

**Lectorate Lifelong Learning in Music
&
Yo! Opera Festival**

**Vocal students as Animateurs
A case study of non-formal learning**

Pilot Project, September-October 2005



Ninja Kors & Peter Mak

Contents

1. Introduction – Ninja Kors & Peter Mak	4
2. Project overview – Ninja Kors & Peter Mak	4
General description	4
Research plan	6
3. The learning environment of the animateur – Ninja Kors	7
Research	7
Research questions	7
Research method	7
4. Framework - Ninja Kors	8
Lifelong learning in music	8
Yo! Festival	8
Animateur	9
Non-formal learning	9
Context-related assessment & reflective practice	9
5. The project: process and product – Ninja Kors	10
Phase 1: workshop day at the conservatoire	10
Phase 2: 3-day workshop at Yo!	13
Day 1	13
Day 2	16
Day 3	18
Phase 3: the bus	20
6. Outcomes and discussion – Ninja Kors	20
Non-formal learning	20
Workshop leaders	21
Content	22
Organisation	22
Partnerships	22
Assessment	22
7. Competencies and skills – Peter Mak	23
Research questions	23
Competence domain of the animateur	23
Tactics	23
Training programme	24
Research methods	24
Data analysis	25
Summary of the experiences on the buses	26
Discussion	30
Limitations of the project	34

8. Legacy of the Yo! Festival bus project – Peter Mak & Ninja Kors	35
Recommendations for a training programme musician animateur	35
Why train student singers as musical animateurs?	35
Key competencies of the animateur	36
Ingredients of the programme	37
Scope and implementation of the programme	40
9. Bibliography	41

1. Introduction

It used to be so easy to train and work as a musician. Either you were a performer, a respectable member of an orchestra or even a soloist, or you were a teacher, an inspiration to generations of musicians yet to come. But as it turns out, things are never that simple. For there is also a kind of musician who will not perform in the way as it is classically understood, nor will he teach within a formally designed structure. Rather, he will engage people (any kind of people) in active music making, using his skills and knowledge as a musician to communicate optimally, taking the lead where necessary, not doing so where possible. In short, he is a music animateur.

The pilot project that will be described in this report was all about the animateur. What are his skills and attitudes? What are the pedagogical interventions that he uses in a workshop or an event? What are the main issues that arise when we try to include such a naturally non-formal and informal practice into a formal setting like the conservatoire? The pilot project has led to a number of conclusions for the lectorate that have direct implications for setting up a module to train animateurs, and regarding project set-up and content.

The research of the pilot project that was done can be seen as two research projects leading to a common set of conclusions. Peter Mak focused his research on the competencies and skills of an animateur. Central to his research were questions regarding the tactics, skills and personality of the animateur, and the factors for success or failure in leading creative music making. Ninja Kors reports on the process that the students of the Royal Conservatoire underwent as they were trained to work as animateurs in a community setting.

This first part of this report focuses on the non-formal learning situation and the reflective learning process of the students. In the first chapter a project overview is given to provide some guidance to the reader. The second chapter has information about research approach and methodology. Chapter III sketches the framework in which the pilot project took place, naming some key factors and concepts. Chapter IV describes the workshops in detail, taking into account prior conditions, programme (intended and realised) and student assessments. The outcomes are listed in chapter V. In the second part the focus is on competencies and skills of the animateurs. The feedback of the students on the research is being discussed.

In the third part we give recommendations for a training programme for conservatoire singing students to acquire the necessary skills and competencies of a musician animateur based on the research outcomes of this project.

2. Project overview

General description

The pilot project was realised by the Lectorate Lifelong Learning in Music (Royal Conservatoire and Prins Claus Conservatoire) in close co-operation with YO Festival. The Lectorate was responsible for the educational content and process. Through this pilot the lectorate did not only aim to contribute to the personal professional development of music students, but also to look into a number of issues that are

important to the conceptual framework of lifelong learning: key competencies of the music amateur, context-related assessment and reflective practice. Therefore the pilot project was monitored and described as a case study. The YO Festival was partner in the project; apart from a strong influence on the content and process, YO also provided the actual framework (a community opera festival), facilities and the workshop leader in the second phase (see further).

The target group consisted of vocal students from the Royal Conservatoire. Most students came from the 3rd year methodology class of teacher Gerda van Zelm, but there were also enrolments from other years. The project was part of a methodology module, though it was not compulsory to take part in this.

The preparation began in the Spring of 2005. The lector discussed the project at length with YO! Festival and the vocal/methodology teacher of the conservatoire. YO! Festival had already contracted the workshop leader for the training days prior to the festival (phase 2). The lector decided to add another session to the project: a workshop day with graduates from the Guildhall School of Music and Drama in London. One week before the first workshop, the lector and the researcher/observer paid the students a visit during their methodology class in order to explain the project and answer any questions they might have.

The first phase was popular, with about 25 students attending the workshop day. At the end, eleven students indicated they were willing *and able* to participate in the rest of the project; eventually nine took part. The student assessments show that many students enjoyed the workshop, for various reasons. Some indicated the discovery of creativity, others focused on the group process of making music together.

The first phase consisted of a whole training day (22 September 2005) in the Royal Conservatoire in The Hague. The day was under supervision of Sean Gregory, head of Professional Development of Guildhall School. There were two workshop leaders, graduates from that same department (singers). The workshop focused on developing the creativity of the students, the rediscovery of *making* music, and trying out ways of communicating through music. There was also some time dedicated to preparing a performance at the end of the day, when the students sang at The Hague's central train station.

The second phase was longer and more demanding. In essence, a non-formal learning environment was created to fit into the formal structure of conservatoire training. During three days of workshops and performances, the students worked on community music skills and towards phase 3, working as amateur in a city bus. The workshop was lead by a community musician and theatre maker. The nine students worked on various aspects of community music making: what it means to be a community musician, how to 'arrange' music for use in the community, developing new materials. Apart from workshops in the studio of YO!, there were also try-out sessions on various locations around the city. These were arranged by YO! Festival.

The students went through an intense process during the second phase of the project. They were confronted with a very different way of working with music than they usually encountered. This had implications for their perceptions of quality in musical work. It also raised questions about their identity as musicians. The workshop leader

found it difficult to adapt his methodology and content as the workshops progressed. The student assessments show their struggle. Intervention by the teacher of the conservatoire, the lector and the artistic leader of the YO! Festival was instrumental in a better adjustment of the project to the students' needs.

The third phase consisted of the actual 'performances' during the YO! Festival. Students, in groups of three, performed as animateurs in a city bus in Utrecht. For about thirty minutes they worked with each other and with the bus passengers to make the bus ride as musical as possible: choir and solo singing, musical games, etc. Participation was voluntary, some passengers would participate, others would not. Assessment took place by the students themselves: self assessment, but also peer assessment as they observed each other during the bus rides.

After the project, the students were asked to write an assessment report about the project. In January 2006 (three months after phase 3) the two researchers came to the conservatoire to discuss the project and its aftermath with the students. The discussion yielded some new insights and adjusted some existing ones.

Research plan

Through this pilot the lectorate aimed to:

1. contribute to the personal professional development of music students;
2. look into a number of issues that are important to the conceptual framework of lifelong learning:
 - key competencies of the music animateur (see further) by mapping the tactics that animateurs use in a creative music workshop related to the context of the bus 5-project.
 - context-related assessment,
 - reflective practice
3. lay the foundations for developing a module for training animateurs in the conservatoire by determining the ingredients for training the students of the singing department of the Royal Conservatoire / Prince Claus Conservatoire in their role as animateur (engaging audiences in creative music workshops).

YO Festival complemented these goals with their own: to confront a broad audience with classically trained singers, and in the process making them feel they are passing the time in a pleasant way and feeling good/harmonious/connected.

The research questions were defined as follows:

- How do we translate the key competencies of the music animateur into ingredients that can be used in training future professional musicians?
- Within the context of working as an animateur:
Which conscious and unconscious interventions took place and how did the leader use them for the benefit of the group?

These questions were used as the basis for Peter Mak's research, in paragraph 7 of this report.

- How does reflective practice take place in the pilot project?
- How do students relate to the process of reflective practice and what kind of support do they need to feel confident?
- What can be learned from this project in order to accommodate and facilitate future projects of this kind in the conservatoire?

These questions are addressed by Ninja Kors in paragraph 6 of this report.

3. The learning environment of the animateur

Research

Research questions

The research questions that were addressed by Ninja Kors were:

- How did reflective practice take place in the pilot project?
- How do students relate to the process of reflective practice and what kind of support do they need to feel confident?
- What can be learned from this project in order to accommodate and facilitate future projects of this kind in the conservatoire?

Research method

As Mak describes in part II of this report, more than one method was used questioning this research. Method triangulation as well as combining the findings of two researchers ensures optimal reliability of the outcomes. The following research methods were used.

This research draws on earlier studies, particularly literature research in the field of formal non-formal and informal learning (Mak, 2005, Kors, 2005), reflective practice (Renshaw, 2005) and lifelong learning (Smilde, 2004). Documentation from the YO! Festival was used to frame the pilot in the context of the theme *community opera*.

