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The purpose of the study was to profile class piano instructors at institutions in the United States in terms of their educational background and teaching experiences. An additional goal was to find out current instructional practice specifically in group teaching techniques and functional keyboard skills.

The study involved an online survey of 1471 group piano instructors whose names appeared in the College Music Society Directory (2000-2001). Six hundred names were selected by random sampling. The results reported in this study were based on 304 responses.

Results showed that a high proportion of class piano instructors did not use multi-dimensional modes of instruction or group dynamics. Students were not given enough opportunities to work within a small ensemble. Results indicated that instructors in different areas of specialization showed significant differences in their emphasis on sight reading and accompanying skills. Further, this study failed to reveal a significant difference between applied faculty and music education faculty in the degree of emphasis on repertoire study. A greater percentage of respondents emphasized repertoire in this study than did those in a similar study conducted 10 years ago. Only sight reading and harmonization were skills emphasized in class piano instruction and identified as skills that would be useful to students in the future.
Instructors who had taken specialized training felt that they were more competent in their teaching compared to those who had not taken such courses. Respondents with group training encouraged more use of small ensemble work and less use of the one-on-one approach within the class piano setting.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

As an increasing number of schools require all undergraduate music majors to attain a certain level of proficiency at the keyboard, group piano instruction has become increasingly popular in higher education institutions in the United States. It was integrated into the university programs in 1929 and has since become a widespread practice in higher education settings (Bartels, 1960). The primary goal of the class piano program is to develop functional keyboard skills among the non-keyboard music majors. It has also been established that knowledge of piano skills is considered a most fundamental musical literacy which should be harnessed together with other music courses. This was articulated by Bastien (1973) who stated:

... the primary function of the class piano program is to provide the non-keyboard music major with functional keyboard skills. The ability to sight-read, score-read, harmonize, transpose, and improvise will best serve the practical needs of choir and instrumental directors and general music teachers. In addition, the class piano program may strengthen and unify other areas of college study, such as relating keyboard harmony to theory, and piano literature to music history. Group instruction serves as a laboratory where various components may be pulled together and used to deepen musical understanding (p. 285).
The undergraduate music majors need these competencies at the keyboard. Nagode (1988) asserted, “group piano courses are considered part of a core degree requirement within the undergraduate music curriculum” (p. 217). The importance of keyboard competency was highlighted in the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) guidelines for undergraduate curricula as one of the competencies common to all professional baccalaureate degrees in music (p. 82). In addressing essential competencies to be developed in the baccalaureate degree in music education, the NASM Handbook (2001) states:

In addition to the skills required for all musicians, functional ability in keyboard and other classroom instruments appropriate to the student’s future teaching needs is essential. Whatever the specialization, functional knowledge of wind, string, and percussion instruments and the voice is essential (p. 94).

Even though the NASM Handbook does not specifically maintain that music students should enroll in class piano, class piano is an ideal setting to develop these competencies. In learning keyboard skills, class piano provides an opportunity to fulfill many competencies that NASM describes as essential to a music student.

A large number of institutions offer training in these skills through class piano. This is because class piano instruction is “viewed as a practical and effective means for the development of keyboard musicianship skills” (Nagode, 1988, p. 217). Group piano instruction has several advantages: practical, efficient and economical use of faculty time (Locke, 1986). Hutcherson (1955) noted, “advocates of class piano claim these six advantages of group instruction over individual lessons: (1) economy of teacher’s time and pupil’s money; (2) a socialized learning situation involving group cooperation and competition; (3) greater performing confidence; (4) more ability in discriminatory
listening; (5) familiarity with more music; and (6) greater rhythmic security resulting from the momentum of group playing” (p. 2). Frisch (1965) also maintained that greater independence in music listening and reading in class could be developed in addition to time saved presenting the same material to a group compared to individual students (p. 50). Roberson (1992) encouraged group learning, stating that most people learn best in groups (p. 23).

The practice of offering these types of classes has created a need for a specialist in this kind of instruction. Experts in the field have become increasingly aware that a trained specialist in class piano (one who should probably know the combination of group dynamics and functional keyboard skills) should direct and teach the course. The “class piano specialist” is one who has specific training in group dynamics, educational psychology, learning styles and, of course, piano skills. Evelyn Starkey (as cited in Lancaster, 1978, p. 29) noted that the success of class piano instructor depends upon pianistic ability, organizational ability, skill in handling groups and ability to present keyboard materials with confidence and enthusiasm. The following are factors that contribute to a successful group instruction: appropriate curriculum design, motivating music and materials, group interaction, effective instructor and communication equipment. All of these aspects have been investigated to some extent and suggestions for improvement have been proposed.

Yet group piano instruction is not always successful and there remain questions regarding how it can be further improved. Former students of class piano who should
have acquired the necessary competence at the keyboard during their undergraduate studies reported insufficient preparation to use the piano as a functional tool (Graff, 1984).

As early as 1967, Vemazza maintained, “The usefulness and importance of the course have been recognized. Now, music educators need to establish new guide lines for how much can be taught in a reasonable length of time, where the emphases shall be and what must be the core of basic piano study” (p. 45). These issues lie within the ability of the trained instructor to impart the appropriate skills in the right magnitude using the appropriate measures. If the group piano program has been designated to be the most suitable means to develop functional skills, the class piano specialist must know how to manipulate the principle of group dynamics in order to ensure that students learn the functional skills deemed most relevant to their professional career.

The instructor’s responsibility is to provide practice steps, instill leadership qualities and facilitate group interaction among the students. A good group lesson is one which is enjoyable and engaging in which the students are on task and satisfied that they have learned something new. A bad group lesson, on the other hand, contains elements such as music that is either too difficult or too easy, where students are off task, confused, or working alone. The worst thing that can happen in class piano is when students practice for the entire class time!

Many articles and studies agree that group piano is an effective approach to teaching and learning. In addition to non-musical advantages, the interactive processes of the group dynamics can greatly benefit student learning.
Need for the Study

In order for class piano instruction to be successful, it takes the trained teacher to teach the right things (emphasizing the appropriate skills) in the right ways (group instructional strategies). This is evidently affected by the educational background and teaching experience of the class piano instructor, both in functional skills and group techniques. Since there exist so many documentations of inferior instruction in class piano, the present study intends to profile the instructors who teach class piano for non-keyboard music majors across the United States.

The most recent study on class piano instructors was conducted by Diana Skroch in 1991. She performed a comprehensive study on the nature and scope on class piano instruction in which she devoted one section to profile class piano instructors. Since then, very little research on this topic has appeared. In addition to examining class piano instructors’ professional background and instructional responsibilities, the teacher’s use of group dynamics will be addressed. Additionally, by using inferential statistics, this study will investigate if the instructor’s academic background affects the amount of emphasis on functional skills within the class piano instruction.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is:

1. To determine whether the instructor’s educational background affects the amount of emphasis on particular keyboard skills.

2. To determine the particular skills emphasized by class piano instructors that students would most likely use in the future.
3. To find out what types of teacher-student interactions and peer interactions students experience in the group setting.

4. To compare instructional practices among instructors in the different types of institutions as classified by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

5. To ascertain the amount of emphasis on functional keyboard skills and use of group teaching techniques among faculty and teaching assistants.

**Definition of Terms**

*Functional piano skills:* Practical skills that allow the student to use the piano as a functional teaching tool. These functional piano skills include (but are not necessarily limited to) sight reading, transposition, harmonization, improvisation, playing by ear, playing chord progressions, technique, critical listening, ensemble repertoire, accompanying, analysis, and score reading.

*Group techniques/Group dynamics:* The processes or strategies that integrate interaction among members in a group setting (Webster’s Third New International Dictionary, 1993, p. 1004).

