COLLABORATION AND THE STUDY OF ENSEMBLE REHEARSAL

Elaine C. King (née Goodman)

University of Hull (U.K.)

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the study of rehearsal by musicians in Western chamber ensembles. In drawing together previous empirical research on solo practice (e.g. Gruson 1988; Krampe and Ericsson 1995; Miklaszewski 1989; Chaffin et al. 2002) and ensemble rehearsal (e.g. Cox 1989; Weeks 1996a; Williamon and Davidson 2002; Davidson and Good 2002), a novel conceptual framework is introduced. The framework divides into three parts—structure, collaboration and techniques—each of which is intended to be used separately or in combination as a basis for reviewing and/or directing research into chamber ensemble rehearsal. For each part of the framework, key elements are identified and used to delineate specific areas of research.

The central part of the framework, collaboration, includes consideration of discourse within chamber rehearsals as well as the social and musical interaction that necessarily arises between co-performers. Socially, collaboration refers to the relationships between musicians as well as the role of individual players (among other factors). Reference is given to the author's recent research on observing musician's 'team roles' within student quartet rehearsals. Musically, collaboration refers to the ways in which performers develop shared interpretations by coordinating and negotiating technical or expressive ideas.

The proposed conceptual framework systematizes the study of ensemble rehearsal and enables researchers to identify potential areas for further investigation. It also forms a starting point for the construction of a manual on ensemble rehearsal that is currently being developed for use by musicians and teachers.

INTRODUCTION

The study of rehearsal has gathered momentum over the past few decades as researchers, especially music psychologists, have begun to uncover the complex skills involved in developing musical expertise and preparing performance, albeit in solo, chamber, choral or orchestral contexts. Some investigations have adopted a quantitative perspective on the subject by measuring, for example, the numbers of hours of practice undertaken by soloists at specific levels of expertise (e.g. Krampe and Ericsson 1995), while other inquiries have examined the ways in which musicians structure their practice (e.g. Miklaszewski 1989; Cox 1989; Williamon and Valentine 2000; Chaffin et al. 2002) and the different techniques involved in preparing works either individually (e.g. Gruson 1988; Chaffin et al. 2002) or in chamber groups (e.g. Goodman 2000, 2002; Davidson and Good 2002; Williamon and Davidson 2002). Such studies have raised vital issues about practice, including questions on the relationship between quantity of practice and quality of performance, and indicated effective practice strategies, such as the importance of structuring a rehearsal and the benefits of 'chunking' or 'segmenting' individual pieces. Inevitably, different areas of consideration have emerged in the light of the varying contexts of each study, whether exposing the skills involved in private piano practice, analyzing the styles of leadership in orchestral rehearsals between conductors and instrumentalists (e.g. Faulkner 1973; Atik 1994; Price and Byo 2002) or observing the relationships between co-performers in chamber groups (e.g. Goodman 2000; Ford and Davidson 2003; Davidson and King 2004). It is acknowledged that related material exists in the light of research on jazz group rehearsals (e.g. Monson 1996) and in non-Western practices (e.g. Brinner 1995), but for the purpose of the present paper, research material will be drawn from studies using classical Western 'art' music genres.

The aim of this paper is to use the growing body of research on practice as a basis for presenting a conceptual framework that can be used to guide the study of Western chamber ensemble rehearsal.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Three principle areas can be identified in the study of chamber ensemble rehearsal, specifically 'structure', 'collaboration' and 'techniques'. Although overlapping, each of these areas can be isolated for the purpose of research. While some of the issues pertaining to the former and latter (structure and techniques) could be applied to other rehearsal contexts (e.g. solo or orchestral practice), the central part of this framework, collaboration, refers specifically to the co-performer interaction that takes place in chamber ensemble rehearsals without a conductor or director. Such interaction, of course, defines the unique culture of the chamber medium. Each area of the framework will be discussed in turn below, and suggestions for further research indicated.

