

Assessment Component One – a written assignment

Critically evaluate a range of concepts theories and models that you have recently studied; explaining their relevance to your workplace practise and procedures, and develop a strategy for applying what you have learned to improve your practise and performance.

Small group lessons: What are the benefits for the singing student and their teacher?

Introduction

As a singing teacher working with students from the age of seven to twenty-one, I will be comparing the evidence for group and one to one teaching with a view to developing my practise.

There is a variety of information including several studies that evaluate the success of small group teaching (Kalra, Modi and Vyas, 2015; Nikendei et al. 2014; Saleh et al. 2013; Pal et al. 2012; Bjøntegaard, 2014; Abusamra, 1978; Surgenor, 2010). However, it seems there is limited information and no strategic pedagogy model widely used, specifically for the subject of singing in a small group context.

Taking information that examines the success of small group teaching from across a broad range of researched subjects, including music, medicine, sports and education as a whole, the following will examine, review and adapt existing models and research to create a new paradigm for students who engage in small group singing classes as their only method of learning for their instrument.

Small Group Teaching vs One-To-One Lessons

The one-to-one lesson is a well known, established and respected universal teaching method commonly used as a way to learn how to master the art of singing and this traditional master-apprentice model remains a preferred choice for many institutions across many different subjects internationally (Abusamra, 1978, p.37; Carey et al, 2013, p.357; Nerland, 2007, p.399). However, pursuant to Manhas and Chindmes (2013, p.81) when reporting their findings in Germany, I believe that group teaching, as an alternative, is an underrepresented model for instrumental tuition that has a number of categorical advantages.

Group teaching previously had a place within the instrumental learning environment before one-to-one became a conventional way of delivering tuition; the music master class had evolved in the 19th century (Bjøntegaard, 2014, p.23), although it is believed to have lost its appeal after the second world war (Manhas and Chindmes, 2013, p.82). By the late 1970s, Abusamra (1978, p.37-38) reports in the UK that the conventional one-to-one method is highly active, however, it had recently been challenged by some tutors who had found that small group teaching had many benefits. Therefore, why is it that many decades later, teaching more than one student at a time is still sometimes seen by educators as an additional resource or a last resort for music students? (Manhas and Chindmes, 2013, p.84)

Looking back for historical context, Abusamra (1978, p.38) reported that it is perhaps the fault of the tutors having a lack of knowledge on how to conduct lessons for small groups. It is suggested that not only do many not know how to teach in this manner but there is also a great resistance to undertake the pursuit of a different way of teaching. Perhaps teachers at this time can be forgiven for not having the experience to tutor more than one student at a time, however it seems no progress was made during this era as this thought is also echoed a few years later in 1983 when Thompson states that group tuition “requires a teacher to acquire certain skills not traditionally associated with instrumental teaching” (Thompson, 1983, p.21). Even several decades later, this continues to be an issue across subjects, not only for those used to the one-to-one method but for teachers who normally teach large groups. Transferring to small group tuition, as found in a qualitative study of medical students in Iraq, results suggest that a training course should be provided as the teaching delivery does not differ for large or small groups (Saleh et al., 2013, p.886). With many studies and reports since the 1970s, showing the success of group teaching in many countries, (Kalra, Modi and Vyas, 2015; Nikendei et al. 2014; Saleh et al. 2013; Pal et al. 2012; Bjøntegaard, 2014; Duarte Manhas and Chindmes, 2013; Surgenor, 2010), how is it that in 2020, there is still not an accomplished, well known and practised method for small group teaching for the training of singers? It appears that in relation to the one-to-one model, attempts were made through academic studies to simply improve the existing authoritative method, rather than trying out substitute forms of pedagogy (Harrison and Grant, 2015, p.557).

Nonetheless, there are teachers who do see benefits in seeking training beyond the one-to-one prototype. Drawing on a case study in Norway by Nerland (2007, p.404 - 405), one teacher (case A), discusses “humans as intellectual beings”, taking performance to a deeper level which requires students to have a profound understanding of their work.

When teaching at tertiary level he states the need to help change their process of learning. This is a strong reason why I believe that peer learning should be established early in training, so that self-efficacy skills (Nielsen, 2004; Hanken, 2014) can be developed and the student is then equipped to learn at an advanced level without so much support from the teacher.

The second tutor in Nerland's study suggests that student proficiency is "socially distributed" (2007, p.409) and encourages students to take part in extra music activities in addition to the private lesson so they can learn from professionals and peers. He believes that this supplementary form of learning provides students with just as much knowledge as they would gain from him (p.410). With this in mind, just how much of an impact can learning from peers make?