*Secondary piano student:* The non-keyboard music major whose principal instrument is any instrument other than the piano.

*Class piano/Group piano:* Synonymous terms used interchangeably to refer to a medium of piano instruction to a group rather than individual/tutorial basis. This kind of instruction focuses on developing functional keyboard skills for non-keyboard music majors or secondary piano students. This is not to be confused with a masterclass or
chamber music class for the piano major. This term also does not refer to group piano classes in an independent studio setting. The frequency of meetings is typically two to three times per week.

**Modes of instruction:** Manner of ways that enable various forms of group interaction.

**Electronic piano lab/Digital piano lab:** Synonymous terms used to refer to a setting in which standard equipment includes pianos and communication technology. This setting allows flexible grouping with a variety of interactions: peer to peer, teacher to student(s), and teacher to ensemble.

**Limitations**

This study does not take into consideration the class piano instructors’ use of educational technology within the piano lab nor inter-personal (teacher/student behavior) approach. The basis for profiling class piano instructors is further limited only to the data collected from current or practicing instructors in group piano. Additionally, the scope of the study is confined to instructors who teach class piano designed exclusively for non-keyboard music majors.

**Organization of the Study**

Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the study. Chapter 2 presents a review of related literature in the areas of functional keyboard skills, teacher training and group dynamics. Chapter 3 describes the methodology of the study, which comprises the selection of the target population as well as the sample, the development of the research
instrument, and the process of data collection. Chapter 4 consists of presentation and analysis of the data collected from responses to the online survey questionnaire. Chapter 5 includes a summary, discussion and conclusion of the study, followed by recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Group Piano Instruction

Class piano instruction is the most effective mode of instruction to develop functional piano skills among college students (Buchanan, 1964; Lyke, 1968). Raymond Burrows, a pioneer in group piano instruction, advocated class piano as an ideal setting for the development of functional keyboard skills (Nagode, 1988, p. 217) such as sight reading, transposition, harmonization, improvisation, accompanying, playing by ear, and score reading. In agreement to the abovementioned statements, Sonntag (1980) asserted that group piano is an effective means of developing and improving functional facility of the music education major. It is in the group piano setting that functional skills receive equal emphasis along with the study of repertoire and technique (Lyke, 1969, p. 53). If class piano instruction is to be effective, the teacher needs to understand and know these specific skills and also strategies that would facilitate group learning. However, many reports indicated that students who graduated from class piano did not feel competent in performing functionally at the keyboard. This situation raises concern; because, if class piano is meant to develop functional skills but students claim that they are not being prepared to use those skills, then class piano program has failed.
Hutcherson (1955) compared group and private instruction in music rudiments and piano performance skills and found no significant difference between the two types of instruction. However, she emphasized that group piano instruction is a more effective means to develop rhythmic proficiency and accuracy in sight reading. In addition to the benefits of group learning, Mehr (1968) contrasted individual instruction with group instruction, maintaining that there is less opportunity in the private lesson to make music with other peers while class piano instruction provides an opportunity for piano ensemble, thus, “convert[ing] music lessons into experiences in making music together” (p. 51). Burkett (1982) also contended that group piano teaching allows the teacher to vary teaching methods, cover a wider area of study and use his or her time more efficiently (p. 31).

Reports on Skill Preparation

Steps have been undertaken to standardize and improve class piano instruction to meet the needs of the students who will draw upon these skills in their career. In 1967, Music Educators National Conference (MENC) published Teaching Piano in Classroom and Studios in an effort to point out the rationale and objectives of group piano instruction. Included in the text is a detailed outline of a two-year curriculum for group piano instruction for music majors and minors. It was hoped then that the wide disparity of the philosophy of group piano instruction among different institutions and instructors could be narrowed. A study conducted by Hunter in 1973 investigated the teaching of ten functional piano skills to undergraduate music education majors at selected west coast colleges and universities. After interviewing class piano instructors
and music educators, he found that only five items were rated as being taught effectively: sight reading, technique, critical listening, analysis, and playing chord progressions. The only functional keyboard skill that was taught by each responding instructor was harmonization. In the investigation of the status of piano classes in Oregon, March (1988) also discovered that among those skills listed in the literature as important, the only one still taught at all colleges was harmonization. This may not be surprising, because Lyke’s survey (1968) already indicated that class piano teachers regarded harmonization as the most functional keyboard skill. Hunter (1973) further reported that some instructors neglected important skills such as transposition and accompanying (p. 106).

It is very important that class piano instructors realize the needs of their students in order that students are taught the appropriate skills relevant to their professional expectations. Unfortunately, March’s study (1988) observed that there was a disagreement when she compared the rankings of the relative importance of functional keyboard skills among college music instructors and public school music teachers. She stated, “the college instructors may not understand the functional piano needs of the school music teachers” (p. 118).

Graff (1984) speculated that instructors would not be preparing their students for the real life teaching career if the importance of functional skills in class piano were minimized. A study conducted by Christensen (2000) revealed that school music teachers would, indeed, use functional piano skills more frequently had they been more proficient in those skills, particularly accompanying skills. These findings indicated that
it is imperative that the class piano instructor matches the ultimate goal of class piano
instruction with the degree of emphasis they place on functional keyboard skills.

Lyke (in Enoch & Lyke, 1977) noted several skills that were considered important
for the “piano minor,” or secondary piano student such as sight reading, transposition,
harmonization, improvisation, accompanying, playing by ear, and score playing (p. 212).

Buchanan’s survey (1964) revealed that the highest ranking keyboard skills
required in all areas of music teaching were accompanying, score playing, sight reading,
improvisation, playing by ear, and harmonizing” (p. 136). From his study, Lyke (1968)
reported ten skills that were considered essential by both music education and class piano
instructors: sight reading, harmonization, playing by ear, transposition, improvisation,
technical development, critical listening, accompanying, playing chord progressions, and
analysis. March (1988) concurred with Buchanan (1964) that general music and choral
teachers regarded accompanying skill to be the most important, while instrumental
teachers indicated score reading to be the most important skill. In addition, all general
music, choral, and instrumental music teachers agreed that playing repertoire is least
important to successful music teaching. March (1988) further stated that the skills
identified most often in the literature as important were sight-reading, accompanying and
improvising; however, these skills were taught least often at the colleges.

In his study of instructional priorities in group piano programs in the United
States, Johnson (1987) found that the most valuable skills for music majors were sight
reading, harmonization, transposition, and score reading; and the least important skills
were playing by ear, memorization, and modulation.
Public school educators who responded to Graff's study (1984) stressed the importance of the following skills: sightreading, harmonization and playing of chord progressions, transposition, critical listening, style concepts, and playing of accompaniments. To this list, choral teachers added choral score reading, instrumental instructors added instrumental score reading, and general music specialists added improvisation, playing by ear, and performance of patriotic songs (p. 13).

Even though each different area stressed specific needs of functional keyboard skills, Christensen (2000) reported that her respondents considered every skill to be important. Graff (1984) identified accompanying, harmonization, transposition and sight reading were skills frequently used by public school music teachers. Although attempts had been made to have a more functional class piano curriculum since the 1960s, researchers and music educators observed that many graduates are still not fully prepared to function adequately at the piano (p. 13).

In a 1962 survey by Buchanan entitled “Basic skills of piano performance essential to teachers of all phases of music,” she investigated the attitude of music educators regarding basic piano skills considered essential to school music teaching. A total of 312 music educators responded, representing choral, band, and orchestra directors or elementary music teachers, music supervisors, and college music educators. She reported, “in such areas as band and orchestra, where the usual college requirements of piano study and proficiency are at a minimum, 64% of the directors thought that their college training in piano did not adequately prepare them for their area of teaching” (Buchanan, 1964, p. 134).
Sonntag (1980) found the inadequacy of functional piano skills training in selected colleges and universities in Ohio. March’s study in 1988 also revealed that 44 percent of public school music teachers contended that their piano training is inadequate (March, 113).