Structure

The way in which a rehearsal is structured is perhaps the most obvious starting point for any study on practice. However, structure might be seen to operate at different levels. For instance, at a general level, structure can be identified in a group's long- or short-term schedule of rehearsals and preparation towards a concert(s) (indeed, a schedule might reflect work on particular repertoire over a period of days, weeks, months or, in some cases, several years). More specifically, structure underlies every practice session, perhaps through a routine of tuning-up to preparing or running through individual works. Structure can also be identified close-up in a group's approach to rehearsing one single movement or passage of a work, both within one practice session and across time. Previous research on practice articulates these different levels of structure, which will be referred to as 'general plan', 'structure of rehearsal' and 'approach to piece'.

General plan. In a study of daily diaries made by individual musicians, Krampe and Ericsson (1995) expose trends in practice behaviour by observing factors such as the length and frequency

of typical practice sessions and the times of day in which practice sessions take place. While this research does not intend to reflect upon the content of practice sessions, the findings do exemplify the existence of structure within the daily lives of individual musicians. In addition, Krampe and Ericsson collected retrospective reports of practice routines over the lifetime of individual musicians. This work could usefully inspire research along similar lines using chamber groups, but attention could be given to additional matters in the diary schedules, such as the aims and objectives of each practice session, and the short- or long-term goals of the rehearsals.

Session plan. Cox (1989) experimented with the structure of rehearsals according to the pace of activity adopted by high school choir directors (fast-paced activity included run-throughs of familiar works and warm-up routines; slow-paced activity reflected instances of detailed work on notes and expression of music). Cox maintained that '*structuring* a rehearsal, regardless of *how*, is the critical factor' (p. 212), although the choir directors showed a preference for rehearsals structured with a fast/slow/fast-paced pattern of activity and a 'closural' activity at the end, such as running through a familiar piece of music. The pacing of activity within a rehearsal is clearly important in the overall strategy of any practice session and directly reflects upon the ways in which musicians' levels of concentration might fluctuate. In addition to the notion of pace, however, further studies might attend to the timing and distribution of activities across rehearsals, the role of specific tasks (such as warming-up) and the relationship between the musicians' objectives and the actual outcomes of rehearsals. Indeed, the structure of a practice session will inevitably involve some flexibility, as musicians will always shape their rehearsal according to the way in which events unfold.

Approach to individual piece. The majority of research on practice to date has focussed on musicians preparing an individual piece of music for performance, highlighting either the methods and/or techniques involved in this task. Such studies have involved observation of one or more practice sessions. Indeed, musicians probably devote most of their practice time to working on repertoire, whether playing through old pieces or learning new ones, hence the obvious need for such research. Musicians are likely to practice a work in stages, such as giving a preliminary run-through, working on technical problems in sections and giving trial rehearsals (Wicinski 1950 reported in Miklaszewski 1989). Chaffin et al. (2002) highlight various stages of practice in their detailed examination of a pianist's approach to learning the *Presto* of Bach's *Italian* Concerto, from 'scouting it out' (stage 1) through 'the gray stage' (stage 2b), 'first polishing' (stage 3b) and 'maintenance' (stage 4; see pp. 100-114). During each practice session, they usefully distinguish between 'runs' and 'work', whereby the former describes 'practice segments extending over two or more complete sections with minimal interruption' and the latter involves 'playing the same short passage repeatedly to solve particular problems' (p. 118).

