad either. She can say something bad straight away, so you know that she’s not trying to meld you around, you know, she’s not trying to make you feel better.

Antonia’s perception of Jody as direct and honest in criticism was evident here as Jody was portrayed as able to ‘say something bad straight away’. This was communicated as of greater value to Antonia’s learning, than having her feelings mediated through a teacher’s discursive manoeuvres. The notion of being told ‘something good’ or being made to ‘feel better’ in order to be told ‘something bad’ appeared of little value and almost a disruption to learning for this student. This seemed to suggest robustness in this student in being able to tolerate interpersonal directness and challenge with this teacher.

5.4.3 Power Relations

The theme of power relations was identified as significant in both teacher and student accounts in this dyad. From Jody’s perspective a thematic of a relationship that was ‘Not Authoritarian’ emerged and in Antonia’s account a theme of ‘Equal but hierarchical’ relations was identified.

Jody’s Perspective ➢

Not Authoritarian

An extract from Jody’s interview revealed her thoughts about power in her relationship with Antonia.

what she has appreciated, and she’s voiced this, is that we don’t have an authoritarian relationship. Whereas in the previous relationship with her teacher, she did […] Where the teacher would always just say the way it was and that was that, and if she didn’t understand it was her fault, you know […] she said very much - you know, within the first couple of lessons ‘I feel like this is going to work ’cos I feel like you listen to me and I feel like we can talk’. And, and so I do think that, that we have that rapport is - has a direct effect on her, uhm, her ability to make progress.
Jody set a scene of past and present of Antonia’s learning relationships as understood from Jody’s perspective. The words ‘we don’t have an authoritarian relationship’ stood out in this interview as they were presented unambiguously. Jody appeared to be making sense of the student’s sense making of their relationship – a kind of double hermeneutic. She indicated that she perceived that she and the student shared an understanding that the relationship worked well and was achieving progress. The capacity to effect change was linked with the conditions of their relationship, including interpersonal rapport and lack of teacher authoritarianism. These forms of relatedness seemed to be juxtaposed with Antonia’s previous one-to-one relationship, where the past teacher was depicted as dictatorial, authoritarian and blaming of the student. Interpretative reading suggested that collaborative forms of relatedness in this dyad were viewed as essential to facilitating progress with this student.

Two other brief extracts from Jody elaborate.

she’s in that state of ‘I’m, I’m taking charge’

she really makes her best progress when she’s feeling free and listened to

These extracts gave further evidence of Jody’s sense that Antonia was felt to exercise authority in this relationship; she was portrayed as ‘taking charge’. Progress in learning was linked with notions of student freedom in the relationship, and this might be relationally interpreted through the notion of dynamic autonomy (Keller, 1985, cited in Aron, 1996). Dynamic autonomy, rather than connoting radical separateness and independence from others, is framed instead as a product of relatedness with and separation from others; this is understood to give rise to a sense of competence. Jody’s account seemed to suggest that she provided relational conditions that supported Antonia’s capacity to exercise freedom / autonomy in the relationship, rather than through isolation from the teacher.

I will turn now to Antonia’s perspective on power in their relationship.

Antonia’s Perspective ➢

Equal but Hierarchical

This paragraph from Antonia’s interview revealed her perceptions of equality and hierarchy.

It’s quite equal in many points […] still there is a position but it’s not a super position, it’s more of a position ‘you’re a teacher, you’re a student’, it’s not like
the teacher is above you like a proper, proper hierarchy type. It's more like 'I have got a knowledge and, and you're coming here for that knowledge' but we, we, we nu- nutritious, you know, each other in, in different ways [...] because there will be things that I will bring and there is of course 99% that she brings (laughs)

Empathic interpretation revealed that Antonia experienced herself as an equal in this relationship. The image of a mutually nutritious relationship was suggestive of Antonia feeling her contributions were of equal value to Jody's. She appeared to make sense of her life-world with this teacher as one in which she was able to enrich Jody's experience, albeit to a lesser degree. There was a perception of power differentials, communicated through reference to 'hierarchy', but Jody was not perceived as accentuating such positions, i.e. not taking up a 'super position' as Antonia put it. A relational interpretation could suggest that this indicated evidence of a collaborative and mutual but asymmetrical relationship; it involved a commonality and sharing that was different in form, quantity, quality or degree for each party (Aron, 1996).

Elsewhere in Antonia's interview the meaning of equality/mutual relations with Jody took on more significance as she shared a past experience of a one-to-one teaching relationship where power relations were experienced as harmful. The following set of extracts referred to her previous teaching relationship:

I think it was a game of power in that case [...] it might be good for some other people, but not for me

It makes you doubt, you know. Now, now I am quite strong in saying how harmful it was, but when you are in the situation there can be moments that you don't see it that clear

manipulation psychologically

harmful, harmful

Empathic reading of these comments about her past tuition relationship revealed that coercive power relations were experienced as deeply disturbing. Use of the phrase 'a game of power', reference to 'manipulation' and repetitions of the word 'harmful' conveyed how seriously troubling such power relations were. The phrase: 'it makes you doubt' seemed to suggest that the relational situation was difficult to make sense of at the time of its happening. The student revealed in the interview that she changed teachers due to this issue and once extricated from the situation, it seemed that more insight could emerge. It is perhaps important to note that there is no possibility of triangulation of this perspective with the particular teacher's perspective, since this teacher was not involved in the current study.
5.4.4 Triangulation of Perspectives: Jody ↔ Antonia

Findings from this dyad revealed convergence of perspective around a sense of relational rapport and mutual respect. Bringing about change in the student was experienced in terms of progress and this appeared to be linked with the student taking a high degree of responsibility in learning. The emergence of a binary of teacher passivity in relation to a highly responsible student was discussed. There was some divergence here between Jody’s account of herself and Antonia’s experience of her, as Jody indicated feeling passive and ‘lazy’ at times, yet the student perceived Jody as often demanding, tough and persistent. The student’s perception was thus more aligned with Marcus’s experience of Jody.

For Antonia, progress or ‘evolution’ was linked with mutual interpersonal directness in their relating. Challenge and direct criticism of the student appeared in this dyad as if it would be welcome from the student perspective.

Triangulation of accounts revealed convergence of perception of the shadow of coercive power relations from a past teaching relationship. This seemed to influence understandings of power relations in the present relationship in both interviews. The student’s account evidenced a past experience of a one-to-one tuition relationship in which the student perceived power relations as coercive, manipulative and harmful to her, and the relationship was terminated by the student for that reason. Through a change of teacher and through working with Jody, Antonia appeared to flourish and progress. Progress was linked in both of their accounts with the student feeling more like an equal and able to mutually contribute to and exercise autonomy in the relationship. Power relations in the current dyad were perceived as equal, but asymmetrical (i.e. there was recognition of role-related hierarchical differences in the student findings), and at times as falling into complementarity along the binary of student dominance-teacher passivity (according to findings from Jody).

5.5 Preliminary Discussion and Summary of Findings from Cluster 1

This case study cluster revealed the way in which two different dyads, involving the same teacher with two different students, brought about quite different relational patterns and dynamics of power. The teacher in this cluster experienced herself and was experienced by the students in very different ways in the different relationships, but there was also a perception of what might be thought of as the teacher’s stable characteristics of relating. Triangulation of findings from all three accounts revealed
that the teacher could be demanding and tough, indeed the two student accounts revealed linguistic similarities in descriptions of the teacher. Marcus talked of Jody’s interactions in terms of ‘tough love’ and Antonia employed the phrase ‘friendly, but hard’. Both phrases synthesised a sense of care with tough demand.

Triangulation of findings across dyads also revealed that the two students brought forth very different qualities of relatedness within their teacher. The two dyadic worlds seemed to habituate or have a tendency to fall intermittently into quite different patterns of relating and different binary configurations.

Findings from this cluster revealed that teacher dominance was not a static psychological property or category of teacher, nor a fixed position taken by the teacher, rather it was periodically desired, taken, resisted, questioned, actively unsettled and associated with troubling feelings in the teacher. In this regard, teacher dominance with Marcus was found to be a conflicted experience for Jody due to her beliefs about and aspirations regarding collaborative forms of learning relations. In the presentation of findings, I discussed the way that Jody employed a range of strategies and self-reflexivity to avert becoming the dominant teacher and to foster collaborative horizontal relations of power. In the dyad Jody-Marcus the relationship seemed to fall intermittently into the following teacher-student binary positions: dominance-passivity, authoritarianism-deference, desire for confrontation-aversion of confrontation, force-acquiescence and pushing-resistant. Such binaries seemed to be associated with trouble with effecting change. A desire for a relationship that could allow for collaboration and that recognised role-related hierarchical power differentials was evident in findings from both students. With the other student - Antonia, teacher dominance did not emerge as a feature of the generative dance of relating (Burkitt, 1999). Rather that relationship was conveyed in terms of equality and intermittent collapse into teacher-student binary positions of passivity-dominance and lazy-responsible. Such relational configurations that positioned the student as dominant or responsible seemed to be linked with student progress in effecting change.

Findings from the cluster thus evidenced that the pairings gave rise to opposite tendencies in regard to binary relational configurations. Teacher dominance-student passivity emerged in one pairing, whilst teacher passivity-student dominance emerged in the other. This aligns with systemic ideas that emergent phenomena in a system cannot be predicted from the characteristics of individual elements in a system (Thelen & Smith, 1994). Teacher dominance in this cluster could not be formulated only as a characteristic of the individual teacher, but instead was found to be contingent upon the pairing with particular students. Findings thus highlighted the significance of the
teacher-student pairing upon the emergent relational dynamics of the dyad. The mutually constitutive nature of relational positions taken up by teacher or student in one-to-one tuition was thus highlighted. This resonates with the intersubjective notion that psychological phenomena are co-created, rather than derived solely from isolated intra-psychic properties of the individual (Stolorow et al., 2001).

Although findings indicated that dyads appeared to fall into complementary binary configurations, these were not found to be fixed, permanent or unalterable; but rather were subject to change. This was arguably related to teacher reflexivity, as there was evidence of her capacities to reflect on herself, the student and the student’s view of her. Findings suggested that the teacher questioned her affective reactions in particular feelings of frustration and impatience, and that such emotional states were a source of concern to her in terms of their potential impact on her student. The data analysis suggested that there was evidence of the teacher’s reflexive self-awareness, defined by Aron (2000) as the dialectical process of experiencing oneself as a subject and of cognitively reflecting on oneself as an object of thought and an object other people’s experiences and thoughts. The methodology of the research may have additionally created the conditions through which reflexivity emerged, since the teacher was invited to view and reflect upon her interactions with the student in the video-data from an observational perspective. As such this could be considered as supporting the creation of ‘the third’ (Aron, 2006).

Findings from both dyads suggested that there was evidence of mutual understanding of the nature of the intersubjective field of relating (Stern, 2004). Between Jody-Marcus, there was shared knowledge of their relationship as a site of interpersonal struggle, of Jody as forceful, tough and pushy and of Marcus as conflict averse. Between Jody-Antonia, there was shared knowledge of the student as needing to exert freedom and autonomy in the relationship and of a shared sense of rapport and mutual regard.

In relation to the theme of the trouble with effecting change that was identified in the dyad Jody-Marcus, findings revealed that there were different frameworks of meaning employed in regard to the nature of the ‘problem’. Teacher and student located the problematic in the student at times, and at times the student located the problematic also in his teacher’s unreasonable demands. Troubling emotions of irritation, frustration and anxiety appeared to be aroused in the teacher by her perception of the student as resistant. It was as if the resistance to change was experienced as an interpersonal transaction, i.e. resistance to the teacher.
Triangulation of teacher-student perspectives revealed different understandings about best resolutions to such stasis or resistance in learning. Findings from this cluster revealed the value of challenge and confrontation in effecting change. This was also found to exist in a dynamic tension with allowing the student time/space to lead pace of change.

In one dyad the student was revealed as conflict averse (according to both teacher and student accounts) and in the other dyad the student appeared to enjoy directness and robust criticism. It was notable that Jody experienced conflict about being challenging with the former student. This may have been due to intersubjective knowledge that conflict would be experienced as more troubling for this student. It is also possible that she felt troubled by challenge due to her desire to challenge being infused with feelings of frustration and irritation that were aroused by a sense of powerlessness to elicit change. Trying to offer a more student-centred approach to allowing space and time for student pace of development with Marcus was found to be complicated by anxieties in the teacher's relatedness to institutional pressures. The teacher seemed to have a stronger belief in the power of forceful challenge with Marcus to resolve issues in learning, and struggled to believe in the possibility of allowing that particular student to lead the process. Conversely with the other student, Antonia, the teacher allowed the student to take charge and to be self-determining. It thus seemed to foreground the influence of the interactional nexus (Dunn, 1995) between teacher and student in constraining or affording possibilities for the students to exert autonomy and agency.

Findings from this cluster also revealed that one-to-one tuition could be experienced as a harmful relationship. There was evidence that one student had experienced a past relationship with a teacher as ‘a game of power’ and that relationship was terminated for that reason. The student’s choice of language was resonant of Schön’s descriptions of the ‘learning bind’ (Schön, 1987). He described this situation in terms of a ‘game of attack and defense’, the ‘win-lose game’ and argued that this trapped teacher and student in an interlocking cycle of attempts to exercise control over the other. The impasse was understood to ultimately inhibit learning. Intersubjective interpretation of this finding might also frame this as an impasse of complementarity (Aron, 2006; Benjamin, 1999). In such a situation the relationship becomes dominated by a power struggle which curtails individual freedom and often preludes termination of relationship. The latter was also evident in findings here.

This chapter presented findings from cluster 1 and revealed how a teacher and her two students experienced, perceived and made sense of their respective relationships. The findings revealed the significance of the dyadic interweaving world of experiencing
on the process and experience of teaching and learning. Further discussion of findings is undertaken in chapter 9.
Chapter 6: Findings from Case Study
Cluster 2

6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents findings from the second case study cluster, Connie and her two students, Hannah and Lara. Key themes and sub-themes from the cluster are detailed in tables 4 and 5 overleaf (presented together for comparison). The narrative account follows the same structure as the previous chapter and presents findings from the dyad - Connie and Hannah, followed by those from dyad - Connie and Lara.

6.2 Brief Introduction to Participants

Diagrammatic illustration giving a brief profile of these participants appeared in the methodology chapter (see figure 6 in section 4.3.1.i) and I will now introduce them in more detail.

Connie had taught for several decades in a number of conservatoires and had had a performance-career as a soprano in her earlier life. She was white, aged seventy-three and articulated current professional identities as including voice teacher, author, researcher and occasional performer. She was currently teaching vocal students in conservatoires ‘A’ and ‘C’. On meeting her I experienced her as energetic, strong minded, passionate about teaching voice and able to laugh easily. Her name came up in various contexts during my engagement in the empirical field as other teachers and students referred to her as an outstanding example of a teacher and technician for the voice. It seemed that she was held in high esteem. Hannah, was a white, British, twenty-seven year old woman, who had been working with Connie for eleven months after leaving a previous troubling teaching relationship. She had experienced a shift in understanding of voice type from mezzo-soprano to soprano whilst working with Connie. During my first lesson observation I noted that Hannah was physically unwell, struggling with low energy and vocal health issues. Lara was twenty eight years old, from the same English speaking country abroad as Connie, and she identified her voice type as soprano. This student struck me as effervescing with vitality, fun and enthusiasm. Both students were in the final year of a postgraduate opera programme in conservatoire ‘A’.
### Tables of Themes & Sub-themes for Cluster 2

#### Connie & Hannah: The Legacy of a Traumatic Learning Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connie’s Perspective</th>
<th>Hannah’s Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Respect’</td>
<td>Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘A Wounded Healer’</td>
<td>Legacy of Traumatic Learning Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Partner in the Process’</td>
<td>Power Relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Themes for Dyad - Connie & Hannah

#### Connie & Lara: Who’s Responsible for the Golden Throat?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connie’s Perspective</th>
<th>Lara’s Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ir/responsibility &amp; the Golden Throat</td>
<td>‘It’s all Kind of too Fun’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline &amp; Authority: ‘I Can’t Be the School Mistress’</td>
<td>Doing it for the Teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge: ‘Frighten the Rabbits’?</td>
<td>Challenge: ‘Pulling Me Up’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Lovely, Lovely’</td>
<td>Rapport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Themes for Dyad - Connie & Lara
6.3 Connie and Hannah: The Legacy of a Traumatic Learning Experience

The title given to this dyad captures the main theme that dominated both of their respective interviews. Their relationship was revealed in both accounts as understood to be working with the vocal and emotional implications of the student’s previous traumatic experience in a long-term one-to-one tuition relationship. Three key themes were identified across their accounts: Respect, Legacy of Traumatic Learning Experience and Power Relations (see table 4 above). Their individual perspectives will now be revealed through sequential presentation of sub-themes under each key theme.

6.3.1 Respect

Connie’s Perspective ➤

‘Respect’

Two extracts from Connie open up this theme.

I have respect for her, because there’s a lot of talent in there, and there’s a lot of guts […] A lot of courage, for courage, for her guts and her talent

I like her very much. She’s game, she’s very desperate to get it sorted

Empathic reading suggested that Connie held Hannah in high regard and that she experienced a sense of connection with and ‘liking’ of this student. The mention of ‘respect’, ‘courage’, and ‘guts’ and the description of the student as ‘game’ suggested Hannah was perceived by Connie as brave and open to taking risks in the process of learning.

Hannah’s Perspective ➤

‘Pearls of Wisdom’

Hannah’s account revealed that respect for her teacher was deeply felt:

I love my lessons. Every week is a real pleasure […] she’s so well known as a teacher, around the world, the fact that she wanted to teach me was a huge honour anyway. So, just every lesson is a chance to go in and be like, ‘What pearls of wisdom do you have for me,’ […] I have so many good things to say about her [laughs]
Empathic interpretative analysis indicated that Hannah was perhaps in awe of this teacher. The words ‘a huge honour’ and reference to Connie’s status on the world stage gave a sense that the student felt grateful to be able to work with this teacher of such international repute. Feelings of joy were communicated about learning with Connie in words such as ‘love’, ‘pleasure’ and ‘so many good things’. The use of the metaphor ‘pearls of wisdom’ seemed to highlight the sense of learning in this relationship as precious and valuable.

6.3.2 A Legacy of Traumatic Learning Experience

The next key theme that dominated both interviews was the legacy of a traumatic learning experience.

Connie’s Perspective

‘A Wounded Healer’

Connie began to teach Hannah after the end of the student’s undergraduate vocal training. Their work focused on trying to resolve a range of problems that were framed as the legacy of a previous teaching relationship. The text that follows was drawn from a much longer elaboration on these issues:

She’s struggling now, because she’s got to juggle a completely new technique and she’s right at the end of her training […] I’ve only had a short time with her and I have to tell her that she’s not a mezzo, she’s a soprano with a depressed larynx and a tongue root problem…

This passage offered a brief excerpt of Connie’s perceptions of Hannah’s learning situation. The student was understood to be struggling with trying to change vocal technique and habits and with discovering that her voice type had been misdiagnosed in her previous one-to-one teaching relationship. Connie recounted during her interview that the student was suffering repeated voice loss, a range of technical issues and vocal health problems that had required medical intervention.

The next extract captured Connie’s understanding of her role with this student.

I think I’m having to heal her. She’s been damaged by a system, and I’m acting as a wounded healer, I think that’s what I’m doing. Because I’ve been through that kind of dispossession, as well, as a young singer.

The claiming of an identity, ‘a wounded healer’, suggested that Connie experienced teaching Hannah in terms of a remedial role. She was trying to repair ‘damage’ that had been done to the student. The synthesis of words, wounded and healer could
suggest that the teacher identified with this student, since the position of ‘healer’ and of ‘the wounded’ (i.e. like Hannah) were both claimed. Reference to the Jungian archetype, the wounded healer 4, seemed to appeal to notions of cure and transformation of another person’s suffering through awareness of both one’s own suffering and through connecting the other to their inner capacity for self-healing. The word ‘dispossession’ has various meanings including being cast out, made homeless, or deficiency. This word was employed to describe her own experience in the past, revealing Connie had also suffered as a young singer – like Hannah.

Connie’s feelings about the suffering that she perceived as having been inflicted on her student were revealed in the next passage:

I’m angry that her teacher, previous teacher at [Conservatoire ‘A’] didn’t pick up on any of this [...] and yet he’s a very arrogant and very young arrogant teacher, who thinks he’s God’s gift to the singing world. So there’s a bit of me that really, really resents what’s been done to her

Empathic textual analysis revealed a sense of grievance and outrage that was directed towards the teacher who was clearly positioned in the account as responsible for harm to the student. Repetitions of the word ‘arrogant’ and reference to the previous teacher’s self-ordination as ‘God’s gift to the singing world’ seem to be alive with mockery and indignation, indicating intensity of anger. An interrogative interpretation, might argue that such intensity of anger was not only a reaction to the harm done to the student, but also to the harm done to Connie’s own younger self. Observing the negative implications for Hannah may have re-stimulated Connie’s anger and hurt about what had been done to her in the past.

Hannah’s Perspective ➢

A Legacy of ‘Trauma’ in Learning

Hannah’s interview revealed convergence with Connie’s around the sense that the student had been harmed due to the effects of a previous teaching relationship. As the interviewer I was impacted by the intensity of sadness and pain that this student communicated in her interview. Emotional distress was not narrated as in the past; rather pain was alive in the telling during the interview process. The past relationship was a dominant focus of her interview and was recounted as ‘traumatic’.

She talked of her experience of the early phase of the previous teaching relationship as follows:

---

4 See Samuels (1999, pp. 187-191) for discussion of the notion of ‘The Wounded Healer’
it was never a sexual thing. It was more, 'Wow! You’re talented. You’re going to tell me – you know, you’re going to show me how to do something that I love for a living' [...] So there’s that kind of idolising [...] when you have a younger – you know, someone of the opposite sex telling you, ‘You’re fabulous. You’re going to be incredible,’ there’s this kind of, ‘Oh, I like this.’ [...] so you thrive on it.

A cautiously offered empathic reading might indicate that this relationship was one that was emotionally powerful for the student and tinged with erotic and aesthetic admiration. The art of singing was implied as that which the student loved, and the teacher portrayed as guiding the student to that ‘love’. The language of desire seeps through the lines of this passage in words like ‘sexual’ (albeit never), ‘idolising’, ‘thrive on it’, ‘fabulous’ and ‘incredible’. Her intense feelings were framed as having been aroused by the teacher and the particularity of that learning context. She talked elsewhere in the interview of the early period of the relationship as ‘enjoyable, passionate’ indicating the sense of desire in that relationship. However, her interview narrative revealed that over its four year duration that relationship became ‘a rollercoaster’, ‘confused’, ‘stressful’ and ultimately a ‘trauma’.

The next extracts give an insight into the state of absolute dependence that Hannah began to experience in that relationship.

I had lost complete confidence with my old teacher and felt I had to ask him about everything [...] also because he wanted it to be that way.

my confidence went because I completely felt I had to depend on him for everything

Textual analysis indicated loss of confidence, self-belief, autonomy and an overwhelming felt sense of deference / dependence. Such a state of dependence appeared to be perceived as co-created by the teacher – ‘he wanted it’, not as solely arising from Hannah. This private relationship seemed to have provided a crucible that fused intense aesthetic and interpersonal intimacy with feelings of dependence and desire which ultimately became a source of troubling experience within that dyad.

Feelings of being powerless were communicated about being stuck in the relationship; these two extracts are indicative of what was communicated in this regard:

I didn’t give myself credit for anything. I was like ‘it’s all because of him’. And I was in kind of, in this web of ‘I can’t get out’ but I knew I needed to, to improve

trapped in a situation that you can’t get out of

Deference to the teacher’s power and lack of self-worth were strongly communicated in these passages. There was lack of ‘credit’ (one might read this as value / worth) given
to herself; rather the credit was all located with the teacher - ‘it’s all because of him’. Overwhelming feelings of being trapped with the teacher were communicated, as the text revealed a ‘web of ‘I can’t get out’’. The sense that learning was being impeded in that relationship was conveyed through reference to the need to extricate her-self in order to ‘improve’. Hannah revealed elsewhere in the interview that her decision to end that relationship and change teachers was extremely difficult and took a year to have confidence to enact.

Interrogative relational reading of that past relationship could conceptualise it in terms of a collapse into an impasse of complementarity (Benjamin, 1999). Fixed binary positions of submission-dominance or powerful-powerless could be proposed as configuring the relational system with the previous teacher. The expression of feeling trapped might suggest being locked into narrowly defined roles where there were limited interactional options (Aron, 2000). Where relationships become trapped in such complementary binary relations, the irresolvable impasse is understood to commonly lead to breakdown of relationship, and this indeed happened.

Hannah’s decision to end that relationship was conveyed by her as unleashing punitive reactions from the teacher which she found shocking and disturbing. Retaliations included the teacher talking about her in negative ways to her peer students and within the institutional context. The experience of becoming the object of negative ‘gossip’ and ‘scandal’ as she put it, was communicated as a ‘trauma’:

Kind of leaving one [referring to leaving her past teacher] and the guilt that went with that. And then sadly the kind of – the trauma I went through for the – it’s still going on. You know, gossip behind people’s backs. This – ‘You’ve left this person. What a scandal.’

This text indicated that leaving the teacher evoked feelings of guilt and was experienced as scandalous. Use of the word ‘trauma’ revealed that change of teacher and the sense of public disapproval was and remained a source of deep emotional disturbance for her. Anger about the injustice of being treated in this manner in the conservatoire was also revealed in her interview:

It's not right. Because these institutions are here to help us make a career [...] we’re not here to massage people’s egos [...] there should be a code of conduct. If people feel they want to leave their teacher, it shouldn’t be a big deal. It shouldn’t be a scandal

The institutional context was interrogated in this passage for its lack of responsiveness to and support of the student in the process of changing teachers. The linguistic descriptors ‘a big deal’ and ‘a scandal’ evoke a sense of this decision as socially
unacceptable. Reference to the need for a ‘code of conduct’ suggests notions of regulation, monitoring and ethical responsibilities in relation to professional practice. This extract seemed to suggest that the student had felt unprotected and alone in this situation within the institutional system.

Hannah’s thoughts about that past relationship and its implications for her current way of relating with Connie were expressed:

I don’t want to be like that with a teacher again […] I don’t want her to be like, God.

A desire to avoid repeating the past way of relating in her present relationship with Connie was conveyed. The metaphor of teacher as ‘God’ could be read as indicative of deference, dependence, obedience or worship of an absolute authority. This symbolically seemed to convey Hannah’s relational position with the previous teacher. Hannah’s comment highlighted her wish to reposition herself with Connie, particularly in respect of the negative outcomes of her deferential positioning in the past relationship. This might be conceptualised through the notion that individuals reposition themselves in respect of others and in respect of past relationships and their outcomes (Burkitt, 1999).

I will now turn to the next sub-theme that emerged under the key theme of legacy of trauma.

**Gratitude and Change**

The following two extracts revealed a prominent theme that emerged across Hannah’s narrative about depth of gratitude felt towards Connie for the changes that had been experienced as a result of working with her in this current relationship.

she’s just enabled me to just sing. (Laughter) […] And it’s just like, ‘Thank you.’ you know? It’s massive

she’s enabled me to – to really start doing what I love again. And it’s – that’s massive. You know, because a year ago, I very often just couldn’t sing. And it’s so depressing.

Read empathically both passages revealed a heart full of gratitude. The fundamental simplicity of being enabled to ‘just sing’ again was conveyed and depth of gratitude was linked with the teacher’s role in bringing about change to the voice and her distressed relationship with singing. I recall at this point in the interview, that Hannah’s joy and appreciation was tinged with pathos, perhaps indicating that the change was deeply valued yet also inter-linked with the painful past.
The following extract indicated further evidence of gratitude:

I don’t know whether she knows how important to me it – it is, having met her and changed really

The process of change appeared to be profoundly valued and Connie’s significance in the student’s life-world was apparent.

that’s what I love about her. You know, you can kind of idolise her from a distance, I suppose […] I don’t want to be gushy with her. But, yeah, this is – she’s really helped me out of a very, very horrible position […] a year ago, I was thinking about stopping singing altogether.

Linguistic references to ‘love’ and ‘idolise’ suggested that this relationship was of profound emotional meaning. Expression of a desire to conceal her feelings from Connie (i.e. avoidance of being ‘gushy’ and idolising ‘from a distance’) perhaps revealed that such depth of feeling raised caution. Interrogative reading might suggest that intense emotion was concealed from Connie due to her sense that previous feelings of attachment and love towards a teacher had been abused and became a source of pain. Temporal referents to the past teaching relationship as ‘very, very horrible’ and to potential disengagement with singing at that time were juxtaposed with Connie’s transformative role – ‘she’s really helped me out’. An interrogative reading might suggest that Connie was experienced as having rescued the student from the precipice of loss of that which she had felt passionate about – her voice and her singing.

6.3.3 Power Relations

The next key theme from this dyad was that of power relations. It will now be examined from each of their perspectives.

Connie’s Perspective ➤

Connie’s interview gave rise to two sub-themes in relation to power, one was ‘a partner in the process’ which revealed her sense of a collaborative relationship with Hannah, and the other was ‘Negotiating Challenge’, which focused on contested authority and Connie’s reactions to this.

A Partner in the Process

Connie and I had watched one of the video-excerpts of her lesson with Hannah and the extract below came from our conversation after that video observation.
Paula: what do you notice watching that, and what do you feel watching that?

Connie: It's fairly, fairly easy. She's a completely fully, she's a partner in the process. I mean she's not standing back and saying, 'Teach me.' She's taking part, she's right in there.

The turn of phrase 'a partner in the process' suggested that this dyad could be perceived as a meeting of equals. Hannah was not viewed in the video-interaction as deferential or passive, as indicated by Connie's comment that she was not 'standing back' awaiting teacher input. Rather the student was perceived as active, engaged and 'right in there' in their relationship. A sense of a collaborative relationship was communicated.

**Negotiating Challenge**

Connie recounted in her interview a recent episode that had taken place in their relationship in which she had challenged Hannah. The next extract was situated within the context of her discussions about the student taking on a performing role that Connie had advised her would be counter-productive to her vocal development.

I said, 'Oh, I don't think you should do this, this will be maybe negative for you, you should pull out.' She said, 'Oh no, I can't, I can't pull out and I don't want to pull out.' So I thought 'Okay, I'm not going to forbid her to do it, I'll let, she needs this learning experience.'

Empathic analysis indicated that Connie experienced her instruction - 'you should pull out' as resisted. The student’s refusal was at first portrayed as an inability to change her actions: 'I can’t pull out'; but the shift in emphasis to a more wilful and intentional refusal - 'I don't want to pull out' was revealed. Connie’s recall of her own reaction: ‘I’m not going to forbid her’ might paradoxically suggest an underlying desire to be forbidding. To forbid would be to execute power and authority over the student. However despite Connie’s belief that negative consequences would ensue for the student’s vocal health, she appeared to prioritise the student’s need to learn from experience.

The next extract revealed what happened when the student took the role and the negative consequences that resulted. It disclosed Connie’s thoughts and reactions to the student’s refusal to take her advice:

The issues are serious and there’s a very serious – she actually, the last lesson she had she was in tears [...] having all of the problems come back. Like its eight months down the road and she can still re-visit the really bad experience that she was having before. And she needed, obviously needed to do that. And when she felt really distressed and upset, I felt and recognised that with her. But her way of working with me and my way of working with her, is not to be too
There was a lot communicated in this passage. Temporal referents to the past, the present and the passage of time revealed Connie’s framework of meaning. In this regard, she perceived a direct link between the student's psychological distress, the vocal relapse (‘all of the problems come back’) and the past ‘bad experience’. Her understanding of the student as distressed was expressed linguistically through her words: ‘tears’, ‘distress’, ‘upset’ and ‘painful’. Connie indicated that she was empathic towards this pain, as she stated ‘I felt and recognised that with her’. Interrogative interpretation revealed however that a feeling of frustration had been aroused in Connie by the student’s refusal to surrender to her authority. The sardonic evocation of a punitive admonishing voice that was blaming, as indicated in the words ‘you deserve to… be disabled’, and the use of an expletive seemed to highlight intensity of frustration; but this type of punitive reaction was disavowed ‘I wouldn’t dream of’. This could be interpreted as an indicator of the teacher’s impulsive reaction which was constrained. Thus her capacity to tolerate and manage frustration, rather than to act upon it without thought for the subjectivity of the other in the teaching relationship may be in evidence here.

Elsewhere in the interview Connie shared that Hannah’s undertaking of this role brought about a reoccurrence of health issues and minor damage to the vocal mechanism, and this necessitated medical intervention in the weeks during our engagement in the study.