The Class Piano Instructor

Richards (1962) asserted that in order to attain successful modern group teaching, there should be small classes, trained teacher, homogenous grouping, adequate facilities, ample time. He stated that when class programs fail, the fault is usually traced to the inadequate preparation of the teacher. Mehr (1968) agreed with Richards that the failure of the group instruction is usually due to a lack of knowledge in handling the group (p. 51). In his conclusion, Lyke (1968) stressed, “where weaknesses were noted, either the teachers: (a) were not informed of current curricular trends in class piano or (b) did not possess the requisite teaching skills to offer experiences in the neglected areas” (p. 114-115).

The majority of class piano instructors developed their performance skills from the private piano lessons. Since private piano lessons typically do not adequately prepare students in the area of functional skills (McDonald, 1989), this could pose a problem in the class piano situation when they are drafted into teaching the course. Applying techniques of one-on-one instruction into the group situation might not be the best way to capitalize on group classes. This approach defeats the purpose of a “group class” concept. Sheets (1983) cautioned, “The ability to play well, or even experience in teaching privately does not mean one is equally qualified to teach class piano” (p. 35).
Johnson’s study (1987) concerning instructional priorities in class piano revealed a major difference among faculty from the music education and other areas of specialization in the treatment of functional skills in class piano. Johnson reported:

Instructors trained in music education consistently emphasized artistic skills more than their counterparts trained in other areas of music, a tendency substantiated by student responses in major areas and specific skills. This find disproves the supposition that group piano instructors trained in music education emphasize functional skills more than those trained in keyboard performance and other areas. The former group’s apparent predisposition toward artistic elements of the curriculum raises questions regarding (1) the adequacy of training received in teaching keyboard concepts and skills, and (2) the validity of the assumption that training a group piano instructor in music education would increase effectiveness in teaching, especially in the area of functional skills (p. 152).

Both Rast (1964) and Webber (1958) believed that the most successful classes were taught by class piano specialists who were familiar with the broad objectives of music education. Rast (1964) noted that the most successful programs for the elementary education major were those directed by music educators or classroom specialists, rather than applied specialists. However, Lyke’s study (1968) discovered that there were more instructors with performance degrees than music education degrees:

far more degrees in applied music than in music education were held by the class piano teachers, even though their work was primarily with music education students (p. 70).

Arrau’s investigation (1990) on the classroom behaviors of eight renowned college and university group piano teachers revealed that most of her respondents held degrees in piano performance or music education; and none of them had a piano pedagogy degree. She reported that the instructors’ professional development was
derived from their educational background, workshops, conferences, seminars, and discussions with (or observations of) their colleagues, self-study, and “on-the-job” training (p. 69-73).

Skroch (1991) also pointed out a possible reason for a deficiency in class piano instruction:

Instructors may hold degrees in piano performance or music education, but seldom have backgrounds in both areas; even more rarely do they have a background in piano pedagogy, or more specifically, group teaching. Although improvements have been made in teacher training programs, research suggests that pedagogical preparation in the teaching of functional skills has been inadequate (p. 3).

Uszler (1992) stated the shortcomings of instructors typically trained in either applied or music education degree. She stressed that classroom teachers, who are skilled in teaching groups, “lacked the confidence and the background required to teach harmonization and transposition or to guide creative activities.” On the other hand, keyboard teachers, who are informed in musical matters, lacked group teaching experience (p. 588).

From reports, comments and suggestions of past researchers, it can be seen that the trained class piano instructor is of utmost importance. Specialized training in group piano is needed to prepare prospective teachers in class piano. The expansion of the class piano program in the twenty-first century requires an equal expansion of schools that offer specialized work in group piano.

Even back in the early 1900s, Ahearn (1929) described the qualities of a class piano instructor as one who combines “musicianship with a definite understanding of piano pedagogy and with the knowledge of educational principles, psychology and group procedures” (p. 51). Lyke (1968) stated that group piano experts in his study regarded
educational psychology to be essential for the teacher involved in class piano instruction. In addressing the class piano teachers, he therefore suggested, “class piano teachers should gain a better command of fundamental principles related to group dynamics and the psychology of learning” (p. 120). Johnson (1987) called for an increase in offerings in workshops and seminars for the group instructor and recommended that music departments insist upon thorough training for all instructors and teaching assistants (p. 152). Teacher training aids prospective class piano teachers to be aware of the concept of class piano.

The problem of untrained instructors in the class piano program is further augmented with the assignment of the duty to teaching assistants. Sixty-one percent of class piano teaching assistants surveyed by Kim (1997) revealed that they found it more difficult to teach group piano than private piano. Fifty-eight percent of the teaching assistants felt that they were given little or no guidance from their faculty members. Skroch (1991) made a reference to Bean (1981) and Taylor (1976) who noted that class instructors were very often graduate students or studio teachers who were inadequately trained for group piano settings (p. 30). This notion was supported by Fink (1991) who stated that many music schools left the teaching to graduate teaching assistants who may or may not have the necessary experience or ability to do the job effectively. He stressed, “skill development is a highly individualized activity that requires thoughtful and innovative teaching and evaluation” and he therefore advised that “there be careful training and supervision of the graduate assistant teachers” (p. 12). This generalization applies to only certain types of institutions, however; those with funding for graduate assistantships.
Functional Skills versus Traditional Skills

It is important to know that group keyboard instruction is regarded as a music teaching tool and the curriculum content is focused on practical rather than performance skills (Uszler, 1992). Johnson (1987) stated, “The purpose of group instruction contrasts with that of traditional private instruction, the latter focusing primarily on various performance and interpretive skills” (p. 2). Johnson, therefore, recommended that instructors of group piano devote less class time to technical development and artistic skills and allow more class time for the development of functional skills.

Buchanan (1964) stressed that more attention to functional skills was needed if college piano teachers were to prepare students adequately for the students’ teaching situations, and these skills were seldom taught in private lessons. She stated that there is a need to emphasize functional skills and de-emphasize technique (such as scales) and repertoire.

Sonntag (1980) observed that the nature of piano requirements in the 24 responding teacher training institutions in the state of Ohio showed variation, lack of uniformity, and lack of standardization (p. 74). He speculated, “a great deal of emphasis is placed on levels of advancement in terms of ability to perform various types of standard literature ….. it is possible that over-emphasis on this type of requirement may account for the criticisms of respondents concerning the failure of their institutions to emphasize a practical knowledge and use of the keyboard for all music majors” (p. 75-76).

The controversy of establishing the objective of class piano instruction arose because not all group piano instructors agreed that it should focus on the development of
functional keyboard competence. According to Pace, (as cited in Lyke, 1968, p. 4-5), the
class piano program is responsible for instilling the concept of Comprehensive
Musicianship among music students whereby technique and repertoire are included in
addition to functional skills. He strongly believed that “musicianship does not preclude
repertoire and technique. Quite the contrary, students with a broad understanding will
have greater reason to develop more technic and to learn more repertoire” (Pace, 1964).
Bastien (1973) agreed with Pace to a certain degree. In his book How to Teach
Piano Successfully, Bastien states, “In the past, individual instruction relied almost
exclusively on the perfection of piano playing per se, and primary emphasis was given to
the study of repertoire and technic” (p. 285). While he was not advocating these areas in
favor of functional skills, Bastien advocated combining “traditional” and “functional”
styles of instruction in order to provide a solid keyboard foundation for the non-keyboard
music major (p. 286).