Miklaszewski's (1989) case-study of an advanced student pianist preparing Debussy's Prelude *Feux d'Artifice* demonstrates, among other things, a primarily sequential (and reverse sequential) approach to practice: the pianist worked chronologically through the piece by '"splicing" consecutive fragments into longer parts' (p. 107) and later made a '"backward" inspection of the Prelude' (p. 106). The division of a piece into segments, or 'chunks', is clearly an important practice technique (discussed later under 'techniques') that is intrinsically linked to the structure of the composition itself. Of further interest, however, is the ordering of segments in practice, which defines the musician's approach to working on a piece. Three different styles of approach were observed in rehearsals by cello–piano duos (Goodman 2000): sequential (working through a piece chronologically); non-sequential (isolating select segments or passages without concern for chronological progression); and 'rounded' sequential (i.e. working through a piece from beginning to end, then returning to the beginning to complete the session). These approaches were also dependent upon complete run-throughs of the piece, which alternated with close-up work on isolated segments (effectively mirroring Cox's findings about the alternation of fast- and slow-paced activity). Run-throughs either prompted further rehearsal activity (segmentation) or provided a means of contextualizing ideas, thus providing a vital structural function (also see Chaffin et al. 2002, p. 118).

The different levels of structure described above are summarized in Table 1, which represents the first area of the proposed conceptual framework for studying chamber ensemble rehearsal. The points listed in each row of the table highlight issues that relate to each level of structure, although they are by no means exhaustive. Each level can be studied separately or in combination when undertaking research on the structure of chamber rehearsals.

STRUCTURE
1. General plan • Overall schedule of rehearsals (e.g. time, frequency etc.) • Goals (e.g. performances, exams, competitions, auditions) • Plan of repertoire to be learned/rehearsed
2. Session plan • Structure of rehearsal (including objectives/outcomes) • Length of rehearsal & pace of activity • Timing & distribution of activities (e.g. warm-up, work on old/new pieces)
3. Approach to individual piece • Stages of practice over time (first 'run' to 'polishing') • Function of run-throughs and close-up work in each session • Agenda according to segmentation: sequential/non-sequential

Table 1: Levels of structure identified in the study of practice

Collaboration

As suggested previously, collaboration is an integral and defining part of the culture of chamber music-making in so far as co-performers necessarily interact both musically and socially without the direction of a conductor. Indeed, collaboration is perhaps most exciting during rehearsal, for it allows musicians the opportunity to cultivate musical ideas as well as to develop interpersonal relationships. Existing studies on chamber ensemble rehearsals reflect a wide range of issues arising through collaboration, such as awareness of conflict and leadership (Young and Colman 1979), group dynamics (Butterworth 1990; Murnighan and Conlon 1991), the roles of individual players (Ford and Davidson 2003; King 2004), the importance of gestures and eye contact in developing musical coordination (Williamon and Davidson 2002) and the ways in which co-performers might negotiate musical ideas (Goodman 2000). In the light of such research, collaboration can be regarded from three perspectives,

each occupying space within the conceptual framework: discourse, social collaboration and musical collaboration.

Discourse. Collaboration is ultimately reflected in the discourse manifested between co-performers during rehearsal. Discourse can be verbal or non-verbal (including gestures, eye contact, humming, playing, counting aloud and singing). In a study of cello–piano duo rehearsals using newly-formed ensembles, it was observed that musicians depended to a great extent upon verbal communication in order to relay expressive and technical information about the music (Goodman 2000). By contrast, Williamon and Davidson (2002) found that there was 'more playing and less talking' in their observation of practice sessions by a newly-formed piano duo. These findings indicate that the quantity of verbal discourse might depend on the familiarity (or rather unfamiliarity) of the performers, their individual experiences of rehearsal and their ability to articulate thoughts either in words or during play, hence explicitly or implicitly. Future research on chamber ensembles might usefully examine the amounts of verbal and non-verbal discourse in rehearsals over an extended period of time, particularly with well-established groups.

In order to fully understand the role of verbal and non-verbal discourse in rehearsal, utterances might be categorized according to a system of discourse analysis. For example, Bales's (1959; 1999) 'interactive process analysis' specifies categories of 'task-related' discourse (i.e. utterances about the music) and categories of 'socio-emotional' discourse (i.e. interpersonal utterances). Such analysis can be used to evaluate the nature of discourse in chamber rehearsals by comparing, for instance, the frequency of particular utterances between members of an ensemble or different chamber groups. In my observations of seven cello–piano duo rehearsals, a high proportion of positive socio-emotional discourse was evident and 'giving opinions' was the most frequent kind of task-related utterance (Goodman 2000). Alternative systems of discourse analysis might be applied in future studies in order to enhance this dimension of research.