In Australia, in contrast with case A of Nerland's study, Latukefu's 2010 study on peer assessment found that students would be encouraged to critique their own work after having the opportunity to assess peers; a useful skill to acquire for their future career (Latukefu, 2010, p.71). Therefore, are Carey, Harrison and Dwyer (2017, p.99) correct in suggesting that the one-to-one model allows for students to entrust too much reliance on their teachers input and instead could it be argued that the pupil should be constructing a more independent way of learning?

The Change in Teacher/Student Dynamic with Peer Support

The role of the teacher changes significantly when leading a one-to-one lesson as opposed to a small group. The master-apprentice model becomes redundant in place of a teacher and peer based learning environment (Bjøntegaard, 2014; Blom & Poole, 2004; Daniel, 2004; Latukefu, 2009; Latukefu, 2010). Can students learn as much from a fellow learner as their teacher? It is usually expected that students do not have the same experience as teachers, therefore it can be understood why some would believe that having individual attention via a one-to-one lesson would supposedly be more beneficial for the learner, hence, doubting "that group applied instruction could be as effective as individual instruction" (Bjøntegaard, 2014, p.25). However, if students sometimes seek out more than one tutor for extra motivation, learning or feedback (Haddon, 2011) then it could be argued that peer learning could be an alternative source of evaluation and inspiration for the learner.

In group lessons, with additional learning and feedback from peers, the dynamic is weighted towards the student taking on a leadership role and offering assistance to their

fellow learners (Duarte Manhas and Chindmes, 2013, p.84). Yet, how can a student improve now that the role of their master/teacher is less dominant?

In an outcome from his new model, US baritone Dr. Holden (2002, p.302) believes that the student will learn more about themselves as a singer both holistically and analytically by possessing the ability to give instruction. Inspired by his observations of a European model used in Austria, Holden applies group learning as a dominant learning strategy for the university singing student with positive outcomes for both student and teacher. Supportive of this, in the three year Australian study by Latukefu (2009), there is positive student feedback about the benefits of peer learning for singers, suggesting that “if the environment is arranged in such a way that peer learning is encouraged and purposely mediated, singing students find this extremely helpful as a way of learning” (p.128).

Nonetheless, establishing the teacher's role in group learning is essential for its success. Using methods such as “Fading” and “Scaffolding” (Latukefu, 2010, p.65), whereby fading is the process of gradually withdrawing the amount of help the tutor provides to the class and scaffolding is an adjustment to the level of support which suits the students capabilities, this could allow the instructor to control the process of how much influence and support they have for the student who is then able to become increasingly self-reliant. In Bjøntegaard's (2014, p.25) “horn model” it can be seen how the teacher's role differs in solo and group lessons. The role of the teacher was to offer advice in the one-to-one lessons whereas in the lessons for groups, all participants shared a balanced role (p.30). Peer learning studies show many positive outcomes (Blom & Poole, 2004; Daniel, 2004; Latukefu, 2009; Latukefu, 2010). However, there are of course students who are sceptical, which is perhaps why we are still searching for an effective model for small group singing lessons. At James Cook University, students found the procedure of offering peer observation a demanding task (Daniel, 2004, p.94) and Latukefu (2009, p.134) finds one student, who having had only one-to-one tuition previously, struggling to learn in a group environment.

Furthermore, problems also arise for teachers. In a study, modifying Peyton's four-step approach in a skills lab, a tutor is found to be sceptical of the process of peer learning, having issues with students teaching one another (Nikendei et al. 2014, p.6). Perhaps this is no surprise giving the evidence previously mentioned for teachers not being equipped for this style of tuition.

Large Group Teaching to Small Group Teaching

It could be argued that it is perhaps easier to see how beneficial small group classes would be for those who have only participated in larger learning settings than for those who have only learned through one-to-one tuition. One might expect that the individual attention received from the tutor will be greater within this transition.

In an tertiary academic setting, students attending lectures often get the added benefit of smaller seminar groups and these have been analysed for medical students and reviewed to see just how beneficial they are as an additional tool of learning support (Nikendei et al. 2014; Pal et al. 2012; Saleh et al. 2013; Kalra, Modi and Vyas, 2015) with some positive results from both the faculty and students (Pal et al. 2012, p.172).

The modification of “Peyton's four-step approach” (Nikendei et al. 2014) was adapted for the teaching of medical students in small groups (see appendix 1). It can be seen in this instance that there may not be a transferable small group teaching method that suits all circumstances and therefore, this study reveals how a method can be revised to suit a specific training subject. Adapted for skills-lab training in the descriptive study, instruction for the small groups is modified and divided into six components (p.2-3).