Even though it is ideal to include various aspects of music learning into the
classroom, Maris (2000) contended that the teacher must be selective and teach skills that
the student will find useful in future. She stated:

As we help students prepare for The Future – their future -- let us remember that
the purpose of education is not for students to learn everything they will need to
know and will need to be able to do (Maris, 2000, p. 33).

Information on class piano instructors’ training in group techniques and teaching
functional skills was documented in several studies. Hunter’s study (1973) revealed that
functional piano instructors did not have sufficient formalized training in teaching
functional piano skills. He disclosed that only three out of thirty-five instructors whom
he interviewed had specific training in functional piano skills (p. 112). Seventy-four out of ninety-eight instructors in Locke's study (1986) indicated that they had taken a college course or workshop in group piano pedagogy. However, only twenty-one had taken class lessons themselves. While studies by Hunter and Locke revealed a notably lack of teacher training in functional skills and group lessons, approximately two-thirds of the community college instructors surveyed by Osadchuk (1984) revealed that they had had some training in group piano pedagogy. Osadchuk suggested that there had been improvements in teacher training because of more available conferences and workshops.

Hierarchical Instruction versus Peer Instruction

The group setting, in contrast to private study, offers a wide variety of ways to interact. Besides communicating with the instructor, students can benefit from peer interaction which is both “supportive and profitable” (Silini, 1977). Through peer interaction, individual ideas are expanded and each student can select new ways of working from different models (Shockley, 1982, p. 108). This practice allows them to freely exhibit leadership qualities and learn from one another. When they are involved in decision-making, they take on a more active participation and thus learn better and perhaps quicker. Skaggs (1981) stated:

The procedure for group piano involves utilizing group dynamics – the student’s interaction through participation. In the hands of a skilled teacher, group dynamics creates the motivation to explore, discover, and finally learn (p. 265).
Using theories of famous philosophers such as William James and John Dewey, (the former advocating for pragmaticism and the latter discovery learning), Shockley (1982) asserted that these philosophers “stress the interaction of doing and learning; the teacher must be able to provide a rich variety of experiences to help students grasp ideas” (p. 105). It is therefore important that the teacher knows how to manipulate various forms of group strategies if he or she hopes to create an effective learning environment within the class piano situation. Bishop (1962) stated that the success of a group instruction is in the effectiveness of group effort and observation (p. 22). However, Lyke (1968) discovered that there was a general lack of student interaction during his observations (p. 74), an activity that allows peer learning and development of leadership and independence. Group interaction involves discussion, peer teaching, positive motivation through peer support and critical listening (Sheets, 1983, p. 35). Thus, the class piano instructor should allow sufficient opportunity for students to participate by sharing, evaluating and reaching conclusions.

The very basis for group instruction is in capturing the essence of helping others learn by resolving problems together. Shockley (1982) stressed:

..... an understanding of the learning process is acquired more easily in a group than in an individual lesson, since students see others utilizing abilities and ways of learning that are different from their own. Students discover that the same solution may not work for everyone but that all can learn from another’s experience. Conceptual thinking and intuitive processes are stimulated by the comparison of similar and different materials and styles, and new ideas emerge from the creative synthesis of individual perceptions (p. 107).
The unfortunate event that might take place in the classroom is when the instructor conducts the class piano instruction the way he or she would a private lesson. Skaggs (1981) asserted:

when the group lesson becomes a series of short private lessons, all the advantages of such study are nullified. A child in a group of six gets only ten minutes or even less; the results are grossly inferior to private study. Furthermore, the uninvolved students may become bored, daydream, or create a disturbance. Neglect may also occur when so many students are enrolled in the group, that each student does not have ample opportunity to participate. When interaction is at a minimum, learning is also at a minimum. Additionally, students in such a group may feel that the teacher is not personally interested in them (p. 267).

Evidently, the teacher must be skilled in handling group situations in order to facilitate interaction among students and allow them to capitalize on group instruction. Even a renowned applied teacher who does not understand this principle would not be effective as a group piano instructor. Lyke (1968) noted that more often than not, applied piano teachers who teach some sections of class piano “favor more traditional approaches to study and are not always qualified to teach groups” (p. 5).

According to Mehr (1968), group dynamics is a powerful learning force in a group setting (p. 50). Nagode also (1988) emphasized:

Of equal importance is the study of group dynamics and an awareness of how students learn within the group piano environment. Equipped with this knowledge, the prospective group piano instructor is able to develop teaching skills that foster effective patterns of interaction within the group setting. In addition to imparting knowledge and monitoring student progress, the group instructor should become thoroughly familiar with discovery learning as a way to develop student understanding. Highly developed communication skills and listening and questioning techniques are especially useful in this regard, and serve to stimulate and motivate student learning and creativity. The group piano instructor must also provide practical and efficient practice routines for students who are highly motivated musicians, but have minimal time for piano practice (p. 219).
The importance of group dynamics was discussed by Lyke (1968) who suggested that “class piano teachers should gain a better command of fundamental principles related to group dynamics and the psychology of learning. The most important principles need to be synthesized and adapted to class piano teaching in the college” (p. 120). He further added, “teachers employed in the future for class piano instruction … should be adequately trained in group techniques and extensive musicianship at the keyboard.

In support of the above statements, Lancaster (1979) stated:

A special skill is required in handling groups. The group must always be cohesive and able to work together. This does not necessarily mean that all people within the group be of the same intelligence and ability, but all students must be able to contribute to and profit from the class. This requires a strong background in educational psychology as well as group dynamics (p. 16).

An advocate for group learning through active involvement and sharing, Skaggs (1981) asserted:

Relaxed in a friendly setting, students participate in a give-and-take which is essential to learning. Most important of all, the stimulation of being part of a learning team provides motivation for practicing (p. 267).

Burkett (1982) discussed the advantages and challenges of the group piano teaching approach. His article provided a guide for teachers to make group classes more effective. Teachers must: 1) learn the psychological factors involved in learning, 2) group the students properly, 3) organize each lesson well, and 4) provide group leadership.

Typical pedagogy courses offered in colleges and universities prepare the piano major to be an independent piano teacher. However, a totally different approach is needed for group instruction and this will require some emphasis in pedagogy offerings.
Lancaster (1978) stated, “It is felt that current pedagogy courses generally do an adequate job in this [one-on-one] area, but that such training usually does not transfer to group teaching situation” (p. 2). In a separate article, Lancaster (1981) noted:

The teacher who has a strong background in group teaching techniques and materials can easily apply this to one-to-one instruction, whereas the teacher who has training and experience only in private teaching cannot necessarily handle a piano class effectively (p. 36).

Lancaster further advocated a specialist in pedagogy to coordinate the class piano program. He maintained, “the weakest college programs are often those where each faculty member teaches one or two classes with no interest in doing so, or no special training in group-teaching techniques” (p. 36). In support of more in-depth teacher training, Skaggs (1981) stated, “the class teacher’s training and background are essentially the same as the private teacher’s except that courses in group-teaching methods are recommended, as well as additional courses in education, psychology, and testing” (p. 269). Page (1973) also asserted that supervised learning of functional skills would aid in helping the prospective class piano instructor to familiarize with those practical skills:

Unless the student is given guided experiences in sight-reading, accompanying, score reading, harmonization, ensemble playing, transposition, and improvisation besides repertoire and technique, such skills [to function at the keyboard] may never be developed (Page, 1973, p. 20).

In a 1978 study, Lancaster reported that 38% of the class piano instructors surveyed in Illinois felt that their training failed to prepare them sufficiently for teaching. Skroch (1991, p. 28-29) reported that Bean (1981) found teacher training programs had not increased alongside the rate of increase in the number of piano classes. However,
Lancaster (1978) stated that more and more specialized training for the group piano instructor was offered as a result of realizing the inefficiency of teacher preparation for class piano instruction.