A relationally informed interpretation of Connie’s narrative in this section suggests a tension between recognising the student’s autonomy (allowing Hannah to act on her desire) versus the desire to take authority and be forbidding with this student. Connie’s resistance to stepping into the relational invitation to become constellation as the authoritarian teacher to a submissive student was perhaps shown. This could be argued as indicative of teacher capacity for mutual recognition, as defined by Benjamin (1999); that is the capacity to sustain and balance the contradiction between asserting one’s own wishes / needs whilst also recognising the wishes / needs of the other, particularly when the latter are contrary to one’s own. It is also possible to interrogate Connie’s perspective further and to ask why the teacher did not take authority in a situation where her expertise enabled her to foresee the negative consequences that did indeed result from the student’s decision. Perhaps this reflects a pedagogic

---

5 This word was an expletive and has been changed although implies similar meaning, as post-interview the participant requested that any expletives used be ‘tidied up’ to more appropriate language.
dilemma for teachers about taking didactic authoritative roles with adult students versus allowing students' freedom, autonomy and responsibility in learning. In this dyad the avoidance of becoming authoritarian may also have been linked to the previous harmful teaching experience. Thus there was avoidance of re-constellating the binary of dominant teacher–submissive deferential student that had become the source of distress and led to the failure of the previous teaching relationship. The generative dance (Burkitt, 1999) of relating was thus different between Connie and Hannah, when compared with the past relationship.

**Hannah’s Perspective ➤**

**Challenge: Contesting Teacher Authority**

The above episode of challenge that Connie had discussed was independently raised by Hannah in her interview without any prompt from me:

we’d challenged each other [...] It was a kind of, ‘Well I’d like you to do this.’ And I was like, ‘Well, I’m not going to.’ And I thought – well this is interesting that I’ve still got the confidence to say, ‘No. I’m going to do what I want to do.’ But actually, looking back, she was completely right. I lost my voice for about three weeks [...] doing this performance.

Here she spelt out through imagined dialogue the positions taken by each of them and evoked clearly her complete refusal to enact Connie’s wishes: ‘Well, I’m not going to’. Significantly for Hannah the refusal appeared to represent valued insight and a shift in feeling state as it enabled her to connect with a sense of confidence or agency. Interpretative reading might indicate that the discovery of an ability to assert her own will in opposition to the will and authority of her teacher carried deeper significance when contextualised in relation to the past teaching relationship. Despite a serious relapse into vocal health problems (the loss of voice for three weeks), the experience of contesting Connie’s authority appeared to be of equal or even of greater value for Hannah. Evidence for this appeared in the next extract:

She hasn’t said ‘I told you so’. She said ‘you needed to find this out for yourself. And that is what it’s all about’... that was a huge thing for me. Because my old teacher would have been like ‘I told you so’ and I would not have heard the end of it.

The lack of admonishing response ‘I told you so’ for defying her teacher’s wishes stood out as a ‘huge thing’ for Hannah. There was a sense that Hannah felt able to discover understandings on her own terms; she could find out for herself, even though her decisions had negative outcomes and were in opposition to her teacher’s wishes. An interrogative intersubjective reading could propose that this presented a ‘moment of
meeting’ (Stern, 1998) and a challenge to Hannah’s implicit relational knowing of power relations in teacher-student relations. In this regard their interpersonal confrontation might be understood as destabilising the habitual canon of their relating and this opened up new relational understandings for Hannah. She appeared to discover that contesting of teacher authority was possible and that confrontation could be weathered in a negotiated manner that allowed for a sense of connection and togetherness with her teacher, rather than a sense of submission-dominance and of teacher retaliation (as in the past). Connie’s resistance to becoming the punitive authoritarian teacher seemed to have transformative effects and open up new relational awareness for Hannah.

Elsewhere in Hannah’s interview she revealed that Connie had accompanied her to the hospital investigations that were required as a result of this episode and this was felt to be deeply moving for the student. Having defied her teacher’s wishes, Hannah experienced Connie not only as allowing her to discover her own mistakes and meanings (recognising her autonomy), but also as supportive in response to the negative consequences on the voice. There was a sense of emotional connectedness and individual autonomy that had been discovered through this relational episode. This could be interpreted in terms of dynamic autonomy (Keller cited in Aron, 1996) as the student was able to achieve a sense of autonomy through relatedness with and separation from her teacher, rather than through isolation, disconnection or termination of relationship as previously experienced.

6.3.4 Triangulation of Perspectives: Connie\hspace*{0.5em} Connie\hspace*{0.5em} Hannah

There was convergence of perspectives within this dyad around perception of the detrimental effects of Hannah’s previous teaching relationship, however teacher and student appeared to emphasise different aspects of what was understood to have been harmful. For Connie the perception of harm related to the effects on the body, voice and technique and resultant distress arising from that; whilst for Hannah the focus appeared to relate to the interpersonal / intimate dimension of the relationship and her experience of dependence and powerlessness with the past teacher. The loss of desire to sing and of vocal confidence was identified as particularly distressing for her.

The theme of power relations emerged in both accounts and triangulation of findings revealed shared understanding of an episode of the student contesting Connie’s authority. This episode was understood by both teacher and student to have led to negative vocal and emotional consequences for the student, but it was also found to be linked with significant positive implications. In this regard, it seemed to transform
Hannah’s understanding of teacher-student power relations. She appeared to discover authority / autonomy in the relationship with Connie; this contrasted with her past experience where she had felt powerless and dependent with a teacher.

Triangulation of accounts also revealed convergence of perception that Connie avoided taking up a position of becoming punitive and authoritarian when challenged by the student’s defiance of her wishes. There was indication in Connie’s account that such punitive or frustrated reactions may have been aroused, but these were disavowed. In the student’s account the lack of retaliatory reaction from her teacher was felt to be highly significant. Both accounts also revealed a supportive teacher-response towards Hannah when she suffered vocal problems arising from the refusal to adhere to her teacher’s advice. Relational interpretation could consider this interactional episode in terms of teacher capacity for mutuality (Benjamin, 1999) as there was evidence of Connie’s capacity to sustain and balance the contradiction between asserting her own wishes / needs whilst also recognising the wishes / needs of her student, particularly when the latter were contrary to her own.

6.4 Connie and Lara: Who’s Responsible for the Golden Throat?

The narrative for this dyad has been entitled ‘Who’s Responsible for the Golden Throat’. This captured a key theme that I identified in their accounts around interpersonal struggle with responsibility and discipline for practice and a perception of this student as having an extraordinary voice. Key and sub-themes from the dyad were presented in table 5 earlier in this chapter. The two main themes that were identified and will now be presented were: ‘Trouble with Change’ and ‘Rapport’.

6.4.1 Trouble with Change

The first key theme I will present from each of their perspectives is ‘trouble with change’.

Connie’s Perspective ➢

Ir/Responsibility and the ‘Golden Throat’

I will open with an extract from Connie which unearthed a key theme in her data:

That has been something I hadn’t really wanted to accept, that she’s just not – it wasn’t about her being sort of disabled in a personal way. It was about her not really wanting to get off her arse and do the work […] she’s so talented she’s been given such fantastic opportunities and people are falling over themselves
to help her. But she’s not actually taking responsibility herself, for her talent. You know, and for the gift, she’s got a golden throat.

Empathic interpretative work offered insight into Connie’s perceptions and feelings about Lara. The metaphor of ‘a golden throat’ shone out from this text, and was suggestive of a voice that was admired as unique, precious, rich and highly valued. The term, ‘the gift’, gave a sense of this exceptional voice as something bequeathed to Lara rather than earned. However, Connie seemed frustrated by the student’s failure to take responsibility for such an extraordinary instrument. Her terse description of Lara as not ‘wanting to get off her arse’ seemed indicative of irritation. The text revealed a shift in Connie’s frameworks of meaning around diagnosis of Lara’s difficulties. There was a move from a perception of the student as influenced by something beyond her control (a disability), to framing the issues in terms of lack of student responsibility, self-discipline, motivation and volition i.e. ‘not wanting to’. Reference to people clamouring, ‘falling over themselves’, for this student, served to heighten the sense that this student was perceived as unusually gifted.

Connie’s response to watching the first video-excerpt of lesson interactions also revealed a shift in frameworks of meaning in relation to the question of responsibility / irresponsibility.

I wouldn’t expect her to hit her straps until she’s thirty. Maybe in a relationship, maybe with a child even, before she’s grown up enough and responsible enough to take full responsibility for this instrument, because it’s a stunning instrument, it’s just not right yet.

The temporal evocation of Lara’s future brought forth reference to age, developmental life stages, maturity, growing up and having a child. This latter reference seems to be gender normative in terms of framing a woman’s life trajectory as child-bearing, but it might also symbolically reveal the change in Lara that Connie believed necessary for her development as a singer. Lara was perhaps understood in this passage as not yet emotionally or developmentally mature enough to take responsibility for the ‘care’ / development of someone or something in her charge. There was a sense in this interview of Lara needing to take a duty of care towards the voice more seriously. Connie’s various descriptions of Lara’s voice - a ‘gift’, ‘stunning’, ‘a golden throat’, seemed to emphasise a sense of the student as having exceptional, outstanding and unusual potential. However frustration seemed to be aroused in Connie due to the student’s attitude and lack of responsibility that appeared to be troubling the teaching relationship. The next sub-theme offered further insights into Connie’s understanding of the impediments to progress.
Discipline and Authority: ‘I Can’t Be the School Mistress’

Connie conveyed a sense of being positioned in this relationship as follows:

a bit teacher-student rather than equal collaborator, teacher-student a bit. And she needs to grow through that [...] you know like she’s much more responsible for how the lesson goes in a way.

Empathic reading suggested that she experienced a differential in power that was not to her desire; she felt like ‘teacher-student’. This was suggestive of a sense of teacher authority-student submission, and was contrasted with the desired relationship: ‘equal collaborator’. The word ‘equal’ points to notions of equivalence or shared power, and the word ‘collaborator’ stimulates the idea of working on the same side, rather than working against one another, which was perhaps how Connie felt at times with Lara. The next extract afforded insights into Connie’s emotional experience of struggling to resist being pulled into a position of dominance with Lara.

really irritating for me, because my job is to get her voice working really well. But I can’t, I can’t be the school mistress that says, ‘If you don’t learn this word perfect for next week I am going to report you to the head of department.’ Or something, it’s not my way of working anyway. She’s got to be a collaborator.

Emotional irritation flows from the text and she had talked elsewhere in the interview about Lara not taking responsibility for practice between lessons. The satirising of taking up a position of disciplinarian ‘school mistress’ with Lara conveyed a sense of frustrated absurdity about feeling constellated into an authoritarian position in order to effect change with this student. Connie’s desire for a collaborative form of relating was clearly articulated. Relational interpretative reading could consider the relational situation from Connie’s perspective in terms of a pull towards complementarity (Benjamin, 1999) and a binary of authoritarian teacher versus care free irresponsible student. The relationship appeared to be experienced as a kind of troubling pass-the-parcel, with Connie feeling the parcel of responsibility for discipline continually falling into her lap, yet she needed Lara to take hold of this and to develop responsibility and self-discipline in order to progress.

Challenge: ‘Frighten the Rabbits’?

Connie revealed a concern about challenging Lara about her lack of responsibility in learning as follows.

I am trying my best for her, and not to frighten the rabbits I feel like she’d run, if I ever got really mad with her
I don’t roust at her, and yell at her or push her too hard. Why I hang back a bit and try and encourage with patience.

The metaphor of frightening the rabbits was suggestive; Lara was perhaps experienced as vulnerable and readily made anxious. Connie seemed to feel that her frustration and desire to be forceful expressed linguistically in the words ‘mad’, ‘roust’, ‘yell’, ‘push’ and ‘hard’, had to be contained. The student was perceived as needing a sensitive patient and supportive relational atmosphere. At another stage in the interview Connie had discussed the way that Lara had been very tearful at times in their early work and this was perhaps underlying her perception of Lara as vulnerable. A tension around being patient versus being challenging was expressed in the next extract.

It tries my patience; I’m being very patient with her. I probably should be less patient. But I don’t like to work in a negative environment. If I yelled at her or came over tough with her, I would lose a lot of what I’ve achieved, really, I think with her. I’m not sure; I should probably test the boundaries of that a bit more.

In this passage Connie revealed feeling impatient, but interrogated her reaction and her approach to Lara’s lack of responsibility. She seemed to initially construct the possibilities of styles of relating as a binary of being either ‘very patient’ or ‘tough’. A shift towards uncertainty and less polarised thinking emerged as she considered testing the confines of her understanding and of risking a more challenging stance. During the interview there was a shift in Connie’s perception of her way of relating with Lara. Initially framing herself as avoiding challenge, she watched one of the video excerpts of their lesson interactions and commented as follows.

So I am raising it, I am doing it [referring to challenging the student]

She’s getting there, she’s getting there, obviously I’m saying more to her about taking responsibility than I think I am

The video-data shown included interactions in which Connie challenged Lara verbally about not dedicating time between lessons to practice and her voice. Connie was surprised to observe this interactional challenge and the video observation seemed to afford the opportunity to take an observational stance towards her-self. This seemed to permit new awareness of what was taking place in her life-world world with Lara.

Lara’s Perspective

‘It’s All Kind of Too Fun’

The first extract under this sub-theme was drawn from the text which captured Lara’s comments about the first video-data excerpt of their lesson interactions.
having a bit of a laugh, a bit of a serious chat as well, but then – but there is always a bit of a laugh going on, unless it’s, I’m getting in trouble or something! (Laughs) But it’s – there is always a bit of a laugh and a bit of a – we have fun, I think, yeah, the majority of the time, I think we have fun.

Taking an empathic hermeneutic, three repetitions of the phrase ‘bit of a laugh’ and two repetitions of ‘we have fun’ conveyed a pervasive sense of joy and fun about this relationship. The ‘fun’ in this passage was briefly punctuated by divergence to a more ‘serious’ tone of relating, but even this was lightened by laughter as she portrayed herself as mischievous and ‘getting in trouble’.

The next extract revealed further insights:

sometimes I do worry that the singing and the lessons and the coaching […] it’s all kind of too fun, because that is not what a job should be

This extract indicated that the student was slightly troubled, indicated by the word ‘worry’, about the degree of carefree enjoyment that she experienced in learning, and how that might relate to a future professional life, referenced in her phrase ‘what a job should be’. This perhaps alluded to an awareness of the hard work or serious responsibility that developing a career as an opera chorister might require.

Doing it for the Teacher?

Lara’s thoughts about her own progress were revealed in this passage:

I wish I could learn faster because then I could get even more and I want to be good. I want to learn it all so that I can be good for her. You know, it’s kind of that kid – you know when you’re a kid and you want to ‘Oh, I just want to do well’

Bringing about more rapid change, ‘I wish I could learn faster’, suggested that Lara perceived delay in her progress. Empathic interpretative work indicated a desire to progress in order to be something for her teacher, to please or to fulfil her teacher’s desires, as expressed in the phrase ‘so that I can be good for her’. Linguistic reference to early developmental life stage of being a ‘kid’ was suggestive of feelings of being emotionally young and of looking up to her teacher.

The next passage taken from Lara’s interview offers a route into understanding her feelings and thoughts about source of motivation in learning:

Lara: I want to do well for her because I know she wants me to do well […]
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Paula: if [...] you are trying to think, ‘Who do I want to do well for most?’ Do you feel you want to do well for her more than you want to do well for you? Or do you feel that is quite equal? Or.

Lara: That’s… Wow! Because I do want to do well for me, because that’s what I’m there for, but, Whoaa! A whole lot of psychological issues, because I suppose it probably would be her. But not a, it’s not like a, that’s not a conscious thought day to day.

During this section of the interview, Lara became rather disconcerted and this came through in exclamations - ‘Wow!’, ‘Whoaaal’, and in her phrase ‘a whole lot of psychological issues’. Reference to the latter might be read in multiple ways: perhaps revealing anxiety about capacity to self-motivate rather than depend upon Connie for this. It might also point to her awareness of my professional background as a psychologist or to anxieties about being revealed or exposed in the relationship with me. This student, by self-definition, indicated a preference for relating that was light-hearted and less serious, and my question perhaps pushed her towards thinking more deeply and seriously about her way of being. Her positioning of Connie as the primary source of motivation was portrayed as out of conscious daily awareness. This might indicate that Lara was not fully aware of her own emotional states and relational motivations; and this coheres with Lara’s sense of being at a young emotional developmental stage, like a ‘kid’, as she put it.

The following extracts emerged during a part of the interview where Lara began to imagine her relationship with Connie ending:

if my student-teacher relationship fell apart, I know I’d just be like, ‘Well, I don’t want to sing anymore.’

say hypothetically if my teaching relationship was to fall apart, and so I know that I’d then search for another teacher. And then, hypothetically, if all the teachers I found after that were just like, ‘Ah, no, no, no. It’s not right. It’s not right. It’s not right. It’s not right.’ I know that I would just – I would just – I would just be like, ‘There is no point.’

Oh my God, yeah. Oh my God, yeah, yeah, yeah, no it would take a long time to get over the motivation that she gives.

These passages create a vivid picture of the depth of emotional attachment that this student experienced with this teacher. There was a well-spring of anticipated loss and despair that was touched upon when an end of relationship was imagined. The search for a replacement teacher, indicated in the second extract above, gave rise to a sense of hopeless protest that would be felt, revealed in linguistic repetitions: ‘no, no, no’, ‘it’s not right. It’s not right. It’s not right.’ The final extract highlighted Lara’s feelings about the motivation that she derived from being with Connie; the phrase ‘it would take a long
time to get over’ seemed evocative of the process of mourning. The expression of feelings of futility conveyed in the phrases: ‘I don't want to sing anymore’ and ‘there is no point’ are common to the experience of grief; and as such this could be understood as indicative of significant emotional attachment and dependency. This revealed a potential problematic and troubling aspect for Lara in her learning process as there was a sense that a primary source of motivation for study was her teacher, rather than herself.

**Challenge: ‘Pulling Me Up’**

The extract below gave evidence of Lara’s perception of a moment of challenge in the teaching relationship.

the week before I was singing really badly and she was like, ‘**Well, why didn’t you come for lessons when – why didn’t you? What happened? Why not?**’ I was like, ‘**Oh but, I don’t know, I just (groans),**’ and I know how frustrating I was and she was just, she was pulling me up on it

In this extract Lara was referring to an interaction between herself and Connie in the week previous to the video-recorded lesson. Connie was portrayed in the above account as challenging Lara, indicated linguistically in the phrase ‘pulling me up’ and in the representation of Connie’s interrogation of her non-attendance. The passage revealed that the student was aware of arousing frustration in her teacher due to her non-attendance at lessons.

The next extract revealed the way that Lara made sense of Connie’s reactions.

She does care and otherwise – if she didn't care, she wouldn't get as frustrated, I don't think, um. And, yeah, I mean after the lesson before this one, I then, I did go away and was actually, ‘**No, she’s right,**’ and I did do a lot more work.

Teacher frustration was made sense of by Lara as an indicator of emotional care or concern for her. Connie’s challenge of Lara appeared to have been experienced as a stimulant of change in behaviour as Lara revealed she committed herself to work more.

A section of dialogue between Lara and I will now be analysed. In this excerpt the student was talking about the lesson which took place the week before the video-recorded lesson, in which Connie had challenged her about not going to lessons when she was encountering personal issues.

Lara: I feel that she wants the best for me and that’s why she does it and, you know-

Paula: You look slightly tearful as you’re talking.
Lara: Ah yeah – no because it's quite – because I, I do really respect what she has to say [...] she wants the best for me whether I want it for myself or not, right? (Laughs).

Paula: Okay, that's a question for you is it? When you just said that – or is that?

Lara: Err, I do want the best for myself, but I have these moments of like, 'No!' You know. And that's when she pulls me up on things.

In this dialogue, there was a sense of Lara recognising that Connie cared about her learning ‘she wants the best for me’. Her emotional reaction to thinking about Connie’s concern was noticeable, hence my observation that she was tearful. The text moved to discussion of her respect for Connie and this was followed by a highly revealing statement. There was recognition that her teacher really ‘wants the best’ for her, yet she indicated she struggled at times with self-sabotage, acting in ways that were not evidence of wanting the best for herself. The emotional sadness seemed to emerge at the moment of experiencing this conflict between her recognition of Connie as supportive of her progress and herself as pushing against progress at times. The contradiction, which became clear as she spoke, was turned into a question when she said ‘right?’ I experienced this as a call upon me to offer some response to this dilemma and I felt she was grappling with her awareness in the interactional moment of our interview exchange. In order not to lead nor foreclose on her own sense-making of this contradiction, I made an observation that a question was being asked perhaps of her-self rather than interpersonally in our interview; this led to a further iteration of her self-contradiction. Reference to both wanting the best for her-self and acting against her-self were communicated in the phrase ‘I have these moments of like, ‘No!’ In such moments, Connie was presented as challenging her (pulling her up).

An interrogative interpretation of this finding could posit that interpersonally there was a binary configuration in their relationship at times of the student working against change (moments of self-sabotage) and the teacher working for change (wanting the best and pulling her up in those moments). This binary could also be interpreted as an intrapsychic conflict within Lara as she both wanted the best for herself, but had some awareness of working against her best interest. There appeared to be only partial awareness of this latter aspect of self.

I will now move onto the final key theme for this dyad.
6.4.2 Rapport

Connie’s Perspective ➢

‘Lovely, Lovely’

Despite feelings of intense frustration at times, Connie conveyed a strong sense of affection for and emotional involvement with Lara. When asked what seemed of significance to her about their relationship, this was her response.

this is a lovely, lovely person [Lara], and I want her to love me. I think there’s some of that in there. Yeah. [...] You can see what a beautiful creature she is. It's not a physical thing at all, it's there's an aura and a personality in there, that if it's coaxed into life, is going to be wonderful, absolutely wonderful and I would be very happy to help her do that.

Empathic reading of the language of this text brings to the foreground a sense that Connie experienced feelings of love and affection in this relationship: ‘lovely, lovely person’, ‘beautiful’, ‘absolutely wonderful’, and ‘happy’. Connie’s desire for wanting mutual affection and perhaps the experience of intimacy to be shared emerged in the phrase ‘I want her to love me’. This seemed to reveal the depth of emotional commitment that this teacher felt with this student.

Lara’s Perspective ➢

‘Warm and Lovely’

Lara talked about the relationship in the following way:

Going to Connie’s is – it is kind, it’s like – it’s going home to, you know, it’s, ‘cause we go to her house and she’s so warm and lovely, and so professional at the same time. It’s just – it is a joy.

The language of affection was conveyed in this passage: ‘warm and lovely’ and ‘a joy’. The phrase ‘going home’ seemed to be particularly poignant. It stood out in her narrative as reaching beyond the immediate phrase or context, as it seemed to capture her feelings of emotional attachment and belonging that were keenly felt with this teacher.

Lara responded to my question about what she liked about Connie in the following way:

So warm and, it’s like yeah, so motherly or grandmotherly or. I can’t – it’s just a family member who – it’s like, 'Ah, I want a hug!' (Laughs). Yeah, yeah.

This text draws on metaphors of familial relational attachments, suggesting that Connie was experienced by Lara almost as if she were a close family member, a mother or
grandmother. The exclamation 'I want a hug!' revealed feelings of emotional closeness and affection. This teacher seemed to be beloved by this student and the sense of a child with a parent was again evoked since the affection was not conveyed as between adults or equals, but rather between generations.

Her learning with Connie was spoken of as follows.

I love it. I love it.

I love learning with her and I’ve gained so much from it.

The joy and pleasure of being in a relationship with Connie was evident.

6.4.3 Triangulation of Perspectives: Connie ➔ Lara

Triangulation of perspectives from Connie and Lara revealed that both experienced change as a troubling process. For the teacher this focused around a perception that the student struggled to take responsibility for practice and self-discipline; and on her sense that relationally she was being pushed in the dyad into taking responsibility for Lara and into becoming authoritarian or disciplinarian. This was a source of frustration as this relational configuration was in contrast to her desired way of being. Connie’s perception of the student as having extraordinary vocal potential that could remain unfulfilled also seemed to fuel frustration. The teacher appeared to seek a collaborative or more horizontal relationship, yet felt nudged towards being hierarchical and dominant. She seemed to be relationally configured towards the position of a parental role or a teacher who would ‘pull up’ Lara, as if the student were a young child. Lara concomitantly revealed a deference and dependence towards her teacher and appeared to be pressing Connie into hierarchical or more vertical relations of power. Findings revealed mutual understanding of this pattern in their relating and relational interpretation might suggest that complementary forms of relating in the dyad along the dimension teacher dominance–student dependence were evident. This was despite Connie’s resistance to such relational invitations to become the disciplinarian. This relational configuration seemed to be problematic in learning since the student’s capacity to self-motivate, self-discipline, and to develop her own centre of authority was perhaps curtailed by dependency.

For the student, her sense of the process of change was characterised by an enormous sense of fun and lack of seriousness; but there was also a partial and troubling awareness of her dependence on her teacher and of her conflict between wanting to progress and acting against her own best interests (i.e. self-sabotaging).
Both teacher and student perspectives revealed that the student was framed as the one in whom the hindrance to change resided, but there was clear variation in the way that they each understood the specific nature of the hindrance in learning. Teacher and student findings converged in relation to their call upon notions of developmental life stage to talk about Lara’s maturity and young emotional state that was hindering her learning. Furthermore Lara’s use of a parental metaphor to convey her feelings about Connie indicated relations of dependency. Lara’s account revealed an awareness of her capacity to frustrate her teacher and this was found to converge with findings from Connie; she was indeed frustrated by Lara. Despite Connie’s reporting of concealing and containing her frustration in order not to ‘frighten’ Lara, the frustration was clearly perceived by Lara. Relational interpretation could suggest that this shared knowledge was in the domain of implicit relational knowing (Stern, 1998) which is constituted by non-declarative, implicit understandings that develop within a specific relational context, since their respective interviews had indicated that ‘frustration’ had not been explicitly shared or declared between them. Despite episodes of frustration, challenge, unsettling emotions and trouble in bringing about change, findings revealed that the student experienced the relationship as a caring one. The pervasive positive climate of relational rapport and mutual affection, identified in both accounts, perhaps enabled difficult interactions to be tolerable, rather than becoming the source of relational impasse.

This dyad revealed that feelings of love and affection were mutually experienced in the one-to-one relationship and that such emotional states were enjoyed and un-troubling.

6.5 Preliminary Discussion and Summary of Findings from Cluster 2

This chapter has presented the themes and sub-themes from the cluster of Connie and her two students, Hannah and Lara.

Looking into the life worlds of these two dyads, both dyads revealed that the process of learning involved implicit and explicit expectations of change in the student and in both pairs there was evidence that trying to effect change was a troubling process, albeit for very different reasons. The data revealed that frameworks of meaning employed to make sense of stasis or delays in progress had points of convergence and significant divergence between teacher and student in a dyad. Diagnosis of the problem in learning was not found to be fixed and static, but instead there were shifting, partial and contradictory understandings. This was particularly evident in the case of Lara who
appeared to be both unaware of any issue when she was in the mode of having fun and being care-free, and partially coming into new awareness during the interview process of her high level of dependence on her teacher and her contradictory desires to both progress and self-sabotage. There appeared to be evidence in all of their accounts of relational tensions that emerged in relation to the teacher seeking to affect some kind of change in the student and of the students being unable to or acting against the desired change.

Findings revealed that teacher empathy and concern were evoked when the student was perceived as disabled in some way, i.e. having a difficulty that was beyond their control. An example of this was Connie’s response to the vocal damage that she perceived as having been done to Hannah by a previous teacher’s harmful teaching methods and misdiagnosis of the voice. Conversely, teacher frustration was provoked when frameworks of meaning indicated that she understood the difficulty as somehow under the student’s control or volition. In this instance, students seemed to be experienced as thwarting teacher desires and this aroused irritation and anger. There was convergence in the data across this cluster that such feelings were however contained by this teacher and not acted upon in a non-reflexive retaliatory reactive manner. Rather there was evidence in both the teacher account and the student accounts that troubling interpersonal interactions and teacher frustration, although unsettling for students, were experienced positively. Indeed Lara spoke of her teacher’s frustration as indicative of care; and Hannah was deeply affected by the episode of conflict between her and Connie where she contested her teacher’s wishes and authority. Although there were negative vocal and emotional consequences to her, this difficult interaction and challenge seemed to proffer a profound discovery about her capacity to assert her autonomy in relatedness with a teacher. This was particularly meaningful and poignant in this dyad, since the data had revealed evidence of a distressing ‘traumatic’ previous teaching relationship. In the current dyad with Connie, there was an experience of a new relational knowing, as Connie had not reacted punitively when her power / authority was contested. Instead, both teacher and student accounts revealed that she was supportive and empathic, although frustrated, and that she allowed the student to assert her own choices and learn from her own decisions. This relational episode of challenge was interpreted through the notion of a moment of meeting (Stern, 1998) where destabilisation in the relational system led to new relational understandings for the student. The teacher’s capacity to balance the contradictions of asserting her own wishes whilst concurrently recognising the needs and desires of a student, particularly when they were contrary to her own was interpreted in relation to the concept of mutual recognition (Benjamin, 1999).
The data from this cluster revealed that some teacher-student pairings can be destructive for student development and other pairings can be creatively enhancing and foster student well-being. Findings from Hannah revealed that in one teaching relationship she had experienced feeling trapped, powerless, loss of confidence and serious vocal health problems that required medical intervention, and had reached a point of wanting to give up singing. The impact of that ‘traumatic’ experience was revealed as not confined to the past, but continued to have influence and implications in the current teaching relationship. Paired with a different teacher (Connie) the student experienced herself as flourishing, vocally developing, gaining in confidence, able to assert authority, and feeling a love of singing again. This highlighted the role of the interpersonal relationship in shaping the experience and outcomes of learning and of influencing student relatedness with the voice and motivation for music making. It also brings into question the notion of student autonomy as a characteristic of the individual, and instead suggests that student autonomy may be a relational achievement of the dyad.

Findings from this cluster highlighted the significance of emotion in the process of teaching and learning. The experience of frustration and annoyance were strongly felt by the teacher, and such emotions can be understood as inevitable and ubiquitous in human relationship (McNamee & Gergen, 1999). Emotions of love and affection, which were felt to create a positive relational climate in one of the dyads, were found. Feelings of pleasure, joy and delight were expressed in both dyads.

States of desire and passion, which were recounted as not acted upon sexually, were identified in one of the student accounts in relation to a past teaching relationship. This experience was found to be exciting at first, but ultimately became a source of distress and harm in the relationship due to the dynamics of power in the dyad. The intense private teaching situation seemed to act as a crucible for the fusion of love of music, interpersonal intimacy and ardent feelings of aesthetic admiration and desire. This seemed to have placed this young student in a highly vulnerable position in relation to a teacher. The teacher had been experienced as acting in punitive and retaliatory ways when the student ended the relationship and lack of institutional support appeared to have heightened distress. The state of dependence and of feeling trapped, seemed to suggest an impasse of complementarity (Benjamin, 1999) in that relationship; it was terminated due to the difficulties. It is important to note that the lack of the past teacher’s perspective means that triangulation of findings cannot be achieved in relation to that particular dyad; however the student’s perspective revealed her experience and the negative implications of such experiencing.
In terms of power relations; the pair Connie and Hannah revealed that power relations were shifting and not static or fixed. The teacher data revealed that their relationship was at times characterised by a sense of equality and collaboration; and at other times there was a contesting of teacher power and authority by the student. It is possible that the relationship did not become fixed in a binary impasse due to teacher capacity to recognise the student's autonomy and to avoid becoming dictatorial even when the desire to be so was activated by the student’s refusal to take her advice.

Findings from Connie’s data in both dyads revealed that she experienced a struggle when constellation into the position of authoritarian / dominant / dictatorial teacher as this collided with her desire for more collaborative negotiated forms of relating. Impulses to take the former positions were indicated in her data, but this was found to be resisted or troubling for her. The data across this cluster seemed to indicate that pervasive patterns of relational configurations of student dependence-teacher dominance were linked with negative effects on the process of learning. Lara’s over dependence on Connie and Hannah’s state of absolute dependence with her past teacher seemed to be associated with difficulties in effecting change and more seriously perhaps with potential disengagement with singing altogether.

This data revealed that the teaching relationship was construed through a range of relational metaphors including familial attachment relationship (parent-child) and a therapeutic healing relationship (revealed through the metaphor of the wounded healer).

In this chapter I presented findings from cluster 2. Further discussion in relation to findings from the other cluster and from the individual interviews strand of the study appears in the Discussion Chapter (see Chapter 9).
# Chapter 7: Findings from Individual Teacher Interviews

## 7.1 Introduction

This chapter presents findings from the individual teacher interview strand of this study. Key themes from the data analysis are listed in the table below in the left hand column and sub-themes appear in the right hand column. These themes are discussed in turn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bringing about Change</td>
<td>Resistance and Frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress and Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict of Needs: Student versus Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Relations</td>
<td>Teacher Dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Teachers</td>
<td>Tricky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accepting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy &amp; Distance</td>
<td>The Value and Complexity of Intimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Value of Separateness and Emotional Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Need for Institutional Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexities of Trust &amp; Honesty</td>
<td>Mis/trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Value and Trouble with Honesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour and Play</td>
<td>Humour and Play</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6: Themes and Sub-themes for Individual Teacher Interviews*


7.2 Bringing about Change

The teaching relationship was framed in all the teacher accounts as one that involved and was predicated on bringing about change in the student and this was expressed as having significance for the relationship. Three sub-themes were identified under this theme: Resistance and Frustration, Progress and Risk, and Conflict of Needs: Student versus Institution.