By adapting Peyton's method specifically for the skills-lab sessions, an invaluable learning practise was founded. From this specific influence, I was able to adapt ideas to form a pertinent imitation for small group singing lessons. Nonetheless, gathering further evidence, specifically any negative experiences must also be taken into account. With many of these studies finding the advantages in small group teaching for both student and teacher, there are also some disadvantages for some who state that they are hesitant to speak out loud in this intimate environment and prefer a lecture based method of learning (Kalra, Modi and Vyas, 2015, p.16). This should be considered when creating a strategy for successful small group lessons, as lessons that fail to meet all students needs demand a differentiated learning strategy.

Social Skills and Confidence

I often hear in initial enquiries for lessons, parents describing their child as shy and proclaiming that they would be unwilling to work in a group until they have built up a degree of confidence. Be as that may, what if teachers could convince parents from a successful model that attending a small collaborative learning group does just that? As Bruffee states “with more confidence and gains in interdependence, students vest authority and trust in their class community and finally, students vest knowledge and trust

within themselves” (1999, cited in Forbes, 2016, p.57).

Of course, the views of those parents are not unfounded; at conservatoire level in Norway, Bjøntegaard (2014, p.26) notes how “student's were concerned about the skills of others, and the competition this implied; linked to this was anxiety about performing in front of peers”. Could introducing peer learning from an earlier stage help combat these students fears? Not only are there musical advantages but also copious benefits for social interaction and communicative skills (Duarte Manhas and Chindmes, 2013; Kalra, Modi and Vyas, 2015).

Transferability

There are many useful and adaptable group teaching methods which can be adapted for small group singing lessons. The University of Central Dublin's Teaching Toolkit by Surgenor (2010) outlines some useful methods that can be transferred to the teaching of singing in a small group (see appendix 2). Additionally there are concepts such as Johnson and Johnson's (2002, p.95) “Learning Together and Alone” which “centres on the integrated use of cooperative, competitive and individualistic learning...to structure any lesson cooperatively, in any subject area, grade level or educational setting”. Strategies from this method, which have influenced my model for small group voice teaching, are “Individual Accountability” (p.96) where the end result is a stronger individual performance from students having learned together in the classroom and “Face-To-Face Promotive Interaction” (p.97) where students learn from one another from taking on a mentoring role. In 2009, Johnson and Johnson discuss the social interdependence theory “when the outcomes of individuals are affected by their own and others' actions” and furthermore stating that “positive interdependence creates the psychological processes of substitutability...and inducibility” (p.366) all of which are implemented in the teaching model I have devised (see appendix 3).

In an effort to prove that “teaching two (or more) students simultaneously is a very positive pedagogical approach, providing innumerable advantages for both students and teachers” (Manhas and Chindmes, 2013, p.85), the pedagogy exemplar that I have created from this exploration of literature for small group singing tuition is designed to have numerous benefits for both pupil and pedagogue. From the outcomes discussed from the research into collaborative learning as a means to study, the SDCPS teaching model is based on the idea of peer learning being introduced as an immediate tool of learning rather than at a later, more advanced or tertiary stage of study. Broken into five elements of support,

development, construction, progress and success, it has benefits for both the student and the teacher. It is designed to be used for students aged seven to twenty-one, shaped by my experience as a teacher and the proven results from the academic research covered in this paper.

Conclusion

If it is true that “teachers who dominate the instrumental lessons seem to give their students limited possibility to assume responsibility for their own learning and musical development” (Jørgensen, 2000, p.70) then we must explore other systems to train singers so they can become more responsible performers.

There are numerous ways in which the one-to-one pedagogy model can be approached (Harrison and Grant , 2015, p.557). Therefore, it could be argued that perhaps with a different approach to the model, teachers can effectively add elements that may be missing for students who only study through this method of tuition. Yet, if students who learn in groups prove accelerated learning over those who learn via the one-to-one method (Bjøntegaard, 2014, p.25) should it not be encouraged in place of private tuition? Although there are still teachers and students who remain sceptical of small group classes, I believe that because many of the studies have only shown peer learning at an advanced stage of their training, any negative reactions from students to this way of study could be avoided if it was to be instilled early in their practise (Saleh et al. 2013, p.886).