A large part of the research was done by observation of the learning process during the workshops and in the bus, and conducting (informal) interviews with the students. Students had also written assessment reports about their work. These reports contain the students' own observations and underlie the research findings in this report. On the one hand they serve as a new source of information, on the other as a record against which the researcher tested her findings.

The project and its findings were also discussed with the research group of the lectorate.

4. Framework

Lifelong learning in music

The pilot project was part of the lectorate Lifelong Learning in Music. The purpose of the lectorate is: 'To create adaptive learning environments in which conservatoire students can be trained to function effectively in a continuously changing professional practice' (Research Approach, November 2004)

Lifelong Learning may be defined as follows: "a concept spanning an entire lifetime in a process of transforming experience into knowledge, skills, attitudes, values and convictions. In a fast-changing world the experiences from which people learn also change continually, creating new learning experiences from which people go on learning all their lives (...). The Lifelong Learning concept is an important conceptual framework for the improvement of people's employability, adaptability and responsiveness."

For the vocal students of the Royal Conservatoire, the pilot project provided an opportunity to explore a different way of communicating with their music. The project was part of the students' personal professional development, which aims to lead to discovery and recognition of their talents and interests. The students were challenged to develop a new area of skills and expertise that may enable them to lead a creative workshop, using their skills as a musician in different ways, and consequently make them more responsive to context.

YO! Festival

The YO! International Youth Opera Festival was founded in 2001 'to contribute to the international development of youth opera' (...). The festival wants to contribute to a higher standard of youth opera repertoire and to promote new repertoire development, and to generate a culture of inquiry and experiment among a new generation of (youth) opera composers, performers and directors." (YO! Syllabus, 2005:2)

YO! also aims to confront a broad audience with classically trained singers. This was the underlying thought behind the 2005 edition of the Festival which had as a theme community opera: '*Your Opera*'. The festival consisted of performances, events and projects but also a working conference about community opera. YO! participated in the pilot project because the future generations of opera makers are a major concern for YO!

Animateur

An animateur is "a practicing artist, in any form, who uses her/his skills, talents and personality to enable others to compose, design, devise, create, perform or engage with works of art of any kind"(Animarts, 2003).

To the animateur, workshop leader skills are essential. Sean Gregory explains the multifaceted role of the workshop leader as 'a skilled musician who can perform many diverse roles, such as composer, arranger, facilitator, improviser, performer, conductor, teacher and catalyst'. Obtaining a high level of performance in all these

aspects is no small feat. The key lies in a number of transferable skills (generic skills) that can be applied to a variety of contexts.

The students in this project were confronted with two very different types of animateur during phases 1 and 2. Their job was to find their own way as animateur, using their own ideas and skills in each of the roles described above. It was not expected of them to become a fully skilled animateur in just a few days, but to encounter what it means to be an animateur.

Non-formal learning

The project was an example of creating a non-formal learning environment within a formal structure (for definitions and comparisons: Mak, 2005) It was part of the students' training programme (voluntary) at the conservatoire, yet the majority of workshops was given by a leader who had no pedagogical training and who was not formally a teacher at the conservatoire. The students had a clear learning intention but also, eventually, a hand in the content of the workshops.

As in many non-formal learning environments (Kors, 2005) there was a strong aspect of informal learning in the workshops. The students used much of their 'free time' (transport, breaks, lunches) to confer and speak about their work.

Context-related assessment & reflective practice

Community opera takes place in a wide variety of contexts: social, practical, musical, etc. It is the job of the animateur to find and realise the ideal result at a particular place and time. Assessment criteria that are commonly used for vocal artists are not applicable as a standard in each of these situations; criteria are needed for assessment that relates to the actual context of the artistic practice, in order to determine if the practice is indeed 'fit for purpose'.

It is important that an animateur (or a student learning to be one) is aware of the quality of what she is doing, and that she is able to adjust the situation accordingly. This reflection *on* and *in* action is the essential part of reflective practice that the Lifelong Learning lectorate wants to establish in the students. As Peter Renshaw states in his article in the YO syllabus (2005: 51): 'reflective practice is crucial to musical leadership. Given the wide scope of social, practical and musical contexts in which community opera may take place, reflection is instrumental in evaluating and ensuring quality on several levels of the project.'

5. The project: process and product

Phase 1: workshop day at the conservatoire

Participants

The workshop was open to all vocal students, and particularly aimed at the second and third year methodology groups. About 23 students participated during the morning, in the afternoon some had to leave for other activities.

Leaders

The workshop was lead by Natalie Williams and Nia Lynn, graduates from the Continuing Professional Development department of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama. They were trained as workshop leaders and particularly skilled in collaborative music making. The workshop day was supervised by Sean Gregory, head of said department, who also led some of the work during the day.

Setting

The workshop took place in the concert hall / auditorium of the Royal Conservatoire, mostly on stage. There was a small audience in the hall: researchers from the lectorate, interested teachers, interested students, and at a later stage also representatives from the YO! Festival: the director, the producer and the workshop leader for phase 2.

The closing event (workshop/performance) was in The Hague Central Station, during rush hour. A tough crowd.

Since the second part of the day would be dedicated to preparing a workshop / performance at the Central Station, it was made clear to the students that those who would not be able to take part at the station, could also not be part of the second part of the workshop.

Programme

Morning programme	Explanation about why and how of the workshop. Warm-up exercises: body rhythms and voice. Goal: gain confidence, and work on coordination and community skills. There is a strong focus on interaction.
Afternoon programme	Repertoire: learn some songs which are useful in a workshop context. These are songs which are easy to improvise with: African songs, gospel, etc. The original plan for the workshop also included song writing (composing a song together) in order to learn how to facilitate song writing in a workshop. This was now only lightly touched upon, and did not result in repertoire for the final workshop/performance at the end of the day.
Closing event	Workshop/performance at The Hague Central Station. It was rush hour at the station so it was very busy and many people rushed past. The group positioned itself in front of the ticket office, back to the glass wall, facing travellers and commuters.

Student assessments

The students were unanimous in their enthusiasm for the training day in phase 1. The way of working with music that they experienced was an eye-opener for many of them: stepping away from the 'glass cage' of the conservatoire with questions only about artistic quality, interpretation and repertoire and back to the basics of just enjoying music. In this workshop they felt none of the fear of failure they usually encounter in classrooms and felt free to experiment and improvise.

Improvisation was one of the remarkable things about the workshop: for classical students it was a new thing, for jazz singers it was done in a new way. In any case, students found the experience of working with other singers/students very pleasant and mentioned the good feeling in the group several times.

The students also volunteered their opinion about the workshop and said they found it useful for the future. Apart from the fact that they took home new repertoire and musical games (if only to try out on little nephews), they also said they felt more confident on stage and enjoyed communicating with their audience in a new way. Many students were surprised by the direct response they received from the audience (and from people who were not paying specific attention) at the station, both positive and negative.

The students also had some concerns. One was to do with their voice; particularly classical singers were worried that this 'free' way of singing might damage their voices, especially since the workshop day was very long and intense. They also felt that to be asked to spend a whole day on this, is sometimes too much for students and their busy schedules.

Additional observations

Closing event:

- Despite the intention of making it a participatory event with people at the station, the event was more of a performance by the student group, led by Sean, Nia and Natalie. The busy and acoustically challenging setting did not easily allow for more interaction with the audience, something many students regretted.

Students:

- Some of the students had already enjoyed some workshops by Renée Jonker, a teacher who was trained at London Sinfonietta to work on collaborative compositions. They saw many parallels.
- The students did not find it difficult to work together at all. They are used to making short theatre pieces in only a few minutes and it was not difficult for them to interact. Was this a result of the open communication and team teaching at the Royal Conservatoire?

Phase 2: 3 - day workshop at YO! In Utrecht

Participants

Out of the eleven students wanting to participate in phases 2 and 3, ten came to the first day, one girl only for the day. This girl could not participate in phase 3. Reasons for cancellation: other study, work, childcare, participation in other parts of the YO! Festival. The nine students consisted of: 8 classical singers, 1 jazz; 8 women, 1 man; 7 Dutch, 2 Spanish.

Leader

The workshop leader was a community musician with a background in visual arts. He is self-taught and never received musical or pedagogical training. He has great experience in setting up singing events, both large- and small-scale, and working with 'difficult' groups: offenders, handicapped people, asylum seekers, etc. His repertoire is largely self-made and usually based on two or three chords. The songs can be adjusted to fit various circumstances, e.g. by adapting melody (simplifying or elaborating) and custom-fit texts.

The artistic director of YO! had contracted the workshop leader to take part in the YO! Festival for various projects, and introduced him into the pilot with the Royal Conservatoire. YO! admired the workshop leader's social engagement as an artist and his ability to bring people together in music making.

Setting

The workshops took place in a rehearsal studio at the home base of YO!, the *Berenkuil* in Utrecht. Practical try-outs happened on location in the city of Utrecht (see programme). YO! Festival had rented bikes for the students to get around to different locations.

Preparation

At the end of the workshop in September (phase 1), the students received a small homework assignment from the workshop leader. He asked them to work on a piece of music for the people at the Provinciehuis (regional government building). The music was supposed to connect with the work of the people there: 'They work for us, this is our way of giving something back.'