Resistance and Frustration

The process of effecting change was portrayed as perplexing to teachers when they encountered a lack of change or stasis in the student or where the pace of change was felt to be too slow. Frameworks of meaning drawn upon by teachers tended to locate the ‘problem’ within the student and the following exemplify the kind of explanations communicated about students in this regard: ‘deep-seated insecurity’ (T10), history of ‘trauma’ (T03), ‘obstructive’ (T04), deference to teacher (T07), fear (T03/T07/T10), lack of responsibility for learning (T06), ‘rigid’ as a person (T02), and ‘too interested in other things’ (T10).

The dominant narrative, identified in seven of the eight teacher accounts, was of student ‘resistance’. The following passages were indicative of this type of framework of meaning:

T06: there's a resistance. It probably is slight dyslexia but there’s a resistance to learning detailed, precise things about music and there’s a resistance, she’s not a linguist either, so things are almost, they’re always almost there, but they never get there. And that’s quite hard to teach because one wants to be encouraging because there’s some very, very good things about it always, but you also want to get all the things that are not right about it, to get them [raised voice] right. And she can’t or won't, or isn’t, it doesn’t happen. […] It’s frustrating

T09: and to have a student like this, I found so upsetting because I couldn't start because she just couldn't, there were too many, whatever, problems - I don't know, mental problems. I couldn't get in there and I couldn't chip away at her (laugh) to try and help her and I found that so frustrating.

T07: they have an area where they're going to struggle, that's when that resistance is likely to come up. And so as a teacher, I need to decide do I keep pushing at the resistance or do I find something else to do or do we find another way to deal with that resistant point. And that's great. It's very good [...] It's part of the pleasure of teaching [...] but usually less fun
The first two extracts revealed frustration when teachers were faced with difficulties in achieving their aims with students; this was identified across the teacher accounts. The first extract (T06) revealed that more than one framework of meaning was drawn upon to understand difficulties - the student was framed as possibly having a learning disability 'dyslexia', but the dominant formulation was of student 'resistance'. The last sentence in that extract: 'she can't or won't, or isn't, it doesn't happen' suggested confusion or conflicted understandings of the nature of difficulties. The extract from T07 revealed a dilemma when student resistance was perceived; to push / challenge resistance or to search for alternative resolutions.

Another extract illustrates the link between encountering stasis or lack of progress and the arousal of frustration:

T10: I couldn’t get anywhere with her. And in the end, I thought, ‘There’s no point’. It was frustrating. [...] I just realised if I got frustrated, it wasn’t going to help her.

[Continued later] if they’re not doing what I want them to do, because they can’t or it’s not ‘cos they’re not trying – I think that’s it. I have to – I have to keep reminding myself, ‘Look, this person isn’t deliberately trying to do something you don’t want them to do. Uhm, and they’re not being obtuse, they’re not stupid, they’re not difficult’.

The emergence of frustration and hopelessness (‘there’s no point’) when change was not forthcoming in the student, was clear in this account. There was a sense here of a teacher who reflexively interrogated her reactions; the self-talk seemed suggestive of attempts to reframe experience so that the student could be understood from perspectives other than as someone who was intentionally frustrating her or being obstructive. This passage was indicative of findings across this data set of the experience of lack of change in the student being experienced as a negative relational transaction in which the student was felt to be actively thwarting the teacher’s will or aims.

Progress and Risk

The sub-theme of progress appeared in six of the teacher accounts in relation to positive emotions of joy, pleasure, excitement and pride.

The following extracts were examples:

T03: the joy in the, in the sound of the voice ‘cos you see a young woman gaining vocal confidence all the time daring to push the boundaries, little bit further, and that just, sometimes I’m very moved [...] I mean I’m very
moved even to speak about it now [participant became tearful] and that's tears of joy.

T09  I feel very excited by that kind of episode in a lesson, when there's a sort of 'light bulb moment' and understanding, a meeting of minds and then the realisation that the student realises that, you know, that they own that particular aspect or element of their singing, that that's what, maybe, makes them a unique performer, you know. That's what really excites me [laughs]

T04: when you see significant emotional, musical, technical things flourish, you know, and you feel that you've had a part in, a really enormous part, even though its specific to singing and becoming a performer, I feel as if the work goes way beyond that and that it feels like you've helped, you've been part of unlocking something in a person [...] I do feel enormously proud

These extracts suggest strength of emotional commitment and depth of feeling that teachers experienced when recognising their student's developmental achievements. Progress was portrayed both as an individual achievement of the student and one that was collaboratively realised in some of the accounts.

Student capacity to take risk and tolerate uncertainty in the relationship was perceived by three teachers as an important characteristic for vocal development. The following are illustrative of these comments:

T04: often the technical development, for example, you're asking them to, kind of, go to the edge of a cliff and jump into a place of physiological unfamiliarity [...] So they go to viscerally very different place. That's what I am trying to encourage them to do and they can't do that unless they really believe that you're trustworthy [...] the moment when they take those risks is when you know; you're at a place where that relationship is at its optimum

T07: being open to taking risks [...] And that risk can be you know, looking stupid in front of the teacher in the one-to-one relationship or it can be looking stupid in front of an audience [...] and that level of risk is something that performers need to deal with all the time.

T10: this thing about the bravery. Being brave enough to do things in lessons. And not feel inhibited.

The accounts indicated that teachers viewed student capacity to tolerate risk, uncertainty, unfamiliarity and self-exposure in the teaching relationship as important for the purposes of technical and performance development. T04's extract also conveyed the significance of qualities of the teacher-student relationship in creating optimal conditions for such risk taking, evidencing a perception that the interpersonal
relationship played an important role in risk taking rather than this being solely a characteristic of the individual student.

**A Conflict of Needs: Student versus Institution**

The pressure of being in a position of trying to bring about change in the student according to institutional deadlines, procedural structures and expectations was identified in six accounts. Teachers were troubled by a conflict between navigating the needs of the student versus the demands of the institutional context.

T01: I found that it was very, very hard to have to churn people off to do that exam, with these things, at that time and some of them weren't ready for it, some needed more time and I hated the pressure to, almost like forcing a bud, I felt, you know, it was like I was being a horticulturalist and I was being asked to make the rose bloom next week. When I knew this was going to be a Chelsea Flower Show winner in a month, but if we bloom next week I'm afraid it, you know it wasn't going to happen.

T04: a student might get a place at a conservatoire when I don't think that they are appropriate. They're forced to jump through hoops at a particular point in their development and I don't think they're ready. So I have conflict

[Continued later] perhaps I have a different opinion than the conservatoire of whether they should be there or not and so that's [...] already a difficult thing to negotiate in terms of a relationship.

These extracts revealed the teachers’ emotional struggles of trying to navigate the tension between serving institutional demands and prioritising the individual within the context of their particular learning situation and needs. Institutional pressures seemed to be experienced as impinging upon the workings of the relationship in troubling ways.

Another example illustrates this issue:

T07: if they get a bad result which isn't necessarily from me but from the panel or a result that it isn't as high as they would like it [...] then I become sort of culpable in that mark, in that bad mark in their minds

[Continued later] there are students who sort of close down and don't want to, just don't want to engage anymore after that experience of a mark that they felt wasn't right

The perception of the negative effects of assessment on the dynamics of teacher-student relating was conveyed here. Unmet student expectations / desires for particular grades seemed to be experienced as having negative interactional and emotional implications for the teaching process. A 'bad mark' seemed to create a
rupture in the relationship which was communicated as having detrimental effects on student capacity to remain engaged with the teacher.

7.3 Power Relations

The theme of power relations revealed three sub-themes: teacher dominance, collaboration and student autonomy.

Teacher Dominance

A theme of vertical power relations was identified in four accounts. The positioning of the teacher as dominant or authority in the relationship was conveyed variously and linguistically through reference to teacher as ‘God’, ‘Master’ and ‘bully’.

Accounts revealed a tension between the impulse or desire to be dominant in the relationship versus an articulated ideal of developing a dialogic type of relating. The following illustrates this kind of conflict:

T03: sometimes of course one wants to just shake the student by the shoulders and say 'look I know this is right, just do it. Don't ask questions just do it', but actually you can't do that, because these are growing people and they need to make their own mistakes and we need to uh respect their place

In this text, the conflict between wanting to dictate to the student, conveyed in the phrase ‘Don't ask questions just do it’ was counterpoised with a sense that such an approach was questionable. A more student-centred approach that respects student need to discover learning on their terms was revealed as the desirable approach.

The perception of the student as the one who creates or desires the power differential with the teacher was captured in the next extract:

T03: the younger students’ perception of the teacher as a role model in this one-to-one situation is very much uh, ‘you’re the God, and I know nothing […] and therefore, you, I gain everything from you and I can be silent and you know I just do what I’m told’

This passage indicated teacher perception of younger students as deferential / passive ('I just do what I’m told') to an absolute omniscient authority; i.e. teacher as ‘God’. This understanding of the student as the originator of the deferential dynamic towards teacher authority was also revealed in the following interview:

T07: the student-master relationship and I think it is dangerous simply to say that it's not valid because it is very valuable […] some people, as I said
before, I feel want to learn by being told what to do and feeling the master is giving them the information

[Continued elsewhere] Some conductors will have that master-student concept in their heads [...] they will have a very clear idea of what they want to do and, in the end, the singer has to do that. If you’re engaged with an orchestra and you’re working with a conductor, the conductor is God and he gets to decide what happens. So in a sense singers do need to be able to adapt to that master-student relationship

[Continued elsewhere] I think the problem, if that’s the only experience they have and if that’s the key way that they work, then they’ll struggle when they’re on stage with a director who’s very vague and not, doesn’t hold [...] specific ideas. They’ll struggle in working with colleagues because the colleagues will want to be open and sharing ideas rather than just being told what to do.

The first extract suggested that this teacher held an understanding that some students were the instigators or creators of a submission-dominance type of relational configuration, as the teacher stated: ‘some people [...] I feel want to learn by being told what to do’. The metaphor of conductor as ‘God’ in the future career context revealed teacher perceptions of the need for students to be able to accept and work within power relations of submission to an absolute authority. Such forms of relatedness in teaching seem to be understood as providing a valuable relational template for future professional relationships. Both the values and constraints of the student-master (submissive-dominance) model of relating in one-to-one tuition were revealed in his account. The last extract indicated this teacher’s belief that students who only understand how to relate within a submission-dominance type of model would struggle in the professional context when more collaborative forms of relating may be required (i.e. when there is a call for collegiate openness and sharing of ideas).

Teacher dominance was identified in the data in a more disturbing and extreme form in one interview:

T09: there are also many singing teachers, I mean I can think of a couple and I won’t name them but there are a couple in [name of conservatoire] who are harsh to the point of, I mean they actually bully their students and I know this because I’ve coached [...] some of those students and they’ve told me about it [...] because they’ve been so upset by what’s been said to them [...] it knocks their confidence

This account revealed teacher perceptions of students who she felt had been subject to excessively harsh behaviour from her colleagues. The word ‘bully’ was evocative of coercive power relations and in this passage other teachers were presented as causing emotional distress and negatively influencing students’ confidence. This suggests a
link between power relations that negate student needs / experiencing in the relationship and negative learning outcomes.

**Collaboration**

Five teachers talked of valuing the experience of collaboration and mutual relating with students. Language employed to describe such teacher-student interactions included reciprocal (T07/T09), collaborative (T06/T07), mutual (T07), a coming together (T09) and feeding off one another (T04). Metaphors of equal ‘energy’ exchange (T04, T07, and T09) were also used.

The following passages were indicative of comments made:

**T07:** the master/student relationship does play a part in all teaching, I suppose but [...] what I’d much rather have is ideas given back to me and, and that collaborative feeling that I can make a suggestion, the student can make a suggestion back and we can try things out, and it’s a process of learning together.

**T04:** I think it’s something to do with the feeling that I’m putting in 120% energy and they’re putting in the same [...] it really feels like it’s the two of us learning together. That’s when I feel I’m most helpful as a teacher [...] it’s a teaching/learning space where they, they’re, we’re feeding off each other.

**T10:** there’s very much a coming together at a certain level in teaching

A sense of pleasure and teacher engagement in the learning process was conveyed. There was a sense of give and take, a ‘collaborative feeling’ and all the above employed the notion of learning ‘together’. Teacher T07 revealed elsewhere in his interview that his ability to relate in a collaborative way was linked to growth of professional confidence:

**T07:** I’m more prepared now to take on board what I’m getting from the students and to be open to what they’re going to bring to the lesson and bring to the work we do. I think 10 years ago or even 5 years ago all that preparation and planning was because I wasn’t confident enough to let them break into that relationship [...] I am more confident and comfortable because I feel that I can be more open just to let the students bring their own material to what we do, rather than me dictating.

Linguistic expressions of allowing the student to ‘break into that relationship’, being ‘more open’ and no longer ‘dictating’ were suggestive of relinquishing power and control in the relationship. There seemed to be a shift towards horizontal sharing of power in the field of relating. Interpretation of the passage might suggest that anxiety
about uncertainty and efficacy in formative stages of professional development had been managed through control and dominance of the relational space with students. With growth in confidence and perhaps establishment of a more coherent stable professional sense of teacher identity, this may have opened up the possibility of new forms of relatedness with students. This could suggest that a collaborative relationship with students brings with it a greater sense of emotional risk and uncertainty, since a teacher is positioned alongside students rather than in a state of dominance or control.

**Student Autonomy**

Findings revealed that four teachers articulated an aspiration of working towards encouraging student autonomy and independence. These were indicative comments:

- **T06:** I like to look forward towards a student's independence

  [elsewhere in interview] I think you need to become a good enough judge to be able to operate without your teacher being there all the time.

- **T03:** for the young ones, it’s a question of encouraging them to be autonomous, rather than lead them by the nose through everything

  [Elsewhere in interview] as they get older, they begin to start their own engine and do it by themselves

One teacher perceived students as more independent in contemporary conservatoires, when compared with her own experience of being a student.

- **T09:** Your typical student nowadays would have a one-hour lesson, one a week. There’s no supervised practice in between [...] it makes the student much more self-reliant and because we have the benefit of technology now and we can record ourselves and listen back to lessons repeatedly, I think that students now are much more self-reliant, proactive, independent in their learning. They are not having to be spoon-fed so much, in terms of, you know like, the meaning of an aria [...] they’ll go away and look it up. We’ve got the Net now, of-course, to help us with all that. So things have really changed.

This extract revealed a perception of contemporary students as more independent in learning due to the structuring of lessons, lack of supervised practice between lessons and technological and electronic innovations. The evocation of the changing world and its influence on teaching framed this teacher’s sense making of the difference between her experience as a student and the present day experience of students whom she perceived as more autonomous in learning.
The theme of power relations thus revealed a range of perceptions across accounts, with students understood in the relationship as deferential and passive to teacher authority, collaborators in the relationship and independent of teachers.

### 7.4 Changing Teachers

The theme of students changing teachers emerged as a ‘tricky’ and emotionally difficult process for the teacher and as a student decision that should be accepted and supported. I will now discuss each of these areas.

**‘Tricky’**

Findings revealed that the process of changing teachers was perceived as a troubling process for teachers (in six accounts). The following convey the type of concerns:

**T06:** it’s very tricky for [...] staff in the vocal department if somebody leaves them because they take it very personally

[Continued later] she decided that she would leave this teacher and she had already set up a consultation lesson with another one. So I have to say ‘Don’t do that because that will upset the first teacher’

**T03:** when it comes to a change of teacher within the school, then it’s more tricky, because there are personality issues to be dealt with

[Continued later] There are the very, very possessive ones, the ones who think that, that ‘the student has come to me, they will learn with me, I will give them everything they need’, and if that student has a desire to change teacher or go and work with somebody else, then that, that is very offensive, to the, to the teacher who is being rejected.

**T02:** she [referring to a student] said should she tell the teacher that she’s with, that she’s thinking of leaving, and I said ‘No. I wouldn’t until you decide what you’re going to do because’, for me, the minute that they say that they’re not happy, or that they’re thinking of going to another teacher [...] the circle of trust, or whatever you want to call it, is broken and not, I know that sounds really dram-, that sounds dramatic but they’re, they’re obviously not, they’re not, they, they don’t have the faith in you any longer, total faith

The experience of students wanting to and trying to navigate a change of teacher was conveyed as ‘tricky’ and complex. Teachers were presented in these extracts as finding this upsetting (T06), offensive and rejecting (T03) and damaging to trust (T02) and students seemed to be advised not to inform teachers of their decisions until a change was taking place. Teaching relationships thus appeared as unable to contain and sensitively respond to students’ wishes to change teacher. The depiction of some teachers as possessive and insulted by student desire for a change (T03) might
suggest that narcissistic or emotional needs of some teachers take precedent over students’ needs.

One teacher discussed her own experience as a student when she had struggled to change teachers:

T09: I remember from my own experience of being the student at Music College [...] when you are in a situation where you feel you need to move teachers; it’s very difficult to have the courage to speak up [...] I waited, probably, 2 years – longer than I needed to, to move teachers [...] I was terrified of offending the teacher because she was extremely well known as a singer [...] I felt that ‘Oh, it must be me. I’m not understanding’ and I waited far too long. I think a lot of singers go through that

In this account the teacher appeared to empathise with current students who may struggle with trying to change teachers. Recollections of being a student revealed anxieties about offending her teacher. Use of the words ‘terrified’ and ‘courage to speak up’ and the portrayal of a protracted process that took ‘far too long’ revealed the fear involved in navigating this within a teaching relationship. The process of changing appeared to have been delayed by difficulties in discerning whether the problem in learning resided within her or within the teacher, and in trusting her own judgement.

Accepting

A slightly more accepting narrative about students changing teachers also emerged in three accounts. The following were examples:

T02: people think that they want to get an experience of somebody else while they’re still here, somebody different. You know, and that’s, normally that’s fine, that’s not a problem.

T03: there are the ones [referring to types of teacher] who seem to hope that their student will go in search of whatever they feel they need at the right moment and therefore we’re only human, we can’t have total knowledge, therefore I’ve reached my limit, I can’t offer you any more, you’re not listening to what I’m saying therefore you have my permission to go and consult another teacher

Although these accounts appeared to emphasise student need / right to change teacher and to search for a good fit for their learning needs, both also seemed to reveal a sense of problematic in this situation. In this regard T02’s phrase ‘normally that’s fine’ and T03’s comments ‘you’re not listening to what I’m saying’ allude to a slight negative tone or concern in relation to changing teachers. The phrase ‘you have my permission to go’ in T03’s account might be interpreted as suggesting a sense of
power-over the student, as the latter was portrayed as being granted ‘permission’, rather than viewed as an equal / entitled to explore such possibilities openly.

7.5 Intimacy and Distance

The next theme to be presented is the complexity of developing intimacy versus maintaining interpersonal distance with students. Two sub-themes were identified: the value and complexity of intimacy and the value of separateness and emotional distance.

The Value and Complexity of Intimacy

The value of developing depth of interpersonal intimacy with students was conveyed in four of the teacher accounts. These extracts were illustrative of the kind of comments:

T02: I feel that the one-to-one relationship is so special and it’s the, it’s the closest relationship that they get

T01: I need to feel like we’re getting inside each other and we’re really, really at one with each other so we can sort of go hand in hand on our sort of musical and vocal training journey

[Continued later] I’m gently nudging into these secret places really which I have to sort of tap into […] they’ve got to be convincingly able to commit themselves totally to this emotional stuff and share it

T04: you become so intimately engaged with this other human being

[Continued later] I find negotiating the relationship really quite difficult. Because I think to make significant vocal development […] you need to have, they need to feel completely, they have to really trust you. But then there’s also, there are professional boundaries and you have to be really careful

[Continued later] I really feel I need supervision because I feel as if there’s just so much that comes up which is in addition to the singing stuff […] things do just come up and it’s often to do with them trying to release something vocally and tears

The above extracts revealed that teachers experienced a high level of intimacy in the one-to-one relationship. The accounts suggested a framework of meaning about teaching voice; it was based on a premise that artistic vocal development requires the provision of relational conditions in one-to-one tuition that foster emotional openness, vulnerability, disclosure and expression in the student. In T01’s extract the need for mutual intimacy and self-revealing was conveyed: ‘I need to feel like we’re getting inside each other’. The complexity however of providing a relationship that involved
such a high degree of emotional connection with the student was captured in T04’s comments about the difficulties of ‘negotiating the relationship’ and ‘professional boundaries’. Her need for supervision was expressed in relation to teaching voice, as this process was viewed as inherently involving the arousal and release of intense emotional states.

The troubling nature of eliciting and encouraging emotional intensity in the teaching relationship emerged in the following interviews:

T04:  I know that vocal development needs that transparency and that real engagement with the person as a person, not just a musician, as a person. I know that. I really do know that from my own experience and from working with so many students, but at the same time that’s a difficult place to be working. I mean, just like in therapy, it feels very, I’ve been in therapy myself, it feels very similar in that way and yet there are such boundaries – lovely clear boundaries round therapy.

T01: for a long time I felt I was counselling all these students and being, as I said, their mum - ‘You can ring me up if you’ve got any problem and tell me’. And I learned that that doesn’t help us because then I’d be there and they’d come in and we get tears […] and then we wouldn’t get any singing done. And it took me a long time to recognise that someone else, I mean the old head of department here helped me with this. He used to say ‘Look, there are counsellors here for them to talk too. Your job is to teach them the singing’.

These extracts revealed the strain and tensions of navigating intimacy and high levels of student self-disclosure versus the need for a sense of containment, interpersonal distance or boundaries. The comparison between vocal teaching and counselling / therapy seemed to capture a dilemma that was experienced. In providing a relationship that was bordering on what felt like a therapeutic role since it encouraged high levels of student emotional awareness, openness, disclosure and expression, this brought with it difficulties for the teachers in containing the students’ emotional experience and its impact on lessons. The expression of a need for professional boundaries (T04) and a need to differentiate between therapeutic and teaching roles (T01) indicated this had been a tension for these teachers. T01’s extract above revealed how understandings of the need for intimacy were subject to change and review over time, rather than such beliefs being static or fixed. Reference to therapy may have emerged in these interviews due to participants’ awareness of my professional background; such choice of metaphor may have been un/consciously articulated as a bridge to an ‘outsider’ to conservatoire teaching in order to enable me to find a point of empathic understanding or identification with the kind of experience that they were attempting to convey to me.
In addition to the therapeutic metaphor used to describe the one-to-one relationship, the final extract above (T01) revealed the use of a parental metaphor; she referred to being ‘mum’ to her students. This construal of the relationship appeared in other accounts, including the following:

T06: I was a sort of mummy [...] I think. In the. Without being mumzy, I think she saw me as a maternal figure who knew a lot. And she thought I knew her a lot and I suppose I do. Yes, she thought I knew a lot, so she would ask my advice a lot.

Interrogative reading of the metaphor of maternal figure reveals several layers of meaning and possible implication. It could indicate intimate close relations that involve dependency and a desire for care and guidance; alternatively it might suggest infantilisation, over-involvement or difficulties with allowing a child, in this instance the student, to separate, individuate and be viewed as an equal adult in the relationship.

Findings revealed that both of these metaphors of the relationship were also interrogated and rejected by other teachers and this will now be presented under the next sub-theme.

**The Value of Separateness and Emotional Distance**

Six of the teachers discussed the value of maintaining emotional and interpersonal distance with students.

Several teachers who had expressed the need for emotional interpersonal intimacy for pedagogic purposes (as discussed above), talked about changes in their way of being in the relationship during their careers due to finding the implications of such deep personal involvement too demanding and too complex to manage.

Teacher T03 described a relationship with a student who had self-disclosed personal information in a lesson that deeply disturbed the teacher. The following four extracts were from her interview:

T03: she divulged this very disturbing piece of information this information is too much for me to cope with by myself

it was extremely difficult [...] when she told me the, the situation and the circumstances of this awful story. It, it hung over me for several days and I just thought, there’s nothing I can do about this. It’s not my job, I have to try to, to put it away and I can’t change it, but of course, it skewed the way I looked at the dynamic between us.
over the long term one realises actually that, you know, one has to keep a distance, more of a distance perhaps than one would normally reckon on within the professional dynamic

Highly personal intimate student self-disclosure was found to have had a significant effect on this teacher; it emotionally troubled her, changed her understanding and way of relating with that particular student, and led to a permanent shift in her way of being as a teacher. The need for greater interpersonal distance was communicated as emerging from this experience.

Teacher T04 who had expressed strong beliefs about and commitments to the need for intimate engagement with students (as indicated earlier), conveyed the potential longer term costs of such an approach to teaching:

T04: I think my inclination is always to do more and I think sometimes I have to, for my own sanity and my own survival and my own energy, I have to sometimes, perhaps make a boundary where I wouldn’t want one, necessarily.

This extract revealed a need to establish boundaries, even when the desire (‘my inclination’) was to the contrary. Such interpersonal distance from students appeared to be linked with physical and emotional well-being, conveyed linguistically in words such as ‘sanity’, ‘survival’ and ‘energy’.

Teacher T01, revealed a significant shift in degree of relational involvement with students over time; from the position of ‘I would give them everything’ and be ‘their mum’ (as cited in the previous section) to a more detached position:

T01: the ones in the colleges that are successful, more like business men and I find that business mentality is how they survive all the stuff I’ve been describing which I find quite hard because I don’t tend to come into it like that as you can tell (laughs). And I’m becoming more business-like about it with, as time’s gone on

In this extract there is a linkage between a ‘business’ approach to the teaching relationship and being able to develop more emotional separateness or detachment. The business mentality appeared to be gendered as a male style of relationship, and this was associated with success. This may reflect gender discourses about emotion and relationship. Her interview revealed a transition in frameworks of meaning from being mother and counsellor to the student (as indicated under the previous sub-heading section), which implied deep emotional attachment and involvement; to being in a business relationship, which was viewed as necessary to cope with, ‘survive’ as she put it, the emotional demands and complexities of this relationship.
The construal of the one-to-one relationship as parental was critiqued and rejected as unhelpful in other teacher interviews:

T07: I don’t think parental is very helpful and I would very much hope that it is not parental. Caring and considerate and supportive, yes, but I think parental becomes; parental would have a negative connotation to me just because of the response of the student back to the parent figure. It becomes too latched onto what they’re getting from the teacher and I think that, that, that’s a dangerous situation especially in an institution, where, in the end we have to send our students out. So if they’re, if they’re dependent on being fed by the teacher, then they’ve not really found the autonomy that they need themselves to succeed in their career and we’re trying to help them to deal to be able to have a career. So parental element, I’m not so convinced by.

This male teacher seemed to interrogate the parental metaphor of one-to-one teaching in relation to its inflection with notions of dependency upon the teacher. Dependency in the teaching relationship and autonomy in the student were presented as a mutually exclusive binary in this extract, and student autonomy was articulated as a desirable learning outcome of one-to-one tuition. His account revealed understanding that styles of relating in the teaching dyad can foster or hinder the development of student autonomy. Autonomy was conveyed as a critical student achievement for the transition into a future performance career.

The next extract, from a female teacher also revealed suspicion of the parental metaphor:

T09: the singer and singing teacher’s relationship is so particular, I think there is so many mothering, singing teachers out there (laughs). There are many of them. I’ve been to many of them (laughs) and, yes, to a certain extent, I suppose I care for my students in that way. I look out for them and I, it matters to me what’s going on in their lives; but I don’t actively ask them to tell me (laughs) everything.

Her laughter in the interview was suggestive of criticism of ‘mothering teachers’ and there was differentiation between being caring and becoming mothering. This teacher also revealed scepticism and rejection of singing teachers as quasi-therapists:

T09: The trouble with singing lessons is that they can become like therapy sessions in a way because singing touches on so many different aspects of one’s self. […] I am not that kind of teacher. I have been to singing teachers who have, like one, in particular, who was absolutely hell bent on using singing as a form of therapy and using other forms of therapy and bringing them into the lesson.

They do need a lot of emotional support but do they need to use their singing as a form of therapy? Probably not (laughs).
Here, the text suggested a strong differentiation between an emotionally supportive approach to teaching, versus the teacher becoming a therapist to students in one-to-one tuition.

Teacher findings thus revealed significant divergence in perspectives in relation to the need for intimacy, deep emotional involvement, intense emotional exploration, attachment and dependency in one-to-one tuition. Teachers, who had advocated the need for intense intimacy for pedagogic purposes, were also found to experience troubling tensions and implications of such depth of interpersonal involvement. Some teachers clearly framed the relationship as not requiring intimacy, and expressed the value of emotional separateness and distance.

**A Need for Institutional Support**

A pattern in teacher interviews emerged in relation to the expression of a need for institutional support to manage the responsibilities and strains of the one-to-one relationship (T01/T02/T03/T04/T09). Teachers communicated that they had sought consultation and support for themselves and / or their students when concerns were aroused about student well-being and in relation to the tensions of intimacy versus distance. These are some examples of communications in this regard:

T03: we’re very lucky in [name of conservatoire] we have very good counselling and complementary services, so we have places where the students can go and dump their emotional baggage totally away from the singing lesson. […] So if one feels that there are issues beyond one’s own world of knowledge then you can gently coax the student to go off and uhm, be supported in another direction

T04: I think it’s one of the most tiring jobs you can have, I really do. I feel like I need supervision.

T02: I was really worried about this. He seems to get so depressed about his singing […] I’ve had quite a few weeks, since Christmas in particular, where I’ve, I’ve thought should I talk to Student Services about him.

The reference to referral to institutional counselling and complementary services in T03’s extract revealed the value of support services and there was differentiation between the role of singing teacher and role of therapist. Student emotional needs were presented as requiring containment and a response outside of the teaching dyad by appropriate professionals / services. The need for institutional support in the form of supervision (T04) and of student services (T02) to manage the strains and concerns of vocal teaching were evident.
7.6 The Complexities of Trust and Honesty

Findings from teacher interviews revealed two interconnected sub-themes around 1) trust-mistrust and 2) the value and trouble with honesty.

Mis/Trust

Data analysis revealed a concern with the presence, absence, partial and shifting nature of interpersonal trust (in six accounts). A dialectical tension seemed to emerge in the data between the need for and value of interpersonal trust versus the problematic and troubling nature of mistrust in the teaching relationship.

Teachers revealed that when they experienced students as unable to trust or querying their trust in them, this was troubling for the teacher. The following extracts were indicative of the kind of thoughts and feelings expressed:

T02: he’s got a real crisis of confidence at the moment and that he keeps saying to me, ‘That doesn’t sound right’ and I said ‘Well you don’t know; you can’t know what it sounds like. You’ve got to believe me’. It’s the faith or trust.

T03: the more difficult thing is when there’s an element or a potential breakdown of trust in the teaching dynamic […] for example it might happen that you have a girl singer who comes in whose singing soprano who actually is not a soprano and you recognise this […] let’s try to work the voice in the lower register, and she doesn’t want to make this vocal personality jump and then she’s saying ‘How do I know that you’re telling me the right thing?’ So that kind of uh, maintaining trust when the voice and the vocal personality are very fragile, that’s a very difficult thing.

T04: I think because certain very difficult technical things started to shift and so they, of course, then trust what you say a little bit more. Why should they trust you before they see evidence of anything changing?

[Elsewhere in interview] I had a terrible time at [Name of a Conservatoire] myself and I was taught extremely badly and I trusted it implicitly. […] I did everything I was told verbatim, hours and hours of it a day, until I musically really messed up my voice and so I’m very aware that I don’t want students to immediately trust me. I mean, I want them to come to that conclusion because they really, genuinely believe that I’m trustworthy with their voice and their development.

These accounts revealed the highly complex nature of interpersonal trust. It was presented in the following terms:
• not fixed, static or permanently achieved; but rather shifting, questioned, partial, established and lost (all the above accounts),
• subject to collapse and difficult to sustain at times (T02/T03),
• unquestioned (‘I trusted it implicitly’ T04)
• desirable (‘you’ve got to beli-, trust me’ T01),
• undesirable (‘I don’t want students to immediately trust me’ T04)
• and earned rather than assumed (‘I want them to come to that conclusion because they really, genuinely believe that I’m trustworthy’ T04)

Teacher T04 communicated the negative impact on her own voice, when she was a student, of having placed trust in a teacher without critically discerning if such trust had been warranted. The need for a student to trust a teacher was conveyed as critical to vocal development in many of the interviews. However, this extract highlighted a tension between the need for a relationship founded on trust versus the need to interrogate the assumption of trust as the latter may provide important protection for some students against negative impacts on their voice / development of problematic teaching technique.

The specificity of vocal teaching was identified as raising particular issues in relation to trust.