Social collaboration. Social collaboration in chamber rehearsals is expressed in the relationship between co-performers as individuals and as a group. There is a growing body of research on social interaction in chamber ensembles (the earliest report was made by Young and Colman in 1979) and the majority of studies have been carried out through case-study observation (e.g. Butterworth 1990; Murnighan and Conlon 1991; Goodman 2000; Davidson and Good 2002). The three studies reported below highlight some of the most recent considerations about social collaboration in both quartet and quintet media: socio-emotional and socio-cultural factors are defined as well as the role of individuals in rehearsals.

In a broad study of wind quintets across the United Kingdom, Ford and Davidson (2003) consider the roles of players and social issues arising therefrom based on responses to a questionnaire. Interestingly, one third of the respondents commented on 'bad experiences' with horn players, such as lack of confidence in their ability, and lack of leadership or commitment to the group. These findings indicate a possible feeling of social isolation among horn players (as the only brass instrumentalist in the ensemble), and the need for praise towards these players (similar to that given to a second violinist in a string quartet; see p. 68). At the same time, the data exhibit the fact that wind quintets have a distinctive 'set of [social] issues' (p. 71), quite apart from those identified in similar research on string quartets (e.g. Butterworth 1990; Murnighan and Conlon 1991). As suggested by the authors, such research could be extended by examining wind quintets from overseas, as well as by closer observation of quintets in practice. The fact that the respondents of this study were able to identify and evaluate such issues within their ensembles indicates how important social collaboration is within chamber groups; indeed, as the authors conclude, good interpersonal dynamics are essential for a group to function effectively.

In a case study of a student string quartet rehearsal, Davidson and Good (2002) identify themes relating to both socio-emotional and socio-cultural issues (pp. 192-4; also see Davidson 1997). They describe positive and negative socio-emotional behaviour between the students, and recognize the influence of gender dynamics (the quartet comprised three females and a male) and the group's concerns over performance anxiety. In so doing, they demonstrate the distinct group dynamic of the quartet. Indeed, every chamber ensemble is a unique entity, and the collaboration manifest from one rehearsal to the next is constantly evolving (the Guarneri String Quartet describe their rehearsals as a 'constant working out process'; Blum 1986, p. 7).

My own recent observational study of social collaboration examined the 'evolving' group dynamics in student quartet rehearsals over a period of ten weeks (also see King 2004). Three ensembles were involved in the study: a wind quartet, string quartet and saxophone quartet. There were noticeable changes in the nature of collaboration and mood of individuals from one rehearsal to the next that invariably affected the group dynamic of each session. Of particular interest, however, was the fact that all of the ensembles functioned as 'teams' in remarkably similar ways by virtue of common 'roles' assumed by individuals within and across each rehearsal (also see Young and Colman 1979). Four 'team roles' were identified in these student rehearsals: the 'leader', who directs most of the rehearsal activity; the 'deputy leader', who contributes strongly to the rehearsal activity and, in some cases, appears to either want to lead, or does lead; the 'fidget', who appears quite uninvolved in the rehearsal activity, but makes his or her presence known audibly or physically while the others rehearse (e.g. by playing random notes, practicing his or her part, constantly tuning the instrument or just physically doing something when not playing, like stroking hair); and the 'quiet one', who says virtually nothing in the rehearsal. It was evident that these team roles sometimes shifted from one person to another across rehearsals, thus changing the group dynamic (for example, in the wind quartet, the flautist and clarinetist acted as 'leader' in different rehearsals). Similarly, some individual players manifest several team roles in one rehearsal (for example, the cellist in the string quartet acted as 'deputy leader', yet also appeared to be the 'fidget' at times). Additionally, there were instances where several players assumed the same team roles (for example, in the wind quartet, there were two 'deputy leaders', while in the saxophone quartet, there were two 'quiet ones'). On occasions, there was also evidence of a further team role at play as an individual sought reassurance or guidance from the rest of the group (the 'inquirer').