Day 1

Planned & realised
Morning: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Workshop in the Berenkuil- Try-out in the restaurant of the Provinciehuis (regional government) Afternoon: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Try-out in secondary school (Utrecht-Zuid College, Kanaleneiland)- Try-out for a community of nuns in the centre of Utrecht

Summary

The first day can be seen as the crisis of the process in a nutshell. During this day students were confronted with the workshop leader's approach, method and personality. Particularly the second try-out, in a secondary school, seriously challenged their belief in his methods and raised a number of issues for them, concerning being a musician in a community setting: preparation, leadership, quality, security.

The first day started with a workshop in which the students could show their creative work (see Preparation). They were also confronted with the workshop leader's approach to music making; his singing technique was decidedly below conservatoire standards and his repertoire lacked the complexity and depth that conservatoire students usually encounter. However, he was given the benefit of the doubt. The 'homework' of the students brought some good finds. Where necessary and following the leader's directions, the short pieces were adapted for use in a community setting:

- Texts were adapted to suit the purpose;
- The underlying beat and rhythm of the song was emphasized (a tip that Sean Gregory had also already given the students in phase 1);
- Harmonies were simplified.

The bike ride to the first try-out location (Provinciehuis) instantly showed the prominence of informal learning. Students were discussing the morning's work, teaching each other musical games, and making suggestions on how to adapt new ideas (coming from street signs, people, etc.) into usable songs. An indication of their enthusiasm was the frequent cry: 'You know what we could also do? We could...'

The first try-out was a bit scary for the students but quite successful. The students were happy and breezy during the lunch that followed. The try-out did raise a number of issues.

- The workshop leader introduced new repertoire without consulting the students, nor teaching them the repertoire. This confused the students and made them feel less in control.
- Not everyone in the restaurant was amused by the singers. A number of people walked away, many refused to participate.
- It was unclear who was leading the songs. Although each student 'fathered' his/her own creation, the workshop leader repeatedly took over.

The second try-out was a turning point for the day itself, and even for the whole project. It took place in a secondary school in a notoriously 'difficult' neighbourhood in Utrecht. There were two groups of about 70 teenagers (ages 13-15). The event took place in a gym hall.

- The preparation with the school was inadequate. The pupils were expecting something with opera but the students did not know that. There had been no deliberation between the school and YO! (nor from YO! to the lectorate) regarding the setting, the number of children, how both children and students would be prepared etc.
- It was impossible for the students to keep order in the gym hall. The teenagers behaved excited and loud, in some cases aggressive. There was no assistance from teachers in keeping the children in line.

- The students were immensely frustrated by this event. There was an immediate discussion. Some remarks from the students:
 - “We are in the pupils’ territory instead of drawing them into our world.”
 - “We should have tried to impress them with our skills. This was not good enough.
 - “We did not deliver quality.”
 - “All I did was scream!”
 - “There was no clarity about leadership.”
 - “We were not working together enough.”
 - “Later on I heard that the children had been told that we were going to do opera.”
 - “There was too much improvisation. We did not have a secure basis for that.”
 - “We need to be secure about what we are doing, we need to be safe.”
- As the students also indicate in their assessment reports, the workshop leader did not respond to their insecurity and frustration. He pushed on and tried one thing after another, while everything seemed to fail for the students.

The third try-out was comparatively easy. The students found a welcoming audience in a group of nuns (ages 55 and up) and some residents of the institution for homeless mothers, where the nuns are based.

- Again, the workshop leader introduced new repertoire that the students were unfamiliar with.
- The workshop leader took charge of the situation, using the students more or less as a background choir.
- Students remarks:
 - “We were unable to show our musical abilities (qualities).”
 - “We could have made more of it (in terms of quality) if we had had more time.”

Day 2

Planned	Realised
<p>Morning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - workshop (Berenkuil) <p>Afternoon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - try-out theatre festival - musical welcome Rineke Smilde at Central Station - Try-out cafeteria bus company - Workshop and decision: who will be animateur, who will be observer? 	<p>Morning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - discussion students and workshop leader about previous day - workshop (Berenkuil) <p>Afternoon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - try-out theatre festival and terrace - offices bus company - musical welcome Rineke Smilde at Central Station - try-out cafeteria bus company - discussion students, Rineke Smilde (lector), Gerda van Zelm (methodology teacher) and workshop leader. Intervention in workshop programme <p>Evening:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consultations about approach, set-up, content third day of workshops

Summary

The discussion at the start of the day, also attended by one of the producers of YO! Festival, gave students new incentives. When this did not work out, students considered not coming to the third day, nor do the ride on the bus. The discussion at the end of the day gave them an opportunity to vent their frustrations to others, and turned out to bring the much desired change.

Day 2 started with a discussion about the previous day. One of the producers of YO! was also present. The central theme of the discussion was the differences between the goals, attitudes and needs of the students on the one hand, and the workshop leader's approach on the other.

- The students asked the workshop leader what *his* goal was, what he tried to achieve in his work as a community musician. His answer was: bringing happiness and comfort, bringing people together.
- The students felt they were not 'believers' like the workshop leader, and that they needed to build confidence, also as a group.
- The students felt it was not good for them to follow the workshop leader all the time. They no longer wanted to use only the workshop leader's repertoire, but rather get their own experience. They wanted to be the ones taking the initiative.
- At the end of the discussion there was some consensus that things needed to improve, but there was no atmosphere of trust and confidence.

During the workshop the students took matters a little more into their own hands, dividing tasks among each other, etc. They worked toward the first try-out of the day: a performance/workshop during the *Theater 4-daagse* in Utrecht.

- There was a better division of leadership during this try-out. Students took creating games and singing songs into their own hands. A theatrical element was added by staging a wedding between two of the students. At the first available opportunity however, the workshop leader took leadership again.
- Despite the small improvements in the work, the try-out was not a success. This had to do with the target group (experienced theatre people) and the setting (partly outside). There was a feeling that the group was working in a too low level for the target group:
 - o “Completely unnecessary performance: we were entertaining people who had to entertain others.”
 - o “Many people had rather we left.”

The other try-outs were a little disorganised. Since there was time left before Rineke Smilde would arrive on the train, it was decided to enter the office building of the GVU (bus company) and sing there. However, since it was Friday afternoon, there was hardly anyone there.

- o “This is where the workshop leader felt most comfortable: visiting the offices with easy sing-along songs; but for this you do not need ten schooled singers who break their voices on it.”

Singing in the hall of the station was hard because of the noise. There was a very positive response from the bus drivers when the students sang with them in front of the cafeteria. The ad-hoc texts and general enthusiasm of the students was infectious.

The discussion at the end of the day marked a turning point for the project. This session was originally intended as extra time for workshop and rehearsal, but clearly there was a need from the students to talk about their experiences. Rineke Smilde (lector) and Gerda van Zelm (methodology teacher) facilitated the discussion.

- It turned out that many people involved were not well prepared: students, pupils from the school, even the nuns expected something different.
- Especially the bad experience in the school on the first day was a memorable event for the students. The negative emotions that emerged from that experience (towards community arts, the workshop leader, the projects) were not relieved by the actions of this second day. The discussion in the morning did not help at all:
 - o “We have no opportunity to use our expertise.”
 - o “I am not comfortable with this, I am not behind it. I feel I am just screaming all the time. Few people actually pay attention.”
 - o “We don’t enjoy this quick-thinking, wishy-washy approach.”
 - o “We like relating to the context but we also want to achieve high artistic quality.”
 - o “I feel embarrassed by what I am doing, afraid to tell people that I am a student of the Royal Conservatoire.”
 - o “There is a contradiction in what the workshop leader does and what we do, especially when we want to be in the bus by ourselves.”

- As a result of the discussion with Rineke and Gerda, and in consultation with Anthony Heidweiler of YO! Festival, some major adjustments were made to the workshop programme. Gerda van Zelm gave the students some directions.
 - o Use your own repertoire, look for things at home that you want to use.
 - o Give yourself a role to play on the bus.
 - o If you decide now to do opera, you don't have to do it the way you usually do it. Make it easy for your voice, then you will be free to do it.
 - o Use the love you have for your thing.
- Some of the students had been so dispirited that they considered quitting the workshop, or at the very least only observe, instead of actively acting as an amateur. The discussion changed this, as one student put it:
 - o "I was going to announce that I would not be here on Saturday but now I am starting to get into it again. Now I am getting ideas about what I could do."

Day 3

Planned	Realised
Morning: - Workshop Afternoon: - Try-out shopping centre Overvecht - Old people home - Tram depot	Morning: - The workshop leader and Anthony go to the old people's home together while the students do their own development and rehearsals Afternoon: - try-out shopping centre Overvecht - workshop: repertoire and performance for phase 3

Summary

The workshop leader was joined by a second 'workshop leader', Anthony Heidweiler, artistic leader of the YO! Festival. Two of the original try-outs were cancelled for the students so that they got more time to work out their own materials for use in the bus. The enthusiasm for working on the music returned for most of the students. The try-out in the shopping centre was used to try the new materials and fine-tune them where necessary.