T09: There’s a lot involved with trust with singers because of the fact that we can’t hear what we’re doing as we sing. We really can’t hear the sound that we’re making that everybody else can hear […] so a singing teacher has to provide those, that you know, trusted pair of ears

The difficulty of a singer being unable to hear their own sound was identified as creating a dependence on the teacher that involved considerable trust. This was echoed in another account where the teacher highlighted the difficulties of the singer being the instrument and the invisibility of some of the workings of the instrument:

T04: you are the instrument and we can’t see half of the things that are going on, so you’re already at an enormous disadvantage

I will move now to the next sub-theme.

The Value and Trouble with Honesty

The need for students to trust teachers was conveyed as valued and important for most of the teachers in this study. Interestingly trust was linked by some teachers with the issue of being honest with students; yet three teachers revealed that honesty or
directness was often partial or felt to be difficult to achieve in interactions. The following accounts revealed this type of dilemma:

T02: although I always say that at the start of a, of a, you know, ‘we really must be honest with each other’. It’s quite difficult to be honest to a student sometimes

[Continued later] you can’t actually say to them ‘well you’re going to make it; but you’re not. So let’s - but let’s carry on’, because that destroys them. So in a way […] you have to have, it’s not exactly a deception, uhm, some people might say it is, but you have to, you have to, I treat them all the same, within the respect that I’ve giving them all what I feel that they, individually, what they need, but I know that, that, that some of them won’t ever be able to fulfil that. Uhm, But, uhm, it’s not up to me to say ‘well you can’t’

T07: you might be critical of what they’re doing in a particular work but you can’t be so critical that the student doesn’t want to continue working. So even if you do think the student is likely to fail, you are not going to tell them that, I presume, or you might intimate that they need to work harder but you’re not going to put it as drastically, but the mark says it very clearly. So yeah it’s a difficult

T04: in a conservatoire you can’t start having those very honest conversations. You can’t say to a student ‘I don’t think you should have got in. I don’t think you have what it takes’. So you’re in a position of, sort of, doing the best you can but actually withholding a certain amount of the honesty

Honesty appeared to be considered important but challenging at times. These teachers appeared to find it troubling to be honest with students in relation to perceptions of inability to achieve or a likelihood of failure to fulfil particular standards in the conservatoire context. Where there was a sense of the student falling short of the expected standard, the need to conceal a difficult truth was conveyed as protecting the student from being too hurt or from disengaging from the learning process. This concern about destabilising the student was communicated linguistically in phrases like: ‘it destroys them’ (T01) and ‘you can’t be so critical that the student doesn’t want to continue’ (T07). This raises complex pedagogic questions for teachers about their role and responsibilities in providing clear and honest feedback about a student’s learning situation; as T01 stated ‘it’s not up to me to say ‘well you can’t’. An interpretative interrogation of these extracts can reveal several possible meanings including, teacher concern to avoid destroying the possibility that a student might exceed teacher expectations, anxiety about being positioned against the institution, fear of causing student distress, or concern about meeting institutional expectations around student admissions, retention and progression.
Teachers also talked of being honest and direct with students (identified in three accounts). This included giving direct feedback that was perceived as difficult for students to hear, yet valuable for their learning. Teacher T04 gave an example:

T04: I felt I had to be really honest with her about that. It’s a hard thing for somebody to hear and I don’t think she quite had an idea of how extremely, how extremely disconnected she was as a performer, to the point where, I think, she couldn’t sort it out that she really shouldn’t go into singing even though she’s got a phenomenal instrument. So I just had to, I had a conversation with her where I was completely blunt with her about it and I think I timed it right because she was able to hear it.

Honesty thus emerged from the data analysis of teacher interviews as possible, valuable, complex, often partial, avoided, and troubled by concerns in relation to student capacity to manage or tolerate such interactions.

### 7.7 Humour and Play

A theme about the value of humour, fun, creative improvisation and playfulness in the teaching relationship emerged in seven of the teacher interviews. These qualities in the relationship were linked with positive effects on learning, including enhanced performance capabilities, the development of an individual artistic voice and transformations in embodiment that lead to improved singing, as the following reveal:

T07: the attitude of the student does affect the dynamic, of-course, so if, if they’re sort of positively engaged and enthusiastic, and they express that enthusiasm through laughter or physical engagement, then I’m likely to be more engaged as well.

[Continued later] This was much more playful, this idea of just trying things out so that sense of relaxation, I think, is very positive from the teacher’s point of view as well as the students which makes for an atmosphere which is relaxing.

T09: I mean some of the best ones have been ‘humorous’ as well, which is a useful emotion sometimes, I think, in a teaching situation.

[Continued later] sometimes getting singers to do something slight ridiculous like moving around the room or gesturing very wildly and over the top-ly, […] can result in a lot of laughter because it’s, kind of, ridiculous and it’s over the top but it’s the very fact of physicalizing what they’re doing and what they’re speaking about or singing about. Yet it liberates them in all sorts of ways. It liberates them mentally speaking, emotionally and physically […] it just takes them out of what can easily become a very, sort of, one track, limited, guarded, inhibited performance.
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The above accounts suggest that a climate of relating between teacher and student that is permeated by humour, laughter and enthusiasm, can have the effect of enhancing teacher motivation and engagement (T07) and improving student music-making and performance (T09). The capacity for playfulness in teacher-student interaction seems to be associated with transformative potential – psychological, emotional and physical (T09). Playfulness might be relationally interpreted as involving improvisatory interactions that destabilise habitual ways of being; as such this can proffer possibility for change (Stolorow, 1997). As T09 articulated, playful interaction may liberate the student from a ‘limited, guarded inhibited performance’.

7.8 Summary

This chapter detailed findings from the individual teacher interviews. There was evidence of both convergence and divergence of teacher perceptions, frameworks of meaning, concerns and experiences across the data set. Data analysis also evidenced that perceptions and experiences could be conflicted, contingent and open to revision within individual accounts; thus reflecting the contradictions and dynamic nature of human experiencing (Gergen, 2009).

Six key themes were identified as patterning the data. These included teacher perceptions and experiences of: the relationship as one predicated on bringing about change, power relations, students wanting to change teachers, interpersonal intimacy versus distance in the teaching dyad, interpersonal trust / mistrust and the dilemmas of honesty, and the value of humour and improvisatory forms of interaction in creating a positive learning climate and enhancing student music-making.
Chapter 8: Findings from Individual Student Interviews

8.1 Introduction

This chapter presents findings from the individual interview strand of investigation conducted with 15 vocal students. Six key themes, with sub-themes, were identified and are presented below (see table 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Human Instrument</td>
<td>• You are the Instrument&lt;br&gt;• Making Sense? The Invisible and the Unintelligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Relations</td>
<td>• Equality and Freedom&lt;br&gt;• Feeling Powerless&lt;br&gt;• Contests / Deference to Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Teachers</td>
<td>• Tricky or Supported&lt;br&gt;• Resolution to a Relational Problem&lt;br&gt;• Discerning a Good Teacher-Student Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy &amp; Distance</td>
<td>• An Intimate Relationship?&lt;br&gt;• A Desirable Distance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mis/Trust?</td>
<td>• The Value of Trust&lt;br&gt;• Questions of Trust?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour &amp; Fun</td>
<td>• Humour and Fun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Themes and Sub-themes for Individual Student Interviews

Evidence relating to these themes will now be presented.

8.2 The Human Instrument

A theme was identified in thirteen of the fifteen student accounts about the significance and implications of the voice as a human embodied instrument, to the process of
learning in one-to-one tuition. Stories converged around two sub-themes; ‘You are the Instrument’ and ‘Making Sense? The Invisible and the Unintelligible’

**You are the Instrument**

Students communicated that they perceived the voice to be unique amongst musical instruments as the instrument was inseparable from the human being and constituted by the human body:

S17: you are the instrument

S09: it is a strange thing, having a singing teacher. Because it’s your body, it’s you; you’re dealing with your emotions all the time.

S20: your voice is your instrument so your voice is something really private; it’s your own thing. It just belongs to you

S10: I really think you open your soul when you sing more than other, more than other, uhm, maybe other instruments […] with instruments there is a, there is an object between you and the listener, whereas with singers it’s your body, it’s your whole self, it’s your idea and image of yourself. It’s all your kind of hopes and dreams and self-confidence is built on what comes out of your mouth.

In these accounts, the experiences of singing and of the voice were conveyed as integrating embodiment, emotion, identity, sense of belonging and even a numinous aspect of human experience - the soul. Students identified teacher-student interpersonal tension as particularly problematic for vocalists as indicated in the following:

S21: I think because I couldn’t express the contradictions I felt in her teaching, and in my singing, I think I took on those contradictions physically. And that’s where the tension comes from.

S08: if the teachers are kind of quick tempered or not very calm, I will be frightened I think […] and, my body wouldn’t be so relaxed.

S15: can’t be, uhm, over-emphasised is how different I think singing is to other instruments, because it can’t be separated from you ‘[…] if you have a relationship with the teacher, uhm, who doesn’t seem to respect your voice and doesn’t seem to like your voice and is unconstructive about it, it totally undermines you as a person, not just as a singer.

These extracts revealed that the process of singing was felt to be intimately intertwined with embodiment and sense of self and thus there was a sense of increased vulnerability to the negative influence of interpersonal tensions with teachers, when compared to other instrumentalists. The extract from S15 revealed that teacher reactions to the student’s voice were experienced as a comment upon the entirety of
the individual's sense of being. The voice, the singer, and the person thus appeared to be experienced as a unified whole, rather than the instrument being viewed as a separate object.

Making Sense? The Invisible and the Unintelligible

Student data revealed a perception that the process of learning to sing was troubled by difficulties in making sense of teacher communications about technique. This was recounted as due to i) the invisibility of the vocal instrument and ii) teachers' reliance upon verbal talk and use of metaphor to convey technical goals.

The invisibility of the vocal instrument and its inaccessibility to direct observation was conveyed in comments such as the following:

S08: With singing you can't really see what's going on in teacher's throat

S09: I think the difficult thing is, uhm, I can't see what's happening inside me when I'm actually doing it

S23: one of the things that seems significant about singing is this fact that the instrument is invisible […] you're using your, your own body and yet it's not like the piano or the violin or viola […] where there's some degree of being able to see what's actually going on

The difficulties with trying to understand teachers’ technical guidance due to the use of metaphor, image and verbal communication was expressed in comments such as:

S10: a lot of singing teaching tends to be through sort of visualisation, metaphor, things like that. So it can take a while to sort of understand what a teacher's talking about if they are particularly obscure

S17: My first singing teacher she'd come up with an idea of you're on a carriage. [...] And you're in control of the horses. And you have to keep the horses going [...] she was trying to talk about line. But she had quite a complex idea. [...] 'And you must pull the reins tight. And keep the reins tight.' It was quite complicated. [...] but I didn't really know how I would turn that into my technical voice (Laughs)

S20: I think the fact that we work only with images, is really hard. We don't really know what we are doing. Like, your soft palate higher, your jaw a bit backward, your support. No one really knows what support is, we're trying to understand, like, even if we see like picture of what we need to do, but then how do we feel it?

S22: there is a level of rational understanding of what someone is saying [...] But that doesn't necessarily translate in being able to do what they are suggesting physically, or to reproduce the sensation as - this is the fundamental problem of teaching the voice rather than the violin is that you can't see it.
These accounts revealed that usage of ‘obscure’ and elaborate metaphors and images and the employment of instructions about use of parts of the body that were not observable were experienced as difficult to transform into embodied and musical forms of knowing. Feelings of confusion and bewilderment were communicated in relation to trying to make intelligible that which appeared to be unintelligible. One student (S23) spoke of ‘a translation gap’ and talked of trying to develop a ‘shared language’ with the teacher. The incapacity to make embodied sense of teacher instruction was reported by some students as creating interpersonal stress:

S15: he made me, sort of, do things again and again even though I wasn’t understanding what he meant. So, it wasn’t getting any better. It was just sort of like, flogging a dead horse (laughs)

S23: when the teacher just goes ‘Do this, do this, do this,’ and again and again and again, and you just cannot. You feel like you’re letting them down because you feel like you’re not trying or you think, you start to worry ‘Do they think I’m really lazy and I’m just not trying?’ And you’re not, you’re just, you cannot make what they’re saying make sense for you. And sometimes I do, in lessons I just wanna go ‘I need to stop. I need to stop. This needs to slow down, uhm; you need to stop talking now.’

In the extract from student S23 there was anxiety about efforts to effect change being unrecognised, lack of progress being misconstrued as laziness and concern about being perceived as a disappointment (‘you feel like you’re letting them down’). Linguistic repetitions in that extract ‘I need to stop. I need to stop’, followed by an instruction to the teacher to be silent: ‘you need to stop talking now’ conveyed intensity of frustration of trying and failing to make sense of teacher instructions. The above extracts revealed that teacher-student incapacity to achieve mutual understanding about problems in learning was frustrating, anxiety provoking and could inhibit progress, as S15 put it ‘it wasn’t getting any better. It was just sort of like, flogging a dead horse’. The latter phrase indicated a sense of futility that could emerge through this lack of ability to arrive at mutual understanding.

8.3 Power Relations

Students talked about power explicitly in the teaching relationship and three subordinate themes were identified: ‘Equality and Freedom’, ‘Feeling Powerless’ and ‘Contests / Deferece to Teacher Authority’.

Equality and Freedom

Twelve of the fifteen students talked about the value of being able to experience
themselves as an equal at times in the relationship with their teacher. A sense of power as shared, linguistic reference to ‘equality’ and ‘freedom’, and reflections on being able to mutually contribute to the teacher’s learning were part of this sub-theme.

The words ‘equal’ and ‘equality’ were used in several accounts to describe the relationship with a teacher:

S20: I think it’s just a really, uhm, balanced, like it’s an equal relationship.

S07: it’s as if we are, we are equals, and I’m able to teach him some things […] and there’s no divisions almost, which is, which is really nice.

S12: I think there’s an equality […] it could be something as simple as interpretation of a song. She might have an idea and I might have another idea. But I don’t feel like she would ever be like, ‘Oh no, well you must do my idea because I’ve had all of these years’ experience and you know, you’re only starting out.’ I feel like […] everything that I say is accepted and taken as, as a valid contribution.

The comments from S07 revealed a relationship experienced as one of equals and as reciprocally enhancing; teacher and student were both presented as learning in the relationship. The comments of S12 about equality gave a picture of a student who felt recognised by her teacher for her contributions and opinions. This was juxtaposed with a polar opposite image of a dominant patronising teacher, that image was repudiated as the type of relationship that she did not experience with her teacher. This act of repudiation served to highlight the significance of her sense of equality in her relationship with her teacher.

The next passage communicated the sense of equality as also involving role related power differentials:

S14 it’s just something about the, the, the way we talk to each other, and the way we relate to each other […] she's in charge, if you like, but she, I don't feel in any way that, it's not master-servant. It’s, kind of […] you're choosing to teach me, and that deserves, you know, respect and, and, and effort from me. But I'm also choosing to be taught by you

This account might be interpretatively read in terms of student perception of a hierarchical role related power differential with a teacher. Reference to 'she’s in charge' confers power to the teacher position, but this power does not appear as absolute, 'it's not master-servant' as the student indicated. Talk of the mutual capacity for teacher and student to exercise choice – 'you’re choosing' and ‘I’m also choosing’, suggested horizontal relations of power-with, rather than vertical authoritarian relations of power-over. A sense of the relationship as equal but asymmetrical in terms of role related differences of power and responsibility seemed to be communicated.
The experience of ‘freedom’ was captured by the following extracts from S10:

S10: with [teacher’s name] I feel it’s much more, there is much more freedom to, yeah, to go my own way a little bit

I feel like I have more, more control [...] I can perhaps have more of an identity myself or developing an identity as an artist myself with [Teacher’s Name]

Here, interpersonal freedom and the capacity to exercise control or autonomy in the relationship were valued and linked with developing an individual artistic identity.

One account from an overseas south-east Asian student revealed freedom to have a voice in one-to-one tuition as influenced by cultural context:

S08 one thing I think is quite positive about being in an English environment is that, there is not such a big hierarchical structure, compared to [name of home country in Asia]. So, uhm, I feel easier to ask questions to uhm, and I feel easier to talk about some of the doubts or some of the things that I’m going through with my teacher.

The teacher-student relationship in the UK conservatoire context was presented in this account as affording a greater sense of equality and freedom in teacher-student relations. The possibility of dialogue and of questioning a teacher was presented as specific to the ‘English environment’ in this student’s experience. This might indicate evidence of social and contextual forces shaping cultural practices of one-to-one tuition which give rise to particular affordances, constraints and understandings of teacher-student relations in this pedagogic context.

**Feeling Powerless**

A theme emerged in several accounts (N=6) about the negative experience of powerlessness in the one-to-one relationship. Such relationships were recounted in language such as ‘traumatic’ (S17, S20) and ‘destructive’ (S20) and were revealed as confusing and highly distressing. Students spoke of ‘power’ explicitly and implicitly, including through linguistic usage of words such as ‘control’, ‘possession’, ‘intrusion’, ‘helplessness’, ‘oppressive’ and ‘victim’. Each of these will be referenced in the findings that follow. Implications of these types of relational interactions were described as having detrimental effects on the student’s sense of self, voice and/or performance. The other key thematic that was identified in these stories was a need for and the value of a third party as support for or regulator of such damaging relationships. I will now present the findings.
An extract from S14 revealed how he made sense of stories he had heard from peers about teachers’ use of power in the form of control:

S14: you hear horror stories, and people have, you know, terrible relationships. And, and also, to, like I've never had this. But teachers can be quite, kind of, territorial, or control, you know, they consider that singers are, not their property. But, you know, they, they put the work in, and they seem to expect some kind of, not, loyalty's the wrong word [...] some kind of sense of possession.

The language used here ‘territorial’ and ‘control’ conveyed a perception of some teachers as exerting power over students in coercive ways, such that the student became an object, ‘property’ or ‘possession’, rather than recognised as an autonomous subject in the relationship.

Feelings of being trapped with a teacher were expressed in the next account:

S18: I felt like I was in a black hole and I couldn’t get out. And I felt to myself, I couldn’t… I felt like I was being a victim

The metaphor of the black hole was evocative of darkness, fear and isolation. The sense of being unable to ‘get out’ was suggestive of the experience of feeling trapped.

Relational interpretation might frame this in terms of a binary impasse of complementarity (Aron, 2006; Benjamin, 1999) where teacher-student relations are felt to be constellated around fixed polar positions of ‘victim-persecutor’ / ‘powerful-powerless’.

Another student S20 talked of a past teaching relationship as highly disturbing. She communicated distress about struggling to recognise the problem at the time of its occurrence and revealed that she had taken on a belief that her teacher had espoused: ‘you need to be quiet and suffer. That's how we learn.’ The following extracts were derived from her interview:

S20: she was quite traumatic for everyone

I think it was just really violent and really excessive

She was going into my private life in a really nasty way, being like, ‘Yeah, your voice is related to what you are, a little girl who can’t just like be honest with what she wants.’

my body was just reacting to something too intrusive and too aggressive

my voice got, like, destroyed.
This student, although describing a teaching relationship that was situated within a European conservatoire, revealed the experience of feeling harmed, intruded upon and intimidated in the context of one-to-one tuition. The impact of that ‘traumatic’ experience was recounted as generating serious vocal problems: ‘my voice got, like, destroyed’. This account thus revealed evidence of one-to-one tuition being experienced as a site of highly disturbing interactions that were harmful to student well-being.

Returning to the London based conservatoire context, the experience of helplessness in relationship with a teacher was communicated in the next extract:

S21: it made me feel more like a helpless student rather than someone who’s developing equally with the teacher

This student talked at length in her interview about a relationship with a teacher, which had recently been terminated, and described it as ‘oppressive’, confusing and ‘double-binding’. The latter turn of phrase she explained to me:

S21: if you take like a parent and child relationship, it’s when the – the mother says one thing and does another [...] Like, so, ‘I love you,’ and then treating them in a very unloving way [...] the double bind comes in when that – the child is not able to express that contradiction. So whenever they say, ‘You say this but you do this,’ the mother’s like – basically doesn’t allow them to express that [...] I’d explained my relationship with my teacher to this counsellor and she said that it sounded like that sort of relationship. And of course, it does completely to me now [...] because it was true. That was why I was confused all the time.

This student talked of consultation with a counsellor outside the institution, a third party, which seemed to support the student in making sense of highly confusing and troubling interactions. Similar to the previous student (S20), this student also expressed difficulties in making sense of what was happening to her at the time that it was occurring. She revealed that the process of coming into awareness of her need for support was slow and took a long time:

S21: It took me two-and-a-half years to get to that place where I realised I needed some help.

She spoke about the need for ‘an impartial person here who has some power’ who would have a position that was separate and independent from the vocal department. This was advocated by her as critical to helping students in such troubling teaching relationships.

The need for a third party outside the teaching dyad to offer support and monitoring for
these types of ‘traumatic’ teaching relationships was discussed by five other students. One of the accounts revealed the following concerns:

S17  one-to-one teaching is – is dangerously unregulated […] I don’t know how that would ever be solved. Because that’s the nature of it, it has to be a one-to-one relationship. But the power is so much in – on one side. And it’s only up to the student whether they put up with that or not.

If a student does feel powerless, uhm, I don’t know where they would go. And they often go to other students. And, like I’ve said, I’ve had, yeah, some of my best friends here who have come to me in – in tears. And they just didn’t know where to go.

This account communicated a lack of institutional support for students experiencing serious interpersonal problems in one-to-one tuition. Linguistic reference to one-to-one tuition as ‘dangerously unregulated’ evokes notions of professional safeguarding, ethical frameworks and standards of practice. In this regard, there was a clear sense of a lack of third party outside of the relationship that could act as regulator or mediator for teaching relationships in trouble. Textual analysis revealed a binary configuration of teacher-student positions of powerful-powerless. Students who were distressed (‘tears’) and feeling ‘powerless’ were presented in this extract as turning to peers (a third person outside the dyad) due to a lack of institutional point of reference. This suggests that support was available along a horizontal axis of power (in the form of peers), but not along a vertical axis of power (in the form of institutional figures of authority / accountability).

The findings from students’ perspectives thus indicated both the value of, lack of and need for a responsive third party to mediate the distress of these relational situations.

**Contests and Deference to Authority**

Student accounts revealed examples of power relations of contesting of and deference to teacher authority. These types of power relations were communicated as non-traumatic and in some instances were associated with positive and stimulating experiencing.

**Contesting Teacher Authority**

A small number of accounts revealed evidence of the student experience of being engaged in a battle, contest or interrogation of their teacher’s authority.

The following student gave a sense of vitality that she experienced in her battles with her teacher:
S23: we’re kind of clashing

I feel like we’re almost a bit like two alpha women not quite sure how to handle each other

it’s a bit more mother-in-lawy [...] and singing is her son [...] It’s her son, her son and I’m married to her son and I’m not sure she’s approve, approves of me. (laughs)

The image of two women jockeying for position and the metaphor of triangular relationships between the mother-in-law (teacher) vying with the student over a relationship with the son (singing) seemed poetically evocative of a creative power struggle. This student conveyed in her interview a sense of liking and identification with her teacher, and a refusal to surrender to her authority:

S23: I said all these things but we do get on, and, and, and I, I do really like her. So it sounds quite negative [...] when you meet someone that you probably actually quite get on with and have a lot in common with and really like. But I guess the difficulty maybe that we have, is that she is used to being very much a teacher, and I’m just not ready to throw all my eggs in, in the basket and go ‘Great you’re my one teacher, you’re my sole teacher, you are the fountain of all knowledge and I absolutely trust everything you have to say. Take me and I will do exactly what you say.’ I’m just not willing to do that

Here we have a portrayal of the teacher as someone who was perceived as familiar with being related to as an authority on singing, but this student refused to surrender to and trust in that authority, despite her liking the teacher.

Another student S14 spoke of constantly ‘evaluating’ whether his teacher’s teaching was helpful and he communicated wariness about submitting to her approach. The following two extracts were form his interview:

S14: when you have one teacher, you become exposed to their, kind of, ideology of singing, whatever that might be. And in general, you buy into it. And it’s a question of whether or not that’s positive [...] whether that’s, kind of, helpful.

Without, too interrogative [...] without being combative. Because people can talk a lot of bollocks about singing [...] one should always be aware of that fact. Because like, again, drink the coolay too much of someone who does talk bollocks, and that probably won’t be helpful for you,

Employment of terms ‘ideology’ and ‘interrogative’ brought into play the language of critical theory and its analysis of structures of power. The linguistic repudiation of being combative perhaps paradoxically indicated that the relationship was experienced on those terms – a kind of battle of wills; and the account revealed irritated scepticism about teacher’s ideologies (one might read this as pedagogic approach).
repetitions of the pejorative word ‘bollocks’ suggested critical contempt of what he often heard espoused about singing technique. The student seemed to experience being dependent on a teacher for their knowledge as troubling due to his questions about the validity of their knowledge and he seemed to inhabit a position of contesting assumptions of teacher as expert / authority.

**Deferec to Teacher Authority**

The opposite pattern emerged in one account. That student talked of a ‘natural’ tendency to become ‘passive’ to teacher authority. However, she revealed that her current teacher was attempting to shift this balance of power with her:

> S21 the whole relationship of authority figure, student, is one that makes you – it’s – well, not so much anymore. But it turns me naturally into a more passive person.

[Later in interview] my current teacher encourages it to not be that authority figure-student relationship. Because I think you become passive [...] it’s always like, ‘This is right. You’re the student. You’re learning from the teacher.’ You become a bit like, you just take things on

The pull towards passivity and submission was communicated as ‘naturally’ occurring for this student, and the teacher in this passage was depicted as destabilising or discouraging the habituation into such a position of submission to teacher authority.

Having discussed the ways that power relations appeared in the student accounts, the next theme to be discussed is that of changing teachers.

### 8.4 Changing Teachers

The process of changing teacher was presented in the majority of student accounts as one that was associated with troubling emotions and difficult interpersonal interactions. Three sub-themes emerged: ‘Tricky or Supported’, ‘Resolution to a Relational Problem’ and ‘Discerning a Good Teacher-Student Match’.

**Tricky or Supported**

Thirteen of the fifteen students talked about changing teachers as a process that was associated with complications, difficulties and unsettling emotions:

> S13: it is a very tricky thing
The word ‘tricky’ was employed in several accounts to describe the decision to leave one teacher for another. Notably, even the contemplation of this possibility was revealed as worrying. In this regard troubling anticipatory anxieties accompanied thoughts about considering a change of teacher. The following extract was indicative of the kind of concerns:

S10: trying to leave a teacher which is difficult, but I find really difficult. How do you broach that? […] some teachers will get their feelings hurt if pupils leave […] I will find that that sort of guilt or worry would bleed into how I felt about the relationship.

[Elsewhere in interview] it’s very tricky ‘cause if you, for example want to go and have maybe a consultation lesson with someone else, do you tell your current teacher? Will they be hurt? […] Do you not tell them and then they might feel betrayed if they find out

Guilt, worry, betrayal, hurt and the metaphor of feelings ‘bleeding’ into the relationship gave a sense of how emotionally troubling this process could be.

Perceptions of institutional resistance to students changing teachers were identified. For example, S21 described changing teachers as a ‘stigma’, ‘a tricky thing’ and ‘the sort of un-done thing. And very, very like a big deal’. Further extracts exemplify:

S15: they don’t like you changing; it’s a pain for them for you to change

S08: There are a lot of people who want to switch teacher, but within the conservatoire environment I think that’s very difficult […] to want to, even to say that they want to change

In some accounts student desire to change teachers was expressed in narratives of fault, blame, insult and harm:

S13: I can imagine the teacher could feel like they’ve done something wrong, you know a sense of pride that you lost at that point when your student leaves you.

S17: it’s very problematic because it is, by its nature, very – it’s personal. You’re, you’re openly insulting, really, you’re openly criticising a person for their method of teaching when you say that. I can’t think how that, how else it could be construed.

S21: It’s tricky to change teachers […] I don’t know whether it’s just me that feels that. But I think it’s generally like you’re going to offend your teacher

The evocation of a teacher who is left by a student in extract S13 revealed a framework of meaning that student decision to change teachers points a finger of blame and implies the teacher is at fault ‘they’ve done something wrong’. Student anxiety about
teachers feeling insulted by a student’s wish to change teachers was conveyed in the above (S17 and S21).

The experience of distress and concern about causing harm to a teacher due to a decision to leave the relationship was captured in the following range of extracts from one student:

S18: it was heart breaking for her

she [referring to his teacher] found out that I was changing teacher and immediately dropped a bombshell on me […] saying ‘I feel I’ve been – I don’t understand what I’ve done wrong’. You know, but I said, ‘It’s nothing to do with you [name of teacher], it’s just to do with my, my sense that I want to change’

I felt bad in the sense of the way that I had to leave her, but it was for the best.

This student appeared to be torn between concerns about having hurt his teacher, i.e. broken her heart, and having to cope with her reactions and his own feelings about having a ‘bombshell’ dropped on him. Use of an explosive metaphor suggested that interactions were experienced as highly emotionally charged. His experience of the teacher as distressed and feeling she was to blame was conveyed in the recall of her reaction: ‘I don’t understand what I’ve done wrong’. The text also revealed student attempt to reassure or absolve the teacher from this sense of blame; he stated ‘it’s nothing to do with you’. His comment about feeling ‘bad’ was suggestive of guilt; and this was found in many of the student accounts.

In summary, changing teachers seemed to be associated with a sense of betrayal, insult, blame, and guilt, and with concerns about hurting teachers.

A very different pattern of talk around changing teachers was articulated in three accounts. There, the process was described in positive and supportive terms:

S09: she’s very open about kind of suggesting new teachers to me if I don’t want to stay with her […] that’s something I really need to address. But [name of current teacher] would help me with that.

S13: you’ve had all you can and, and often they’ll be like, they’ll put you in contact with another teacher that they work well with […] she’ll advise instead of just being like ‘Okay, I’m done with you now’

[elsewhere in interview] judging by [name of conservatoire]’s standards I would say they handle it very well, because it’s never going to be an easy thing, because as much as you can say it’s not personal, it always
is going to be reflected, you know, on the teacher and pupil’s relationship with each other.

In these comments the two students indicated that their individual teachers had offered advice and assistance in their considerations about moving to a new teacher. Extract S13 revealed a juxtaposition of the positive with the troubling; her words ‘it’s never going to be an easy thing’ mirrored the pervasive theme within the findings that changing teachers was felt to be ubiquitously and inherently difficult.

Resolution to a Relational Problem

Eight students presented the desire to change teacher as a solution to resolving a troubling interpersonal relationship with the teacher. An extract from the following student is one illustrative example in relation to the implications of feeling controlled in the relationship:

S10: if you have someone else wanting to control every, every note or every nuance to that degree, that’s, that does take away a sense of ownership […] I’m being very critical […] I wouldn’t be here without her […] So I’m terribly grateful to her and she’s lovely. But at the end of two years with her I felt I wanted my freedom actually.

The sense of feeling controlled in the teacher-student interaction appeared to have evoked the need to end the relationship in order to exercise ‘freedom’ and ‘ownership’ in learning. The textual shift from the student voicing criticism to expressing praise for the teacher perhaps reveals the co-existence of both positive and negative feelings about the relationship. An interrogative reading might however question if this was indicative of student anxiety / tentativeness about expressing criticism about teachers, hence the shift to counteract the negative with positive articulations.

The next extract revealed a student’s reflections on how she would approach a teacher if a relationship was not working effectively:

S23  I think I would have to arrange to meet the singing teacher and go ‘Look, this is how I feel, uhm, I feel like our relationship isn’t working. I feel like we need to – I think we need to see other people. It’s not you, it’s me.’ Basically I would dump my singing teacher […] it’s very difficult, because you are basically saying it’s not you, it’s me, and you do mean it. […] it’s a personal thing and sometimes you just cannot get what you need from a person for whatever reason, just a personality difference. And it might not even be that you don’t like them, it’s just, it’s just, you know, translation problem that’s never gonna be fixed.

There was a lot revealed in this passage. The student opened up an imagined dialogue with a teacher around wanting to end a relationship due to it not working well. A solution to the problem was presented: ‘I think we need to see other people’. This
phrase was linguistically evocative of committed personal relationships coming to an end due to irresolvable difficulties. Use of the word ‘dump’ conveyed a sense of getting rid of / discarding a relationship that was no longer wanted and ‘isn’t working’. The text also disclosed blame lurking around the decision to end the relationship. In this regard, the student took up the position of the person to be blamed: ‘it’s not you, it’s me’. However, reference to a ‘translation problem’ and ‘personality difference’ that were irresolvable, ‘never gonna be fixed’, suggested a different framework of meaning was also emergent. Rather than the problem residing in either the teacher or student, there seemed to be a shift towards understanding the issue as residing in the realm of the interpersonal. This extract captured a theme that emerged across accounts, that some teacher-student pairings were troubled by intractable relational difficulties, and that the best resolution in such instances was termination of the relationship and a change of teacher.