Structured interviews took place with each of the students in this study after the ten-week period. When asked to describe the role of each person in their quartet rehearsals, the majority of students identified a leader, deputy leader and quiet person (albeit in their own words). The students also identified roles for each player

'outside' of the rehearsals, such as the person who sorted out the music and the person who organized the rehearsals. The identification of individual roles both within and outside of the student quartet rehearsals leads to the question of how team roles operate in professional chamber groups and, perhaps more importantly, which team roles are needed to produce effective ensemble rehearsal (it is acknowledged that the student rehearsals observed above do not necessarily represent 'best' practice). This research will be expanded in due course in order to address these questions and with a view to applying some of the ideas expressed in related work by Belbin (2003) on team-role theory and concepts for management teams.

Musical collaboration. The interaction between co-performers in chamber ensemble rehearsals is always going to be musically driven, normally to achieve a specific goal, such as performing a particular work(s). In rehearsing pieces, musical collaboration might arise explicitly through verbal negotiation of technical or interpretative ideas (as discussed in Goodman 2000), while it may also occur implicitly during play, through eye contact, bodily gestures (see Williamon and Davidson 2002) and in the subtle shaping of sound. To this end, the existing research on musical coordination during ensemble performance itself, particularly on the synchronization of timing between musicians (e.g. Rasch 1979; Shaffer 1984; Clayton 1985; Sundberg et al. 1989; Weeks 1996b; etc.), reflects upon the kinds of collaborative processes that are being developed in rehearsal. For example, the 'predictive' and 'reactive' behaviour between co-performers during play (likened to 'hunting'; Shaffer 1984) and the establishment of a 'shared common timekeeper' will arise from the first stages of practice, although no research to date has explored how these processes might change and develop in rehearsal. The consideration of musical collaboration in rehearsal is thus quite limited to date: there are only a few existing studies that begin to address the complexities of such interaction.

Davidson and Good (2002) draw upon the theoretical notions proposed by conversational analysts (Clark and Brennan 1991) in their observational study of a student string quartet rehearsal (mentioned above). Two elements of the musical process are considered: coordination of *content* (i.e. general beliefs about musical style and interpretation) and coordination of *process* (i.e. the moment-by-moment unfolding of the sound, exits and entrances etc.). With regard to content, they observe, for example, how the quartet expressed awareness of the scoring in Mozart's work, using specific chords to coordinate ends of contrapuntal passages, while in rehearsing Britten's *Rhapsody*, the performers tried to work more like soloists and needed to count intently to execute the various time changes (see pp. 194–6). In terms of process, the quartet showed ways of coping with the technical limitations of players, such as by giving 'space' at appropriate moments to enable tricky passagework to be executed. They observed 'conversations with the eyes' to facilitate the coordination of entrances and exits as well as gestural movements to indicate expression (for example, swaying in the same direction; see pp. 196–8). This inquiry provides useful general insight into the nature of musical collaboration, and might inspire further studies using other chamber groups at similar and different levels of expertise.

In focusing more specifically on verbal exchanges between co-performers in rehearsal, my detailed transcription of discourse in seven cello–piano duo practice sessions emphasized the importance of 'negotiation' as part of the musical collaborative process (Goodman 2000). Verbal discourse reflected ways in which the performers (advanced students and professionals) agreed to think about the music *cognitively* (e.g. to imagine a particular mood or emotion in a phrase) and to execute the music *physically* (e.g. to play at a certain dynamic level). Technical and interpretative ideas were negotiated in different ways when using verbal discourse. Six types of negotiation were highlighted: 1) personal preference based on trial-and-error (e.g. 'I like it that way, it sounds better'); 2) observing the markings in the score to back-up points (e.g. 'it's marked *forte*, it needs to be loud'); 3) reconciling emotional insights (e.g. 'let's make it sound more searching'); 4) considering the music's form as a process (e.g. talking through a passage to map out its highpoints); 5) technical reasoning (e.g. 'I need time there to allow my note to "speak"'); 6) awareness of the music's structure (e.g. 'slow down to indicate the return of the opening theme'). Other kinds of negotiation might be recognized in further studies; indeed, my own recent investigation of the student quartet rehearsals showed reference to external sources, such as recordings, performances, textbooks and teacher's suggestions, as a means of negotiating musical points.