The day started with an announcement by Anthony Heidweiler about how the programme was adjusted. The student group, diminished by one for the day, was split into smaller groups of 3 and 2 to work on developing their own materials for use in the bus. In the meantime, the workshop leader and Anthony visited the old people's home. The try-out at the tram depot was cancelled. The visit to the shopping centre could not be cancelled, but was used as a try-out for the materials developed that day.

- The students were curious about what Anthony, as an opera singer, would do at the old people's home. Unfortunately there was no opportunity to witness or discuss this.
- Although the students divided themselves into groups, there was some disappointment: some students were counting on having the male voice in their group. However, since the two Spanish girls felt more comfortable in a Dutch group (2 Dutch, 1 Spanish) because of language difficulties, it turned out differently.
- Two students did not want to sing on this day because they felt they had overstressed their voices the previous days.

The students taught each other their repertoire. When Anthony and the workshop leader returned they played the part of 'audience' and the students tried out their repertoire. The workshop leader and Anthony gave some directions.

- o Add theatrical elements, taking positions, adding dramatic breaks in the songs.
- o Explain to the audience what you are going to do.

The try-out at the shopping centre was successful in building the confidence of the students. The activities turned out to be more like performances than creative or even participatory workshops. Two quotes from the student assessments that reflect the general atmosphere well:

- "In the afternoon we went to the shopping centre and it was nice to actually try out the things that we had planned. Of course the transitions from one piece to the other were not yet smooth and sometimes it was not clear who was in charge, or there were different ideas about the order of the pieces, or the places where we would sing them, but these are all things you can work on if you have more time."
- "What was important for me that day was the freedom I felt in singing. When you sing an aria with a tea towel around your head and a piece of cleaning cloth in your hand, then you don't think about technique for one second but you just give everything you have to offer at that moment. And you know that is enough. Now I try to maintain that confidence at the conservatoire as well."

After the shopping centre, the students went back to the Berenkuil to evaluate and to determine the repertoire and the play list for their work in the bus. YO! had provided the setting of the city bus by drawing the outline of the bus on the floor. There was some exchange of repertoire (particularly the canon *BusBusBus* was popular and was adopted by all) and excitement about unusual elements and songs. Afterwards, the students arranged to meet each other in the following week, before the YO! Festival, to refine their work.

Phase 3: The bus

The small groups of students, three persons each, were divided over 12 bus rides. Group A consisted of students who were there only on Saturday. Therefore, they made their four rides on one day. The first one left at 10.00 o'clock.

The groups were very different from each other, both in personalities and in repertoire: from musical games and clownery to serious opera repertoire.

Peter Mak addresses in his report the interventions, successes and challenges that students faced while working in the bus.

Schedule:

Saturday			Sunday		
Ride	Animateurs	Observers	Ride	Animateurs	Observers
1	A	B	1	B	C
2	B	A	2	C	B
3	A	C	3	B	C
4	A	B	4	C	B
5	C	A	5	B	C
6	A	C	6	C	B

6. Outcomes and discussion

Non-formal learning

In this project the non-formal setting lacked a number of vital criteria for learning. First, there was not enough focus on the final goal of the workshops, this was confusing for the students.

Second, the students did not feel they were being acknowledged as professionally trained singers, therefore it was hard for them to identify with what they were doing in the workshops and the performances. A vital aspect of creating a non-formal learning environment within a formal structure is the increased need for (self-)reflection. The main shortcoming in the practice-based approach in phase 2 was the lack of (good) reflection. The students had little opportunity to discuss their experiences and findings with the workshop leader unless they demanded his attention, and if they did they did not feel that their remarks were taken into consideration. There were no evaluations during the process, so there were no points for the students to stop and realise what they had learned. This gave them the feeling that they had not learned anything. Only when they saw their newly acquired skills written down in Peter Mak's preliminary report did they realise what they had learned (during the evaluative discussion in January 2006).

The idea behind the original set-up of the project was to make it as practice-based as possible. This would let the students gain some actual working experience, and it would allow the hands-on approach of the workshop leader in phase 2 to come out optimally. The overall feeling was, however, that there was an imbalance between practice and preparation and coaching. Donald Schön in his magnificent opus 'Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions' (1987) advocates the reflective practicum as the learning environment where this kind of artistry practice can be acquired. Main features of a reflective practicum are: learning by doing, coaching rather than teaching, and a dialogue of reciprocal reflection-in-action between coach and student. In reflective

practice meaning is mediated by distinctive dialogue of student and coach, in which description of practice is interwoven with practice. Being in a group is an important aspect of the reflective practicum because students learn from each other (peer learning). Without these conditions there is no non-formal learning context.

There is no learning without crisis, but in order to get the level of quality that the students needed and demanded; more control was needed. The empowering aspect of non-formal learning, where students have a large degree of influence over the content of the programme, was not recognized. The problem was that the workshop leader in phase 2 was insufficiently aware of the (level of) frustration of the students and his inability to act upon that. As a result, the students did *not* feel empowered at all. The crisis as a result of this did bring to the surface the unspoken learning goals of the students:

- we want to do something that is our own;
- we want to do it with a certain level of quality.

The students did not indicate this at the start of the workshops, when they adopted an attitude of wait-and-see. When they were handed the reins, after the meeting on day two, the effect was electric. It was amazing to experience the raise in motivation after the intervention at the end of workshop day 2 of phase 2. The students were allowed to do what they were good at, being professional singers in training trying to communicate musically with a broad and unknown audience in a particular public context. As a result of this empowerment (the learning became personally significant and meaningful) the students quickly taught each other tips and tricks they knew, musical games and exercises. This not only took place during workshop times, but also during the bike rides between the locations where they performed.

Workshop leaders

The workshop leaders of phase 1 (from the Guildhall School of Music & Drama in London) were well received by all students in the group. Their approach was appreciated and brought about many positive changes concerning group work and creativity. Their approach basically consisted of putting emphasis on making music together and on working from the strength of the participating student singers. This approach is often opposed to the way they are trained in the conservatoire, where professors are more focussed on improving student behaviour that is wrong or insufficiently acquired. Too much emphasis on these issues often has detrimental effects on the student's self esteem and motivation (O'Neill & McPherson, 2002). The only real concern was the strain that the unorthodox approach would put on their voices.

The appreciation for the workshop leader of phase 2 was less uniformly positive. Although some of the students see a positive side of their experience of working with him, the general feeling is that they were let down – particularly after the positive experience in phase 1 (interviews). The workshop leader had no background in pedagogy, musical training or coaching. This resulted in a lack of pedagogical planning and motivation for the workshops: no clear learning goals and targets, no pedagogical technique, no evaluative moments in the learning process. In addition, his working method was based on him working alone, as the central musician in the process of making music with people in the community. This left little room for the

students to experience and try out their own materials and approaches. The students felt that their input was not validated by the workshop leader. Indicative is the remark by one of the students: “He could have done it without us!”

Content

The most effective and popular parts of the workshops were the creative elements, where the students were required to make something themselves (as in phase 1) or worked on their own materials (beginning and end of phase 2). It gave them a sense of ownership and recognition of their musicianship – the feeling that they had something to bring to the situation. Indicative was the electric response to the fact that they could bring their own materials to the workshop on the third day of phase 2. Learning is most effective, easy and well liked when it relates to intrinsic goals of the learner. Students had little chance to take or experience leadership during the workshop process, although there was resistance against the leadership of the present workshop leader, and the clear wish to take control in terms of music making and learning.

Organisation

Phase 2 consisted of three full days of workshops and try-outs. This was heavy on the students, particularly as there were few quiet points and reflective moments. Three try-outs a day, as was originally planned, was too much. The full schedule was very demanding for the students, and for some students it was difficult (or impossible) to fit this into their busy schedule. The fact that nine of them did, shows their commitment to the project.

Partnership

The communication between the partners, as well as with other parties involved in the project, was not always optimal. There was not enough mutual clarity about the goals of the project, the implications of the responsibilities of each of the partners, and what was expected. For example: The try-out in the secondary school was ill-prepared in the sense that the school did not know what was coming, the students did not know what the school expected of them, the workshop leader did not prepare the students enough for what might happen there, the lectorate did not know about this situation etc.

Assessment

The students had their role in the assessment and the importance of their reports for the research project explained to them. The result was a high response rate and in some cases lengthy reports. However, it turned out that in some cases, the aim of the assessments, the presence of an observer and the interviews were not always clear to the students. This could perhaps have been prevented by involving the students more in the research project itself, stressing the future uses of the outcomes.

7. Competencies & skills

Research questions

The research question as described in paragraph 2 of this report, were further specified by Peter Mak as follows:

1. How do the passengers of bus 5 appreciate the creative music making?
2. To what extent is success in creative music making related to the person of the animateur?
3. To what extent is success in creative music making related to the tactics and skills handed over to the animateur in the preceding training sessions?
4. What kind of obstacles do the students of the singing department experience in their role as animateur?

Competence domain of the animateur

Workshop leader skills are essential. Sean Gregory stated during the preparation: *An effective workshop leader has to be a multi-skilled musician who can perform many diverse roles, such as composer, arranger, facilitator, improviser, performer conductor, teacher and catalyst.*

In his overview ‘What takes place in a creative workshop?’ Sean Gregory mentions a range of activities (and skills) that take place in a creative workshop: warm-ups, interpretation, instrumental skills, arranging, improvisation, performance, listening and evaluation.