**Discerning a Good Teacher-Student Match**

The significance of the quality of the ‘match’ between teacher and student was identified in eight student accounts. This emerged strongly in interviews where students had experienced serious interpersonal mismatches with teachers which had led to terminations of the relationship. An example was from a student whose relationship with a previous teacher had been conveyed as harrowing and having had negative implications for her sense of self and voice:

**S15:** it’s really just consolidated the things that I, like, how important I think the relationship is, which I never really realised before last term. I think there is always something I’ve taken for granted, but now I think, yeah, it will; it will be something that I am very wary of and careful about.

Here, awareness of and caution about the quality of the interpersonal relationship was communicated as emerging out of having had a troubling relationship which she had recounted as ‘a total mismatch’. Further examples of the need to discern a good match with a teacher included the following from two students:

**S20:** For me it has been like looking for the good therapist (laughs) because I think I’ve tried quite a few to finally find someone who was exactly good for me

I think we need to be able to find this match

**S08:** It can be daunting, because you want to make sure that you are committing to something which will help you, whilst you are learning. […] it took me a while, for that relationship to really uhm, reach that stage, that I trust her
S08: it’s really difficult because the formation is asymmetric. They have all the information that we don’t. It’s a bit like going to a doctor and trying to find a good doctor.

The use of similes of searching for a good therapist or good doctor might be interpretatively read as implying both positive and negative implications. In this regard both professions when practised with ethical concern may provide supportive, sensitive and responsive relational experiences that facilitate some form of change / improvement in the individual. Negative connotations however might suggest that such professional relationships, when practised without due care and ethical responsibility, leave individuals dependent and vulnerable to harm. The second extract revealed that the search for a good teacher-student match could be ‘daunting’ (S08), and concerns about trust, commitment and the need to be discerning (‘you want to make sure’) were evident.

The centrality of finding ‘the right teacher’ to study with was revealed as critical to the experience and outcomes of learning in the following accounts:

S18: if you go with the right teacher, then you’re really enjoying yourself, you know, you come out with a smile every time you come out of the lessons. But if you don’t get on with them, you know like [name of his past teacher], then forget it. You know, it’s not worthwhile.

S21: I’m only just beginning to realise how important is it to get the right person. And the right teacher as well. You know. The mixture of personality and uhm, what they teach.

[elsewhere in interview] learning to sing with one person in a room, every week, for an hour is difficult [laughs] […] but it could be made so much easier […] if that pairing is just as good as it can be.

These passages conveyed the significance and role of the interpersonal relationship in making or breaking the student experience in one-to-one tuition.

8.5 Intimacy and Distance

Findings revealed a theme about the value and complexities of intimacy versus interpersonal distance within one-to-one tuition in fourteen of the accounts. Contradictory beliefs about the preference for closeness or distance with teachers were found both within individual accounts and across cases. The relationship was construed by students in a number of ways including an emotional attachment, parental, business like, friendship, and friendly but not friends.
An Intimate Relationship?

The experience of teacher-student intimacy in the relationship was expressed as highly valued in the following ways:

The following extracts were from one interview:

S10: she’s seen so far into my, sort of, deepest personality. The kind of things that one tries to hide from normal people about, sort of, your insecurities and all that. She just seen right in that.

I can’t hide anything from her. And that’s good, because in order to sing better I think I shouldn’t try and hide things

She needs sort of access, full access in a sense [...] You can’t just do the technique and keep everything, sort of, closed down mentally or emotionally. You have to be very honest.

In this account, the following framework of meaning was identifiable: to become a singer required profound emotional openness, self-revealing and exposure of vulnerability to the teacher. The reference to revelation of insecurities which would normally be hidden was suggestive that the high degree of personal exposure was felt to be unusual.

The experience of becoming intimate friends with a teacher was expressed as valuable by the following student.

S17 I had a more – a more intimate relationship with [name of teacher]. We became more friends [...] when she knew that me and my girlfriend didn’t have any money and stuff, she – we went and stayed down in her [...] holiday flat [...] So we had a more – yeah, we had a more intimate relationship. More – more friendly relationship.

This relationship was communicated as evolving beyond the boundaries of teacher-student roles and the conservatoire context. Such intimacy was enjoyed.

Another student revealed her desire for intimacy:

S13 I’ve wondered about this actually, because I do see [name of her teacher] as like a third parent [...] because I see her all the time I just, you know, I want to be, I guess, attached to her in some way whilst I don’t have my mum here [...] She kind of fills that role (Laughter) [...] She totally doesn’t know that. (laughs)

This passage revealed a construal of the relationship as parental and an emotional attachment. The comment ‘she totally doesn’t know that’ suggested concealment of such feelings from the teacher. This might indicate student perception that such dependence and emotional need might meet teacher disapproval. During her interview...
this student communicated that the relationship was intimate, special and mutually self-disclosing of personal information, and she revealed that she often cried and looked to her teacher for comfort and reassurance. This gave rise to a picture of deep emotional attachment and dependence. Later in the interview however there was a shift in her narrative. She spoke of needing ‘to just rein it in a little bit' and said ‘it’s healthy to just pull it back a little bit’. The opposing desire for interpersonal distance was revealed as follows:

S13  Whilst I, I’ve been saying for the last half an hour that's it’s, it's great that we’re so close, and that we don’t have so many boundaries, actually, sometimes it, it’s nice to know that, that you have a little distance between each other. Because in the end you still have to go in and get the work done, and you are here because you want to be a professional opera singer. And sometimes our, kind of, personal relationship gets in the way

Whilst intimacy was desired and enjoyed, it was juxtaposed here with the need for interpersonal distance. The latter was connected with fulfilling the demands of becoming an opera singer. She appeared to allude to a sense that such a dependent and emotionally close relationship could become problematic if sustained too long, due to the demands of the operatic professional context.

The tension between intimacy and distance appeared across accounts. The following extract offers an example of this type of tension:

S09  it’s very much a business relationship […] she’s not emotionally attached to me as a person. She might be slightly, because that comes with – you know, I am slightly attached to her. But it’s not an emotional attachment.

[Elsewhere in interview] she’s not asking me intimate questions about my past and things like that. And I would never want that from a teacher. If I want that, I will go to see a psychiatrist or whoever. Yeah, the right professional.

Ambiguity in framings of the relationship was conveyed; there was both partial acceptance of (‘she might be slightly’, ‘I am slightly’) and rejection of (‘it’s not’) the idea that teacher and student were emotionally attached to one another. A binary of emotional attachment versus business relationship seemed evident here. The indication of intimate questions being unwelcome and the need for a teacher to differentiate their role from becoming quasi-therapeutic, i.e. a ‘psychiatrist’, indicated that high levels of intimacy and self-disclosure were undesirable for this student.
A Desirable Distance?

Interpersonal distance from teachers was expressed as a desirable state of relationship in one-to-one tuition in many accounts; even where the opposite desire for intimacy had been identified.

The experience of mutual respect for personal privacy was revealed as one important aspect:

S20: I think it’s more about the fact that she never crosses the line of my private life. I can tell her what I want to tell her, but she will never go where she doesn’t have to go and I’m doing the same with her. I’m never asking her a question that I feel like ‘this is her private life’. So I think it’s having a really private relationship, really good relationship, but really healthy, not intrusive.

The desire for a non-intrusive relationship with boundaries around self-disclosure (‘she never crosses the line of my private life’) was indicated here. This desire for interpersonal distance was expressed in a range of ways in student accounts, including through rejection of the notion of teacher as like a parent:

S20: I like having someone who – she’s my singing teacher. She’s not my mum. She’s not, err, part of my family. She’s not some weird authority on me, I’m a grown up person and we’re just having a good relationship on the singing bit.

S17: I don’t put anything into that relationship that doesn’t need to be put into it […] he’s not a substitute father […] I guess there could be situations where a teacher becomes a substitute paternal/maternal figure […] I haven’t done that.

S08 some of my friends who are coming from different cultural background, have said that […] they should feel like the teacher is like their mother. And that’s something I feel is a bit different from how I feel about my teacher, in the English environment. Because like, they are working within their professional capacity. So, that kind of distance is quite comfortable for me. But I know of some friends who found that a bit too cold.

Student S20 called upon and negated the idea of teacher as mother-figure, ‘she’s not my mum’, and this appeared to be linked with taking ownership of authority in the relationship. The notion of teacher as mother figure was expressed as a cultural normative expectation amongst English students in S08’s account, and she differentiated herself from her peers indicating a desire for interpersonal distance, which was connected with notions of professionalism.
Concerns about emotional intrusion in relation to teachers becoming too personal with their self-disclosures or their desires to know about the student’s emotional life-world were communicated. This arose in particular in relation to concerns about the one-to-one teacher-student relationship being mis/understood as friendship:

S09: I had a teacher and she was just way too personal. And like – and it’s – it’s – for me it’s too much […] it becomes a friendship. I don’t want a friendship from my singing teacher. I don’t want to be emotionally tied

S10: I knew all about her ex-husband and even the current bloke she might have been with […] she wanted someone to talk to […] like you were her friend […] I didn’t want it necessarily

[Continued elsewhere in interview] I felt very much that I was her student and therefore, sort of, subordinate in that she was the one in authority and that, you know, she chose to, sort of, tell me things about her life, I couldn’t disagree. As a, because friends should be, sort of, equals in their friendship. I didn’t feel that we were.

S11: I’m not someone who wants a teacher who is going to be one of my friends, because I don’t find that as productive

[Continued elsewhere in interview] I find it very annoying and I find it quite patronising. And sort of, ‘I want to sort of work with you, I don’t necessarily want to be your friend.’ […] I find that when it’s kind of forced in that way, uhm, and sort of trying to overly show how caring and sort of pastoral, uhm, they can be. I find it a bit patronising […] I know that it’s really well intentioned, but it’s just something that doesn’t inspire me to necessarily open up

In the above passages there was a sense of struggle and anxiety about the way the relationship may be construed or misconstrued as friendship. Issues of power were identifiable in relation to the confusion of navigating friendship versus teacher-student positions. Interpretation of the reference in S10’s account above, to the student as ‘subordinate’, the teacher as ‘authority’ and to questions about the capacity to exercise choice about levels of intimacy, foregrounded the tension arising from the intersection of power relations and intimate relations. The extract from S11 suggested that teacher attempts to position themselves as friends could be experienced as ‘patronising’. This perhaps indicated the experience of feeling infantilised and of vertical relations of power. Concerns were revealed in the above accounts about emotional intrusion in relation to teachers seeking to know or to be known too personally by students.

The teacher-student relationship as friendly, but not friendship, was identified as a desirable type of relationship. The following were indicative of such comments:

S12: I just feel like, my singing teacher, it’s great that we have a nice relationship. But she is my singing teacher and that’s her professional
role, and that's why I go to her and why I pay her to do what she does. And I just think, there's, there's a dangerous territory which I've seen other people [...] they still get good singing results but for me that would, I wouldn't feel comfortable having a close friendship, kind of, relationship with my teacher. Although I want it to be open and friendly.

S23: I think you always feel like you’re quite friendly with your teachers. Uhm, but as I, I, I just think it takes a lot longer because you don’t want to interfere with that balance. You don’t wanna push over the edge. On the other hand it’s not helpful to feel that you’re not friends with your teacher and you can't be friends with them.

In summary, the theme of intimacy and distance revealed convergence and divergence in students’ beliefs, experiences and feelings around the value and tensions of such states of relationship in one-to-one tuition.

8.6 Mis/Trust

Students talked about the nature, value and complications of trust in the relationship with teachers (fourteen accounts). Key patterns of meaning identified under this theme included: the value of trust and questions of / lack of trust. A dynamic tension between trust and mistrust was evident.

The Value of Trust

The need for interpersonal trust in teacher-student relations in vocal one-to-one tuition was communicated in fourteen of the accounts. Examples of comments included:

S12: I think, I, singing is such a vulnerable thing, like you’re opening your, yourself, your soul, your voice it’s so personal and it hurts so much when it’s like, knocked down. So I think you have to really trust the person you’re working with to make it the best that it can be.

S14: you're entrusting your, your future with someone, and, and so much of your sense of self, if you're, you know, because so much of your identity becomes tied into being a singer as well, it’s, it's not just, it's not like, I mean, everyone puts identity into what they do. But because, some, for all those reasons, it's such a personal thing.

These extracts captured the sense of vulnerability of being in the position of learning and being dependent upon a teacher. Linguistic reference to ‘your soul’ (S12), ‘your identity’ and to entrusting the teacher with ‘your future’ and ‘sense of self’ revealed the significance of trust that a student placed in this relationship. There appeared to be so much at stake emotionally, psychologically and professionally and the capacity to trust in the teacher was communicated as critical.

Positive experiences of trust with teachers were conveyed:
S20: I trust her to always tell – I’m scared of not going to honesty more […] Always tell me the truth about where I am and, like, what my level is and where I’m going and just being really honest about, like, what I can do or not and that’s really good to have someone who just tells you. It hurts sometimes because you want to hear something else, but it’s really, like, yeah. But I think that goes more for honesty. I think for trust I would say, like, I can tell her anything and I trust her completely.

S21: trust that what she says is ultimately going to be a good a thing for me. Whether I can do it then or not. I trust that she has faith in me and likes who I am as a person, and as a singer. Uhm and I trust – mm, yeah. I just – yeah, it just feels like there’s an environment of trust.

The extract from S20 revealed the valuing of teacher honesty, even though honest criticism could be experienced as emotionally troubling, as indicated in the phrase ‘it hurts sometimes because you want to hear something else’. Student S21 related the positive experiencing of ‘an environment of trust’ and of the teacher having ‘faith’ in her.

Interpersonal trust was found to emerge out of the experience of feeling encouraged by a teacher to take risks and overcome fear:

S22: it’s about removing the fear, uhm, and I think that there can be quite a lot of fear involved in the process of singing, particularly at the top of the voice for men if you’ve had a tendency to crack, which I have because I didn’t have the technique to deal with it. Uhm, but very cleverly and almost without my noticing, she managed to remove a hell of a lot of that fear, uhm, and, yes, her ability to do that and make that section of the voice work meant that I, yes, really trusted her judgement and - I suppose it comes from doing what you are told to or asked to and finding that it works. That’s the thing that breeds trust, really, and finding that it doesn’t seem to be damaging you, because there is a fear of that as well. Because there are a lot of charlatans that tend to do things that, uhm, are not really good for you

Four repetitions of the word ‘fear’ in the above passage indicated the high degree of anxiety involved in developing the voice and the need for trust in this process was communicated. Use of a linguistic metaphor of teachers as charlatans, suggested a perception of some teachers as deceptive or not to be trusted in terms teaching methods. Reference to ‘damaging’ and teachers doing ‘things that… are not really good for you’, revealed anxiety about potential for vocal damage with some teachers due to questionable teaching practices. For this student however, his experience with his teacher was positive; he had felt supported in working with and improving the top of his vocal range and this was conveyed as requiring trust (‘I… really trusted her judgement’) and enhancing trust (‘that breeds trust’).
Questions of Trust

Findings (in ten cases) also revealed ambivalence about how, if and when to trust teachers.

A tension between the desire to trust a teacher’s approach versus anxiety about whether the teacher and their teaching should be trusted was identified. The first three extracts are illustrative of this concern and were derived from one student:

S08: I want my teacher to be someone that I feel I can trust and feel safe. Both as a person and also in her judgement as a singing teacher.

I’m still learning the singing, so I don’t really know what’s right and what’s wrong, and I made the decision to trust her. But I appreciate that I don’t know everything, so there is always a little bit of uncertainty.

in order to accelerate your learning, it’s more effective if you just embrace the method and just go with it. And if you have some doubts which is stopping you going, and that will spoil your development. And at the same time, if that person is taking you to the wrong direction, you will be heading to the wrong direction as fast as you can [laughs] So that’s very sad.

In these extracts the need to ‘trust’ in and ‘embrace’ a teacher’s pedagogic approach to singing was linguistically communicated: ‘her judgement’, ‘the method’ and ‘her methodology’. There was a juxtaposition of the need for trust in order to develop, ‘to accelerate your learning’, versus uncertainty about being developmentally at a stage where it was difficult to determine if the teacher’s methods were productive or counter-productive. This dilemma of needing to and not knowing whether to trust was revealed in other accounts, for example:

S09: I can’t hear my own voice. And that is 100% in her hands. She’s the person that will hear me on a most regular basis in a focused – focused situation. So I have a huge amount of trust for her to tell me, and to reassure me that things are going in the right direction

I think there are always moments I have doubts. But that’s me constantly questioning.

I trust [name of teacher] more than anything. And I have to. I have to trust her. And that’s hard […] there’s still the monetary – I’m not at all saying that she’s (laughs) like this. I’m just saying that you’ve to remember that there’s still the monetary thing. You know, my fiancé will say, ‘Of course she’s going to say you’re improving. You’re paying her.’ (Laughs)

This student revealed the complex nature of trust. The extract communicated the experience of dependency that was felt to be particular to the vocal student, due to the inability of the singer to hear and evaluate their own sound. This seemed to position
the vocal student as perhaps more dependent on a teacher than other instrumentalists for honest feedback. The issue of the economic structuring of the relationship was referred to. This was particularly in relation to questioning how a teacher may be influenced in giving honest critical feedback if they were also financially benefiting from having the student attend and pay for more lessons. In the conservatoire where this student was studying, findings revealed that some students were paying privately for additional lessons due to feeling time constraints in the institutional provision of lessons; and this was being referred to here.

Several students talked about experiencing or concerns about the consequences of lack of or collapse of trust in the relationship with the teacher. The following extracts were indicative.

S10 I think when there’s a, sort of, maybe a collapse of the commitment or the trust that can get really difficult. I find that kind of bleeds into the rest of it.

S21 I felt like I couldn’t challenge or question. Uhm, and for me, that was a big problem. Because, uhm, I think if you feel like you can’t question, it kind of makes trusting compulsory and therefore you don’t trust. If – if – if trusting is compulsory, then you – then it’s much hard to trust, isn’t it? (Laughs)

Student S10 captured the sense that loss of interpersonal trust in the relationship was felt to permeate the entire learning experience with a teacher. The account from S21 revealed that incapacity to question or challenge a teacher was felt to be troubling for the development of trust. Trust that was felt to be ‘compulsory’ might be considered as coerced, imposed, assumed or demanded, rather than relationally earned or negotiated, as indicated by reference to the need to feel able to challenge and question. The notion of compulsory trust emerged in this passage almost like an oxymoron and it seemed as though the student was trying to deconstruct her understanding of the nature of interpersonal trust.

Student S15 talked in her interview about ‘hostility’ and lack of ‘care’ and ‘honesty’ in an interpersonal relationship with a past teacher. This was linked with her sense of not being able to trust the teacher; the following extracts were from her account:

S15 there was also, like a fundamental lack of honesty in our relationship. Like, I never felt like – and trust as well

I’m absolutely fine with people criticising me and I’m very happy to, like, laugh at myself when things go wrong, etc. But when you feel like somebody has that hostility towards you, uhm, and you don’t feel like they really care about you, or, like, actually want you to get better. (Laughs) […] it’s just impossible to put up with criticism like that
Here the experience of lack of interpersonal trust and honesty with a teacher was associated with the impossibility of making use of teacher critical feedback. This opens up important pedagogic questions regarding the implications of lack of trust in a learning relationship, as student openness to teacher feedback appears from this account to be curtailed.

The final theme of significance in student accounts was that of humour and fun.

### 8.7 Humour and Fun

Nine of the student accounts revealed that the capacity to experience humour and fun with the teacher was desirable and valued.

S14: I think it’s fun. I, I don’t think that’s a prerequisite for, for a teaching relationship. But I think it’s quite important. I want to feel like I can relax and, you know, if I fuck something up, say, ‘I’ve fucked that up,’ and, you know, you can have a laugh, and it, you know, it doesn’t get in the way of the work, it helps the, work better.

S15: I’m not at all scared of her and if I did something wrong she’d be like, ‘Yeah, that was wrong,’ and make me have a laugh about it and then we’d find a way of solving it.

S22: I really enjoyed the process, I suppose, and we laughed an awful lot, particularly at my mistakes, uhm, which is very helpful for making sure those mistakes aren’t, you know, sources of terror anymore. You start to see them as being rather silly and things that you can certainly get rid of.

These accounts revealed the role of humour, laughter and fun as shared interactional phenomena in relationship in enabling students to feel less troubled by their difficulties in learning. Mutually shared humour seemed to function as a mediator of anxiety about failure and perhaps acted to reduce feelings of shame, embarrassment or inadequacy at falling short of expectations. In this regard S22 indicated that being able to laugh with his teacher at his mistakes led to reduction in level of distress, as mistakes were no longer ‘sources of terror’. This led to a revision in his framework of meaning, as mistakes became understood as less significant (‘rather silly’) and possible to resolve (‘you can certainly get rid’ of).

### 8.8 Summary

In this chapter, findings from the student individual interviews were presented. I identified areas of convergence and divergence in relation to themes across the student data. Meanings, beliefs and experiences were found to be claimed, refuted, shifting, partial and contingent in the findings.
Six key themes were identified as significant in the student interview data. The theme of the human instrument revealed issues relating to the specificity of the voice as an embodied instrument and to difficulties with translating teachers' verbal communications into embodied musical knowing. Power relations were explicitly identified in the data, including in relation to equality and freedom in a mutual but asymmetric relationship, the harmful effects of powerlessness, and student relatedness to teacher authority as contested or deferential. The process of changing teachers was identified as particularly troubling and there was perception of institutional resistance to and lack of support in this regard. The limited evidence of students feeling supported in making a change of teacher was presented. The value and complexities of interpersonal intimacy versus distance and of interpersonal trust versus mistrust were outlined. Finally the value of humour and fun in teacher-student interactions was presented and found to be a positive mediating factor in overcoming difficulties in learning.

These findings will be discussed in relation to findings from the individual teacher interviews, in-depth case studies and the extant literature in the discussion chapter (chapter 9) which now follows.
Chapter 9: Discussion

9.1 Introduction

This study examined the way that teachers and students perceived, made sense of and experienced the relationship in the context of one-to-one conservatoire vocal teaching. Through in-depth and detailed examination of the relational systems of teacher-student pairs and through investigation of individual perspectives of teachers and students, the research sought to explore two key questions:

- What significance do teachers and students give to the ‘relationship’ between them in one-to-one tuition?
- How do qualities and forms of relatedness between teacher and student influence the process, experience and outcomes of learning?

Findings revealed a number of features and phenomena of the relationship that were found to be significant to teachers and students. These included the relationship as predicated on a process of effecting change, power relations, changing teachers, the value and complexities of interpersonal intimacy versus distance, the complexities of trust and honesty and the value of humour and play. This chapter presents a discussion of findings under these thematic areas and highlights points of convergence and divergence between the two strands of investigation and in relation to the extant literature.

9.2 Learning as a Process of Bringing about Change

Overall findings revealed that one-to-one vocal tuition was made sense of and experienced as a relationship predicated upon effecting change in the student. This aligns with concepts that define learning as a process that involves some form of permanent capacity change (Illeris, 2007). Findings from the case study strand revealed that transformations required on the part of the student included in music making, performance, emotional expressivity, embodiment, and energetic engagement, attitude to practice, responsibility for learning, self-discipline, emotional maturity, risk taking and vocal technique. Some changes might be thought of in terms of ‘assimilative learning’, involving accumulation and assimilation of new information, skills and knowledge (Piaget, cited in ibid), whilst other changes seemed to require
more fundamental transformations in ways and forms of knowing, what was termed ‘accommodative learning’ by Piaget. Examples in the case study findings of what might be construed as the latter include:

- changes in relatively stable characteristics of a student’s way of being, communicating or expressing themselves in the world (exemplified in the case of Marcus),
- changes in a student’s level of emotional insight, developmental maturity and attitude to responsibility (e.g. in the case of Lara),
- changes in embodied knowing that required a synthesis and integration of emotional, physiological, cognitive, interpretative and musical forms of knowledge (e.g. in the cases of Marcus and Hannah).

The study revealed that different relational, experiential and emotional implications for teachers and students emerged according to whether there was a sense of progress (change was forthcoming) or whether there was trouble with bringing about change (change was unforthcoming). These two thematic areas ‘progress’ and ‘trouble with change’ will now be discussed.

### 9.2.1 Progress

Findings from both strands of the study revealed that experiences and perceptions of progress in the student were associated with positive emotional states of joy, pleasure, excitement and pride.

The case study data revealed that each dyad seemed to have a dominant thematic of either progress (in the dyad, Jody-Antonia) or trouble with change (as in the dyads of Jody-Marcus and Connie-Lara). However, to present this as an absolute binary would obviate indicators in the data that these relationships could be experienced in terms of both progress and stasis at different times. That said, where progress was identified as a dominant theme within one of the dyads (Jody-Antonia) this was linked with teacher-student relational rapport and ease, mutual understanding and mutual directness. In that dyad there was evidence of mutually collaborative relating and binary forms of relatedness on the dimension of student dominance–teacher passivity. The student was perceived by the teacher as taking charge and having a high degree of responsibility, agency and authority in the relationship. The presence of that binary relational constellation was not experienced as particularly troubling. This finding might suggest that dyadic relations associated with progress involve the student taking a
position of authority, active engagement and responsibility and the teacher supporting the co-creation of such relational possibilities.

These findings linked with Serra-Dawa’s (2010) research on teacher-student relationships in one-to-one higher education vocal tuition; she too found evidence of teaching dyads where student dominance was identified. In her study this was less common than teacher dominance in these relationships and that concurs with current case study findings where student dominance was also found to be less prevalent. The findings here also connect with Burwell’s study (2005) in which she found student ability to be linked with higher levels of student participation in lesson interactions.

Findings from the individual teacher interviews also identified the theme of progress and this was linked with teachers’ perceptions of student openness to risk taking and capacity to tolerate uncertainty / unfamiliarity. This seems to suggest that learning may involve an experience that is not free of anxiety since it involves coping with uncertainty and an unpredictable sense of risk.

9.2.2 The Trouble with Change

When change was felt to be unforthcoming in the student, findings from both strands of this study demonstrated that this evoked emotional reactions of frustration and anxiety in teachers and students, and findings specific to the case study strand revealed that this was linked with the emergence of troubling oppositional teacher-student relational configurations. These findings will now be explored.

Mis/Understanding of the ‘Problem’ in Learning?

Triangulation of teacher and student perspectives within dyads and across the clusters in the in-depth case studies revealed that when there was a sense of delay or stasis in the process of effecting change, teacher and student were found at times to share an understanding of what was inhibiting change, and at times there was considerable divergence in frameworks of meaning. Evidence from two dyads across the clusters (Jody-Marcus and Connie-Lara) revealed that teacher and student framed the difficulties with effecting change as a ‘problem’ that was located within the student. However, despite sharing a perception of the location of the problem, formulation of the nature of the difficulty was understood quite differently by teacher and the respective student. For example, in the dyad Connie-Lara, the teacher framed the difficulties in terms of the student being irresponsible, lacking in self-discipline and emotionally immature, whilst the student revealed partial and intermittent awareness of her over-dependence on her teacher and of a tendency to self-sabotage. Quite different
frameworks of meaning were thus unearthed regarding the impediments to progress within the dyad.

There was also some evidence from the case study clusters of conflicting understandings of the location of the ‘problem’ in learning between teacher and student; in other words there was difference of opinion regarding within whom the issue resided, teacher or student. For example, in the pair Jody-Marcus, triangulation of findings indicated that at times they shared understanding of the problem as residing within the student (i.e. his resistance / obstacles to change); but at other times, their understandings were opposed. In this instance, the teacher viewed the problem as located within the student (his resistance) but the student viewed the problem as residing within his teacher (her unreasonable demands).

Findings revealed convergence across the two case study clusters with regard to teachers sharing a perception of students as somehow responsible for the stasis or slow pace of learning. When the teachers perceived students as resistant to / frustrating change, it seemed as if this became experienced as a relational transaction. It was as if the student was resistant to or frustrating the teacher, even though the student in one dyad (Marcus) felt he was doing his utmost to achieve his teacher's learning goals. Such perceptions of a student were found to be associated with the experience of intense states of frustration, irritation and impatience in both teachers. Through triangulation of teacher and student perspectival data within dyads and across the case study clusters, a link was identified between the emergence of the following binary oppositional relational configurations in the relationship and the experience of trouble with effecting change (see figure 8 below):
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**Figure 8**: Binary Oppositional Relational Configurations Associated with Trouble in Effecting Change

These relational binaries that seemed to constellate the teacher in the dominant / responsible position and the student in the passive / deferential / irresponsible position were associated with difficulties in effecting change in the student and this resonated with findings from Burwell (2005) on the link between student passivity, teacher dominance (in terms of talk in lesson interactions) and lower student ability as indicated
earlier. Further discussion of these binary constellations identified in this study appears in the section on power relations (see section 9.3), where they are explored in greater depth.

Turning to the individual interview strand of this study, results from the teacher interviews revealed similar findings to the case study teacher perspectives in the following ways: teachers tended to understand difficulties with effecting change as a problem residing within the student, the dominant formulation of delay in progress was that of student ‘resistance’ and such perceptions gave rise to teacher frustration and anxiety. Like the case study teachers, these teachers were found to question their reactions, perceptions and assumptions about the student and the nature of the problem and this indicated that multiple, partial and shifting frameworks of understanding were employed. These teachers were also found to experience a tension between being responsive to individual needs of students (i.e. being student-centred in relation to pace of change), versus responding to perceptions of institutional pressure to achieve change at a particular pace and time. This latter finding was also identified in the case study teachers’ findings.

The study thus revealed strong coherence between individual teacher interview findings and case study teacher perspectives, suggesting that the experiences of the latter were not unique to those two teachers, but rather shared amongst a wider group of vocal teachers.

Turning to findings from the individual student interviews, the theme entitled ‘the human instrument’ exposed that students struggled with making sense of teachers’ technical communications and transforming teachers’ ideas into embodied, musical and expressive forms of knowing. Lack of visibility of and accessibility to the workings of the instrument (i.e. the human body/voice) were identified as one dimension of this problem. Lack of ‘shared language’ through which to communicate about the latter was identified as the other troubling dimension. These findings also revealed that the voice, body, sense of self, identity and even the ‘soul’ in some accounts, were experienced as inextricably interwoven. In Oakland’s (2010) study of opera choristers she used the term the ‘embodied voice’ to describe the inseparable nature of the voice from the human body for singers and this notion is supported by the current study. Findings from the current study (individual student interviews) revealed that due to the embodiment of the instrument, interpersonal tensions in the teaching relationship could manifest in bodily tension which by implication could negatively influence music making. It thus seemed that the qualities of the interpersonal relationship might significantly influence the learning process for vocal students.
Individual student interview findings also revealed that teacher usage of complex metaphors and imagery and reliance upon verbal language to communicate technical information, were found to be difficult to transform into embodied forms of knowing. This gave rise to student feelings of confusion, anxiety and frustration. This finding was not identified in the case study strand of the research; however there is evidence of similar themes in the extant literature. In this regard, Persson (1996a) found evidence of a piano teacher perceiving students as confused by her use of metaphor and imaginative communications and Purser (2005) found that teachers had difficulties with evaluating students’ technical issues due to invisibility of areas of the body that were involved in teaching of brass and wind instruments. In relation to the voice, Fleming (2005) talked about the vocal teacher and student relationship as troubled by a barrier of lack of shared language through which to communicate about invisible and involuntary muscles involved in vocal development. This suggests that the issues identified in the current study in relation to vocal students may transcend particularity of instrument, since there appears to be some commonality across piano, brass, wind and vocal instruments. The findings here raise important pedagogic questions for one-to-one music higher education around how teachers communicate technical and interpretative knowledge to students.

In summary, findings from this study suggested that the one-to-one teaching relationship was predicated on an implicit agreement between teacher and student to work together to effect change (see figure 9 below for diagrammatic representation).
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Learning = Predicated on Implicit Agreement to Effect Change

**Figure 9: One-to-One Tuition - an Implicit Agreement to Effect Change**

However when change was felt to be unforthcoming, there was evidence of a tendency in teachers to employ interpretative frameworks that cast the student as the inhibitor / resister of change, while students appeared to employ frameworks of meaning that both coincided with and at times significantly diverged with teachers’ understandings. When there was trouble with bringing about change, the relationship itself appeared to become a site of interpersonal struggle.
Triangulation of findings between teacher and student perspectives from both strands of the study, revealed points of significant divergence between teacher and student ways of making sense of the trouble with effecting change at times. This divergence between teacher and student understandings raises an important question about perspectivism in teaching and learning and whose account of the learning predicament takes prominence. Lack of shared understanding seems to inevitably lead to a problem in finding appropriate resolutions. What is viewed as student resistance by a teacher for example, but viewed as incomprehensible teaching instruction by the student, would suggest difficulties in establishing solutions (see figure 10). Schön’s (1987) notion of the ‘learning bind’ is useful in considering this situation. This concept described the development of serial miscommunications between music teacher and student that led to lack of mutual understanding of the nature of issues in learning. He argued that this created an interlocking interpersonal dynamic that could dominate the relationship and constrain learning as neither teacher nor student could understand the framing of the issue from the other’s perspective.