The SDCPS model incorporates established evidence of successful group models and takes into account the negative findings that were raised. It can be argued that the positives outweigh any negatives, especially as any adverse reactions to the learning process in the featured studies were not consolidated by all participants (Latukeyu, 2009; Latukeyu, 2010; Blom & Poole, 2004; Daniel, 2004; Bjøntegaard, 2014; Duarte Manhas and Chindmes, 2013.; Holden, 2002; Saleh et al. 2013.; Kalra, Modi and Vyas, 2015.; Nikendei et al. 2014; Pal et al. 2012).

There are many suggestions that peer based learning greatly enhances the students knowledge and craft (Blom & Poole, 2004; Daniel, 2004; Latukeyu, 2009; Latukeyu, 2010) and although it can be argued that students still in training should not take instruction by the unqualified judgement of peers (Daniel, 2004, p.89) we must avoid going back to the days of “rugged individualism” where “strong individuals were built by isolating each student and

having students learn by themselves without interacting with classmates”

(Johnson and Johnson, 2009, p.365).

If group tuition can become a predominant, successful method of learning across a broad range of subjects (Kalra, Modi and Vyas, 2015; Johnson and Johnson, 2009) then where is the reason not to implement this from the start of a singers training and not just as an additional tool to one-to-one tuition (Manhas and Chindmes, 2013). To further the credibility of the SDCPS model, further research must be carried out in order to see evidence-based results. However, I stand confident that small group teaching for singing is a strong pedagogic method of training for students starting their learning journey and as they progress through the different levels of study. Furthermore, if teachers who are resistant to group tuition become open to a new way of tutoring, they will in turn reap the benefits of a higher remuneration. SDCPS is a promising, potential model for both the student and the teacher.

Assessment Component Two – reflective review

- a) Reflect on your recent learning experience, and the value of learning you have acquired. Assess your current competences and identify future development needs in the context of your work situation.
- b) Devise a detailed personal development plan which incorporates identified areas for development, objectives, activities to be undertaken, methods, resources, review periods and timescales.

This assignment has encouraged me to assess my reflective practice. Prior to beginning this assessment, I believed that I was a reflective teacher. However, on completion I have realised that although my music and performing arts academy is a business which has grown successfully over the years, this accomplishment is predominantly based on my practical teaching experience and less so, on being a comprehensive reflective practitioner. Discovering the literature about small group teaching highlighted to me that I had a considerable gap in my knowledge and understanding. By undertaking further study into this area of expertise, I have now formed a stronger opinion and reasoning for promoting small group tuition.

I discovered that up until recently, my approach to self reflection was similar to that of Gibb's reflective cycle of description, feelings, evaluation, analysis, conclusion and action

plan (Gibbs, 1998) and I would use this model of reflection in the following manner:

- Description - Easily identify what had happened in class.
- Feelings - How the situation would encompass my thoughts for a considerable amount of time after the event.
- Evaluation - It would be easier to concentrate on the negative experience rather than take note of the positive changes to be made.
- Analysis - Rationalise the incident and put it into context.
- Conclusion - Gain an understanding of why the event happened.
- Action Plan - Think of a better way to handle a similar situation in the future.

However, when reading Finlay's (2008) analysis of this model and noting that for me, this has often been only a thought process without documenting the event in writing, it occurred that perhaps I was not doing enough in my reflective practice to justify being respected by peers as a good principal and teacher and that I should be using a "broader, more critically reflective approach" (Finlay, 2008, p.8).

This personal observation could easily have imposed a negative impact on my personal view of my ability as a teacher. However, I was reassured to learn that Roberts (1998) believes that new teachers do not have the skills to imitate the methods of others without first establishing their own teaching framework. On account of this viewpoint, could I be forgiven that up until now the majority of my reflective practice has been at a basic level? The fact that I have now commenced this course of study, suggests that I am at a stage of wanting to further my self reflective practice. I would certainly not suggest that I am similar to any student who would "adopt a minimalist approach" (Finlay, 2008, p.14) as I recognise how much just a small amount of reflection has impacted my teaching development and to what extent the process could enhance my practice moving forward. Furthermore, it could be argued that my academy would not be the success that it is today if I was not reflecting on my practice regularly. In light of this, perhaps I could instead refer to myself as an "alert novice" (LaBoskey, 1993).