One of the main goals in the process is to create an environment where the activities interact and are interconnected with each other. Although each activity needs a particular focus, the ‘turning points’ tend to be when elements come together as a whole, each becoming a catalyst for the next.

Tactics

Making contact with and gaining confidence of the passengers in the bus will be the first priority of the animateur (student from the singing department) starting to work with the passengers. Therefore he or she starts with ‘warm-ups’ that act as a ‘tuning in’ process aimed at developing concentration, group awareness, self-awareness, confidence and spontaneity.

Fundamental is the ability of the animateur to relate and respond to a range of musical styles and genres as and when they arise during the collaborative process. It is critical that the given material is sufficiently open for the passengers to add to, adjust or discard ideas in order to feel ownership of the process.

The relation between intervention and non-intervention of the animateur is extremely subtle in collaborative forms of music-making. Individual decisions are constantly made, but the critical issue is how the animateur uses these decisions for the benefit of the whole group.

Summary of tactics to be used in this particular context:

Critical is 'Leading through Doing': the bus is on the move, passengers get on and off, and the animateur has to keep it going without stopping or explaining (Schön's: Reflection in Action!).

In this context the following tactics are useful:

- The musical idea should be clear and easy to join in.
- Use of simple rhythms (one *feel* to hold on to), and around that just one key idea.
- The concept of 'variations on one theme': stopping, highlighting, moving on. The leader takes an inviting role to 'join in'.

Training programme (Thursday, September 22)

The training programme consists of three parts:

1. Warm up exercises: body rhythms and voice, in order to gain confidence, and to work on coordination and community skills.
2. Learn some songs which are useful in a workshop context (like in the bus). They will be songs which are easy to improvise on, like gospel, blues, African songs (world and folk music).
3. Song writing work: composing a song together. Goal of doing this is learning how to facilitate song writing in a workshop. (N.B. no scores, everything aurally).

Research methods

We try to use more than one research method for each research question. This principle (triangulation of methods) strengthens the validity of the outcomes of the research. If different research methods generate the same outcomes, the outcomes have more value because they are not connected to one particular research method.

Research question 1

How do the passengers of bus 5 appreciate the creative music making?

Methods:

- Oral interviews with a number of passengers after the event.
- Observations in the bus (how many passengers participate spontaneously in the creative music making).

Research question 2

To what extent is success in the creative music making related to the person of the animateur?

Methods:

- Observations in the bus (criterion: not the tactics are decisive but the personality of the student/animateur).

- Observations are done by the students as well as by one of the trainers (if possible) and/or the researcher.

Research question 3

To what extent is success in creative music making related to the tactics and skills handed over to the animateur in the preceding training sessions?

Methods:

- Observations in the bus (registration of action and reaction chains that take place in the creative process and evaluating the results of the actions by the fellow students in the bus; if possible successful actions and tactics can be analysed in more detail if the workshop is registered on video tape, this can be done later on).

Research question 4

What kind of obstacles do the students of the singing department experience in their role as animateur?

Methods:

- Self assessment of the student/animateur (what were difficult situations, what were the dilemma, why was chosen for the solution as observed in the situation).
- Peer observations (what was successful and what went wrong).

Data analysis

From the workshop on the 22nd of September 16 students wrote a self-reflective report. Quotes from these reports are rubricated under the headings 'general remarks' (personal meaning of the workshop experience) and 'remarks on the contents of the workshop and the performance in the central station of Utrecht' (what they liked and did not like). For the workshop and the performance days in October the students had to write self reflective reports based on the following questions:

1. Self reflective accounts of the 11 students taking part in the training sessions in Utrecht, October 6, 7 and 8. Write a self-reflective account on your personal experience of the training sessions and answer the following questions:
 - Which thoughts, feelings and experiences are prominent in your memory about the training sessions? (Please answer this question spontaneously, be open and frank about what you liked and disliked and about your doubts.)
 - What was easy for you and which aspects of the training did you find difficult?
2. Self reflective accounts of the 4 students in their role as animateur
Write a self reflective account on your personal experiences of your role as animateur in the bus and answer the following questions:

- If you look back at the performance in the bus, which moments were difficult and what went smoothly?
- What kind of strategies did you use to cope with the situations you met?
- Do you consider your performance in the bus as successful (for yourself and for the passengers)?

4. Description of the performance of the amateur students in the bus by the passenger students (acting as peers).

Make an eyewitness report of the actions that took place in the bus. Describe the *actions* taken by the animateurs and the *reactions* of the passengers over time. Write in your journal keywords during the bus ride and work them out afterwards in a full report of what happened on the bus. Which actions were successful (i.e. generated a broad response from the audience) and which were definitely not?

The quotations of the students about the workshop and performance days in October are used to answer the research questions (chapter 8). For findings that can be important for answering a question and which are clear enough (what is meant by it exactly) or not certain how widely it is shared by other students questions are formulated which will be discussed in the discussion meeting where the first results are presented. Subsequently the findings of chapter 8 and the clarifications on these by the students are used in the discussion (chapter) 9 to shed more light on the competence domain of the animateur.

Summary of the experiences in the buses

In this paragraph the experiences and reflections of the students involved in the bus project are summarized and related to the four research questions of the lectorate. Sometimes the experiences were not decisive enough to draw clear conclusions. Therefore the researcher raised some questions for further discussion with the students. These questions are depicted in the text below after the answer has been given to a research question.

Research question 1

How do the passengers of bus five appreciate the creative music making?

From the student observations it becomes clear that only few passengers did not appreciate the performance in the bus. They left the bus at the first stop or kept on ignoring what happened. Some people kept their distance in the beginning, but started to unfreeze during the travel. Most of them did not participate but liked to watch and some of them even smiled. The people who most liked the performance were elderly people, parents with children and visitors of the festival who entered the bus specifically to watch the performance.

In general it was easier to entertain on busses that were neither too full nor too empty. If the busses were too full communication between the animateurs spread over the bus became more difficult. Walking through the corridor of the bus was limited,

which made inviting people to join in and to support their actions more problematic. If the number of people on the bus was too limited and there was no mutual relationship between the passengers, the inviting gestures of the animateurs could be perceived as threatening. Then people felt more shy and it took more time to get them involved.

Passengers in the bus were more amused when they could actively join in with the music by singing, clapping or other activities. The music they performed had to be relatively easy, the music itself (the product of all activities together) can be of a more complex nature. For instance singing together in a canon or performing a simple line of a complex song. Songs with a simple structure, with a melody that's easy to sing, attractive rhythm, and a funny or nonsense text related to the context or the direct environment the passengers live in, like the 'bus song' or the 'Utrecht medley' were highly appreciated. Humour seemed to be a very strong trigger in getting the passengers involved.

Questions to the participating students

1. Is the fact that the passengers like the musical activities related to the kind of music repertory that is used? Or is the criterion you should be able to join in (singable)? Or is the musical background of the passengers a key variable in this. Is it not the kind of music that is important, but what you do with it?
2. Do people from (certain) ethnic minority groups appreciate the music activities in the bus less and are they less willing to join in? If there is a difference, has it to do with the kind of repertory that is used on the bus? Is it a difference in cultural background? Or is it that they feel themselves to be a minority group?
3. Humour seems a great tool in making the audience more receptive. When does it work and when does it not?

Research question 2

To what extent is success in creative music making related to the person of the animateur?

Enthusiasm, self-assurance and flexibility are the most frequently mentioned personality traits related to being successful as an animateur in the bus. Enthusiasm here means having fun doing the things you do and in the interaction with the passengers. In the various reports there are clear indications that having fun doing what you do is strongly influenced by activities on the bus which resemble the personal motives for music making of the students. Probably it is the personal involvement, besides having control over the situation he has to deal with, that makes the performer more self-assured and which attracts the audience. The other aspect concerning expressing enthusiasm has to do with liking people, seeking eye contact with them, inviting them to participate, triggering and supporting their actions, and not pushing them into action if they only want to watch. This is where flexibility comes in: adapt your actions and reactions to the individual passengers. Concentrate on those who are willing to join in, though always try to invite those people who are not yet participating. Be sincere in your actions is also a critical point. Don't overact, don't be

cynical, don't send conflicting signals (for example invite people to join in by making inviting movements and at the same time not look at them or only pay attention to fellow students).

Question to the participating students

4. Can you be more precise about those personal actions and attitudes which are counter productive in entertaining people on the bus?

Research question 3

To what extent is success in creative music making related to the tactics and skills handed over to the animateur in the preceding training sessions?

What kind of tactics and skills work while performing as a singer animateur on the bus? From the student reports we can draw the following conclusions:

First, make a plan and work things out carefully (all students are novices in this field). The plan has to contain repertory that enables people to join in easily by singing, clapping, making movements etc. Make use of improvisation and games, not all people will join in, but hearing people improvise (like in the Utrecht medley) creates fun and makes them more receptive. Playing games (like the boat race) and singing canons goes even further in creating commitment and team spirit among the passengers, while they sing together the same melodic line.

Second, make sure there is variation and contrast in the activities you offer. Musical activities with a lot of action for the passengers, alternated with activities which are more relaxing (just listen to what happens).