The expansion of the class piano program and the failure to generate trained specialists from teacher training institutions at the same rate necessitates private piano teachers and the applied faculty to be drafted into the college group piano position. According to Bastien (1973), “the most serious problem confronting group piano instruction is selecting the teacher. The advanced performing pianist is usually not equipped to teach class piano. The goals of group instruction are many times undermined by lack of training, lack of interest in the program, and lack of imagination and creativity on the part of the instructor” (p. 286). The private teacher who was drafted into teaching class piano resulted in inferior instruction compared to those of piano class specialists (Richards, 1962, p. 153). Lyke (1968) went to the extent to recommend removing teachers who are presently responsible for class instruction but not adequately trained or interested in this form of teaching and be replaced by class piano specialists (p. 121).

Gibbs, (as cited in Lancaster, 1978, p. 36) a former member of the MENC Piano Instruction Committee, commented on teacher training for group piano instruction:

The preparation of the class piano teacher is a never-ending task, and one which demands time, enthusiasm, energy, and patience. The process, however, is an interesting one and the rewards are commensurate with the demands. The person who does not like to teach should not attempt class piano, but the teacher who has caught the spirit of creative teaching will find the piano class an opportunity for a fascinating adventure (p. 17).
Lancaster (1979) followed up and made a strong statement, “any person who has doubts about whether he will enjoy teaching or not should not enter the group piano teaching profession” (p. 16). The importance of specialized training in group dynamics for the group teacher is also emphasized by Shockley (1982):

Perhaps the most striking feature of a group lesson is the dynamics, and this may be the area where the teacher needs the most specialized training. Although group dynamics operate in an individual lesson, they are more complex and powerful in a group, and the success of the lesson may depend largely on the teacher’s ability to understand them and utilize them constructively (p. 108).

During an interview with Kwon, Frances Larimer stated that the reason class piano developed a bad image was due to a lack of teacher training for such a class. Insufficient knowledge of the group teaching and learning process on the teacher’s part caused the class piano program to develop a poor reputation (Kwon, 2002, p. 16).

Sonntag (1980) also mentioned the differing views of applied piano teachers who favor tutorial approaches to study and are not always prepared to teach groups. The era has arrived when learning to play the piano typically through private instruction is combined with some kind of group instruction. The adamant piano teacher who believes that the private lesson is sufficient to train pianists is not only depriving himself or herself of the different modes of instruction but also depriving the student who will or may some day find himself involved in group teaching.

Amidst the skepticism on applied teachers and the lack of training in group teaching techniques and functional skills, there arise the issue concerning the college training of the applied instructor. Shockley (1982) revisited the curriculum of the piano majors and identified two areas that will familiarize piano majors with group teaching.
movement: (1) the extension of group instruction to college piano majors in the studio, and (2) specialized teacher training for group work. She stated, "these areas are importantly related, since studying in a group can be one of the most effective ways of training teachers, particularly if they are to teach groups" (p. 103). Besides observation and practice teaching in group and class techniques offered by pedagogy programs in colleges and universities, Shockley believed that "the first-hand experience of studying in a group gives a unique insight into the learning environment, and helps the prospective teacher relate to students in a group setting" (p. 103-104). She shared her own experience both with being involved with group learning as an advanced piano student and on her teaching experience with college piano majors:

...... students who learn in a group not only develop musically to a high degree but are more open to new ideas, more sensitive to others, more independent, and more enthusiastic about learning and teaching. Yet this kind of success depends largely on the teacher's effectiveness with groups, for which specialized training is essential (Shockley, 1982, p. 104).

Taylor (1985) believed that the quality of training in the undergraduate applied curricula and the successful application of knowledge acquired from the pedagogy courses to professional class teaching are two very important factors that will determine if graduates of applied curriculum are ready to teach class piano (p. 20). He further suggested that the piano major should familiarize with the class piano program by composing his own syllabus so that there is a realization of the long-term teaching goals as well as the short-term objectives of class piano instruction (p. 21).

Lyke (1968) recommended that college and university music departments devote immediate attention to the preparation of group piano teachers, that instructors hired to
teach piano classes be trained specialists, and that these instructors keep abreast of newer developments in the field, while improving their techniques in the teaching of neglected skills such as improvisation.

The importance of matching the job of a class piano instructor with the appropriate qualifications was further emphasized by Lancaster (1978) who advised administrators to hire group piano specialists and to require candidates applying for group piano position to give a class piano teaching demonstration as part of the interview process. This ensures that a qualified group piano instructor will be involved with the program rather than other instructors with pianistic skills who may not be familiar with functional keyboard skills or the handling of group procedures.

Since Richards’ suggestion (1962) for more materials to be made available for class instruction, the market has been flooded with materials for over 30 years since 1965. Some texts offer teacher’s guides that help with curriculum planning, sequencing, and pacing but not actual instruction. In addition to suggesting more materials to be designed for a group class setting, Richards also advocated additional pedagogy courses that will prepare the prospective class piano instructor. He remarked:

At the present time, a curious dichotomy lies in the fact that a number of universities offer piano classes as part of their applied piano program, but do not include group procedures in the pedagogy courses. Probably these courses are taught by private piano teachers without experience in group procedures (Richards, 1962, p. 156-157).

The beginning of the new millennium had seen numerous class piano texts being published. While no one text is completely sufficient in itself, responsibility falls on the
class piano instructor to select appropriate sequencing of the course and provide students sufficient amount of group interaction as well as individual practice in the classroom.

Nagode (1988) stated that many schools limit class size to between ten and fifteen students for first year classes, and between six and ten students for second year classes. He added that there appears to be direct correlation between class size and the effectiveness of group piano teaching: “Large class enrollments are more economically efficient but small class enrollments are usually more effective pedagogically” (p. 218). Unfortunately, budget restrictions often prevent class piano to be limited to a small number of students with whom instructors are comfortable working. Page (1973) found that class size of more than twelve students could be unmanageable because it hinders sufficient attention to student needs (p. 21).

Teacher Training

Teacher training includes internships, practicum, guided supervision, periodic faculty observation, videotaped observations, and team teaching. A group setting is an ideal setting for peer teaching, observation and evaluation. It is during teacher training that prospective teachers learn ways to manipulate group dynamics in order to apply the same principles to their teaching in future. Skaggs (1981) noted:

The group instructor is often a teacher of concepts, and elects the group approach in order to create opportunities for learning through active participation (group dynamics). In private lessons, the group teacher contends, the child is passive and learns only by imitation. According to some educational psychologists, learning by imitation is undesirable. They recommend that children explore and discover concepts under the teacher’s leadership so that they become thinking students rather than imitative ones. Essentially this is what the group teacher of concepts
strives for: the thinking, independent student, not one who constantly needs the teacher as a crutch. The group setting provides the means for developing such a student (p. 268).

Teacher training for group piano specialist, therefore, includes not only teaching skills that facilitate group dynamics, but also lesson planning that promotes discovery learning.

A survey sent to 49 public secondary Florida schools by McCalla (1989) revealed that not many class piano teachers reported having received either pre- or in-service preparation for class piano. Quite a number of teachers stated that the majority of their instructional time was spent working with individual students.

Teacher training involves a variety of activities. Lancaster (1978) reported:

The CMP Invitational Forum on the Graduate Education of College Music Teachers made recommendations concerning teacher training. Forum members concluded that the best way to learn to teach is to teach under the supervision of master teachers. Teaching experience can be gained through observation of model teachers working with music majors and general college students, micro-teaching, and internship programs. Supervised student teaching should involve a variety of concerns including applied music and music programs in community colleges. Such experiences can be provided in special courses and seminars, graduate and undergraduate on-campus classes and cooperative arrangements with community colleges and private music schools for off-campus teaching experience (p. 25-26).