Nonetheless, I was reassured by identifying other theories of reflection which I could identify with in my own practise. In particular, I was drawn to Brookfield (1995) who describes critical reflection as 'stance and dance' whereby I need to further improve my exploration of research to adapt my teaching methods. In addition, I have found that the model of Brookfield's four lenses covers all the angles that should contribute to the

construct of my SDCPS small group teaching model:

LENS 1: AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL

Using the autobiographical lens, I intend to enhance any aspects of my pedagogy that need to be heightened or even established. Looking further into this process, I realised that my reflective teaching manner corresponds with Schön's "reflection-in-action" (1983). Although I have many years of teaching experience, I am now aware that I limit my reflective practise and I personally feel that I fall into the category of "over-stretched professionals" who "are likely to find reflective practise taxing and difficult" (Finlay, 2008, p.10). This is not to be used as an excuse but instead to evaluate why I reflect in this manner. To enhance my practise in this area, I will add a reflective journal in order to keep track of all positive and negative experiences that may materialise in the classroom and also from client correspondence. Furthermore, I intend to put future goals in writing so that I can gain confidence in my accomplishments upon review.

LENS 2: STUDENT'S EYES

Just as I have incorporated a journal for students to reflect in the SDCPS model (see appendix 3, 'Progress', para.4), I intend to lead by example by keeping a small group teaching journal which will encourage me to analyse what format is working best for all the students learning in this manner and identifying the rate of individual progress. I would like to determine exactly why students are successful and what makes them return to my tutelage.

LENS 3: OUR COLLEAGUES EXPERIENCES

Although my own small groups are centred around peer learning, I myself do not wholly share Solomon's (1987) thoughts on seeking help from other practitioners. This is due to some negative experiences I have encountered with the competition in the local area. However, I do agree that "working alone does not nurture critical reflection and that we need others to clarify and challenge tacit assumptions" (Finlay, 2008, p.17). To overcome this lack of trust, I do seek help from outside of my immediate territory from singing teachers and experts in the wider field of vocal pedagogy as I understand that this will have a positive impact on my business. Prior to undertaking this course, I would attend workshops for singing teachers at least every six to twelve months focusing on areas I was not familiar with, such as the latest advancements in voice science. However, I would now like this activity to become a more regular part of my practise and form ongoing professional relationships with other teachers who are using small group teaching for

singers as a method of tuition.

LENS 4: THEORETICAL LITERATURE

When embarking on this assessment, I was overwhelmed with the amount of literature that was available. During the initial stage of study, I questioned my ability to understand how I had been organising and planning the content of my small group tuition. As I continued to study the research, I came to believe that it had been my own intuition, based on my years of experience that had enabled me to create these successful small group classes. This style of reflective teaching could be described as “routine action” (Dewey, 1910) whereby a progression to “reflective action” is needed for professional growth.

At first, I was reading medical studies (Nikendei et al. 2014; Saleh et al. 2013; Pal et al. 2012) and wondered how these transferred to my practise of teaching singing. Did the same theories apply if the small group was learning a different subject? I then discovered articles which were arguably more suited to the research as they applied to music lessons directly (Bjøntegaard, 2014; Duarte Manhas and Chindmes, 2013). However, I was glad that my study time was not wasted in reading the medical research and I could use this information to support my own creation of the SDCPS model, for example the development and expansion of Peyton's four step approach (see appendix 1). Therefore, I concluded that the subject the small groups were studying in the literature did not have to correspond and each piece of research only served as an additional tool for my study. There is still plenty of information to review that can assist my learning development as both a teacher and a business owner.

To conclude and order my thoughts on what happens next, I am drawn to Driscoll's cycle of 'What', 'So What' and 'Now What' (Driscoll, 2007) built from Borton's reflective model (Borton, 1970).

What?

It could be argued that when practise is going well there is not an urgent need to reflect as the results of having regular returning students would suggest that the teacher is doing a good job. This is perhaps, in my case the reason I may not have researched to a greater extent until now. Is it not until you have a problem, either in a lesson or with a client who has an issue with your business practice that you question your methods and seek to find a justification as an answer.

So what?

I feel reflective practises are a personal choice depending on your teaching personality

and way of learning for each individual practitioner; teachers should not become enveloped in an idea that they are not reflecting correctly. Some practitioners may be far too critical of their own practise already and therefore, a deal of trust in ones own methods from results of success should be taken on board when assessing personal development. A state of balance is also important to keep in mind as Finlay states “the process of reflection should not overwhelm actual practice” (2008, p.12).

Now what?

I do believe that I have been engaged in a basic level of reflective practice since beginning my teaching journey and I am now at a stage where I am taking reflection to the next phase through undertaking this course. Whether this added layer of knowledge will be transformative to my teaching practice is to be seen, however, I have confidence from my new found awareness of reflection, that it will improve my ability as a teacher as I expand my proficiency in this area of study. Having completed this assignment, I believe I have improved my understanding of reflective practice significantly and intend to continue to use the theories I have learned to support my teaching practice. What I personally hope for is a deeper level of understanding which enables me to reach a higher level of respect from more advanced students and peers.