Third, pay attention to the transitions between the activities. Bridges connect two succeeding activities and they are used as an intermediary activity when the bus makes a stop. The Bridges can be verbal introductions (explaining what will happen), little dialogues, jokes, saying good bye to passengers who leave the bus and welcoming new passengers who enter the bus by making use of rhythms, chants etc. The use of jokes is sometimes mentioned as problematic, especially for people who don't understand the Dutch language well enough. The same holds for the use of verbal explanations and dialogues.

Fourth, repeat an activity that was performed earlier with a lot of success. The passengers in the bus like to repeat the things they did earlier.

Fifth, make the plan you work out beforehand a flexible one. The conditions in which the animateur has to perform can vary strongly. Busses can be full of passengers, almost empty of passengers and everything in between. If the bus is very full, soft and introverted songs are less effective. Also dialogues between animateurs spread over the bus and activities they do in synchrony are more difficult to perform. If the bus contains only very few people students report that the passengers can be overwhelmed by addressing them too personally.

Sixth, don't push too hard to get every passenger to join in actively. Concentrate on those people who are willing to join in immediately and keep an inviting attitude to those people who are not yet involved.

Seventh, leading skills are essential. Leading by doing, not by giving instructions or explaining extensively. Taking the lead in this context means knowing what to do, not be hesitant or unsure. A good cooperation between the animateurs is a necessary condition in order to achieve this. To have success on the bus means that the communication between the animateurs has to be well prepared and go smoothly.

To what extent did the students feel prepared by the workshop in working successfully as an animateur on the bus one week later? The majority of the students were disappointed about the three days workshop given the week before the performances on the bus took place. Their critique concerned the content of the workshop, the workshop leader and the organisation of the workshop. In this report only a summary is given of the responses of the students, an extensive account of what took place can be read in the assessment report from Ninja Kors (2006). Critique on the content of the workshop concerned the lack of a clear training programme, there was no connection with the musicianship of the students (classical or jazz singers), there was a lack of preparation time, too little striving for musical quality in what they did, and an absence of coaching (reflection on action). Critique on the workshop leader concerned his unwillingness to listen to the students and to honour their contributions. Another serious point of critique was that he was not very directive about performance tactics and was hesitant to make preparatory plans for the coming performances. The students described his way of performing as an animateur as intuitive, improvisatory and highly related to the moment in action. They further mentioned that the workshop leader had not much affinity with the kind of musical repertory they were familiar with. Critique on the organisational level had to do with that they felt ill informed about the conditions they had to perform under. It turned out that the locations in which the students had to perform were not well informed what to expect from students either. The lack of preparation time was mentioned earlier. One student explicitly posed the question in her report: why nine performances in three days? The report of Ninja Kors will address this issue more deeply). Although the students were unanimous in their critique about the content of the workshop, the workshop leader and the organisation of the workshop, some of them also mentioned positive results from the three workshop days. One student mentioned that she gained more insight into the relevance of why she makes music for herself. Three other students reported that despite all the critique they had, they would never have been able to move so freely in the bus as they did without these workshop days. One of them remarked that she intends to transfer this basic feeling of trust to her singing lessons at the conservatoire. Another student said that she learned a lot from the workshop leader by looking at what he did. Two students liked that they had to think about how to reach the public: what do they like, what can we ask from them. They were thrilled to create new songs, to think up activities for the passengers to join in and to do this all together with other students of the singing departments (classical and jazz).

Questions to the participating students

5. When repeating an earlier activity at the end of the bus ride: how many of you did this and which activity was chosen for this purpose (criteria)?
6. Variation is also introducing new elements into old activities or enriching activities with new elements. How many of you did this?
7. What can be said about the introductory activity: what works and what definitely does not?
8. About leading: is it necessary for one of animateurs to take the lead?
9. Did the workshop in September (Guildhall) relate to the workshop days in October?
10. How essential was your experience in the workshop in September for your performing as an animateur on the bus?
11. How were the performances on the workshop days assessed afterwards?

Research question 4

What kind of obstacles do the students of the singing department experience in their role as animateur?

- Choose musical repertory that is easy to sing and/or come up with activities for the public (singing lines, movements) to join in.
- Plan the activities for the performance in which what to do and how to do it is worked out (the transitions between the activities included) and at the same time to adapt it to the conditions present at the moment of performance.
- The use of words for explaining things in interactive dialogues between the animateurs during the performance. All big cities in Holland have multi cultural populations. For many of them Dutch is not their native language, they speak Dutch very limitedly or not at all. This also holds true for the use of humour (as far it is based on words) which was stated earlier is a powerful tool in making people receptive to what happens in the performing context.
- The teamwork between the students in preparing the performance plan and during the performance. The team must be united in spirit and enthusiasm to entertain people in public situations, such as the bus project in Utrecht.

Question to the participating students

12. Which aspects of teamwork are essential for entertaining on a bus?

Discussion

On January 13, 2006 the experiences as described were discussed with the students who were involved in the bus project. In this paragraph we try to relate all the information (the outcomes as described, the discussions with the students and the answers they gave to questions) to the competence domain of the animateur. For this purpose we also made use of our observations of Sean and Nia who were the leaders of the workshop in September in The Hague.

The experiences of the students in the bus as described in their self reflective reports and as discussed in the meeting of January 13 confirm what is said about the competencies of the animateur, especially in relation to the bus-project. Critical in this context is 'leading by doing', the leader takes an inviting role for others to join in, the musical idea should be clear and easy to join in (the use of simple rhythms - one *feel* to hold on to, and around just one key idea, and the concept of 'variations on one theme') and making proper preparations.

Leading by doing

Leading by doing here means keep the show going without stopping and explaining. The leaders of the workshop in September gave the following examples.

The workshop leaders, Sean and Nia in particular, make a lot of use of their facial expressions, eye contact and body movement. It is not necessary for them to explain their gestures and indications. They can make their intentions clear by simply pointing or looking. To name two examples:

- Nia clearly emphasizes the pronunciation of the South-African words, almost ridiculing it. This does not only express the sounds or their meaning in a musical sense, it also helps students remember them – they were mimicking this three weeks later!
- When Sean wants the students to follow his step, he indicates this by putting his leg forward and putting his hand it a few bars before, so that students know his intentions.

(Observations made by Ninja Kors).

If there are more animateurs working together in the performance situation the students make clear that shared leadership is a critical variable in having success in the bus. Shared leadership in this context means clear agreements about who is doing what. If every animateur knows what to do the performance will proceed more smoothly (fewer stops and hesitations). In the discussion the students emphasized that it is important for them that taking the lead changes from one animateur to the other. Every animateur must have the opportunity to take the lead in a performance. In the bus project this was done by giving one animateur the lead of a certain activity. Leading through doing also means keeping the show going when people leave the bus and new people come in. It is up to the newcomers to join in or not. Long verbal explanations of what is happening in the bus or training the newcomers first before joining in is out of the question because this means a stop in the performance. Although verbal explanation can hinder the continuity of the performance, especially when it is too verbal, the students mentioned in the discussion that many passengers were interested in knowing who the students were, what they were doing in the bus and why. A short introduction at the beginning of the bus ride by the students about this was appreciated by the passengers. People entering the performance situation at a later stage, when the performance was actually taking place, can be informed by short written texts on flyers, banners or notice boards. People will feel at ease more quickly if they understand the context of the situation they have just entered.

Inviting people to join in

Enthusiasm is contagious. If you express your enthusiasm as an animateur people respond to that in the same way, they become eager to join in. In the workshop in September we saw this in the interaction between the workshop leaders and the students.

The enthusiasm and participation of the students is enhanced by the obvious enjoyment of the workshop leaders in front of them – it is contagious.
(Observations made by Ninja Kors).

Don't push people to join in. Concentrate on those who are willing to participate and be inviting to people who are not yet participating. This is what Sean Gregory means by 'reading the group'. Make a quick scan in the bus of who are willing to participate in the activity that is going on, address yourself (as an animateur) to these people personally and support their actions by synchronizing them with yours. In doing this and in going from one active passenger (or group of passengers) to the other, keep an eye on those who are willing to join in and stimulate them by addressing to them personally. If you are too early don't react disappointed and wait for another change. The students reported a number of techniques they used to make the passengers more receptive and interactive. Strong techniques are making use of humour, give people something to do and let them work together. Humour is a very powerful 'weapon' in making people feel at ease in a situation in which they are not. In the bus project the use of humour had a negative effect when the passengers did not understand what was being said and when the animateurs made jokes which were addressed primarily to each other. In the latter case passengers had the feeling the animateurs made fun of them. Humour only works when it is understood as such.

Giving people something to do and let them work together was achieved in various ways in the bus. People had to pass little plastic boats to each other while an opera song about a boat was performed. By doing this the students noticed a change in the atmosphere in the bus, people started to speak to each other and became more willing to participate in the activities later on. Polishing the bus with little polishing cloths evoked a similar disarming attitude among the passengers.