Similar to other courses in the field of education, supervised student teaching is paramount over extensive lectures, discussions and survey of materials. When a student teacher gains the actual teaching experience, more is learned (Lancaster, 1981, p. 37). In addition, "guided experience" is needed for the training to be effective (Richards, 1964, p. 38). Frances Larimer added that the teaching practicum, supervision and observation of experts in group piano instruction are among other components that can properly train a group instructor (Kwon, 2002). She provided five components that should be included
in a pedagogy program for training prospective teachers: 1) learn how to evaluate
methods and teaching materials, 2) develop diagnostic skills, 3) understand the teaching
approaches, 4) observe master teachers at all levels of instruction, and 5) involve
supervised intern teaching (p. 16). In addressing teacher training in piano pedagogy
courses, Goss (1990) maintained that practice teaching should include “observing the
teaching of experienced teachers; practice teaching under supervision of a pedagogy
instructor; and regular, frequent evaluation of the pedagogy student’s practice teaching.”
She stated that the class piano coordinator should evaluate the student’s practice teaching
as frequently as possible, and comments and feedback given in the form of written
critiques or personal conferences (p. 27-28).

Summary

Many authors and researchers acknowledged that the objective of the class piano
program is to develop functional keyboard skills. Studies have shown that there is a
mismatch between skills taught in class piano and skills that students will actually use in
their career. This situation stemmed from the disagreement among applied instructors
and music educators regarding the degree of emphasis that should be placed on functional
skills and artistic skills in the class piano instruction. Other factors included the lack of
training in group techniques among the instructors who may not understand group
dynamics and thus conduct the group class like a private lesson. It is the intention of the
present study to investigate this situation and to find out the current practice of instructors
in the class piano program.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The Population and the Sample

The initial phase of the study involved a selection of group piano instructors listed in the College Music Society Directory of Music Faculties in Colleges and Universities, U.S. and Canada (2000-2001). This directory consists of higher education institutions in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and Canada that include two-year community colleges and four-year degree granting colleges and universities. This directory was chosen because class piano programs share a common objective regardless of the type of institution: to train functional keyboard skills. Therefore, community colleges and universities were included in the study to determine if there is a difference in teacher emphasis on functional skills and use of group teaching techniques. Out of a total of 1568 names listed under “Group Piano,” 32 were from Canada and 5 from Puerto Rico. These 37 names were eliminated since this study is primarily concerned with instructors within the United States. The population for this study was hence 1471 group piano instructors at colleges and universities in the United States. To avoid biasness, a random sampling was performed. Numbers were first assigned to the alphabetically ordered last names of the remaining group piano instructors in the list (1471). To obtain
a level of confidence of about 95% the determination of sample size was decided at 600 (Rea & Parker, 1997, p, 121). A total of 600 subjects were then randomly selected by using the Random Access Generator from a scientific calculator in the form of a fraction. Because the population exceeded one thousand, the fraction was multiplied with 1471 in order to include numbers above one thousand. The number that would eventually be produced is in percentage. In the event that decimal numbers were generated, the truncation method of a whole number was used. Throughout this sampling process, the recurring whole numbers that had already been selected were skipped and replaced by generating new numbers. Beside each name of the instructor is listed institutional code for the corresponding teacher. This code was then matched to the institution in which each chosen prospective participant teaches. In order to obtain electronic contact addresses of the recruited subjects, the researcher visited the school’s website. If there was no information on electronic mail, calls were made to solicit their participation. In addition, eighteen names that did not appear in the list were also invited to participate.

The Research Instrument

The research was conducted by means of an online questionnaire survey. The first part of the questionnaire was designed to obtain general information: the name of the institution, whether or not the respondents were teaching class piano at the time of the survey and if the piano classes were limited to non-keyboard music majors developing functional keyboard skills.

The questionnaire consisted of four sections, namely, academic credentials, teaching responsibilities and program information, teacher preparation, and current
instructional practice. Respondents were requested to indicate their educational background (highest degree held, their area of specialization and keyboard-related courses and courses in which they learned as a member of a group), teacher preparation (courses in group teaching techniques for class piano and courses that include specific training in how to teach functional piano skills, workshops and conferences attended), teaching responsibilities (teaching assignments/load and type of appointment), program information (number of class piano instructors and number of class piano sections, class size, use of equipment) and current instructional practice in group dynamics and values in functional keyboard skills (the list was adapted from James Lyke's study in 1968). Participants were also asked to indicate their competency in group teaching skill and performing and teaching specific functional keyboard skills. They were also requested to provide information concerning their teaching experience and factors that might have changed their attitudes regarding class piano. Additionally, the questionnaire asked graduate teaching assistants about types of supervision from their coordinators. A copy of the survey instrument can be found in Appendix A.

Collection of Data

A personal recruitment letter/cover letter together with the link of questionnaire was sent to the 600 randomly selected group piano instructors via electronic mail (Appendix B). Respondents gained access to the website for the questionnaire by clicking on a link. To respond, they performed tasks such as clicking on buttons (which only allows one answer to the question), checking on boxes (multiple answers possible), pulling down to select the correct response and also writing comments in the space
provided. A number of early replies indicated that a substantial number of instructors were no longer teaching class piano. Other typical comments indicated that either they had already retired, or they were not class piano instructors. However, most of these contacts indicated that they will forward or had already forwarded the request to the appropriate faculty member. To ensure a proper follow-up, the name and electronic mail address of these potential participants were requested. A number of the electronic mails were returned because of failed delivery. In this instance, further random sampling was carried out to make up a total of 600 individuals. When there were no further available choices, invitations to participate in the study were sent to group piano instructors who were known to be teaching class piano, but whose names did not appear on the College Music Society group piano list. A total of eighteen names were generated outside of the list. The first electronic mailing was sent out on January 30, 2002.

Responses that were submitted by the participants were stored in an electronic database and presented in the form of excel spreadsheet. To insure confidentiality, the identities of the respondents were masked. This is particularly necessary since electronic mail replies show the identity of the sender. Individual names were replaced with identity numbers instead. One participant requested a hard copy of the questionnaire because she was not able to open the link to the online questionnaire. Her response to the questionnaire was promptly completed and returned.

It was possible to check on the return rate periodically through a link that performed immediate update. Two hundred twenty-nine responses (38.17 percent) were received from the first send-out. A follow-up letter was sent on February 14, 2002 through electronic mail to the individuals who did not indicate that they have completed
and submitted their responses (Appendix C). This reminder yielded another 106 responses (17.67 percent) making a grand total of 335 responses (55.83 percent).

A minimum of fifty percent return rate was satisfactory for the purpose of this study. The survey was officially closed on February 28, 2002 and any response received after the date was discarded. As the data were being processed, invalid and unusable responses (31 responses) were further eliminated from the pool of respondents. These included responses from participants who were not teaching group piano classes and those whose institutions do not offer class piano that are specifically designed to develop functional keyboard skills for non-keyboard music majors. This event reduced the return rate to 50.67 percent which was still considered acceptable. Therefore, the results reported in this study are based on a total number of 304 responses. Data were processed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) software to obtain both descriptive and inferential statistical information.

Respondents had the option of revealing or withholding the name of their institution in order to protect their anonymity. Out of the 304 responses, 235 (77.30 percent) participants chose to provide that information. Sixty-nine returns (22.70 percent) submitted their replies without the name of the institution and therefore cannot be included in Table 1:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Survey Response Rate by State

continued
Table 1 cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the names of schools (when given/available), it can be deduced that forty-five states were represented in this study. Non-participating states or participating states which were not indicated by the respondent were Connecticut, Hawaii, Utah, Vermont, and Delaware in addition to District of Columbia. A complete list of participating institutions can be found in Appendix D. One hundred seventeen instructors expressed an interest in the study and wished to be informed of the results.