Finally, Quinn's suggestion that all reflective models involve the three processes of “retrospection”, “self-evaluation” and “reorientation” (1998 – 2000) which I always incorporate into my work, has encouraged me to not only remain confident in how I reflect but to use what I have learned about this type of practice to further enhance my ability as both a teacher and business owner.

Personal Learning and Development Plan

Why am I doing this course?	Enhance my knowledge Further my understanding of voice science Possible new career path – lecturing
What is the direct benefit to me?	Extra qualification Further opportunities Possible higher wage Confidence in my teaching ability

Developmental Area 1. Develop a teaching strategy for small groups 2. Review the success of the model after the first set of exams have been completed 3. Alongside this work, develop ways to conduct these lessons online when students are told to work remotely due to Covid-19 restrictions	Action This assignment has created a suitable model for small groups which I will be testing in my classes. Completion I will continue to use this model until the end of this academic year when students will be entered into their singing examinations. Action When the examination results have come through I will compare the impact of the model compared to previous results when it was not in place. I will also ask parents and students to fill in a questionnaire to find out their own thoughts on small group classes. Completion July 2021 Action Although, I have not discussed online tuition in this assignment, I have now had three months of experience conducting small group singing lessons online which took place between May 2020 – July 2020. Since September 2020, these groups have resumed in person, however now that I have completed further research into small group teaching I would also like to create a more successful strategy for teaching these
--	--

4. Continue to add further reflective practise to enhance my ability as a teacher	online group lessons. Completion September 2021 Action Keep a teaching journal. Use the journal as a reference point and further develop my reflective practice on a monthly basis. Completion Ongoing
5. Contribute to singing teaching practice by making my model available for peers should it prove successful	Action Continue to test my model, keep a track of its success and should an opportunity to share this model with other practitioners arise, ensure I have documents in place to do this. Completion After several years of continued development. Aim for 2023.

Catherine Whitehall

Student ID: 1921123

October 23rd 2020

References

- Abusamra, W. (1978). Small Group VS Individual Instruction in the Performance Studio. *The NATS Bulletin*.
- Bjøntegaard, B.J. (2014). A combination of one-to-one teaching and small group teaching in higher music education in Norway – a good model for teaching? *British Journal of Music Education*, 32(1), pp.23–36.
- Blom, D. and Poole, K. (2004). Peer assessment of tertiary music performance: opportunities for understanding performance assessment and performing through experience and self-reflection. *British Journal of Music Education*, 21(1), pp.111–125.
- Borton, T. (1970). *Reach, touch, and teach : student concerns and process education*. New York McGraw-Hill Paperbacks.
- Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco, Ca: Jossey-Bass.
- Carey, G., Harrison, S. and Dwyer, R. (2016). Encouraging reflective practice in conservatoire students: a pathway to autonomous learning? *Music Education Research*, 19(1), pp.99–110.
- Carey, G.M., Bridgstock, R., Taylor, P., McWilliam, E. and Grant, C. (2013). Characterising one-to-one conservatoire teaching: some implications of a quantitative analysis. *Music Education Research*, 15(3), pp.357–368.
- Daniel, R. (2004). Peer assessment in musical performance: the development, trial and evaluation of a methodology for the Australian tertiary environment. *British Journal of Music Education*, [online] 21(1), pp.89–110. Available at: http://researchonline.jcu.edu.au/989/1/BJME_daniel2.pdf [Accessed 13 May 2019].
- Dewey, J. (1910) *How we think*. London: D.C. Heath
- Driscoll, J. (2007). *Practising clinical supervision : a reflective approach for healthcare professionals*. Edinburgh: Baillière Tindall Elsevier.
- Duarte Manhas, A. and Chindmes, O. (2013). *Instrumental lessons in pairs: Learning and/by performing together*.
- Finlay, Linda (2008). Reflecting on 'Reflective practice'. Practice-based Professional Learning Paper 52, The Open University.
- Forbes, M. (2016). If the shoes doesn't fit: A case and a place for collaborative learning for

music practise in higher education. *Australian Journal of Music Education*, 50(1), pp.53–62.

Gibbs, G. (1988). *Learning by doing: a guide to teaching and learning methods*. Oxford: Oxford: Further Education Unit, Oxford Polytechnic.

Haddon, E. (2011). Multiple teachers: multiple gains? *British Journal of Music Education*, 28(01), pp.69–85.