The animateur had to learn that not everyone in performance situations like the ones in the bus will join in. As the students reported, of the people who did not join in the majority did leave the bus with a smile. For the animateur it is important to have enough self confidence to animate people if, for instance, there are not many people who are joining in. If people are listening to the performance and giving small signs of appreciation, there is success in what the animateur is doing. From the reports of the students and the discussions with them it is hard to draw firm conclusions about sections of the population which are harder to reach. It turned out that more orthodox Islamic people, especially women when they were alone in the bus, were more reserved concerning what was happening and less willing to participate. However, it is not clear why. Has this to do with their cultural background or has it do with their unfamiliarity with the musical repertory that was used? One of the students made an interesting observation in this respect. She had a group of Spanish passengers in the bus who reacted rather unfriendly to what was happening until she started to sing a Spanish song to them. The students preferred the buses with mixed populations (people who came for the festival and were very willing to join in, and people who went home from shopping and were less willing).

The musical idea is simple and easy to join in

The music must be recognizable for the audience, people must be able to relate personally to what they hear and do in the performance situation. This doesn't mean, however, that what they hear has to be simple or has to match their musical taste in all respects! The students noticed that musical activities that were too simple attracted the attention of the passengers only for a short period. Making the familiar more complex by adding extra elements to it increased the attention span and also the appreciation of the passengers. This is what creates 'flow' in the experience of the passengers. People experience flow in listening to music and in making music when the musical challenge they face is a mixed balance between the familiar and the unfamiliar (Elliott, 1995). In the bus project this was aimed for in various ways. By mixing the familiar (a popular song easy to sing or an easy accompaniment) with the less familiar (a song from an opera or musical).

The 'flow' can also be achieved by the quality of the performance as an added element. This happened when the students used their qualities as a professionally trained singer in singing for instance a song from an opera or musical over a simple accompaniment sung by the passengers. Make use of your strong points as an amateur. Another procedure to keep the musical activity interesting for the listeners is to start simple and make it more and more difficult. Singing a simple song together and later on singing it in canon is an example of this building principle. Integrating additional actions in activities the passengers already perform effortlessly, is another example. The advantage of these methods is that the amateur can adjust the complexity level to keep the activity interesting to the people who are involved (which you know only by finding it out).

Asking the participants to improvise can be a powerful means to create more commitment, because it makes them owner of what is happening in the performance situation. To make use of improvisation for this purpose the following conditions have to be met: the person who is asked to improvise has to feel safe, has to feel competent and has to feel free to do it. To feel safe has a lot to do with the atmosphere that is created in the group. A positive atmosphere is created when judgement of a person's performance and competition among the participants is absent. Further, the individual has to feel competent to take on the improvising task. In the bus project we saw that improvisation with the audience was very successful in the 'Utrecht medley' where the audience had to come up with names of places in the neighbourhood of Utrecht.

Prepare by devising and planning the performance

Entertaining an audience means that you have to offer them something. The expert amateur has a lot of activities at his disposal that he knows from experience the audience likes. He also knows how to make slight adaptations to make the activity more attractive for the people who are present at the moment of the performance. His acting looks like improvisation but is not accidental, there is a lot of experience and implicit knowledge in it. Novice amateurs lack this experience and implicit knowledge. They have to rely on proper preparation. The same holds for novice teachers, they have to work out lessons more thoroughly than experienced teachers because they lack the experiential knowledge and flexibility.

The students liked the creative aspects of the two workshops – devising activities for the performance later on – very much. Especially devising activities related to musical repertory they were familiar with, made them very creative. The students' motivation for the whole project was the strongest at these moments. Working out activities in a

team was mentioned as an extra value. Members of the group inspire each other, making the activity better (more attractive and better fit for the purpose) and they experience shared ownership over the end product. Working out musical activities for the performance, putting them in a sequence, and inventing effective bridges between the activities make the novice amateurs more confident in the performance situation. Besides this it gives them a hold to evaluate their performance: what worked, what did not work and why.

Limitations of the project

Not all aspects of amateurship finally had a place in the bus project. In the first three research questions the activities in the bus were described as creative music making. In fact the interaction with people in the bus on the level of musical creation was small. What took place in the bus can be defined more adequately as a performance with possibilities for the present public to join in, with a division of roles prescribed by the students. This makes the findings of the project not less valuable, but it does limit us in what can be said about the various roles the singer has to perform as an amateur. However, we made a crucial observation concerning creative music making in the workshop in September.

Directions are given not authoritatively (by the workshop leaders) but in an inviting way: “How can we make this better?”

(Observations made by Ninja Kors)

Music making in this kind of context has more to do with empowering people than correcting them. This kind of philosophy was transferred by the workshop leaders to the students, and made them look at themselves and at what they did that day.

Between the lines, the workshop leaders give some directions and opinions about (community) music making to the students. To give two examples:

- Nia: “Have a holistic approach to the music. Making it so serious kills it. Don’t sing for your teacher but work on your own, whole music. At the end of this day, think about it and realise what you have done and what it means.”
- Sean: “In society, we should *make* more music together. Give yourself permission to let this happen. Don’t let yourself get tied down by quality etc. because you *know* you are good, so there is no need to worry about that.”

(Observations made by Ninja Kors)

Various research methods have been mentioned to give an answer to each research question. The reason for this was to strengthen the validity of the outcomes. When the project was running, it was not always possible to collect the information as planned. For instance, oral interviews with a number of passengers after the event in the bus (research question 1) proved not feasible because there was no interviewer available. Observation of the performances of the students in the bus in order to determine to what extent success in the bus is related to the personality of the student by the workshop leader proved to be impossible because he had to perform somewhere else. Making video recordings of the performances in the bus to study successful actions of the amateurs in more detail was not possible because it was forbidden to make these

recordings, for privacy reasons. The validity of the results is warranted by confirmation from the students to whom we presented the results at a special evaluation meeting on January 13, 2006. The validation is further strengthened by matching the results with what is known about animateurship in literature (internal validity).

Action research design would have been a greater help to assess this project. In such a design research is performed collaboratively, enhancing the competencies of all the actors (see Bakerville, 1999). The students are involved as co-researchers and are fully aware of what is looked for. Action research is a dynamic research process, a combination of research (use of scientific methods as well as self assessment), intervention (theory driven) and co-generative learning (enhancing theory and actor competencies). Such a design, however, requires a closer cooperation between the researchers and the students. The researchers have to be present all the time discussing the planning of the interventions (performances), assessing the interventions and evaluating what worked and what did not, looking for explanations as to why things did not work, formulating hypotheses for change, planning new interventions, and starting the whole process again (Boog et Al, 2005).

8. Legacy of the Yo! Festival bus project

Recommendations for a training programme musician animateur

One of the objectives of this pilot project for the lectorate is to give recommendations for a training programme for students of the singing departments (jazz and classical) of both conservatoires (Royal Conservatoire and Prins Claus Conservatoire) to acquire the competencies of an animateur. First we pose ourselves the question why such a programme should be installed within a conservatoire. Second we describe the ingredients of the training programme, based on the research outcomes of this project.

Why train student singers as musical animateurs?

There are three important reasons why it would be fruitful to install a training programme for animateurship. First, such a programme can contribute to the personal development of student singers in the conservatoire. Many students who entered the workshop on the 22nd of September at the Royal Conservatoire of The Hague mentioned that the kind of music making in the workshop brought them back to the essence of why they make music. The descriptions connected to this are, enjoying singing (absence of feeling continuously observed and judged while singing), getting in touch with what is really important (feeling connected with body and mind), singing together with students from the classical and the jazz department (feeling connected to each other, learning from each other) and experiencing that music making, before everything else, is communication (with the people you sing with and the people you sing to). Musical activities as were done in the workshop can offer a counter balance to the regular, more performative singing activities (assessed by professors and peer students) in the curricula.

Second, the awareness of what you are doing and why becomes very prominent in situations which are new to the individual. Within these conditions mentoring is often

seen as an effective way of helping people to foster a deeper awareness of context and place, thereby strengthening a person's conviction and understanding of what they are doing. (Renshaw, 2006)

'They provide opportunities for individuals outside their immediate situation and become detached spectators on their own practice and learning. Connecting to their context in this way helps to broaden people's perspective and invites them to ask fundamental questions regarding their motivation, purpose and future direction. For example:

- How do I perceive my identity within the changing landscape?
- In what ways does this impact on my professional life and work?
- Why am I doing what I do?
- Where am I going?
- What determines my long-term goals? (Renshaw, 2006)

Third, the market forces are changing: there is a growing demand in society for musicians who can work with non-musicians in various settings who wish to participate in creative music making outside the regular stream of music educational activities. A professional singer who is able to work as an amateur increases her employability. She can use her competencies in both domains for various purposes. First for increasing people's quality of life, especially people who are in a disadvantaged position (for instance in a hospital, nursery home or prison). Making music with them can help them come to terms with their situation. The competencies can also be used in finding and creating new audiences. Working as an amateur, the professional singer can bring people who do not attend concerts into contact with classical or jazz music. They can bridge the gap between the music people are familiar with and the music that is alien to them.

To install a programme of musical amateurism for student singers in the conservatoire is useful for two reasons: First, it serves their personal development for various reasons, as explained above. Second, it increases their employability as a singer by contributing to the quality of other people's lives and/or by finding new audiences.