The process of collaborating about a piece of music in rehearsal is affected constantly by social influences, whether through awareness of how an interpretative idea might be received by another player (perhaps in creating tension or conflict) or in reflecting the social hierarchies embedded within the musical composition itself (as Loft remarks, 'the prominent, topmost melodic voice sets an inescapable stamp on the temper of the group'; 1992, p. 18). Arguably, studies of musical and social collaboration will reflect this interdependency, although it is possible to focus on particular elements for the purposes of research, as indicated above. Table 2 summarizes the different areas of 'collaboration' that have been distinguished in existing research within the proposed framework.

COLLABORATION
1. Discourse • Verbal/non-verbal (e.g. balance between talking/playing) • Analysis of 'task-related' utterances and 'socio-emotional' utterances
2. Social collaboration • Observation of socio-emotional & socio-cultural factors • Analysis of group dynamics (within & across rehearsals) • Identification of 'team roles' within group
3. Musical collaboration • Coordination of *content* and *process* • Types of negotiation using verbal discourse (for exchanging technical/expressive ideas)

Table 2: Areas of consideration identified in the study of collaboration in chamber ensemble rehearsals

Techniques

The final area of the conceptual framework focuses on rehearsal techniques, which are, of course, a fundamental part of practising. Gruson's (1988) study on solo piano practice was perhaps the first inquiry that really attempted to systematize *techniques* of practice. Using her 'Observational Scale for Piano Practising' (OSPP), which included sets of techniques (e.g. repeating a note/bar/section, slowing down, making errors, uninterrupted playing and playing hands separately), she measured the repetition

of techniques during piano practice sessions. Interestingly, she observed changes in the measurements of practice techniques across different levels of ability: 'novices' relied heavily upon 'uninterrupted playing', so tended to play their pieces over and over again until the mistakes were 'ironed out', while 'experts' focused on and repeated sections of a piece (hence 'segmenting' the music more frequently).

The technique of segmentation (discussed previously) is identified in other research on solo piano practice: Miklaszewski (1989) and Chaffin et al. (2002) noted that segments became longer in the later stages of practice, while Williamon and Valentine (2000) found that pianists who employed longer segments of material by the middle stages of practice produced better quality performances. As mentioned previously, segmentation helps to define the way in which a musician might structure his or her practice about an individual piece and, perhaps for this reason, it might be regarded as the most important technique of practice. Moreover, other rehearsal techniques might be used in conjunction with segmentation, such as slow practice of sections (with or without a metronome), adjusting rhythms to secure passagework, trial-and-error, breaking down and hearing select parts together (e.g. hands separately for pianists, or outside/inside parts for a quartet).

TECHNIQUES
1. General (examples)
• Intonation-building techniques
• Tuning-up/warming-up techniques
• Preparing scores/editions/programmes
• Balancing 'runs' and 'work'
2. Piece-specific (examples)
• Segmentation/chunking
• Slow practice (with/without metronome)
• Trial-and-error
• Analysis of score/form (e.g. to isolate key lines)
• Hearing select parts together
• Tuning specific chords & progressions (from bass upwards)
3. Group-specific (examples)
• Metronome exercises to improve group's timekeeping
• Intonation-building techniques
• Techniques to support weaker players (if necessary)
• Techniques to improve blending of sounds/timbres