![Figure 10: Lack of Mutual Understanding of the Learning Predicament](image)

**A Pedagogic Dilemma When Change is Unforthcoming: Challenge or Allow Student-Led Pace of Change?**

Case study strand findings revealed that when change was found to be a troubling process both teacher-participants struggled with navigating a tension between two key resolutions: challenge/confront the student or allow space/time for student-led pace of learning. Teacher’s use of interpersonal challenge was found in all four case study pairs, including the dyad that was characterised in terms of progress. Challenge was found to have transformative effects in students; including increased effort and motivation, recognition of self-destructive behaviours, greater risk taking, more robust
singing, deeper insights about contesting teacher authority, recognition of capacity to assert autonomy with a teacher, and greater recognition of when to surrender to teacher authority rather than oppose it.

Triangulation of case study teacher and student perspectives revealed that both teachers and students were unsettled by episodes of challenge but this was more pronounced in the dyads where the process of bringing about change was found to be troubling (Jody-Marcus, Connie-Lara and Connie-Hannah). In the dyad where teacher and student (Jody-Antonia) both shared a quality of directness as a relatively stable characteristic of each of their individual styles of relating, there was evidence that this relationship weathered difficulties more easily. A sense of interpersonal freedom emerged from that pairing and this was the dyad characterised by progress. In the dyad, Jody-Marcus, where the emergence of relational confrontation was most troubling to the student, that dyad encountered more difficulties in bringing about change. Again, this might support the view that relational capacity to tolerate the destabilising effects of challenge may be linked with positive outcomes in learning and this raises pedagogic questions about how and if this capacity may be developed / learnt.

Findings from both case study teachers revealed concerns about student capacity to cope with challenge and about alienating and being unfair to the student. There was evidence in both teachers’ accounts of a coupling between being challenging and anxieties about unjustified forcefulness or authoritarianism. This may have been due to acts of challenge being infused with teacher frustration about feeling powerless to effect change at times. Thus challenge may have been experienced as teacher-centred rather than student-centred. Both teachers were found to interrogate their motives for, and questioned the validity of, challenge, recognising that challenges created difficult emotions and interactions for the student. However these concerns were juxtaposed with teacher belief in the need for challenge to promote significant change in students.

Moments of interpersonal challenge were relationally interpreted in the case studies as creating episodes in the teacher-student relationship of unpredictable disturbance and disequilibrium. Such moments from relational perspectives (Stern, 1998; Stolorow, 1997) are understood to open up the possibility of change, particularly if both participants can tolerate and contain the troubling emotional states that accompany such periods in relationship (Stolorow, 1997). This reading of findings offers insight into the importance of challenge and the inevitability of associated troubling emotions in the process of learning.
Student perspectives from the case study clusters revealed that challenge was indeed emotionally unsettling. However it was also highly valued and tolerable in all four dyads as findings evidenced that teacher challenge was felt to be indicative of care and of positive teacher intention. This highlights the significance of the qualities of the relational climate in making challenge a creative rather than destructive experience. Student perception of teachers’ caring intentions seemed to support the former in making use of challenge rather than such interactions being defended against and experienced as punitive or harmful. Findings from the individual student interviews under the sub-theme of ‘lack of trust’ offered additional support for this idea, as challenge that was experienced within a pervasively negative relational climate, was found to be experienced as hurtful criticism and as difficult for the student to utilise.

Returning to the case study strand, findings also revealed that giving space and allowing the student to lead the pace of change could be experienced as transformative. One student (Marcus) found that space and time away from his teacher enabled deeper embodied understandings and greater ownership of technique. However triangulation of teacher and student perspective within that dyad revealed that this sat in stark contrast to his teacher’s prevailing beliefs about resolving the stasis in learning. Although she evidenced desires and repeated efforts to be collaborative, she struggled to believe in the potential of allowing this student to effect change at his own pace. Triangulation of findings within the cluster revealed however that the same teacher (Jody) with a different student (Antonia) evidenced more collaborative relating and she was able to trust in and allow that student to lead the learning process. This indicated that different relational pairings brought about different pedagogic approaches within the teacher and thus highlighted the significance of the dynamics of the relationship and their influence on teaching and learning.

**Brief Summary of ‘The Trouble with Change’**

Overall the theme of the trouble with change suggested that the experiencing of difficult emotions in relation to challenge may be inevitable and even valuable in the process of effecting deep change. The findings revealed that lack of teacher-student mutual understanding about the nature of difficulties in learning may have negative consequences on the experience and process of learning. Findings suggest the need for conservatoires and teachers to employ pedagogic frameworks that take account of the ‘problem’ of perspectivism (Mitchell, 1997, cited in Gerhardt, Sweetnam, & Borton, 2003); in other words whose account or framework of meaning takes precedent in one-to-one tuition - the teacher’s and/or the student’s. The power invested in the position of teacher may make it more likely that the teacher account will eclipse that of the
student, and thus there is a need for pedagogic practice that seeks to understand the student's framing of their difficulties to support learning.

This latter point links with Burwell’s (2005) research on music lesson interactions - she recommended that teachers make use of more exploratory questions, rather than rely on interrogatory instructive ones in teaching. By taking an explorative and dialogic approach to the relationship, where student perspectives are taken into account, this seems to proffer an opportunity for collaborative forging of resolutions. This is consonant with Creech (2012) who indicated that teaching dyads that could be considered as involving a facilitative student-centred model of learning involved teachers who were receptive to taking in student views. Such dyads, also characterised by mutual respect and reciprocity, were found to have highest musical achievement. Developing understanding of how a learning predicament is construed by each party can prevent the development of a spiral of misrecognition, which leads to an impasse. This situation was described by Schön as the ‘Learning Bind’ (1987) and he identified this impasse in the music teaching studio as a hindrance to learning.

9.3 Power Relations

This study found that power relations in the teacher-student one-to-one relationship had significant implications for the experience and outcomes of learning. The following areas will be discussed:

- collaborative relations,
- dynamics of submission-dominance and the question of student autonomy
- reflexivity as a mediator of binary power relations
- harmful relationships and the effects of powerlessness.

9.3.1 Collaborative Relations

Evidence of collaborative forms of relating in one-to-one tuition was found in both strands of this study. The case study strand revealed that both teachers preferred, experienced and made conscious repeated attempts to create collaborative forms of relatedness with their respective students. Such relations were however not permanently established with a student, rather both teachers felt intermittently relationally pulled/pushed into vertical power relations of teacher dominance / authoritarianism (e.g. in Jody-Marcus and Connie-Lara). This was experienced as frustrating due to teacher preference for more horizontal collegiate styles of interaction. Student perspectives across case study clusters revealed that power relations that
recognised the student’s contribution and autonomy within the one-to-one relationship were associated with positive learning experiences and outcomes. Such relations were connected with enhanced self-esteem, emotional well-being, vocal confidence, improvements in singing and development of an individual artistic voice. Findings from Cluster 1 revealed that both students valued an ‘equal’, or ‘collaborative’ relationship, yet described it as ‘hierarchical’. This highlighted complexity in the notions of collaboration and equality between teacher and student, since such mutual relations seemed to be valued alongside recognition of hierarchical role-related power differentials between teacher and student.

There was strong convergence in findings from these case study clusters and the individual interview investigative strand. In the latter, teachers similarly valued reciprocal collaborative relations with students and this was linked with enhanced teacher engagement and motivation. The student perspectives from the individual interview (similar to the case study students) revealed that experiences of ‘equality’ and ‘freedom’ to exercise control and to express a voice were highly valued along with recognition of role related power differentials in the relationship.

These findings are congruent with those of earlier researchers (Barrett, 2006; Burwell, 2005; Gaunt, 2006; Wirtanen & Littleton, 2004) who found evidence of collaboration, co-operation, mutuality and reciprocity in one-to-one music tuition. The dialogic nature of interactions and the negotiation of meaning and solutions were also found in earlier research papers to support student confidence and development of artistic identities (Barrett & Gromko, 2007; Wirtanen & Littleton, 2004). The current study brings a nuanced understanding to existing notions of teacher-student collaboration, highlighting that collaboration does not equate with a meeting of equals. Rather a more apt conceptualisation might be of a mutual but asymmetrical relationship, to invoke a relational idea, where mutuality involves a sense of commonality and sharing that is significantly different in form, quantity, quality or degree for each party (Aron, 1996). Such a framing recognises the differing roles, functions and positions of influence within the relationship between teacher and student, whilst acknowledging that both may mutually gain from and collaborate in the relationship.

9.3.2 Dynamics of Submission-Dominance and the Question of Student Autonomy

I will now discuss dynamics of submission-dominance and interrogate the notion of student autonomy in relation to findings from this study.
Triangulation of findings within and across clusters from the case study strand revealed intermittent emergence of binary power relations of submission-dominance, deference-authoritarianism or passive-active. As mentioned in the section earlier on the trouble with change, in three of the four case study dyads, the teacher was found to be pulled toward the position of power in such configurations and in one of the dyads (Jody-Antonia) there was a reversal with the student inhabiting the position of active / dominant. There was also evidence in one dyad (Connie-Hannah) of the student contesting and resisting teacher authority.

Findings from the case study clusters revealed that these binary power configurations appeared to repeatedly emerge in the teacher-student relationship in ways that were experienced as troubling, uncomfortable and undesirable to either or both participants, but importantly not as traumatic or harmful. Such relational positions were not found to be fixed, rather each partner in the dyad seemed to feel intermittently and implicitly pulled, pushed or nudged into position. For example, analysis of data across clusters revealed that both teachers felt relationally pressed by their students into becoming authoritarian in response to student passivity. This was conceptualised in relation to the concept of complementarity (Aron, 2006; Benjamin, 1999) which describes the intermittent and inevitable collapse into binary complementary forms of relatedness in all human relationships. Notably despite such relational pulls, teacher impulses to become authoritarian / dominant were experienced as troubling, subject to self-questioning and self-restraint and actively resisted at times. Such desires were found to be juxtaposed with desires and indeed repeated attempts to develop collaborative forms of relating as discussed earlier. This resonates with Gaunt’s (2011) finding that the creative process in one-to-one instrumental and vocal tuition was often teacher dominated, despite teacher aspirations to develop student autonomy, and the current research has provided insights into the dynamic and conflicted nature of such desires and forms of relatedness in teachers. Contextualising these findings within institutional ‘norms’ and cultural practices within the field of one-to-one conservatoire tuition and in relation to teachers’ own histories of learning, the emergence of teacher dominance in these types of relationship might be understood as also shaped by such influences. Interestingly findings in this study also revealed that teacher dominance could be both a relatively stable individual characteristic and an emergent property of the dyadic relationship as will now be discussed.

Findings from cluster 1 revealed that teacher dominance was a relatively stable characteristic of the teacher’s interactional style (Jody) but was also relationally co-created. Interpretation of her account revealed that dominance in relating was a familiar aspect of her relational repertoire; however she was found to experience
herself as having a tendency towards passivity with a highly autonomous student but an opposite tendency towards dominance and authoritarianism with the other student. Findings from this cluster thus revealed that two opposite power configurations emerged with the same teacher in the different dyads and different qualities of relatedness were brought about in the same teacher by the different relational contexts. This links with the intersubjective notion that psychological phenomena are not derived solely from isolated intra-personal properties of individuals; instead they emerge at the interface of mutually co-constructive worlds of experiencing (Stolorow, 1997).

Similarly, examination of findings across the two case study clusters revealed that power positions were found to be relationally co-created, rather than solely stable characteristics of individuals. For example, the case studies revealed evidence of students that could exert autonomy in relationship with current teachers (Antonia with Jody, and Hannah with Connie). However the same students were found in previous one-to-one relationships to have struggled to effect independence in relatedness with the teacher. In this regard, Hannah had experienced herself as compliant, submissive and dependent on her previous teacher in what was recounted as a traumatic relationship. With a change of teacher (i.e. of dyadic pairing) she was able to contest teacher authority and assert her own will in opposition to the current teacher. Triangulation of teacher-student findings in this dyad (Connie-Hannah) revealed that the student’s experience of contesting teacher authority, and of having her autonomy recognised even when she defied the teacher’s wishes was found to be a highly valued and transformative experience for the student. This was particularly significant due to the student’s past experience of feeling powerless, trapped and dependent with the teacher. The discovery of autonomy as emergent from a sense of connection with and separation from the teacher, rather than disconnection and isolation seemed to be significant to this student’s understanding of herself as a learner and to her understandings of teacher-student relations. This was relationally interpreted through Keller’s (cited in Aron, 1996) notion of dynamic autonomy that emerges from a sense of relatedness with as well as separation from others.

The concept of mutual recognition (Benjamin, 1999) was also drawn upon to interpret the teacher’s (Connie’s) capacity to sustain and balance the tension between asserting her own will (to prevent the student taking on a particular performance role), whilst recognising the will and desire of the other i.e. the student’s wish to take the role against her teacher’s advice. That relational episode could be thought about in terms of mutuality, as defined by Aron (1996), since teacher and student were able to sustain a sense of relational connection whilst also being in a state of asserting difference or disagreement. Aron wrote as follows:
for mutuality of recognition to exist in a relationship, there must be two participants who feel themselves to be autonomous people capable of agreement and disagreement (ibid, p. 151)

This provides support for the notion that the relational system between teacher and student is a determining feature of the capacity for students to achieve autonomy in the relationship. The current study thus problematises a one-person psychological perspective of student autonomy / independence, querying it as a quality or property of the individual student. Instead the interpretative analysis revealed that student autonomy was both an individual and relational achievement that was contingent on the nature of the interactional world of the dyad. Like other researchers (Purser, 2005; Serra-Dawa, 2010) this highlights the significance of the teacher-student match in one-to-one tuition. Furthermore, previous researchers have questioned how the tendency towards teacher dominance and student passivity in one-to-one tuition may hinder the development of student autonomy (Gaunt, 2010, 2011; Jørgensen, 2000); in this regard the relational conceptualisation in this study has elaborated existing understandings by foregrounding the dynamic and intersubjective nature of the development of student autonomy.

The findings from the case study strand of investigation indicated that teacher dominance, student passivity, student autonomy or student independence were not static characteristics of individuals, nor fixed power positions within the one-to-one relationship. Rather such positions seemed to be taken up and resisted, desired and unwanted, accepted and rejected, questioned, troubled and destabilised. Power relations were thus found to be contingent, contextual, intermittent, and dynamic rather than fixed categories of individuals or even of dyads. However there was also evidence of these dyadic relationships having tendencies to habituate or fall into particular binary patterns of relating within particular pairings.

Turning to the individual interview strand; the value and limitations of the master-student model of relating were revealed in teacher findings as follows. The value of students learning about submission to teacher authority through the template of the teaching relationship was linked with future career situations where conductors might demand absolute submission to their will. Equally student understanding of collaboration and capacity to exert autonomy with teachers was linked with the professional demands for collegiate relations and individual artistic vision in the future operatic career context.

The individual teacher interviews revealed evidence of teacher perceptions that the student was the originator or desirer of deference to teacher authority. This was
convergent with findings from the teachers’ perspectives in the case study strand and with findings from Lara in case study Cluster 2 who appeared to experience a high dependence on her teacher and to position her teacher in a dominant role. These findings align with those of Purser (2005) and Jørgensen (2000): the former found evidence of teacher perceptions of students inviting a ‘dictatorial’ teaching approach, and the latter argued that many students want to conform and be passive in the one-to-one teaching relationship.

Findings from the individual student interviews in this study however contrasted with findings from the individual teacher interviews and from the aforementioned researchers (Purser, 2005; Jørgensen, 2000). Students revealed very limited evidence of desire for deference or passivity to teacher authority. Indeed, to the contrary, there was considerable evidence of desire for an equal albeit asymmetrical relationship as discussed earlier (in 9.3.1). Furthermore there was also some evidence of students contesting teacher authority, including questioning teachers’ methods and interrogating assumptions of teacher as expert. The overall findings from this study and the extant literature indicate that teacher dominance and student submission are commonly identified relational positions in one-to-one tuition. However this disjuncture between teacher and student perceptions of: who is the instigator / desirer of particular power positions, is interesting. It seems to suggest that the inhabiting of particular role-related power positions in a pedagogic relationship influences the way that power relations are understood. This finding thus troubles previous claims that students are the initiators of teacher dominance or the guardians of desire to conform to teachers. Rather the relational interpretation of findings suggests that power positions are dynamic and co-created within relationship. Thus, the question of who does what to whom, or who instigates what in interactional space, is revealed as more complex in the current findings when compared to previous claims.

9.3.3 Reflexivity as a Mediator of Binary Power Relations

The case study clusters revealed that despite troubling emotions and relational power configurations emerging within the teacher-student dyads these were not found to be detrimental, traumatic or harmful in these current relationships. Why this was so will now be explored.

The case study data and the relational rendering of findings indicated that both case study teachers evidenced capacities for self-reflexivity (Aron, 2000). In this regard, there was evidence of both teachers being able to shift between experiencing modes of self where intense emotional states were felt (for example, feeling angry, frustrated,
irritated, wanting to be forceful) and observational modes of self (ibid), in which teachers reflected on such feeling states and desires as if an object of critical thought. I argued that this enabled teacher recognition of the student as an independent subject, not merely as an object of the teacher’s own will or expectation. There was evidence of teacher recognition of their students’ autonomy, perspective, needs, will and experiencing, even when that was opposed to the teacher’s. Rather than teachers inhabiting a rigidly fixed position in frustrated opposition to their respective students, both teachers revealed capacities to contain and reflect upon their feelings, to query their reactions, and to take account of the student's perspective. This was interpreted in relation to the capacity for creation of ‘the third’, which involves the creation of a reflective mental space to think about the self, the other, and the other's perspective on the self. This is understood to allow the individual to step out of a binary power struggle. No longer is the individual defined in binary opposition to the other (Aron, 2006; Benjamin, 2009), rather the creation of ‘the third’ is understood to enable transcendence of the binary positions and proffer the possibility of new forms of relating.

This aligns with ideas from relationally responsible inquiry (McNamee & Gergen, 1999). The shift in feeling states and attitude towards students, evidenced in both case study teacher accounts of moving from a position of anger and frustration to one of empathy in response to students’ difficulties, finds an echo in the following passage:

> to move […] from the angry to the sympathetic invites an alternative identity from the other. To become questioner invites the other’s authority […] and to replace anger with sympathy enables defensiveness to be replaced by good will. If effectively pursued, relationally responsible inquiry has transformative potential for the participants’ (ibid, p. 27)

This seems apposite to understanding the teaching dyads in this study. Despite settling into troubling binary patterns of relating, findings indicated that the current teaching relationships were not experienced as trapped in irresolvable impasses. This, I would argue was due in part to teacher capacities to shift relational positions from states of frustration to questioning those reactions and becoming more empathic towards their students’ struggles.

It was notable that the students in all four dyads revealed their experience of feeling cared for. I would propose that a ‘good’ teaching relationship that engenders the experience of care, is one that has the containing and facilitating features of teacher self-reflexivity; these enable the creation of the intersubjective third (Benjamin, 2009) to mediate conflicts, troubling emotions and binary patterns of relating. Such a perspective coheres with Schön’s conceptual world in which ‘reciprocal-reflection-in-
action’ (1987) can proffer the possibility of transforming a ‘learning bind’ into a possibility for change. In his theoretical argument, through teacher and student attempting to develop understandings of the other's framing of their interactional conflict, this additional ‘rung’ on the ‘ladder of reflection’ can bring about conflict resolution. This also coalesces with ideas proposed in Creech and Hallam (2003). In their examination of interpersonal conflict in instrumental learning partnerships, they advocated that a systemic perspective of the relationship, rather than a one-person psychological framing of learning problems, proffered possibilities for participants to reframe expectations, styles of relating and teaching strategies. This was understood to lead to possibilities for conflict resolution and improved prospects of musical outcomes.

In a psychotherapeutic relationship, interpersonal difficulties are supported and monitored through clinical supervision. Relational impasses may become subject to in-depth analysis and exploration both within supervision and within the clinical dyad itself between therapist and client. However, in a teaching and learning relationship, such in-depth ‘reciprocal-reflection-in-action’ (Schön, 1987) upon the nature of interpersonal difficulties seems to have limits. The value of teacher reflexivity to serve the pedagogic functioning of the relationship was found to be important in this study however the emergence of on-going complementarity / conflict that dominates a learning process seemed to require a response that was beyond the scope of the teaching dyad to resolve. I will turn now to discuss the type of relational experiences that appeared to require such external intervention, due to extent of psychological distress that was identified as associated with such relationships.

9.3.4 Harmful Relationships and the Effects of Powerlessness

The theoretical interpretation of findings advocated thus far has highlighted that intrapersonal and interpersonal tensions, troubling emotions and difficult oppositional interactions can play a significant part in the process of learning. Such an interpretative perspective casts the experience of struggle and the toleration of some degree of emotional pain in teaching and learning as inevitable and to be understood as a part of the process of effecting change. However findings from both strands of this study revealed that some relational experiences in one-to-one tuition were beyond a threshold of tolerability and aroused deeply distressing emotions.

Data from two of the four case study students, and approximately half of the individual interviews with students identified the theme of harmful power relations in one-to-one tuition relationships. These types of relationships were characterised in student
narratives in both strands of the study in terms of the experience of feeling trapped, powerless, submissive, controlled and helpless and like a victim. Such relational experiences were reported as ‘harmful’ and ‘traumatic’ (to quote student participants) and were associated with serious negative consequences, including loss of motivation, performance ability, confidence and self-belief and physiological loss of voice. There was a recurring theme in both strands of the investigation of students struggling to make sense of and understand what was happening to them, at the time that these relational interactions with teachers were occurring. Difficulties had been experienced by students as they tried to extricate themselves from these relationships. Such relationships were terminated by students as they were experienced as too disturbing and aroused complex feelings of anxiety, anger, frustration, fear, pain and guilt.

This confers with findings from Gaunt who found evidence in a small number of cases of students having had ‘traumatic experiences’ (Gaunt, 2011, p. 169) with teachers and identified that the one-to-one relationship had the potential to be ‘damaging’ (Gaunt, 2005, p. 263). It also aligns with Persson’s (1996a; 1996b) findings that identified teacher behaviours towards students that were intimidating, offensive, insulting, and verging on ‘abuse’ (1996b, p.41). Persson raised a question in his study about why students ‘put up with harsh and insensitive treatment within the confines of their training’ (ibid, p. 44) and I will attempt to answer that question now in relation to findings from the current study.

Findings from both strands of this investigation offer insight into this question; they revealed that insufficient self and self-other awareness, lack of understanding of the relational situation at the time, confusion about what was occurring with a teacher, lack of institutional support, anxiety about repercussions, guilt for leaving a teacher, experiences of shame and fear and experiences of teacher retaliatory reactions for decisions to terminate the relationship, contributed to the difficulties in this regard. Termination of these types of relationship were found to be difficult and protracted due to the aforementioned.

It is possible to relationally interpret such harmful and traumatic relationships in terms of a collapse into complementarity around the binary positions of submission-dominance / powerful-powerless (Aron, 2006; Benjamin, 1999). As mentioned earlier, such relational configurations are common in human relating, so the question emerges, how do these types of relationships become traumatic and detrimental, rather than troubling but tolerable or even troubling but productive?
Relational interpretation argues that on-going complementarity stifles relationships as power relations of ‘doer/done-to’, victim/persecutor, powerful/powerless, authoritarian/deferential become fixed and unalterable. Each person in a dyad becomes locked into the binary, bringing the relationship to a kind of stand-off, impasse or stalemate. The irresolvable interlock is understood to often prelude the termination or breakdown of relationship, as the power struggle comes to dominate the relational space (Aron, 2006) trapping each person into the binary dynamics. Analysis of student data from both strands of the study revealed that the sense of being trapped and powerless, often in a protracted situation with a teacher, evoked highly distressing emotions. This state of relatedness with a teacher seemed to be the defining characteristic of what was linguistically referred to by students as ‘harmful’ or ‘traumatic’. Literature on trauma (Hensley, 2009; Herman, 1997; Rothschild, 2000) reveals that the states of helplessness, powerlessness, dependence and feeling trapped are common features of the experience of traumatic relationships. Furthermore, a lack of recognition, support or responsiveness to the individual during or after the traumatic situation can act to heighten distress (Herman, 1997). In this regard, triangulation of student perspectives from both strands of this study revealed a shared perception of lack of institutional recognition and support that deepened the sense of isolation and distress for students. One of the case study students (Hannah), who had reported her past teaching relationship as a ‘traumatic’ experience, revealed that she felt that she had become the object of institutional ‘scandal’ and felt unsupported after terminating the relationship with her teacher. Analysis of her account revealed that this had exacerbated the sense of psychological distress. The need for impartial consultation and institutional support to mediate and monitor such relationships was identified in her account and this need was clearly articulated in the individual student interview data also. This suggested that this was a shared concern rather than specific to only one participant.

Triangulation of teacher and student perspectives within and across the case study dyads revealed that the legacy of the effects of what were reported as previous ‘harmful’ / ‘traumatic’ learning experiences could influence the style of relating between teacher and student and effect the process of learning in the current teaching relationship. Current teachers (Jody and Connie) both recognised and made sense of the needs of their respective students (Antonia and Hannah) in the present, in relation to the harm of the past. Indeed Connie used the term ‘wounded healer’ to describe her work with Hannah, and this captured her sense of the remedial nature of this relationship. The legacy of detrimental effects of traumatic experiences in one-to-one tuition were unearthed in this study and the ameliorating effects of positive learning
experiences in the present that modulated the negative effects of the past were also indicated.

9.3.5 Brief Summary of Power Relations

In summary, this study found that power relations were discussed by teachers and students and a clear critical student perspective emerged from both strands of examination. This finding contrasts with Gaunt (2006, 2011) who found that power dynamics were of significance in one-to-one tuition, but this was largely implicit in her data with only 4 of 40 participants discussing it, all of whom were teachers not students. Her role as part of the establishment and of the institutional structures of power was identified as a potential limitation in her study (Gaunt, 2006). This may have constrained student capacity to talk about the effects of power in one-to-one tuition relationships since the researcher may have been perceived as a colleague of the students’ teachers and thus anxieties about allegiance and implications could have been in play. The current study extended knowledge about the nature of power in one-to-one tuition through the in-depth relational analysis. This research revealed the dynamic and contingent nature of power relations and evidenced its significant influence on student learning and well-being.

The next theme to be discussed is that of changing teachers.

9.4 Changing Teachers

Findings from both strands of the study revealed strong evidence that changing teachers was experienced as a highly complex and troubling process and there was limited evidence of this as a supported experience.

Although changing teachers was not identified as a specific theme in the case study strand, data analysis revealed that two of the students had changed teachers due to irresolvable interpersonal tensions in previous relationships. Findings from one of the students (Hannah) revealed that changing teachers had been a distressing and protracted process that aroused guilt. Experience of teacher retaliatory reactions and lack of institutional support were reported as disturbing (as mentioned in section 9.3.4). It should be noted that it was not possible to triangulate the student’s perspective with the past teacher’s perspective, since that teacher was not a participant in the present study; however the experience of the student was evident.

Findings from the individual student interview strand provided strong evidence that changing teachers was felt to be a troubling and complex process. The majority of
accounts revealed that student anxiety about a decision or wish to change teacher was linked with concerns that such a decision would be experienced by teachers as insulting, blaming or hurtful. Students were found to struggle with feelings of guilt and with not knowing how to navigate this decision with their teacher and within the institution. There was a perception of institutional discouragement of changing teachers and concern about and experiences of negative teacher reactions. These findings were convergent with the case study strand indicating that this concern was shared within a wider collective of students.

Findings from the individual student interview strand also indicated that some relationships were felt to be an irresolvable teacher-student mismatch, such that decisions to change teacher provided the optimal solution to the situation. Where students had experienced harmful relationships, this was found to raise awareness of the significance of the interpersonal relationship in one-to-one tuition, and anxieties about trying to find and discern what might constitute a good teacher-student match in a new relationship. The relational match was conveyed as a critical and determining feature of the experience and outcomes of learning in relation to those students who had experienced serious relational problems with teachers. In a minority of student accounts in the individual interview strand, students expressed positive perceptions in relation to changing teachers.

From the individual teacher interviews, students’ desires or actions to change teachers were found to be perceived as troubling and complex for teachers and the sense of some teachers feeling insulted by such actions was identified. This provided evidence of confirmation that student anxieties were consonant with teachers’ reactions. This suggested that students’ concerns might reflect an intersubjective experiential reality within the educational context. There was however also some evidence of teachers expressing accepting views and being supportive of students wanting to change teachers. Interestingly one teacher shared her past experience as a young student in relation to trying to change teachers and this account closely reflected the contemporary anxieties that were identified in the individual student interview findings.

Overall, findings from both strands revealed strong evidence that student wish to change teacher was framed as an implicit relational attack upon the teacher, and that anxieties about blame and insult were found to trouble the process for both teachers and students. These findings differ from those of Presland (2005) who gave no indication of changing teachers as troubling in her study in a conservatoire piano department. However current findings are aligned with those of Gaunt (2010, 2011) and Serra-Dawa (2010). The former found evidence of student anxiety, confusion, delays and concerns about betrayal
of the teacher and this is consonant with the sense of blame and guilt evidenced in the current study. Serra-Dawa identified the most cited reason for change of teacher in her study on vocal one-to-one tuition as interpersonal issues rather than technical, and this is convergent with findings here that some changes of teacher were found to be associated with serious interpersonal difficulties in the relationship.

In considering these findings, it is inevitable that some students will want or need to change teachers during their studies for a variety of reasons. This might relate to developmental stage, curiosity to try a different style of teaching, or simply to have the opportunity to work with other teachers. Such decisions may reflect a desire for a new experience, rather than a desire or need to leave a difficult relationship. However, the latter was also clearly evident in current findings. Institutional resistance to changing teachers or the normative expectation of teacher and student working together for the duration of study may be valuable for teacher-student dyads that function well; but this seems likely to exacerbate the situation for those where the relationship itself is in trouble. The findings raise serious questions about how students who are struggling in relationships, and particularly for those experiencing 'harmful' relationships (as discussed in section 9.3.4), are able to resolve the situation. Such a student seems to be caught in a catch twenty-two, so to speak; to continue the relationship, is to be trapped and distressed, but to leave the relationship is to be fearful and troubled by a range of anxieties. This seems to call for institutional consideration and further research.

I will now turn to discuss the value and tensions of intimacy and interpersonal distance.

### 9.5 Intimacy and Interpersonal Distance

The theme of intimacy and interpersonal distance was identified in this study as significant to teachers and students and emerged in both strands of investigation.

Case study findings from Cluster 2 revealed that a high degree of personal intimacy was experienced in one-to-one tuition. Through triangulation of teacher-student perspectives in one dyad (Connie-Lara) feelings of love, affection and strong emotional attachment were identified as mutually shared. Such feelings appeared to be enjoyed in the relationship and were not indicated as troubling. Findings from the other student (Hannah) in that cluster revealed a different dimension to intense emotional attachment with a teacher. This student experienced a previous teaching relationship as ‘passionate’. A sense of erotic and aesthetic admiration, coupled with a high degree of emotional attachment and idealisation was at first experienced as pleasurable, however this highly affectively charged relationship was recounted as ultimately
traumatic due to the emergence of feelings of intense dependence and powerlessness for the student. This led to loss of confidence, ability / desire to sing and termination of the relationship. This finding could not be triangulated with the respective teacher data since the teacher referred to was not part of the current study; however it gave clear evidence of the student’s experience. Although this type of experience was identified in only one case in the data from the whole study, the idiographic approach taken recognises the significance and implication that may emerge from a lone voice (Chamberlain, 2011). This finding thus raises important questions for one-to-one music pedagogy about whether teachers and students are adequately supported to manage intense emotional states and deep emotional involvements in this context. It highlights the potential vulnerability of the position of a young student who may experience powerful feelings towards a teacher and the dependence upon a teacher to manage such feelings with ethical care. The power invested in the position of ‘teacher’, places responsibilities of duty of care for the well-being of students upon teachers. Psychotherapists, even when trained and supervised to work with such relational phenomena, often struggle to respond to the force of intense desire and the implications of such intimacy with clients in long-term one-to-one clinical contexts (Mann, 1999). Conservatoire teachers have been noted as usually untrained as teachers (Odam & Bannan, 2005) and they are not trained to understand the relational complexities of long-term dyadic relationships as psychological practitioners might be. So questions arise about institutional responsibilities in relation to how teachers are supported to make sense of and respond appropriately to such situations. Findings here suggest a need for support in this area where issues of power and intimacy intersect in one-to-one tuition.

Findings from the individual interview strand opened up additional insights into this theme. Differing understandings and positions were taken by teachers and students around the value of intimacy versus interpersonal distance in the teaching relationship. Ambiguity and conflicting views were communicated both within and across accounts evidencing the shifting and partial nature of accounting for human experience.