Key competencies of the amateur

Definition

An amateur is a practicing artist, in any art form, who uses her/his skills, talent and personality to enable others to compose, design, devise, create, perform or engage with works of art of any kind (Animarts, 2003).

1. She has to be able to relate and respond to a range of musical styles and genres:
 - keep close to your identity as a professional musician, use your strong points, don't do things you are not good at or you cannot stand for;
 - strive for musical quality in whatever you do.
2. She has to know how to work effectively in mixed groups varying in size, age, musical background and experience:

- how to 'read' the group;
 - how to create a safe atmosphere (being inviting without pushing people)
 - how to create 'flow' in the experiences of the participants
3. She has to know how to teach the group:
 - learning a song together; learning to pitch at the right level, learning not to get into details; engage physically; voice/body coordination, holistic experience, empowering people instead of correcting them.
 - leading through doing: keep the show going without stopping and explaining, make use of body language, facial expression and eye contact for giving directions.
 4. She has to know how to make use of the creative energy and potential of the members of the group:
 - radiate enthusiasm, give people confidence by encouraging them
 - make people owner of the musical process and the product;
 - make use of the musical expertise present in the group;
 - take care of the structure of process and product (it must have meaning for the participants);
 - knowing when to intervene and when not to.
 5. She has to be able to switch between the various roles of a workshop leader an animateur (composer, arranger, facilitator, improviser, conductor, teacher and catalyst) according to the momentum in the (group) process:
 - perform the role always as inconspicuously as possible.
 6. She has to be able to reflect on the process (in and on action) and her own role in it.

Ingredients of the programme

The learning contents

The programme is focused on professional singers in training who want to broaden their professional horizon towards amateurism. From the research report of the Yo! Project we know that it is important that students are given the opportunity to make use of their singing competencies. The training programme has to enclose this professional background in order to be successful. This is very much in line with what Donald Schön defines as teaching artistry through reflection: learning new ways within competencies you already possess (Schön, 1987). Students learn what else they can do with their singing competencies: new ways of communicating musically with various (often new) audiences.

Additional contents that have to be scheduled in the training programme:

1. Repertoire

Singing and becoming acquainted with repertoire outside the specialisation of the student (especially popular music, world music). Broadening the 'swinging' repertoire can take place in the practicum in the conservatories, where all

participating students sing a diverse repertoire together, combined with exercises on musical leadership (key competence 1).

2. Musical leadership

How to communicate musically with a group. How to combine the various roles of the musical leader (composer, arranger, facilitator, improviser, conductor, teacher and catalyst) for the benefit of the group (key competencies 2, 3, 4 and 5).

3. Creative exploration of musical materials

What can be done with the musical material to accommodate it and make it interesting to the group the animateur is working with. This can be done by adding or deleting musical elements as well as integrating it with non-musical elements (key competencies 2, 3, 4 and 5).

The learning environment

Animateurship can be defined as an artistry practice which cannot be learned from books (Schön, 1987). It cannot happen in the sequence of the normative professional curriculum: first classroom theory, then practical application. Artistic decisions have to be made in the process of acting, related to the conditions presenting itself at the moment. Learning a practice is about learning by doing. The student comes to the practice situation with a capacity to follow instructions, and to imitate. Reciprocal reflections becomes more and more core business. The student must learn operative listening, reflective imitation, reflection on her own knowing-in-action and the coach's meanings.

The learning environment needed for this is what Schön calls a 'reflective practicum'. Main features of a reflective practicum are: learning by doing, coaching rather than teaching, and a dialogue of reciprocal reflection-in-action between coach and student. Being in the group is important in a practicum, students sometimes play the coach's role. Meaning is mediated by the distinctive dialogue of student and coach, in which description of practice is interwoven with performance. Most students do not begin with a tacit knowledge of the competence domain they are in. Only later, when they have learned aspects of acting in the domain, can they advance their learning by reflecting on the tacit knowledge implicit in their own performance. Initial learning is therefore twofold: learn how to execute the domain performances and to recognize their competent execution. As a student begins to perform, she also begins to recognize competent performance and to regulate her search by reference to the qualities she recognizes.

According to Schön the dialogue between coach and students has three essential features: it takes place in the context of the student's attempts of practice; it makes use of actions as well as words; it depends on reciprocal reflection-in-action. The coach experiments in communication, testing with each of his interventions both his diagnosis of the student's understandings and problems and the effectiveness of his own strategies and communication. In this sense he reflects-in-action. In this process several kinds of learning take place.

Telling and listening

The coach responds in the context of the student's *doing*. Instructions are always incomplete. The coach must try to produce descriptions suiting the student's present know-how.

Demonstrating and imitating

A coach demonstrates things to help his student grasp what he thinks she needs to learn, giving her a capacity for imitating. This is a combination of telling/listening and demonstrating/imitating.

The ladder of reflection

It is the chain of reciprocal actions and reflection that makes up the dialogue of the coach and the student.

A practicum seeks to represent essential features of a practice to be learned while enabling students to experiment at low risk, vary the pace and focus of the work, and go back to do things over when it seems useful to do so. The coaches must be first class. A good coach is capable of inventing strategies of instructing and responding on the spot. A coach: may frame a question that draws the student's attention to a new aspect of a practice situation; may give the student a very concrete operational instruction that contains an implicit, deeper meaning; may pick up the exact words the student uses in order to describe her intention; may try to find a concrete image, accessible to his student, that carries a network of associations.

The learning environment needed here is a non-formal learning context. Non-formal learning is learning that:

- is embedded in planned activities that are not explicitly designated as learning but that contain an important learning element, what is sometimes described as semi-structured learning;
- refers to any organised educational activity that takes place outside the established formal education system;
- is highly contextualised, intended to serve identifiable learning clientele and objectives;
- is based on a curriculum that is tailor-made, adapted to the needs of the learner group;
- is based on 'learning by doing' and 'learning on the job';
- depends strongly on reflection (in and on action) fostered by an expert in the field, acting as a mentor: helping students/apprentices to transform experience into knowledge, skills, attitudes, values and convictions.
- is fostered by self assessment and peer assessment (Mak, 2006).

Essential elements of the learning process are: learning on the job, reflection in and on action, self reflection, tailor-made curriculum, peer learning and assessment and high quality coaching by experts in the field.

Scope and implementation of the programme

The training programme is meant to be part of the vocal training programs of the classical and the jazz singing departments of both conservatoires (Royal Conservatoire and Prince Claus Conservatoire).

The scope of the programme can vary according to the preferences of the students. Some parts of the programme, like singing a diverse repertoire together, can be part of a compulsory programme. This can be scheduled weekly, at a fixed hour in the first or second year of the study. In the weekly meetings the singing students not only sing a diverse repertoire together, they also learn how to lead by doing: giving directions to fellow students by making use of body language. Besides this they learn how to empower each other, not by correcting but by working from the strength of the participating students and by making changes in the musical device which contribute to musical quality. Learning how to do this can be of benefit for students who enter the teaching programme.

Another important aspect of the training should be the exploration of the musical material. How to make it more interesting by adding extra musical or non musical elements. This kind of creative music making was very much appreciated by the students who participated in the Yo! Bus Project. It gave them a sense of ownership of their musicianship – the feeling that they had something to add. At the end of the semester an interactive performance could be prepared in an unusual performance situation and/or a new audience (people who do not usually attend classical or jazz performances). The extent to which the performance is really interactive here is probably limited, restricted to parts of the performance. The minimum duration of these kinds of activities in the compulsory programme should at least be one semester. The availability of a high quality musical coach is an absolute condition to install the programme.

After the compulsory part, student singers who would like to gain more competencies in musical amateurism should be able to specialize. In the specialization students work in groups and the coaching is more intensive. Students learn how to function in a team in an interactive performance situation. The creative aspect of the performance is on a higher level. Therefore they have to know what can be done with the musical material and how to relate this to the people they are working with. The performance situations make greater improvisatory demands on the students working as a musical amateur. They not only need to learn what can be done musically in a particular situation, they also have to learn to communicate quickly with each other without having time to discuss verbally what to do. In the specialization programme the performance situation is an essential part of the learning situation, to acquire the competencies needed in these performance situations. The performance situation should thus be chosen with care, starting with more familiar performance situations and limited interactive music making elements, leading to less familiar situations and more interactive music making. The quality of coaching must be of the highest level and take all aspects of performance into consideration. The minimum duration of the specialization should be one year, based on weekly meetings and regular performances (once a month).

7. Bibliography

Boog, B. Slagter, M, Jacobs-Moonen, I. & Meijering, F., Eds (2005). *Focus op action research: de professional als handelingsonderzoeker*. Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum.

Elliott, D. (1995). *Music Matters, A New Philosophy of Music Education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mak, P.H.M. (2006). *Learning music in formal, non-formal and informal contexts*. www.lifelonglearninginmusic.org.

O'Neill, S.A. & McPherson, G.E. (2002). Motivation. In: R. Parncutt & G.E. McPherson. *The Science and Psychology of Musical Performance: Creative Strategies for Teaching and Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Renshaw, P. (2006). *Lifelong Learning for Musicians: the Place of Mentoring*. www.lifelonglearninginmusic.org.

Schön, D.A. (1987). *Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in de Professions*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.