Hanken, I.M. (2014). Listening and learning in a master class. *Music Education Research*, 17(4), pp.453–464.

Harrison, S. and Grant, C. (2015). Exploring of new models of research pedagogy: time to let go of master-apprentice style supervision? *Teaching in Higher Education*, 20(5), pp.556–566.

Holden, R.B. (2002). A New Model for Training the Collegiate Voice Student. *Journal of Singing*, 58(4), pp.299–303.

Johnson, D.W. and Johnson, R.T. (2002). Learning Together and Alone: Overview and Meta- analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 22(1), pp.95–105.

Johnson, D.W. and Johnson, R.T. (2009). An Educational Psychology Success Story: Social Interdependence Theory and Cooperative Learning. *Educational Researcher*, 38(5), pp.365–379.

Jørgensen, H. (2000). Student learning in higher instrumental education: who is responsible? *British Journal of Music Education*, 17(1), pp.67–77.

Kalra, R., Modi, J. and Vyas, R. (2015). Involving postgraduate's students in undergraduate small group teaching promotes active learning in both. *International Journal of Applied and Basic Medical Research*, 5(4), p.14.

LaBoskey, V. (1993) A conceptual framework for reflection in pre-service teacher education, in: J. Calderhead & P. Gates (Eds) *Conceptualizing reflection in teacher development*. Lewes: Falmer Press.

Latukefu, L. (2009). Peer learning and reflection: strategies developed by vocal students in a transforming tertiary setting. *International Journal of Music Education*, 27(2), pp.128–142.

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

Nerland, M. (2007). One-to-one teaching as cultural practice: two case studies from an academy of music. *Music Education Research*, 9(3), pp.399–416.

Nielsen, S.G. (2004). Strategies and self-efficacy beliefs in instrumental and vocal individual practice: a study of students in higher music education. *Psychology of Music*, 32(4), pp.418–431.

Nikendei, C., Huber, J., Stiepak, J., Huhn, D., Lauter, J., Herzog, W., Jünger, J. and Krautter, M. (2014). Modification of Peyton's four-step approach for small group teaching – a descriptive study. *BMC Medical Education*, 14(1).

Pal, R., Kar, S., Zaman, F., Jha, D. and Pal, S. (2012). Assessment of impact of small group teaching among students in community medicine. *Indian Journal of Community Medicine*, 37(3), p.170.

Quinn, F.M. (1998.2000) Reflection and reflective practice. In C.Davies, L. Finlay and A. Bullman (eds.) *Changing practise in health and social care*. London: Sage. (Original work published in 1998 and reproduced in 2000).

Roberts, J. (1998) Language teacher education. London: Arnold.

Saleh, A.M. (2013). A Qualitative Assessment of The Small Group Teaching at Hawler College of Medicine. *JOURNAL OF CLINICAL AND DIAGNOSTIC RESEARCH*, 7(5), pp.883–887.

Schön, D.A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

Stanley, M., Brooker, R. and Gilbert, R. (2002). Examiner Perceptions of Using Criteria in Music Performance Assessment. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 18(1), pp.46–56.

Solomon, J. (1987). New Thoughts on Teacher Education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 13(3), pp.267–274.

Surgenor, P. (2010). *A Wealth of Teaching Resources - UCD Teaching & Learning*. [online] www.ucd.ie. Available at: <http://www.ucd.ie/teaching> [Accessed 13 Jul. 2020].

Thompson, K. (1983). *An analysis of group instrumental teaching: principles, procedures and curriculum implications*. pp.1–413.

University of West London (2020). *London College of Music | Leading Music Exams & Diplomas From LCM. - University of West London*. [online] lcme.uwl.ac.uk. Available at: <https://lcme.uwl.ac.uk> [Accessed 13 Jul. 2020].

Warwick, P. (2007). *Reflective practice: some notes on the development of the notion of professional reflection*, The Busy Teacher Educator Guide, ESCalate Help Directory.

Appendix 1 (Reproduced from Nikendei et al. 2014, p.2-3).

Peyton's four-step approach	Adaptation for skills-lab training
1. Demonstration	A – Demonstration and Deconstruction
2. Deconstruction	B – Comprehension Tutor's Performance and Observation
3. Comprehension	C – Comprehension Trainee's Performance and Observation
4. Performance	D – Tutor and Peer Feedback
	E – Circulation
	F – Completion and Conclusion

Appendix 2 (Adapted ideas from Surgenor, 2010)

Techniques for use in Small Group Teaching
Buzz Groups
Brain Storms
Silent Reflection
Rounds
Three Minutes Each Way
Syndicates

Appendix 3

SDCPS: 5 Steps to Successful Small Group Singing Lessons

SDCPS MODEL

Designed for small group singing lessons.