Responding institutions were categorized according to The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (2000 edition). The following categories are colleges and universities in the United States that are degree-granting and accredited by an agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education (Category Definitions, 2000):

Doctorate-granting Institutions

**Doctoral/Research Universities – Extensive:** These institutions typically offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs, and they are committed to graduate education
through the doctorate. During the period studied, they awarded 50 or more doctoral degrees per year across at least 15 disciplines.

**Doctoral/Research Universities – Intensive:** These institutions typically offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs, and they are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. During the period studied, they awarded at least ten doctoral degrees per year across three or more disciplines, or at least 20 doctoral degrees per year overall.

**Master’s Colleges and Universities**

**Master’s Colleges and Universities I:** These institutions typically offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs, and they are committed to graduate education through the master’s degree. During the period studied, they awarded 40 or more master’s degrees per year across three or more disciplines.

**Master’s Colleges and Universities II:** These institutions typically offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs, and they are committed to graduate education through the master’s degree. During the period studied, they awarded 20 or more master’s degrees per year.

**Baccalaureate Colleges**

**Baccalaureate Colleges – Liberal Arts:** These institutions are primarily undergraduate colleges with major emphasis on baccalaureate programs. During the period studied, they awarded at least half of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts fields.

**Baccalaureate Colleges – General:** These institutions are primarily undergraduate colleges with major emphasis on baccalaureate programs. During the period studied, they awarded less than half of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts fields.

**Baccalaureate Colleges – Associate’s Colleges:** These institutions are undergraduate colleges where the majority of conferrals are below the baccalaureate level (associate’s degrees and certificates). During the period studied, bachelor’s degrees accounted for at least ten percent of undergraduate awards.

**Associate’s Colleges**

These institutions offer associate’s degree and certificate programs but, with few exceptions, award no baccalaureate degrees. This group includes institutions where, during the period studied, bachelor’s degrees represented less than 10 percent of all undergraduate awards.
Specialized Institutions

These institutions offer degrees ranging from the bachelor's to the doctorate, and typically award a majority of degrees in a single field. The list includes only institutions that are listed as separate campuses in the 2000 Higher Education Directory. Specialized institutions include:

_Theological seminaries and other specialized faith-related institutions:_ These institutions primarily offer religious instruction or train members of the clergy.

_Medical schools and medical centers:_ These institutions award most of their professional degrees in medicine. In some instances, they include other health professions programs, such as dentistry, pharmacy, or nursing.

_Other separate health profession schools:_ These institutions award most of their degrees in such fields as chiropractic, nursing, pharmacy, or podiatry.

_Schools of engineering and technology:_ These institutions award most of their bachelor's or graduate degrees in technical fields of study.

_Schools of business and management:_ These institutions award most of their bachelor's or graduate degrees in business or business-related programs.

_Schools of art, music, and design:_ These institutions award most of their bachelor's or graduate degrees in art, music, design, architecture, or some combination of such fields.

_Schools of law:_ These institutions award most of their degrees in law.

_Teachers colleges:_ These institutions award most of their bachelor's or graduate degrees in education or education-related fields.

_Other specialized institutions:_ Institutions in this category include graduate centers, maritime academies, military institutes, and institutions that do not fit any other classification category.

Information gathered from the questionnaire was tabulated and analyzed. This information will be presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Presentation of the Data

*Types of Institutions according to the Carnegie Classification*

Data presented in the first section of this chapter concern institutional information. They are based on the total number of participating institutions (N=197). These 197 participating institutions fell into the following categories of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education: fifty-one (25.89 percent) doctorate-granting institutions, seventy-four (37.56 percent) master’s colleges and universities, thirty-five (17.77 percent) baccalaureate colleges, thirty (15.23 percent) associate’s colleges and four (2.03 percent) specialized institutions. Three responding institutions were not categorized.

The largest response was received from master’s colleges and universities (37.56 percent) while the smallest response was received from specialized institutions (2.03 percent).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Number of Responding Institutions</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate-granting Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Research Universities – Extensive</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Research Universities – Intensive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Colleges and Universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Colleges and Universities I</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Colleges and Universities II</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges – Liberal Arts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges – General</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate/Associate’s Colleges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Colleges</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 69 participants did not provide the name of the institution and 5 respondents were from institutions that are not categorized in the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

Table 2: Classification of Higher Education Institutions

The three institutions that were not categorized in the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education were not included in Table 2.
The following section is based on the total number of respondents (N=304). Respondents were asked if they used an electronic piano lab for class piano instruction. Almost all the participating instructors (98.36 percent) reported that they used an electronic piano lab. Only five respondents stated that they did not employ electronic keyboards in class piano instruction. Class size taught by these five instructors ranged from four to fifteen students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Electronic Keyboards</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors using labs</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>98.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors not using labs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Employment of Electronic Keyboards in a Piano Lab

One question was asked to find out the number of electronic pianos available in the piano lab. Some labs contained as few as six but as high as forty. The average number of electronic keyboards in the piano lab was fourteen (13.80).

Teaching Responsibilities

When asked to indicate the type of academic appointment held by the respondents, a large majority of the class piano instructors indicated that they were full-time faculty (183 or 60.9 percent), while part-time faculty comprised sixty-three or 20.7 percent. Only thirty-nine (12.8 percent) graduate teaching assistants responded to the
survey. Other appointments included 3/4 time adjunct, artist-in-residence, visiting Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer, Department Chair and Director of Piano Studies. The breakdown is presented in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Teaching Assistants</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 5 or 1.6 percent of participants did not respond to the question.

Table 4: Number of Faculty and Graduate Teaching Assistants

The questionnaire also asked to which faculty class piano teachers belonged and if they were also pedagogy instructors. One hundred eighty-two (59.9 percent) indicated that they were class piano coordinators. Of all class piano instructors (N=304), one hundred thirty-five (74.2 percent) noted that they belonged to the applied faculty while sixty-five (35.7 percent) stated that they were also pedagogy instructors. Less than ten percent (17 or 9.3 percent) were music education faculty. Quite a number stated their responsibility as Accompanist, followed by Theory Faculty and Chairperson. It should be noted that applied piano faculty (135 or 74.2 percent) by far outnumbered the music education faculty (17 or 9.3 percent) who taught class piano. Table 5 summarizes the current responsibilities of class piano coordinators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator/Supervisor of class piano</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy Instructor</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Piano Faculty</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education Faculty</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Responsibilities at the Institution

Class piano coordinators (N=182) came from different areas of specialization. One question asked instructors about the area of specialization in which they earned their degrees. Almost forty percent of them (71 or 39.0 percent) noted that performance was their major. A combination of performance and pedagogy major was held by fifty-two (28.6 percent) followed by pedagogy majors (22 or 12.1 percent). Coordinators who majored in music education comprised only 4.9 percent of the total number of class piano coordinators. Other areas of specialization included accompanying, choral music, Suzuki Piano Instruction and church music. Table 6 shows the education background of the class piano instructors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Specialization</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance/Pedagogy</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Composition</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2 instructors (or 1.1 percent) did not respond to this question.

Table 6: Education Background of Class Piano Coordinators

Also interesting was to find out the percentage of class piano instruction within the total teaching load. Table 7 presents a comparison of percentage of teaching load in class piano between full-time and part-time faculty with graduate teaching assistant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Piano as Total Teaching Load</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Full-time Faculty</th>
<th>Part-time Faculty</th>
<th>Graduate Assistant</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-99%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-74%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24% or less</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 5 instructors did not respond to the question.