Table 3: Areas of consideration in examining practice techniques in chamber ensemble rehearsals

It is evident from reports on chamber ensemble practice to date and through my recent observation of student quartet rehearsals that specific rehearsal techniques might be introduced to rectify particular problems experienced by individual ensembles, such as a second violinist who struggles to execute a particular line (see Davidson and Good 2002), a saxophone player who appears to produce a quieter sound than the rest of the ensemble players, or a group that has difficulty with maintaining tempi. Ensembles can also employ techniques or strategies to improve (or maintain) general aspects of their playing, such as intonation. In effect, therefore, rehearsal techniques might be defined as group-specific (i.e. pertaining to the needs of the individual ensemble), piece-specific (i.e. pertaining to the demands of a particular piece) or general (i.e. reflecting general practice). Table 3 gives examples of the kinds of rehearsal techniques that might exist under each category (there are overlaps), some of which have been highlighted above and within other parts of the conceptual framework. There is, however, enormous scope for further research on practice techniques in chamber ensemble rehearsals. Indeed, Gruson's structured observational approach could be usefully adapted for this purpose, and trends in practice behaviour could be assessed across chamber ensembles of varying levels of expertise in future studies.

DISCUSSION

The three parts of the conceptual framework outlined above – structure, collaboration and techniques – provide a basis for systematizing existing research on practice and, as indicated, help to isolate areas for further study on chamber ensemble rehearsal. Moreover, the framework itself could be expanded in future work as other areas of consideration are introduced. For example, there is potential for determining a category that refers to 'evaluation', such as the methods used by individuals and groups to self-evaluate their own practice. Indeed, Ford and Davidson's (2003) questionnaire study of wind quintets hints at the value of such measures, although this kind of work could be carried out in a more localized context by monitoring weekly self- and group-evaluation reports of rehearsals by members of chamber groups. Similarly, there is a need to consider the influence of external parties on rehearsal behaviour, such as that given by professional coaches or tutors who might provide guidance or direction for a group's practice. This is particularly important for inexperienced chamber ensembles that are trying to develop effective rehearsal strategies.

The implications of studying chamber ensemble rehearsal are wide-ranging. First, this work might be seen to contribute towards the understanding of small group processes and group work in general, especially when compared with investigations undertaken in related fields. Additionally, it provides insight into human skill development in terms of both individuals and groups. Second, research on music practice from other Western 'art' genres (e.g. solo, choral and orchestral media) feeds into and out of inquiries directed specifically at chamber ensembles (indeed, the proposed framework does exploit these crossovers to some degree). While the culture of music-making in Western chamber groups is quite unique, there is scope for broader consideration of overlaps with practices from other contexts, including popular cultures and non-Western traditions. Third, the study of chamber ensemble rehearsal has strong pedagogical implications: it is important for musicians and researchers alike to identify and share experiences of 'good' practice. The conceptual framework discussed in this paper forms a starting point for the construction of a manual on ensemble rehearsal that is currently being developed for use by musicians and teachers. It is hoped that existing and future research on practice will encourage aspiring chamber groups to understand, reflect and improve upon their work.

REFERENCES

Atik, Y. (1994) 'The conductor and the orchestra: Interactive aspects of the leadership process', *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 13: 22–28.

Bales, R. F. (1950) 'A set of categories for the analysis of small group interaction', *American Sociological Review* 15: 257–63.

Bales, R. F. (1999) *Social interaction systems: Theory and measurement*. London: Transaction Publishers.

Belbin, R. M. (2003) *Team roles at work*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Blum, D. (1986) *The art of quartet playing: The Guarneri String Quartet in conversation with David Blum*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Brinner, B. (1995) *Knowing music, making music: Javanese gamelan and the theory of musical competence and interaction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Butterworth, T. (1990) 'Detroit String Quartet', in J. R. Hackman (ed.) *Groups that work (and those that don't)*, pp. 207–24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chaffin, R., Imreh, G. and Crawford, M. (2002) *Practicing perfection: Memory and piano performance*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Clark, H. H. and Brennan, S. E. (1991) 'Grounding in communication', in L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine and S. D. Teasley (eds.) *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Clayton, A. (1985) 'Coordination between players in musical performance'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh.