Findings from the individual teacher interviews revealed that intimacy was understood as both a desirable and undesirable relational phenomenon in the one-to-one relationship. The development of high levels of intimacy and deep emotional engagement with students was understood as a pedagogic necessity to support vocal and embodied release, emotional expressivity and interpretative abilities in students by some teachers. However the demands, strain and complexity of providing such intimate relationships was also revealed as difficult to manage, and thus the need for emotional distance from students was also communicated by those same teachers.
Interpersonal distance was linked with fostering student independence and with teachers' needs for self-protection against becoming exhausted by the emotional demands of too intimate a relationship. For some teachers the relationship was perceived as a more interpersonally distant relationship and there was a rejection of the need for emotional closeness for pedagogic purposes. Quite differing ideas were thus communicated.

Looking across findings from both strands of investigation, the relationship was construed in a number of ways by teachers, including like a therapeutic, parental and business relationship. These metaphors were used, positively advocated, resisted, and rejected across accounts and even within individual accounts. The therapeutic and parental metaphors appeared to be associated with high levels of intimacy, vulnerability and personal emotional disclosure, whilst the business metaphor seemed to be linked with notions of independence and professionalism.

The complexities that emerged for teachers around navigating intimacy and distance in the relationship aligns with earlier findings from Nerland and Hanken (2002), Purser (2005) and Gaunt (2011), who all identified similar tensions for teachers. Nerland and Hanken (2002) talked of personal exposure of emotion as inherent to the study of music and this was linked with the fostering of intimacy and mutual vulnerability in the relationship. However such states of relatedness were presented by the researchers as creating tensions for teachers in receiving student criticism. This highlights a complex relational situation where intimacy is presented as an inevitable and necessary feature of musical teaching in conservatories, but that very state of intimate relations creates the conditions where critical student feedback becomes problematic. This raises important questions for conservatories about how students voice criticism within this pedagogic context.

The individual student interviews revealed a range of experiences, beliefs and values in relation to intimacy and interpersonal distance. This included students valuing the experience of feeling profoundly known by teachers in relationships with high levels of self-disclosure. This was perceived by some as necessary for vocal development, thus mirroring beliefs expressed by some of the teachers in individual interviews. However the complexity of trying to navigate the tensions of dependence and independence emerged in relation to high levels of intimacy. There was evidence that intimacy could be experienced as intrusive and undesirable at times and for some students; whilst at other times or for other students it was highly valued. At times and for some students interpersonal distance was highly valued and linked with the capacity to be autonomous and develop the necessary independence for the future career context. These findings
have some coherence with those of Presland (2005) who found that piano students in a UK conservatoire preferred more interpersonal distance with their teachers. There are also links with Gaunt (2010), who found that instrumental and vocal students struggled with making sense of the social boundaries of relationships with their teachers. She identified a divide between those that enjoyed social relations with teachers and those that preferred a non-socialising relationship, and she discussed the intimate nature of the one-to-one relationship.

Individual student interviews in this study revealed metaphors of relationship that were drawn upon, claimed, used and refused by students (even within individual accounts) and that revealed the un/desirability of relational closeness or distance with teachers. Metaphors included a parental relationship, an emotional attachment, therapeutic (psychiatrist) relationship, friendship, friendly but not friends, a business or professional relationship. Similar constructions were identified in Gaunt (2006, 2011), including parent-child relationship, Dr-patient and friendship. Findings from the individual student interviews in the current study revealed tensions in navigating closeness and distance, and in particular there were concerns about the relationship being construed as friends when relations of teacher power-over students were co-existent. A recurring theme of wanting a friendly relationship, but not a friendship emerged since the latter was felt to be complicated by the structural role related power differentials of teacher-student positions. The capacity of a student to determine appropriate levels of intimacy from the position of student was identified as a problematic. This seemed to link with findings from the case study student (Hannah) discussed earlier, in relation to the issue of power, dependence and intimacy. Where power resides in the teacher-position, there appears to be an inherent tension in the dyad in relation to the implicit or explicit negotiation of appropriate / desirable levels of intimacy versus distance.

The tensions and conflicted views around intimacy and interpersonal distance found in this study investigation might be understood through a relational lens as common to human experiencing. Aron (1996) talked of the complementary and conflicting human desires in relationship of the desire to know and not know about the other and to be known and not known by the other. This suggests that such tensions in the one-to-one teaching relationship around how intimate or detached, close or distant, involved or uninvolved a teacher or student may wish to be at any given moment in time in the relationship would be inevitable. Support may thus be required to enable both participants to navigate such tensions since teachers and students alike were found to struggle in this regard.
9.6 Complexities of Trust and Honesty

The theme of complexities of trust and honesty was identified as significant in the individual interview strand of this study.

A dialectical tension between trust and mistrust was evident in the teacher perspectives, with trust being valued and desirable and interpersonal mistrust troubling and difficult to navigate. Trust seemed to be recounted as shifting, questioned, unquestioned, partial, subject to collapse and earned rather than assumed. It did not appear as a static or permanently achieved state of relationship, rather the complex nature of establishing and securing interpersonal trust was revealed. Similarly being honest with students was expressed as desirable, valuable and necessary for student development, but teachers also revealed that honesty was often partial, difficult to achieve and avoided due to concerns about students’ capacity to cope with such feedback.

The troubling aspect of teacher honesty raises an interesting contradiction when considered in conjunction with teacher desires for student trust. The earning of trust might be considered as predicated on a sense of being able to read and rely upon the other’s honesty; where honesty is partial, limited or withheld this raises the paradox: can trust be born out of a lack of honesty? And if teachers struggle to be honest with students about their abilities and struggle to view that as their responsibility, who does a student turn to for an accurate understanding of their development?

The individual student interviews revealed that trust in teachers was desirable, highly valued, sometimes partial and also complicated by anxieties. Student perspectives revealed a strong desire for honest direct feedback from teachers, even when that was experienced as emotionally difficult to hear. Viewed in conjunction with teacher findings, this suggests that teacher concerns about protecting students from honest feedback may conflict with student preference to hear honest critique even when it may be difficult.

The individual student interviews also revealed a specific anxiety that teachers’ methods of vocal training could damage the voice. In this regard, developmental stage of the student was indicated as creating difficulties for students to discern if a teacher’s methods were vocally sound or not to be trusted. A tension between needing to trust in order to develop versus questioning trust on the basis of concerns about teachers’ methods and the economic structuring of the relationship was found. The latter was raised by students in conservatoire ‘B’ in relation to paying privately for additional lessons with teachers due to feeling there was limited institutional time available for one-to-one
tuition. The question of trust relating to anxieties about teaching methods also appeared in findings from one of the individual teacher interviews. A teacher revealed her own past experience as a student of experiencing vocal damage due to her teacher’s instructional methods and this was linked with desire for her own students to question their trust in teachers, including in her. This issue was also identified in one of the case study dyads (Connie-Hannah); this student had developed serious vocal health problems that required medical intervention and these were linked to the previous teacher’s methods of vocal training. Triangulation of teacher and student perspectives in that dyad revealed that a central aim of the current teaching relationship was to work with the problems that had been caused to the student’s vocal health and technique. These findings raise important questions about conservatoire vocal pedagogy and teacher training in this context.

Looking at the intersection of relational phenomena of trust and honesty in this study, there is indication of a potential link between students’ questioning of trust in teachers, and teachers’ struggling to be honest. Teachers’ difficulties with being honest and challenging with students about their limitations may be likely to co-influence the emergence of students’ doubts and questioning of trust in their teachers since students may sense this dissonance between what is said and what is left unspoken.

The findings in this study elaborate on those of Gaunt (2010) who identified that conservatoire one-to-one tuition can be experienced as a trusting relationship; the current study highlighted the complexities inherent in the achievement of and instability at times, of relational trust.

9.7 The Value of Humour and Play

There was evidence from both strands of the study of the value of shared humour, laughter, fun and play in interactions in one-to-one tuition. Although this was not identified as a specific theme in the case study findings, there was considerable evidence in those accounts that humour and laughter were found to be valuable in teaching and learning. This included in relation to mediating power and formality in the relationship, overcoming difficulties in learning, a pleasurable and valued aspect of relating, and questioned in relation to having too much fun (in relation to Lara) which was linked with issues of responsibility and self-discipline.

Individual student interview findings revealed that shared humour and fun in interactions with teachers seemed to act as a mediator of anxiety about difficulties in learning and fears of failure whilst findings from individual teacher interview strand evidenced that a
relational atmosphere involving humour and playfulness could enhance teacher motivation and was perceived as leading to improvements in students’ music making. The use of playful improvisation in teaching was communicated as releasing students from psychological and physical constraints such that this could enhance vocal performance. A relational conceptualisation of teacher-student interactions involving play or improvisation could frame such forms of relating as creating moments of unpredictability that destabilise habitual ways of relating and being. According to Stolorow (1997) and Stern (1998) such moments in a dyadic relational system shift interactions out of the usual canon of implicit relational expectations and this is understood to open up the possibility of change and new forms of experiencing. As such, this might suggest pedagogic implications for developing the role of improvisation and play in conservatoire teaching in relation to enhancing music making and performance.

9.8 Summary

Findings overall revealed that participants’ accounts of their beliefs, experiences, perceptions and frameworks of meaning were dynamic, conflicted and self-contradictory at times, rather than static or fixed and this was coherent with a dynamic relational psychological paradigm (Apter, 2003; Gergen, 2009; McNamee & Gergen, 1999). I have highlighted the contingent, partial and paradoxical in both presentation and discussion of findings in line with the epistemological approach taken, and also identified the emergent points of coalescence and assembly.

The provision of a long-term, weekly relationship that offers a high degree of personal attention was found to provide a valuable crucible for artistic and musical development. However this study also revealed that the dynamics, structure, tensions and ambiguities of the one-to-one relationship generate complexities for both participants.

In this chapter I presented a discussion of findings from this study. The case study strand afforded an in-depth analysis and comparison of individual perspectives on the experiencing of the ‘relationship’ within particular teacher-student pairs. This revealed the co-constructive nature of patterns of relatedness and highlighted the influence of the pairing in determining the experience and outcomes of this pedagogic context. The methodological approach allowed for dyadic findings to be positioned in relation to a wider collective of individual perspectives. Points of convergence in findings from the two strands of investigation were discussed. This highlighted that findings from the case studies were not unique to those particular relationships, but shared amongst a wider group of teachers and students across conservatoire contexts. These findings
included: learning being experienced as a process of bringing about change, mis/understandings of problems in learning between teacher and student, the trouble with effecting change, and the significance and workings of power and its influence on learning. The individual interview strand of investigation offered additional insights which were not identified as key or sub-themes in the case studies, though in some instances they were emergent under other themes in the latter. The additional themes included the problematic of changing teachers, the value and tensions of intimacy and interpersonal distance, the complexities of trust and honesty and the value of humour and improvisation in teaching and learning.
Chapter 10: Limitations, Implications and Future Directions

This chapter presents discussion of limitations of this investigation, highlights potential implications and looks forward to directions for further research.

10.1 Limitations of the Study

10.1.1 The Research Process as Creation of ‘The Third’

The epistemological approach taken in this study, including the relational paradigm, inevitably leads to an understanding of the findings and outcomes as a co-constructive process that has been derived from the intersubjective encounters of the research interviews with participants. The methodology of the research could be argued as an enactment of ‘the third’ (Aron, 2006; Benjamin, 2009), since the in-depth interviews provided a reflective mental space in which participants were invited to consider self, self-other relations and the other’s view of the self. In particular the use of video-stimulated reflective interviews offered participants the opportunity to observe and reflect upon their interactions with another; thus the methodology could be thought of as supporting the development of the observational mode of self which has been discussed in this study as a constituent of self-reflexivity. As such, the methodology may have had implications for participants, for example, acting as a mediating influence in teacher-student relationships as a result of having taken part in such reflexive activities. This is acknowledged and might indicate opportunities for future research to examine the impact of such a methodological approach in this learning context.

10.1.2 Researcher’s Subjectivity

I acknowledge the influence of my subjectivity (Mitchell & Aron, 1999; Smith, 2004) in shaping knowledge constructions in this thesis. As a psychological practitioner, my professional life has involved supporting individuals in exploring the more troubling and sensitive aspects of their relationships. This has been at the heart of my work. As such this may have created particular conditions for ‘talk’ that increased likelihood of elicitation of more troubling disclosures and critical perspectives which were evident in findings in this study.
Participants had been made aware at the outset of my professional background, my lack of institutional affiliations in the empirical field, and my lack of music pedagogic knowledge. It is thus possible that this position as an ‘outsider’ to that community of professional practice enabled criticism and contentious opinion to be voiced by participants. Affordances of being an ‘outsider’ include: lack of institutional based allegiances which can grant more critical distance to interrogate the status quo of the field (Ford, 2010), reduced participant anxieties about professional rivalry, enhanced participant anonymity and lack of dual and managerial / hierarchical relationships in the empirical context.

However, my relative ‘naivety’ in terms of the discipline and context of music higher education may have constrained discipline specific understandings and this is acknowledged as a potential limitation of my particular knowledge construction here. The primary focus of this project was to understand relationality, and this was situated within the conservatoire one-to-one vocal pedagogic context; thus the disciplinary specific technical and specialised knowledge was arguably not essential to fulfilling the primary aim. Most of the extant research into conservatoire one-to-one tuition is derived from the ‘insider’ perspective, so my particular ‘speaking position’ (Coyle, 2007) can provide complementary understandings and extend existing perspectives. This aligns with the aims of a contextualist approach (Madill et al., 2000), as adopted in this study.

10.1.3 Constraints of Sample

The sample of participants in this study was constituted by ten teachers and nineteen students; in relation to gender, twenty one were female and eight - male, and the majority identified ethnicity as white (UK) with only one participant being represented from black and minority ethnic identity, as Asian (Other). The sample is thus not balanced in terms of gender or representative of a wide spectrum of ethnicities. This creates potential limitations to the knowledge produced in the thesis since experience and perception of ‘relationship’ may be differentially influenced by gender and ethnicity. An in-depth focus on these areas was outside the scope of the present study, but may provide future directions for research. Logical or theoretical generalisations (Yardley, 2008) that may be drawn from this study (see later discussion in section 10.2) should thus be considered cautiously and in relation to this limitation.

10.2 Implications and Future Directions

Implications of findings and future directions for further research will now be discussed.
The current findings suggest a need in conservatoire higher education for development and implementation of systemic structures and provisions that make manifest the reflective space of ‘the third’ in order to manage and respond to the complexities of this one-to-one relationship. Critical functions of training, consultative support, mediation, monitoring and safe-guarding seem to be called for.

The role of supervision and continuing professional development in my own field of professional practice, psychotherapy and counselling psychology, is seen as a priority in supporting practitioners in their work in one-to-one relationships. The need for and use of third-party consultation was evident in findings from this study. In this regard sources of support that had been made use of or referred to by participants included student support services, counsellors, heads of departments, other teachers and peer students. There was an explicit call within findings for more support, supervision and monitoring to manage the troubling aspects of one-to-one tuition. A lack of consultative structures of support, supervision and training for conservatoire teachers in one-to-one tuition was noted in Gaunt (2006) and in recent years there have been new developments in this area⁶.

A range of provisions could be offered which might include for example, structures of student-staff consultative support, student mentoring schemes, staff supervision, collaborative working relationships, on-going staff training, use of video-enhanced reflective practice ⁷ in teacher professional development training and curricula developments within the programme of study. Such provision could encourage psychological literacy and understanding about the emotional vicissitudes of the process of learning in this context. An encounter and grappling with the unfamiliar and the troubling was found to be indicative of and central to bringing about some kind of transformation in musical forms of knowing. Such awareness could enable both participants in the teaching relationship to understand anxiety, frustration and intermittent interpersonal tensions as inherent to the experience of vocal training. Development of an understanding of the tensions of this pedagogic situation could also support students and staff in differentiating between troubling episodes that are indicative of the process of change versus those which signal more serious relational

---

⁶ For examples of recent developments see activities of Polifonia at: http://www.polifonia-tn.org/ accessed 31/07/14; see also the continuing professional development programme in teaching and learning in higher and professional education at Guildhall School of Music and Drama and Institute of Education: at www.gsmd.ac.uk/music/courses/continuing_professional_development.html accessed 31/07/14.

⁷ See Strathie, Strathie & Kennedy (2011) and Cave, Roger & Young (2011) for discussion of video enhanced reflective practice.
problems that require mediation, consultation and / or support with a change of teacher.

Provision of systematic support, supervision and mediation, could provide critical input into distressing and damaging relational situations. This could open up possibilities for teachers to be supported in making sense of their own difficult feelings, reactions and interactions, so that they might consider ways of managing the relational system with a duty of ethical care for the student’s well-being. This thus involves developing teacher reflexivity, which was identified in the study as an important mediator of problematic relations.

The study suggests the need for more research into and support for this relationship to ensure that the duty of care for students’ well-being remains a central concern. This seemed particularly significant in relation to the closed-door isolation of one-to-one tuition, the intersection of power relations and intense intimacy, and the experience of harmful relations that were identified in this research. Recent media attention to allegations of abuse in music schools has brought public awareness to this area of serious concern; further research seems necessary to investigate and interrogate power relations in this context. Notably some students talked during interview and informally post-interview with me about suggestions for changes in conservatoire teaching practices in light of their negative experiences. Suggestions included group teaching, having more than one teacher and opening the doors of these private relationships so that other teacher-student pairs could be regularly observed.

The study found that the voice and the student’s relatedness to singing could be significantly enhanced and seriously disrupted by the experience of the relationship with a teacher. This therefore opens up a question for conservatoires about how the qualities of the interpersonal relationship between teacher and student are taken into account in relation to learning outcomes.

This study also raised questions for music higher education pedagogy in relation to the teaching of vocal technique, as teacher usage of verbal language and metaphor was found to be difficult to transform into meaningful learning for students. This seemed to be an area requiring further research.

Positive findings in relation to the value of teacher-student collaboration, of play and improvisation and of encouraging student articulation of their framing of their difficulties in learning, could indicate areas for development in teaching practices within one-to-
one music pedagogy. Such areas seemed to provide fertile ground for considering constituents of good practice.

The study took a qualitative methodological approach and thus in terms of generalizability, the research did not aspire to make statistical generalisations nor seek to have findings exactly replicated when repeated by another researcher. Rather it might offer theoretical or logical generalisations which aim to provide insights that may be useful in other contexts (Yardley, 2008). In this regard, I propose that the findings from this study may have relevance, although cautiously offered, to one-to-one music teaching contexts across instruments, across conservatoire institutions, and across educational contexts, including junior conservatoires and private one-to-one tuition. It may also offer insights that are of value to other one-to-one teaching and learning contexts such as clinical supervision, academic PhD supervision and clinical/psychotherapeutic relationships.

It would be valuable for further studies to be undertaken that involve larger samples and employ other methodologies (both quantitative and qualitative). An examination of the relational dimension from critical and discursive perspectives could extend understandings in relation to the potential significance of gender relations and cultural conventions of conservatoire one-to-one tuition, since relational expectations and forms of relatedness may be influenced and shaped by gendered discourses and cultural educational practices. This has been outside the scope of analysis within the present study.

Research that investigates the nature and frequency of incidence of the more troubling issues that were identified in this study seems necessary. Areas that stood out as requiring further investigation included: the process of changing teachers, the intersection of power and intimacy, the experience and potential for emotional and vocal harm, and the positive potential of play and improvisation in one-to-one tuition.

Having discussed limitations, implications and future directions, I will now draw to a final conclusion in the following chapter.
Chapter 11: Conclusion

This study examined the relational dimension of one-to-one tuition in conservatoire vocal studies education. The overall findings revealed that qualities and patterns of relatedness between teacher and student were highly significant in influencing the process, experience and outcomes of learning in this pedagogic context.

The study revealed that the pairing between teacher and student, i.e. who is paired with whom, could advantage and indeed disadvantage the student in the learning process. Relational patterns and dynamics were found to be emergent properties of the dyad itself, rather than derived solely from psychological properties or characteristics of individual teachers or students. The research highlighted the need for conservatoires to consider learning experience and outcomes in this context as contingent upon the pairing and qualities of the relationship. The relational interpretation of findings also indicated that student achievements, including in relation to independence/autonomy, music making and performance, could be understood as both individual and relational achievements, rather than only the former. Similarly, there was evidence that problems or ‘failures’, so-to-speak, in the learning relationship were also relationally co-created, rather than solely reflective of abilities or properties of the individual student or teacher.

The research found that learning in this context was predicated upon a process of effecting change in the student. Where there was trouble with bringing about change, this appeared to become experienced interpersonally in the relationship. Troubling relational tensions and emotions were however revealed as inevitable and ubiquitous to the process of effecting deep change. They were thus framed as inherent to the process of learning. Findings importantly revealed that there was a significant disjuncture between the way that teachers and students made sense of difficulties in learning. Teachers tended to view problems with effecting change as student ‘resistance’, whilst students revealed that teachers’ reliance upon verbal language and use of metaphor to communicate technique was unintelligible and difficult to transform into embodied musical knowing. The invisibility of the ‘human instrument’ (the workings of the voice) was also identified as creating problems in learning. The study thus revealed important pedagogic implications for vocal teaching. In this regard, it highlighted the need for difficulties in learning to be understood perspectivaly, that is through taking account of not only teacher perspectives, but also student framings of their difficulties.
The findings revealed that power relations in one-to-one tuition were highly significant from both teacher and student perspectives. An in-depth and highly detailed analysis of the dynamic and complex workings of power was offered through the relational interpretative framework. This provides an original contribution to current understandings of power in this pedagogic context. A collaborative but asymmetrical relationship that recognised role-related power differentials was found to be desirable for students and associated with student well-being. There was differentiation between relational conflicts that, although emotionally troubling, seemed to be tolerable and even productive, versus experiences of one-to-one tuition that were found to be highly disturbing. Student findings revealed clear evidence of ‘harmful’ and ‘traumatic’ teaching relationships. These were characterised by the experience of feeling trapped in a state of powerlessness in one-to-one tuition. Such experiences were found to have serious negative consequences for students in terms of confidence, psychological well-being, music making, performance ability and relationship with the voice. These types of tuition relationships were found to be difficult to terminate and there was a sense of lack of institutional support in this regard. The potential for harm and the need for ethical care and intervention in such situations were identified. This problematic area seemed to be interlinked with another finding - there was strong evidence of ‘changing teachers’ as a problematic process. There was an explicit call in findings for greater institutional support, mediation and monitoring for this complex situation in one-to-one tuition.

The containing and facilitating features of teacher self-reflexivity were found in this research to provide a critical mediating function for navigating troubling emotions and relational tensions in one-to-one tuition. An in-depth examination of the value and nature of self-reflexivity in this particular pedagogic context was offered through the relational interpretative framework. This provided unique insights that extend the current state of knowledge in this area. Implications of findings highlighted the need for conservatoires to develop staff training, supervision and consultative systems to cultivate teacher and institutional reflexivity in relation to one-to-one pedagogy.

The study also identified a range of other significant features of the ‘relationship’, including the value and complexities of intimacy versus interpersonal distance, the intersection of power and intimacy and its ramifications, the complexities of trust and honesty and the value of humour and play. In all these areas a relational dynamic psychological reading of the phenomena was provided. This empirical research has thus identified the critical influence of the relationship in the pedagogic context and offered new ways of thinking about and theorising the relational dimension of conservatoire one-to-one tuition.


Ford, B. (2010). *What Are Conservatoires For? Discourses of Purpose in the Contemporary Conservatoire*. (Degree of Doctor of Philosophy), University of London, Institute of Education.


Serra-Dawa, S. A. (2010). The Teacher-Student Relationship in One-to-One Singing Lessons: a Longitudinal Investigation of Personality and Adult Attachment. (PhD), University of Sheffield, Sheffield.


Appendices
Appendix 1: Sample of Hard Copy Advertisement

Research Seeking Vocal Students

Are you:
- a vocal student
- under- or post-graduate
- currently studying voice in conservatoire or University
- have experience of 1-1 tuition

If yes, would you like to take part?

Contact: Paula Collens
Senior Lecturer & Counselling Psychologist
Email: xxxxx
Mob: xxxxx

Project Aims

To explore teacher-student relationships in One-to-One Vocal Studies tuition

Examine how relational dynamics influence the experience of teaching and learning

Deepen understanding of the benefits and complexities of one-to-one teaching

What’s involved?

- An audio-recorded interview with the researcher
- Interview lasts ~45 mins and is arranged at place and time to suit you
- Willingness to talk about your experience of the one-to-one teaching relationship
Appendix 2: Sample of Student Participant Questionnaire

Please answer the questions below. Please feel free to leave blank any question that you feel unable or do not wish to answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Initials:</th>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>Gender:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice type:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: Is English your 1st / 2nd language?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If second, what is your first?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: x / ✓ Black African White (UK) Black Caribbean White (Other) Black Other (specify) Asian (UK) Chinese Asian (Other) Indian Bangladeshi Pakistani Black (UK) Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you wish to indicate any other significant social/cultural Identities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatoire Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What year of study are you in?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad / Postgrad?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What qualification will you achieve on graduation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you select/choose your teacher or were you allocated your teacher by the College?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior/ Other Music Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you play any other instruments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous one-to-one tuition?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you have any other previous 1-1 teaching relationship/s that are of significance to you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes – give brief description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long you worked with them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal / instrumental?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualities in a Teacher: Please list the 5 most important qualities you would look for in a relationship with a teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Sample of Ethics Informed Consent Form

Research Participant Consent

Title of project: Intersubjectivity in One-to-One Tuition in Conservatoire Vocal Studies Education

Study approved by School Research Ethics Committee

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this research. The person organising the research must explain the project to you and you should have read any accompanying information sheet before you complete this form.

If you have any questions arising from the Information Sheet or explanation already given to you, please ask the researcher before you decide whether to participate. You will be given a copy of this Consent Form to keep and refer to at any time.

- I understand that if I decide at any time during the research that I no longer wish to participate in this project, I can notify the researcher involved and withdraw from it immediately without giving any reason. Furthermore, I understand that I will be able to withdraw my data up to the point of data transcription (2 weeks post-interview).
- The final outcomes of the research will be available to you in a summary report, please indicate if you would like be sent a copy: Yes / No
- Your identity will be made anonymous to ensure confidentiality in the public domain and your name will not be revealed in any subsequent publication.
- Where teacher and student pairs take part in the filming of lessons and interviews about the video-recorded lessons, the data will be treated with sensitivity. The researcher will ensure your anonymity in the public domain, however absolute anonymity from a co-participant may not be possible to guarantee, since you may recognise your co-participant’s comments in the context of discussions about your working relationship with them in future publication.
- I consent to the processing of my personal information for the purposes explained to me. I understand that such information will be treated in accordance with the terms of the Data Protection Act 1998.

Participant’s Statement:

I, __________________________________________
(full name, please print)

agree that the research project named above has been explained to me to my satisfaction and I agree to take part in the project. I have read both the notes written above and the Information Sheet about the project, and understand what the research involves.

Signed:

Date:
Appendix 4A: Sample A - Information Sheet for Participants (presented as an A5 booklet)

Guide for Participants
Research: The ‘Relationship in One-to-One Tuition
Conservatoire Vocal Studies Education

Paula Collens, MA, HCPC Reg
Senior Lecturer, Goldsmiths College

What does it involve?
As a teacher or student, you are invited to take part in an audio-recorded interview about your experience in the one-to-one teaching relationship in the conservatoire context. This will take ~45 minutes.

If you decide to participate:
• the project has ethical approval with Institute of Education and (name of conservatoire A)
• The study is guided by ethics procedures to safeguard your well-being
• You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time without giving a reason.
• Your name will not be revealed in any publication, and all data will be treated with sensitivity and anonymised.
• A follow-up debriefing or referral to support is available should you require this, in relation to any unforeseen reactions, discomfort or misconceptions arising through participation in the research.

Taking Part
I would like to invite you to take part in this research and hope that you might find some personal benefit from talking about and reflecting upon your teaching or learning experiences. This leaflet gives information about the project, its aims, and what would be asked of you if you are willing to take part.

Research exploring the one-to-one teaching context in conservatoire education is a relatively new area of exploration. If you are a teacher or student in this context and would be willing to take part, your participation would be a valuable contribution to the development of research, and theoretical and applied knowledge.

Paula Collens, MA, HCPC Reg
Senior Lecturer, Goldsmiths College

The Project Aims to:
• Explore teacher-student relationships in Conservatoire Vocal Studies Education
• Examine how relational dynamics may influence the experience of teaching and learning
• Deepen understanding of the benefits and complexities of one-to-one teaching

Research Project Details
About the Researcher:
Paula Collens, MA

I am Senior Lecturer, Therapeutic Studies at Goldsmiths College, University of London and a Counseling Psychologist (HCPC Registered).

For the past 15 years I have worked in Universities as a Psychotherapist, Psychological Consultant and Senior Lecturer in Counseling and Psychology.

I have a personal interest in the voice as an amateur singer and musician and as a lover of opera and song.

I am undertaking this research as a PhD study at the Institute of Education.

If you have any questions please contact
Paula Collens:
Tel: xxxxx Email: xxxxx@ioe.ac.uk
Appendix 4B: Sample B - Information Sheet for Participants

Title of project: Intersubjectivity in One-to-One Tuition in Conservatoire Vocal Studies Education

Study approved by Institute of Education, Research Ethics Committee

Taking Part:

I would like to invite you to participate in a PhD research project that I am undertaking at the Institute of Education. It is important that you understand you should only participate if you want to and that choosing not to take part will not disadvantage you in any way. Before you decide whether you want to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what your participation will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please feel free to ask me if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information.

Aims of the Research:

The purpose of the research project is to investigate the one-one tutelage relationship in conservatoire vocal studies education and to explore how teachers and students perceive the interpersonal aspects of the relationship as influencing teaching and learning in this context. There is relatively little existing research exploring the one-to-one tutelage relationship in conservatoire education. The project seeks participation from teachers and students in conservatoire vocal studies education.

What will participation involve?

As a teacher and student, you are invited to take part in one or all of the following:

- An interview about your experiences of one-to-one tuition in higher music education context
- Having your one-to-one lessons observed and filmed
- Taking part in an individual interview with the researcher who will show you sections of the film as a prompt to discussion. This interview will be audio-recorded with your consent, and will explore your perceptions of the teaching context. It will take ~one hour.

If you decide to participate:

- The project is guided by ethical protocols (Code of Ethics and Conduct of the British Psychological Society) to safeguard your well-being; There are no known risks to you in participating.
- You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time without giving a reason. A decision to withdraw at any time, or a decision not to take part, will not affect the standard of care/education you receive.
- You may withdraw your data from the project at any time up until it is transcribed for use in reports and publication (two weeks post interview)
- Your name (and any reference to individual / institutional names during your interview) will not be revealed in any publication, and all data will be treated with sensitivity and anonymised.
- Film and Interview audio recordings will remain confidential.
• Data gathered during the project will be used for academic research purposes and will be stored on a password protected computer.
• You are free to decline to answer any questions in the research put to you.
• A follow-up debriefing and/or referral to support is available to participants should they require such support, in relation to any unforeseen reactions, discomfort or misconceptions arising through participation in the research.
• If you do decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form.

Benefits of taking part:

• Those involved in the filming phase of the study will be offered a copy on DVD of the filmed lesson. This can be used for continuing professional development portfolios or self-reflective work. Any usage of the film should be negotiated with your co-participant (teacher or student).
• You will be offered a final summary report of the findings.
• Your participation will make a valuable contribution to the development of knowledge and understanding of conservatoire 1-1 tuition in the UK.

Future Participation:

If you agree to take part you will be asked whether you are happy to be contacted about participation in future studies. Your participation in this study will not be affected should you choose not to be re-contacted.

In the Event of a Complaint:

If participation in this study causes you any significant concerns that you do not wish to discuss with the researcher or you wish to complain, you can contact the Institute of Education for further advice and information. Please contact Dr Andrea Creech (xxxxx@ioe.ac.uk), the lead project supervisor, in this instance.