S = Benefits for Student. T = Benefits for Teacher.

SUPPORT	Number of Students (S & T) Social Inclusivity (S) Age/Level (S) Economic Value (S/T)
DEVELOPMENT	Technique (S) Repertoire (S) Theoretical Knowledge (S)
CONSTRUCTION	Performance Platform (S) Holistic & Analytical Feedback via both Teacher and Peer Analysis (S)
PROGRESS	Individual Learning (S) Improvement (S)
SUCCESS	Confidence (S) Ability (S) Exam Results (S & T) Economic Gain (T)

SDCPS: Support

The *number of students* in a group should ideally be no more than 6 (up to 8 for beginners as repertoire tends to be shorter at this level). Controlling the numbers in the group aims to ensure that students receive adequate individual attention during their class time and as Johnson and Johnson suggest “the smaller the group... the greater the promotive interaction tends to be” (2002, p.3).

At the start of each session, students will be welcomed individually and invited to speak to breakdown any communication barriers and ensuring *social inclusivity* (Surgenor, 2010). Classes should be created for similar *ages and levels* so that exercises and repertoire will be suitable all voices (Holden, 2002, p.301).

The *economic value* of the class should benefit both the student and teacher. For the

student the lower cost of the lesson offers an agreeable resolution for those hoping for a cheaper alternative than private tuition without the compromise of a lesser experience. The lesson fee will also reflect the level taught and the length of the class ensuring that teachers receive ample remuneration as “due to more intense teaching effort, it seems more appropriate that remuneration be different for group and individual classes” (Duarte Manhas and Chindmes, 2013, p.82). Consequently, although the advertised class fee may be lower, tutors can have up to six times as many students in a class, thus supplying substantial financial reward.

SDCPS: Development

Each class should cover *technique*, *repertoire* and *theoretical knowledge*. Ensuring that all students do not miss any elements of tutelage that they would receive in a one-to-one lesson (Williams, 2013).

Technique will be covered as a group, with opportunities for students to demonstrate exercises alone and for the listening participants to develop their aural skills and awareness of musicality.

Repertoire should be taught to the whole group. At a later stage this can be developed and divided on the performance platform (see *Construction*).

Theoretical knowledge must also be introduced to the group in class. This may be proceeded by exercises in pairs and/or individual research between lessons (see *Progress*).

SDCPS: Construction

Students will be able to reap the additional benefits from using the *performance platform* giving them “the opportunity to sing in-front of their peers and test their ability to communicate as singers” (Holden, 2002, p.302). In turn this will lead them to receive *feedback* from both the teacher and classmates. (Holden, 2002; Bjøntegaard, 2014; Hanken, 2015; Carey, Harrison and Dwyer, 2017; Forbes, 2016; Daniel, 2004). With encouragement to use both holistic and analytical feedback (Laturkefu, 2009), criticism must always be constructive; students must include both positive comments and practical solutions to improve and embolden the performer (Bjøntegaard, 2014, p.28). The teacher must also be aware not to pressurise students into performing in-front of their peers until they are ready to avoid a negative scenario and instead offer regular encouragement to achieve positive outcomes (Bjøntegaard, 2014, p.29).

With the above in place, students who are observing rather than performing will receive

“vicarious reinforcement” to ensure they are constantly learning (Hanken, 2015, p.456) as “although only one person may be singing everyone is included in the discussion” (Holden 2002, p.301).

SDCPS: Progress

Having learned how to critique the work of others, *individual learning* between classes will give the student a sense of self-efficacy (Nielsen, 2004, p.419 and Hanken, 2015, p.457). Students will be encouraged to keep a practise journal, in turn this will lead to further *improvement* which aspires to be “positive, collaborative, supportive, open, exploratory and reflective” (Carey et al. 2017, p.101). Further enhancement of practise will be encouraged at different levels as students progress and can include using the “metacognitive self-regulation scale” and “resource management scale” (Nielsen, 2004, p.422).

SDCPS: Success

Following the model aims to ensure *confidence* building and *skill ability*. Once students have worked towards a qualification, their *results on paper* from entered examinations (Stanley, Brooker and Gilbert, 2001; Blom and Poole, 2004; University of West London (2020) will benefit the teacher who can share these results to give their lessons credibility, aspiring to create a larger client base. The student base should build from this success ensuring *economic gain* for the teacher moving forward.