Cox, J. (1989) 'Rehearsal organizational structures used by successful high school choral directors', *Journal of Research in Music Education* 37: 201–18.

Davidson, J. W. (1997) 'The social in musical performance', in D. Hargreaves and A. North (eds.) *The social psychology of music*, pp. 209–28. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davidson, J. W. and Good, J. (2002) 'Social and musical coordination between members of a string quartet: An exploratory study', *Psychology of music* 30 (2): 186–201.

Davidson, J. W. and King, E. C. (2004) 'Strategies for ensemble practice', in A. Williamon (ed.) *Musical excellence: Strategies and techniques to enhance performance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Faulkner, R. (1973) 'Orchestra interaction: Some features of communication and authority in an artistic organization', *The Sociological Quarterly* 14: 147–157.

Ford, L. and Davidson, J. W. (2003) 'An investigation of members' roles in wind quintets', *Psychology of Music* 31 (1): 53–74.

Goodman, E. C. (2000) 'Analyzing the ensemble in music rehearsal and performance: The nature and effects of interaction in cello–piano duos'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of London.

Goodman, E. C. (2002) 'Ensemble performance', in J. Rink (ed.) *Musical performance: A guide to understanding*, pp. 153–167. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gruson, L. (1988) 'Rehearsal skill and musical competence: Does practice make perfect?', in J. Sloboda (ed.) *Generative processes in music: The psychology of performance, improvisation and composition*. pp. 91–112. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

King, E. C. (2004) 'Defining the individual roles of musicians in ensemble rehearsal', Paper presented at the International Conference on Musical Collaboration, The Open University, Milton Keynes, U. K. (23–24 April).

Krampe, R. and Ericsson, K. A. (1995) 'Deliberate practice and elite musical performance', in J. Rink (ed.) *The practice of performance: Studies in musical interpretation*, pp. 84–104. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Loft, A. (1992) *Ensemble! A rehearsal guide to thirty great works of chamber music*. Oregon: Amadeus Press.

Miklaszewski, K. (1989) 'A case study of a pianist preparing a musical performance', *Psychology of Music* 17: 95–109.

Monson, I. (1996) *Saying something: Jazz improvisation and interaction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Murnighan, J. K. and Conlon, D. E. (1991) 'The dynamics of intense work groups: A study of British string quartets', *Administrative Science Quarterly* 36: 165–186.

Price, H. E. and Byo, J. L. (2002) 'Rehearsing and conducting', in R. Parncutt and G. McPherson (eds.) *The science and psychology of music performance: Creative strategies for teaching and learning*, pp. 335–351. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rasch, R. (1979) 'Synchronization in performed ensemble music', *Acustica* 43: 121–131.

Shaffer, L. H. (1984) 'Timing in solo and duet performances', *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 36A: 577–595.

Sundberg, J., Friberg, L. and Fryden, L. (1989) 'Rules for automated performance of ensemble music', *Contemporary Music Review* 3: 89–109.

Weeks, P. (1996a) 'A rehearsal of a Beethoven passage: An analysis of correction talk', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 29 (3): 247–290.

Weeks, P. (1996b) 'Synchrony lost, synchrony regained: The achievement of musical coordination', *Human Studies* 19: 199–228.

Williamon, A. and Davidson, J. W. (2002) 'Exploring co-performer communication', *Musicae Scientiae* 6 (1): 53–72.

Williamon, A. and Valentine, E. (2000) 'Quantity and quality of musical practice as predictors of performance quality', *British Journal of Psychology* 91: 353–376.

Young, V. M. and Colman, A. M. (1979) 'Some psychological processes in string quartets', *Psychology of Music* 7: 12–16.