Project Supervisor: Dr Andrea Creech (Inst of Education)

Researcher: Paula Collens, M.A.
Senior Lecturer, Therapeutic Studies, Goldsmiths College
HCPC Reg Counselling Psychologist / Integrative Arts Psychotherapist
PhD Student, Institute of Education

If you have any questions please contact me:

Tel: xxxxx
Email: xxxxx@ioe.ac.uk
## Appendix 5: Profile of Teacher Participants in Individual Interview Strand of Investigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Self-Identified Voice Type</th>
<th>Conservatoire of Employment</th>
<th>Self Identified Current Professional Identities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T01</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>A, C, D</td>
<td>Voice Teacher, Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T02</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Tenor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Nil response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T03</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Voice / Singing Teacher, Coach, Accompanist, Consultant, Choir workshop leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T04</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mezzo-Soprano / Soprano</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Performing Soloist, Music/Singing Educator, Creative Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T05</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mezzo-Soprano</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Performer, Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T07</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>White (Other)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Baritone</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Language / Repertoire Coach, Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T09</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Soprano (lyric)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Performer, Voice Teacher, Coach, Mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mezzo-Soprano</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Performer, Voice Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: Profile of Student Participants in Individual Interview Strand of Investigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Self-Identified Voice Type</th>
<th>Conservatoire of Study</th>
<th>Played Other Instruments</th>
<th>Postgraduate (PG) / Undergraduate (UG)</th>
<th>Year of Study</th>
<th>English as First Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S07</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Tenor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Piano, Woodwind</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Asian (Other)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>White (Other)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Piano, String, Woodwind</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>White (UK/Other)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Piano, String</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mezzo-soprano</td>
<td>X-</td>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Piano, Woodwind</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Tenor</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Piano, String</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>String</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Bass-baritone</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>String</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Tenor</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Brass</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>White (Other)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mezzo</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Baritone</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Piano, Brass</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>White (UK)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>String</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X- means did not supply information
Appendix 7: List of Potential Prompt Questions for Video-Stimulated Reflective Interviews

- What do you notice about the interactions between you and your teacher/student?
- What do you notice about your posture, position in the room, voice tone, energy in relation to your teacher/student?
- How do you feel watching the excerpt?
- Do you recall how you felt at the time?
- What stands out to you now about that excerpt?
- How typical or atypical are the interactions in the video to your relationship more generally.
- How would you describe the atmosphere of relating between you?
- If you had 5 words to describe the relationship between you, what comes to mind?
- What has been the highpoint of your relationship?
- What has been the most difficult aspect of your relationship?
- What key moments come to your mind as significant in your relationship?
Appendix 8: Pilot Interview Schedule

Pilot Schedule of Potential Questions for Semi-Structured Interviews with Teachers in the Individual Interview Strand of Investigation

1) How long have you been teaching in conservatoire?

2) How long do you generally work with students?

3) What have you most enjoyed about your 1-1 tutelage relationships?

4) What have been the difficulties or challenges in these 1-1 relationship for you?

5) Teaching methods:
   Could you tell me about your ‘typical’ approach to a lesson?
   Repertoire, technique, improvisation, video/audio playback, demonstration with your own voice, other?

6) How do students come to work with you – allocation / match?
   Could you describe your feelings about this?
   What do you feel makes a good match between you and your student?

7) Have you had an experience in the relationship with a student that really troubled you?
   Briefly describe what was difficult.
   How did you manage the challenge?
   How did you feel at the time?

8) Have you had an experience with a student that has changed the way you teach?
   Could you describe this?

9) Are you able to give me an example of a relationship that you would define as a positive learning partnership with a student?
   Can you briefly describe what you felt was positive.
   How did you experience yourself in this relationship?
   If the student were asked to describe you and how they felt about you do you have any thoughts on this?
Appendix 9: Final Schedule for Individual Interviews with Teachers

List of Possible Questions / Potential Topics for Discussion in Individual Semi-Structured Interviews with Teachers

- What is it like being a 1-1 vocal teacher in the conservatoire?

- What do you value most about the 1-1 teaching relationship?

- How do you know when a teaching relationship with a student is working well?
  - Prompts / possible avenues for exploration:
  - What tells you that it’s going well for you?
  - Feelings
  - Thoughts
  - Sense of self in the relationship
  - Behaviours
  - What do you notice about yourself / the student?

- Could you talk about a specific example of a relationship with a student that you felt worked well (past or current).
  - Prompts:
  - 5 words that describe the qualities / nature of the relationship between you.
  - Seek examples of interaction that illustrate the 5 words
  - Check out feelings, thoughts, behaviours
  - Influence on teaching / learning?

- What have you found most difficult or troubling about the 1-1 relationship?
  - Specific examples where you felt troubled / had difficulties?
  - Check out thoughts, feelings and behaviours
  - Look for how teacher has made sense of/meaning of the experience
  - Influence on teaching / learning?

- Do you meet with students outside the 1-1 teaching hour?
  - Can you give me examples of the kinds of contexts and interactions you might have outside the studio?
  - How do you feel this influences you as a teacher?

- If you think of your work as a teacher in 1-1 context as a journey – what has been the highest point of this journey and the lowest point?

- Does it matter if you get on with a student or not, to teach them effectively?

- Have you had an experience with a student that has changed the way you felt about teaching?

- Coming to end of interview, wondering what it has been like to talk about your experiences? Is there anything particular that you feel you will take away from this conversation?
Appendix 10: Final Schedule for Individual Interviews with Students

List of Possible Questions / Prompts for Discussion in Individual Semi-Structured Interviews with Students

1. Could you tell me about your experience of working with your teacher in 1-1 relationship?

2. If you think of your relationship with your teacher as a journey – what kind of journey has it been? What have been the key moments in the relationship?

3. Could you think of 5 words to describe the relationship between you? Can you give me a specific example of an episode / experience from your relationship that would help me to understand each word that you chose?

4. What do you value most about your relationship with your teacher? Specific e.g.
   a. Can you give me an example of an experience when you felt your relationship was working well between you?

5. What do you find most difficult about being in this relationship with your teacher? Specific e.g.
   a. Can you give me an example of when you felt the relationship was working less well?

6. If anything could change about your relationship, what would it be?

7. Have you ever thought of changing teachers? If so what prompted this?

8. Do you meet up with your teacher outside the studio / teaching hour?
   • Socially / linked to your learning / performances?
   • Can you tell me a bit about that
   • How does this affect how you feel in the relationship?

9. How do you imagine your teacher feels about you and your development?
   • How would you know what they think and feel?

10. Have you talked about your relationship with your teacher before? If yes, Can you tell me about this?

11. Does your teacher ever ask you for feedback about their teaching - e.g.?
   • Do you give the teacher feedback (positive e.g. / negative e.g.)? How do you feel about giving feedback?

12. Does it matter if you get on with your teacher or not?

Ending Interview:

13. In coming to the end of the interview, would you like to say anything about what you feel you will take away from this conversation?

14. Is there any feedback you would like to give about your experience of this interview?

15. Without going into any details, are there any areas of experience that you feel you have not been able to discuss with me that you could flag up to me?
Appendix 11: Sample of Initial Coding of Section of a Transcript

Section of Initial Coding and Annotation of Transcript from Teacher Participant T01

Transcript continued overleaf…
Appendix 11 Continued: Section of Initial Coding and Annotation of Transcript from Teacher Participant T01
Appendix 12: List of Initial Codes for Individual Teacher Interviews

Codes listed in 2 Columns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Interactions</td>
<td>Inheriting Unhappy Students’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakthrough in understanding</td>
<td>Instrument is the Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of teaching style due to negative experience</td>
<td>Isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Teachers</td>
<td>Jealous of what the student is getting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close - Distant</td>
<td>Light Bulb Moments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close attention</td>
<td>Meeting of Minds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed door approach</td>
<td>Mutuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating through demonstrating</td>
<td>Mutuality/I’m Giving More than the Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication - Language of music</td>
<td>Openness/Lack of Openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict - Battle</td>
<td>Parallels to Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection - in Tune with One Another</td>
<td>Parental relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection - Lack of Play - Fun</td>
<td>Play - Fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context as Influence and Impingement</td>
<td>Positive Transformation in the Dynamics of the Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Relationship Boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosures - emotionally charged</td>
<td>Resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosures - keeping student emotional issues out of lesson</td>
<td>Responding to Student’s Developmental Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Teaching Relationship</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>Sexuality in the relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposing Inner / Emotional Self</td>
<td>Student Attributes/Student’s Desire to Communicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facing difficult interactions</td>
<td>Student Attributes/Student’s Developmental Life Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Change</td>
<td>Student Attributes/Student’s Fire in the Belly - Iron in the Soul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Teacher Attributes/Teacher’s developmental stage influencing their approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flirting - playful</td>
<td>Teacher Attributes/Teacher’s life context influencing their way of relating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>Teacher Attributes/Teachers not trained to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining understanding of student in their life context</td>
<td>Teacher Attributes/Teacher's own history of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender in Teaching</td>
<td>Teacher Attributes/Teacher’s performing ego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender in Teaching/Boys - Male</td>
<td>Teacher Attributes/Teacher’s Self-Doubts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender in Teaching/Girls - Female</td>
<td>Teacher Attributes/Teacher’s sense of role responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender in Teaching/Male Teachers</td>
<td>Tension of Authoritative versus Encouraging Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting deeper understanding of student</td>
<td>Third Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting something back</td>
<td>Touch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving too much - becoming empty</td>
<td>Triangular Relationships with Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding confidence in face of slow learning process</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic Relationship</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty and its negotiation</td>
<td>Unique tailored response to the student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour</td>
<td>Unlocking Something in the Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impasse - cycle of resistance</td>
<td>Unlocking Something / Student Locked in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation and Play - non-normative</td>
<td>Unlocking Something in the Student/Primitive Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinite possibility</td>
<td>Witnessing student’s development - impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of 82 Initial Codes for Individual Teacher Interviews
Appendix 13: Mapping of Themes at Different Stages of Analysis

A) Below: Example of Early Stage of Developing Themes from Data Analysis of Video-Stimulated Reflective Interview with Student - Marcus Regarding his Relationship with Teacher Jody - Case Study Cluster 1
Appendix 13 Continued – Mapping of Themes at Different Stages of Analysis:

B) Below: Example of Early Stage of Developing Thematic Map for Data Set of Individual Teacher Interviews – exploring interconnections between codes / themes.
Appendix 13 Continued – Mapping of Themes at Different Stages of Analysis:

C) Below: Example of a Later Stage of Development of List of Themes & Sub-Themes for Data Set of Individual Teacher Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1 - Beginning &amp; Ending a Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changing Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>’Tricky’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Resolution to a Relational Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher-Student Match</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 - Boundaries and Intimacies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flirtation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly-Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Close is Too Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining interpersonal separateness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to be Intimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal disclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 - Bringing About Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bringing about Change - Unlocking Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading or Allowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance - Lack of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Challenge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4 - Envy of student          |
| 5 - Fun-Humour-Play          |
| 6 - Harmful Interactions     |
| 7 - Honesty-Dishonesty       |
| 8 - Mis-Trust                |
| Lack of Trust                |
| Trust                       |

| 9 - Need for Third Party Consultation |
| 10 - Openness to Risk           |
| 11 - Power Relations            |
| Deference to Teacher Authority  |
| Encouraging Student Authority   |
| Mutual                        |

| Submission-Dominance                   |
| 12 - Responsibility for Learning      |
| Lack of Responsibility                |

| 13 - Reward of Teaching Student       |
| 14 - Teacher’s Past influencing present teaching |

| 15 - The Human Instrument              |

Total of 15 Themes and 31 Sub-themes at this Stage
Appendix 13 Continued – Stages of Analysis:

D) Below: Middle Stage of Developing Thematic Map from Analysis across Dyads and across Clusters in the In-Depth Case Studies – exploring interconnections between themes / ideas.
Appendix 13 Continued – Stages of Analysis:

E) Below: Example of Late Stage of Developing Map of Themes Across the Entire Data Set from Both Strands of Investigation (using MindMap)

F) Below: Example of Final Stage of Developing Map of Themes Across Both Strands of the Study (using MindMap)
Sample of Coded Sections of an Individual Student Interview: Participant S10

Participant S10

Interview Transcript - Participant S10

Interviewer: Okay, the first question I ask is a really broad one, so that you can just sort of guide me and then I'm going to ask you some very specific questions. But do you want to say a little first about your experience of studying with your teacher in a one to one relationship?

Respondent: Okay. Em, I've been, can I say, can I say her name in the because you cancelled it out?

Interviewer: You can and would be all edited out, yeah.

Respondent: So I don't have a key to my teacher.

Interviewer: Yeah, you can use their name and it'll be taken from the data.

Respondent: So I've been with [Teacher's Name] and I sort of started about two months ago, in September. So it's still a, it's still quite new. I feel that, em, we get published quite quickly actually, I was quite pleased, because sometimes it can take a long time to really feel like you understand what a teacher is or about, how they communicate. Because I think if I've, if I've been playing instruments, I think it's more the case in singing that sometimes you have to get used to a teacher, because you can't physically control what you're doing. If you see what I mean.
Appendix 14 Continued: Sample of Coded Sections of Individual Student Interview: Participant S10

And in terms of the relationship itself, I felt like he [Teacher's Name] really was quite different. She had presented herself in such a way that she was a caring and compassionate person, and she was friendly. But she wasn't that approachable. She didn't really give too much of herself in terms of her personal life or her background.

My previous teacher was a lot more personable and accessible in that way. She was a very warm and supportive type of teacher who had a lot of confidence in her teaching abilities, and she really got to know her students. And I think that [Teacher's Name] was more reserved in that way. It was more of a quiet relationship with the students. She was a lot more approachable than I was, which is the truth. I think she was a lot more approachable, and she didn't hide things from the students. She was always open and honest with me. You can actually really get to know her. You can actually sit down and have a conversation with her, and you can really get to know her. She was quite open and honest with me. She was a really great teacher.

Interviewer: So you're noticing a difference in the way that you've had a previous one-to-one relationship and the one you have.

Respondent: Yeah, definitely. I mean, my previous teacher was kind of expected to be a friend and sort of guide you a bit.

Interviewer: That's interesting.

Respondent: Yeah, she definitely did sort of, she was an absolute buddy person. She was very present and very interested in the sort of the social aspect, the social aspect of my life.

Interviewer: Yeah, that's interesting.

Respondent: Yeah, absolutely. So with [Teacher's Name] you could sort of say, "Oh, let's sing this." She was, "Yeah, okay," unless I completed the wrong response form. You know, she's very honest, but she usually says yes, do that whenever, she's not sort of...my previous teacher was very much, "Oh, I'm not sure if that's gonna turn out well, you should go and do something else."

So with [Teacher's Name] I feel like I can just go and sing anything I like. She'll tell me if it's a complete disaster, but she says she's not the one to pass judgment. You know, I mean, not in the way that she's not approving or anything, but she's just not the one to say, "No." I think she's really great guidance, she's really great guidance, she's really good about letting us do things our way.

Interviewer: So you may have that to come.
Appendix 14 Continued: Sample of Coded Sections of Individual Student Interview: Participant S10

Respondent: So I guess I expected maybe I have that to do. At the moment she is still being managed, even if you are at any small element that, that there as you heard in the lesson.

Interviewer: So when you are doing the one, the interview, you heard was, you used the word reordering,

Respondent: Yeah

Interviewer: ...and sometimes it kind of self-cornering or self-

Respondent: Yeah

Interviewer: What, you’re thinking about your authority as an artist,

Respondent: Same.

Interviewer: ...how do each of those relations has support that symbol that?

Respondent: It feels your thoughts around that, and I guess they might have different issues.

Respondent: There’s very different, I think, yes. With my previous teachers I felt that would I wasn’t. There couldn’t be anything they had, the very small part of knowledge and content even if you were what meant.

So if I had an audition, you have sometimes they come up, auditions come up anyway. Short notice or whatever and, you know, you had to think that you have an audition, and third immediately try to arrange as many, become as the usual. And, you know, the day before an audition, having a lesson, she might not necessarily have really

positive in some ways. Like me, she isn’t the one that just kind of assumes the day before. So sometimes you’d feel, you’d come out of the lesson thinking, "Oh, I still got so much that I didn’t finish the lesson." With an audition the next day. So just need, like, oh, it’s a tricky situation, how do you...

And already I think the answer is to not to have a lesson the day before an audition actually. I think that’s the time when you need personal practice, and as you said, have an idol or as an idyll in your own right. I don’t see how it goes the audition without the teacher behind it.

So having that sort of level of interference and using, "Oh, well, we would put a lesson in there and a lesson in there, and that’s not quite perfect" and sort of thought, "Well, actually, it never gonna be perfect" and I’d rather sort of prepare it, sometimes my own way, then have someone that I trust to a kind of be the self of the material or existing something. So that [teacher’s name] say, "Hey, you know, there is much more learning to be done..."

Like with, so there are these sections that go to the summer camp, the [name of camp], and said, "No, I don’t really wanna do that in the lesson she has happy about that. But if I had been my previous teacher she would have said, "No, you’ve got to work on that," and this would have taken the whole lesson on that and actually, actually, I’m not really sure about that audition. It’s not that important in my lot of, I think, and [teacher’s name] a happy to.

At the same time, I don’t really work on the basis of, and actually, which is called, but basically the sort needs done in some more because it’s a lot related to the theme of the most content something.
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Later section of transcript...
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Later Section of Transcript…

And... (transcript continues)
Participant S10

Interviewer: Is that something that, when you say I'm not very good at, are you
saying that you wish you were maybe a little happier with that?

Respondent: I don't know, I'm sometimes.

Interviewer: Are you sometimes with not.

Respondent: Well I'm usually, no I'm usually fine with whatever relationship I have with
the friends, it's absolutely fine. But see sometimes other people
have developed a much more it, you know, another relationship,
which can change the lesson. And I always feel bad about that
because I feel like sort of professional aspect of the
relationship and parents.

Interviewer: And so, you're in some ways you're just taking your neutral
about that. You're just seeing.

Respondent: Yes, oh did this the same, but I've noticed that.

Interviewer: Okay, and what about your

Respondent: Em, I think it's a kind of... I'm not sure what

Interviewer: I know that's almost, I'm sort of confused when you don't

Respondent: It's almost, I think when there's a sort of... I'm

Interviewer: And so, you know, that's kind of... I'm not sure if

Respondent: It's almost, I think when there's a sort of... I'm

Interviewer: And so, you know, that's kind of... I'm not sure if

Respondent: It's almost, I think when there's a sort of... I'm

Interviewer: And so, you know, that's kind of... I'm not sure if

Respondent: It's almost, I think when there's a sort of... I'm

Interviewer: And so, you know, that's kind of... I'm not sure if

Respondent: It's almost, I think when there's a sort of... I'm

Interviewer: And so, you know, that's kind of... I'm not sure if

Respondent: It's almost, I think when there's a sort of... I'm

Interviewer: And so, you know, that's kind of... I'm not sure if

Respondent: It's almost, I think when there's a sort of... I'm
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Interviewer: So that's quite difficult.

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: And you're saying, because I sense that it's something that many students find difficult, but I'm saying you feel it's something that you find more difficult than your peers or other people...

Respondent: No. I don't think I don't think I find it any more difficult than anyone else. I think it's just generally very difficult. And there was someone here who was struggling with it and she was being to just go, you know, after the teacher. We were just talking about how she was saying, 'What time do I know if I do it?' You know, 'I don’t do all of the assignments and then you might get penalized.' And I thought that was the whole lesson. So I do the rest of the lesson in which case I'm explaining the whole lesson and not asking about doing it...

Interviewer: So that's quite interesting when you get to a stage of the question was then you thought of changing teachers? That moment was quite difficult when you were to that point in your mind and actually I want to be with somebody else and be able to be somebody else.

Respondent: Barely very difficult. Do and I believe it's very tricky, you see, for example, want to go and have a consultation lesson with someone else do you tell your current teacher? If you're being not? Because then maybe the teacher you are with won't be the same. You might have other teachers in these other schools. You might have a discussion with the other school's teacher...
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Interviewer: This was the teacher you’ve been talking about.

Respondent: Yeah, it was really...it was real. Because I go to this school and it’s easy, you know. It was done for me. So, you know, obviously, we worked towards the college and form us, and she was making that I wanted to progress and...and it wasn’t that I wanted to leave her, I just wanted to go to college. And she didn’t want us at college, so...

Interviewer: So that’s correct, miss. You wish it I simply want to leave you.

Respondent: Yeah and it’s nothing against you; I feel the best at that time. I didn’t quite know how people would react.

Interviewer: Yes...you.

Respondent: I think it was really hard. And clearly, you’re happy surprised and think the, you know, this is going to be the best thing for me. Let me wanna make sure I know how they think about that. That’s going to be the same as anything else. Some people will not make that way. I ensured.

Interviewer: Okay, if you could change anything about your relationship with your current teacher. [Teacher’s Name], what would you change?

Later in Transcript...

Interviewer: Yes, yes.

Respondent: Those are the things you see, it’s always that. That worked on what did we discuss. The next...[ respondent’s name ] was sure, you can really hear, what’s going on. It will all in your own way and I think that it is really a lot. How do I think, I don’t think I was really. I think my academic was higher and my language was lower. We don’t really have a way. So, it’s always about trying to look at what you was.

So she’s good at making you...and some short term one whenever you not able...

Interviewer: Okay, and in terms of you getting her feedback, do you, do you give her feedback?

Respondent: Notice the nature of our working relationship. No, partly because I’m happy in that.
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Later in Transcript…

Interviewer: "Yes, what or maybe it depends on that for me. Whether getting on with people and by you, you see it’s got mean several different things. ‘Course ‘Course ‘Course, there’s being on other, being in one thing but getting on well and may not include liking. What thought do you have about that.

Respondent: Em.

Interviewer: "It term all being with a teacher and what difference it makes to your learning."

Respondent: It’s funny because kind of depends – that it depends on the teacher’s style, because some teachers will put that essentially and they’d that usually like what they do and teaching how, how their teaching is different. So because in a sense, [Teachers having classes] seem to have a lot. In that sense, essentially I feel like that’s not as much as it is in teaching some aspects of our lesson. It’s just those kind of lessons.

So with my previous teacher, the one was more, more, more, personal thing really, because we would go to the house, we and we could have a cup of tea and go and sit up in another room and, we could talk to her and it was sort of a more personal because as in her house, yes, although I think it’s quite the same level with all [Teachers having] house, I’m I think.

Interviewer: "When you do the same level, do you say a little more case of I can get to see the difference."

Respondent: Sort of, even, feeling like the personal aspects of test and sort of blend into the learning a little bit. I feel that that’s what it means.

Interviewer: "You feel there’s more, she seems more separate in…"

Respondent: Yeah, I think so.

Interviewer: "You feel there’s a boundary and not the..."

Respondent: No, not necessarily a boundary, but that it’s, her relevant, Em, whereas, yeah, with the previous teacher, you know, learn all about her as a person and even being the feeling she might have seen with, and you know, being taught the teacher can come to talk to as well. That was the thing, the case, because she was divest and sort of living on her own doing lots of teaching in her house, I think it was a bit brief sometimes and so she would talk to you and sort of merging, like you were her mentor. And then she necessarily make me feel slightly awkward because that wasn’t the relationship that we have now, not much, but even, you know, actually that we don’t quite have the relationship, and that didn’t mean it necessarily because I don’t think we would necessarily be friends.
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Interviewer: Because then it’s marketing because you’re selling as if for one year... was it your final? to think you were nothing else that you’re not the same one of the students who may be 2nd, 3rd... involved in sabra to...?

Respondent: Yeah.

Interviewer: And sorry, you’re saying in the previous relationship you would have... you weren’t sure if exactly?

Respondent: Yeah, I wasn’t.

Interviewer: You weren’t that comfortable.

Respondent: Because I’m not sure I did necessarily get on with him. In terms of her sort of ideas and principles and sort of religious viewpoints and things like that. And I know, we were completely different. But don’t feel I talked about anything like that. But I think watching the sort of how my parents dealt with me, I think something. But if you would not up to know, I didn’t feel over it a position as her student to say that disagree with her.

Interviewer: Okay, that’s interesting.

Respondent: Because I think because that was my thinking about her. And therefore sort of subordinate in that she was the one in authority and that, I think, she chose to sort of. But the things about her life, I didn’t happen. As a teacher, teachers should be sort of equal in that relationship. I didn’t believe we were. I never she said that.

Interviewer: So you’re being pulled into a sort of a friendship, but that friendship has differential that that always feels different. Then.

Respondent: Yeah, and I didn’t get over that. Maha some other people can make. They become friends with each other, they feel more or they never had that sense. I don’t know. But I always had the sense that they were someone in authority and that I should sort of respect. But with my dad, exactly my dad is also a principal and he was much trustee with his teacher. But I didn’t know. It’s another different sort because old thinker than his teacher.

Interviewer: Your dad is older than his teacher.

Respondent: My dad is a year older. And they come from a sort of a similar world, and they never Into people it coincides and that they have become friends. And yeah. It’s very strange, then, in thinking them would have exactly at the moment with a teacher.
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Interviewer: Hmm, that’s interesting.

Respondent: Yeah. But then maybe I might manipulate the results of authentic and laboratory, and eventually, with what I need in terms of relationship, I can know.

Interviewer: And you’re doing just okay with it.

Respondent: Yeah. Oh no, I’m fine with it.

Interviewer: You’re even benefiting from it.

Respondent: Oh yeah. Oh it’s not a problem.

Interviewer: You’re not saying “Oh I think I’d like to change this,” you’re actually enjoying.

Respondent: No, no. I’m happy with it.

Interviewer: “...I’m not noticing the end and it’s just the way I do it.”

Later in Transcript...

So I feel I went to an extent because they’re younger. I feel like there has to be an even bigger gap between me as teacher and them as a student in order to make a difference. So I think, you know, 12 years between them as well. You think like: I need to, not directly, but it’s not a set of other thing. It’s not a set of other. It’s not a set of other. It’s not a set of other. It’s not a set of other. It’s not a set of other.

Interviewer: Okay. We’re coming towards the end of the line. Emm, have I mentioned the one with the kite?

Respondent: No, I don’t think we’ve got over a bit if you’ve got more to talk about.

Interviewer: Well, there’s maybe just a couple more things. How do you imagine your teacher looks about you?

Respondent: Laughter. I think they know me very well. I’m very nice, I’m very nice, I’m very nice, I’m very nice, I’m very nice, I’m very nice, I’m very nice. Not necessarily more than other lots, but with them there’s I, there’s an object yourself. You do the balance, you’re not you, but you’re, the whole balance, it’s yours. That’s me, and it’s mine for yourself. It’s all part of the whole and myself, it’s built on what comes out of my mouth.
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So I think through through things and the way I learned is how to
make of a lot of it all in, I mean [Teacher's name] was very
well, as [she] showed [her] the brain about how I need to be
more focused, I need to read and do assignments. All these are
some of the things that are kind of major in my personality. That's
so [she] can make things happen. Many issues in it. She's never
so far into my sort of, how I was [name], that I had to
write the end of things that she still take from the normal people about
which you discuss and all that. She's just seen right in that. So I think that
also she helped me a lot.

Interviewer: And what is the job that feels like to feel that, well, this morning?

Respondent: Oh it's good, it's good because I can hide something here. And that's
good, because I actually, I think I should try and hide things. In order to be able to fit
the course of it all even well, the internal and the sort of mind as an externals, these, and
knew that he needs both. She needed me as a, she needed me as a
person to both myself to if you can like. You can't just do
the When and has everything sort of closed when it's sort of
sentiment you have to be very yourself.

Interviewer: It's quite an answer. I mean I know when I saw some things lately, when I go and watch...

Later section of transcript...
Appendix 15: Sample of Participant Extracts from Individual Teacher Interview Data Set for Sub-Theme – Resistance and Frustration

Master Theme: Bringing About Change; Sub-Theme: Resistance & Frustration

Extracts Derived from Transcripts using NVivo

Nodes\Tree Nodes\Bringing About Change\Resistance & Frustration

Interview Transcripts\Participant T02

Sometimes you get people and they just, you know that they are completely rigid and they’re not going to bend. They sing exactly the same way as they did when they walked in. They don’t even... they, It’s not always that they, well I don’t know really, maybe it is because they’re not trying, but, or that, I don’t think they often put, openly put up a resistance, it’s just that they don’t, it’s sometimes, you think, ‘Well that’s going to take some time to break that resistance down or to find a way in’.

Interview Transcripts\Participant T03

it becomes very clear in the way that a singer uses his or her body, uhm, and the consequent effect on the voice

whether that’s free flow air, and if the air is not flowing freely then one starts to look for the reasons why it’s not flowing, and quite often there can just be physiological reasons or sometimes they can be a physiological reaction to a psychological defense

I could not make an honest work with her because there was this uhm, invisible screen between her and me where she just, she couldn’t go there

it was too traumatic for her, uh, and, it affected the voice very severely. She was completely withheld. And every time we had to uh, put more vigour in the voice or she had to be more extrovert, or more uh, animated

she just backed right off it. She just was so frightened to let her anger and her, uh, fear and everything come out in the singing voice
**Interview Transcripts\Participant T04**

**When I first met this student, I thought ‘obstructive’. Is that the right word, ‘obstructive’?**

I: ‘Obstructive’, yes


---

**Participant T06**

She never fulfilled what she might have done because there is either a learning problem, well there is a learning problem actually, there is. It’s not dyslexia but there’s a problem, there’s a resistance. It probably is slight dyslexia but there’s a resistance to learning detailed, precise things about music and there’s a resistance, she’s not a linguist either, so things are almost, they’re always almost there, but they never get there. And that’s quite hard to teach because one wants to be encouraging because there’s some very, very good things about it always but you also want to get all the things that are not right about it, to get them [raises voice] right. And she can’t or won’t, or isn’t, it doesn’t happen [...] It’s frustrating.

---

**Participant T07**

I suppose that’s when I have to do the most work because I have to be finding solutions to, not just the issue in, that we’re working on, but also solutions on how this particular student is going to get around that problem. It is what I’m here for ....

I: Sure. Yes.

P: but that’s when it’s the, more, it’s me giving more than they are able to give because they are putting up that barrier.

---

once they know a little bit and they feel that they have a particular position and a particular ability and you start to prod at that ability and they find that, actually, they are not as good as they thought or they have an area where they’re going to struggle, that’s when that resistance is likely to come up. And so as a teacher, I need to decide do I keep pushing at the resistance or do I find something else to do or do we find another way to deal with that resistant point. And that’s great. It’s very good.

I: Yes.

P: It’s part of the pleasure of teaching and finding ways around problems but usually less fun

---

Where there is a barrier and I feel ...

I: Yeah.

P: I’m having to push and we’re not getting anywhere, are the ones who just want me to tell them the answer.
I Right.

But they do want more that sense of ‘here’s what you must do, just do it’. I think some, I think that’s very much an individual thing. And some people are more able to respond to a very open free environment. Some people, through their own schooling experience or their own educational experience or whatever, expect the teacher to tell them and then to do and if you, if you reach a situation where they’re then unable to do it, that’s, that’s frightening and

I’m thinking of a particular example where the student, where I very much got the feeling they were, they have the sense of knowing more than they did and didn’t want to admit not knowing what they should know and so they just sort of closed down

Interview Transcripts\Participant T09

1  PC  01/11/2013 10:50
to have a student like this, I found so upsetting because I couldn’t start because she just couldn’t, there were too many, whatever, problems - I don’t know, mental problems. I couldn’t get in there and I couldn’t chip away at her (laugh) to try and help her and I found that so frustrating.

Interview Transcripts\Participant T10

2  PC  01/11/2013 13:51
I really do expect my students to make lots of progress. And I hope I’m not boasting if I say they do. But this one didn’t. But I liked her all the same. She was a great person and a great musician and I liked her a lot. But I couldn’t get anywhere with her. And in the end, I thought, “There’s no point...” It was frustrating. That’s frustrating for me. And I – so I just realised if I got frustrated, it wasn’t going to help her. So I had to sort of look at her in a different – slightly different way. Not exactly give up on her. But just let her make the progress she did make, which wasn’t great, at her pace. And also recognise that she was someone who did so much that she probably wasn’t devoting her time to it. And so I couldn’t – I couldn’t expect her to do that, because she was too interested in the other things she was doing.

3  PC  01/11/2013 13:55
If they’re not doing what I want them to do, because they can’t or it’s not ‘cos they’re not trying – I think that’s it. I have to – I have to keep reminding myself, ‘Look, this person isn’t deliberately trying to do something you don’t want them to do. Uhm and they’re not being obtuse, they’re not stupid, they’re not difficult’.

4  PC  01/11/2013 14:01
I suppose what I found difficult about the one that was talented is this sort of feeling there’s a slight resistance to what you’re asking them to do or – which I don’t think came from her. It came from actually a slightly deep – well, rather deep-seated insecurity. Uhm, which was unfounded, because she was so good. Which – I mean, it’s not uncommon. You do find that. Uhm, but this sort of not wanting to – not wanting to give.
Appendix 16: List of Activities – Immersion into Empirical Context

Activities, additional to data collection processes, which I undertook during the project to support familiarisation with the field of study given ‘outsider’ researcher role:

- three pilot exploratory interviews with conservatoire vocal graduates prior to the main study to help shape research aims and interview schedule of questions and to develop tacit procedural understanding of conducting a research rather than a therapeutic interview;
- attended vocal master classes, song recitals, opera performances and research forum presentations in three London-based conservatoires;
- observed group tutorials with a vocal teacher and her students in Conservatoire ‘B’;
- participated in the Reflective Conservatoire International Conferences in 2009 and presented a paper at the 2012 conference;
- 6 informal lesson observations involving two teachers with their students who had offered to become part of the case study strand of the project. Their participation in the latter strand did not come to fruition due to a range of practical constraints, but these observations developed my familiarity with the studio context.