Table 7: Proportion of Class Piano Within the Teaching Load of Faculty and Graduate Teaching Assistants
Ninety-three respondents (30.59 percent) stated that class piano constituted less than 24 percent of their teaching load. Of this ninety-three, eighty or 86.02 percent were full-time faculty members. Class piano was a small portion of the full-time faculty’s teaching load. Instructors whose teaching load of class piano was 100 percent were mostly part-time faculty. They comprised almost one-half (13 or 46.43 percent) whose teaching load was totally class piano.

When respondents were asked the number of class piano sections they were currently teaching, about one-third (103 or 33.9 percent) reported just one section. Eighty-one respondents (26.6 percent) stated two sections, while fifty (16.4 percent) noted three sections. Seventy (23.0 percent) claimed that they were responsible for teaching at least four sections in the current school term. This information is displayed in Table 8 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of sections</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Number of Class Piano Sections that Instructors were Teaching
In addition to class piano, respondents whose responsibility was not totally in
class piano indicated other courses that they taught as well. From the responses received,
it was evident that it was very typical for class piano instructors to teach more than one
course. Results showed that over two hundred participants (209 or 68.8 percent) were
applied piano teachers. Seventy-seven respondents (25.3 percent) stated that they taught
piano pedagogy. Music theory instructors (66 or 21.7 percent) and
accompanying/chamber music instructors (64 or 21.1 percent) were also class piano
instructors. Other courses that were taught by class piano instructors included applied
organ, applied harpsichord, aural skills, choir, music technology, piano ensemble and
church music. Table 9 shows a listing of courses taught by class piano instructors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Piano</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Pedagogy</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Literature</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Theory</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music History/Appreciation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying/Chamber Music</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Additional Courses Taught by Class Piano Instructors

Respondents who were coordinators of class piano were asked to indicate the
number of instructors who were teaching class piano at their institution. Even though
there were one hundred eighty-two or 59.9 percent (Table 5) who identified themselves
as coordinators, two hundred two responded to this question. The data reported here is based on the total number of respondents who identified themselves as class piano coordinators (N=182) and not based on the number of instructors who answered this question. By splitting the data and finding out the returns who were coordinators and matching them with their responses to the number of instructors at their institution, the following was found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Instructors</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six or more</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>177</td>
<td><strong>97.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 5 class piano coordinators (2.7 percent) did not indicate the number of class piano instructors.

Table 10: Number of Class Piano Instructors in an Institution

Sixty-two supervisors (34.1 percent) stated that there was only one class piano instructor at their respective institutions. Only a small number (15 or 8.2 percent) reported that there were six or more instructors who taught class piano. Class piano supervisors (N=182) were also asked to indicate the average enrollment for a typical class piano section. One hundred seventy-five supervisors (96.2 percent) responded and 7 (3.8 percent) did not reply to the question. The figures they provided ranged from 3 to 24, but
the average class size was 10 students (9.9). Also, when all respondents (N=304) were asked the maximum number of students enrolled in one section of class piano, over half of the respondents (164 or 53.9 percent) indicated that they taught 7-12 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 – 6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 12</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 and above</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Maximum Enrollment in One Section of Class Piano

_Academic Background_

Information concerning the instructor’s academic background included their highest degree, area of emphasis, and teacher training. Data presented in this section was based upon the total number of respondents whose institutions offered courses specially designed to develop functional keyboard skills for non-keyboard music majors and who were currently teaching class piano (N=304).

In the earlier section of this chapter, information regarding the coordinator’s area of specialization was presented (please see Table 6). The following information concerns splitting the areas of specialization of all class piano instructors by the levels of degree. Of the 304 respondents, a total of one hundred forty respondents (46.05 percent) who taught class piano at their institution held a Master’s degree. One hundred thirty-six or 44.73 percent indicated that they held a doctorate degree and twenty-eight or 9.21 percent
who replied held a Bachelor's degree. One hundred twenty-two (40.13 percent) instructors specialized in performance followed by performance/pedagogy (85 or 27.96 percent) while 35 instructors (11.51 percent) had a pedagogy degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Specialization</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and Pedagogy</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Composition</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2 Bachelor's degree holder and 2 Master's degree holder did not indicate area of emphasis.

Table 12: Highest Degree Held by Class Piano Instructors

Participants (N=304) were asked if they had taken courses in group techniques for class piano and courses that included specific training in how to teach functional piano skills. One hundred sixty-eight participants (55.3 percent) reported that they had taken courses in group techniques while one hundred ninety-two of the instructors (63.2 percent) noted that they had taken courses that specifically trained them how to teach functional piano skills. These figures are summarized in Table 13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Teaching Techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Taken</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Piano Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Taken</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Teacher Training from Coursework

When asked to rate their competence in group piano teaching on a five-point scale (1 being the least competent and 5 being the most competent), one hundred seventy or 55.9 percent noted that they were most competent in this area. When requested to rate their competence in performing and teaching functional piano skills on a scale of 1 to 5, one hundred seventy-six or 57.9 percent noted that they were most competent in performing, while one hundred seventy-two or 56.6 percent indicated a 5 in competence with teaching functional piano skills. More than half of the instructors felt confident of and competent in their instructional skills in class piano.

In attempting to answer the question as to what areas were included in piano pedagogy courses instructors had taken, the results were revealed in Table 14. Of the 304 participants, two hundred fifty (82.2 percent) stated that they covered survey of materials and repertoire. Observation of a group master teacher, which is considered an important aspect in teacher preparation, showed a relatively high percentage (67.1 percent). Peer teaching and supervised internship seemed to indicate a less favored coverage in piano
pedagogy courses (51.3 percent and 49.3 percent respectively). Quite a startling finding was that five of the instructors commented that piano pedagogy course was never part of their education or training: “Have not taken pedagogy class,” “I haven’t taken any,” “Never took piano pedagogy class,” are some of the comments and two respondents mentioned “none.” A small number cited observation of peers and survey of learning theories were included in the pedagogy course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey of Materials and Repertoire</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Teaching</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised Internship</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation of a Group Master Teacher</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Components Covered in Piano Pedagogy Courses

Shockley (1982) stated that potential group teachers should experience group learning in order to understand the principle of group dynamics. The questionnaire asked two separate questions in which instructors were requested to indicate which courses they had taken and which were group classes. Even though the 295 class piano teachers who responded claimed that they had taken some kind of keyboard-related courses, there were varying degrees to which those courses were conducted in a group setting (Table 15).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Taken</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Courses Learned in A Group</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Piano</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>Applied Piano</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Pedagogy</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>Piano Pedagogy</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard Harmony</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>Keyboard Harmony</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Sight Reading</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>Piano Sight Reading</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>Accompanying</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Music</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>Chamber Music</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 9 did not respond to the question. * 28 did not respond to this question.

Table 15: Comparison between Courses Taken and Courses Learned in a Group

The widest disparity was noted in the applied piano course. While it had the highest number of respondents who took this keyboard-related course (287 or 94.4 percent), the least number of respondents (56 or 18.4 percent) indicated a group learning environment within the instruction. Respondents who answered “other” for courses in which respondents learned as a member of the group were not considered because of the lack of homogeneity. These courses included piano literature, group piano pedagogy and jazz improvisation. One participant noted, “mostly learned all skills as private student, however, accompanying is an on task type skill.” Other keyboard-related courses that instructors had taken included piano literature, applied organ, applied harpsichord, advanced group piano, Suzuki Piano Training, score reading, and group piano pedagogy.

A question inquired about the factors that changed teachers’ views and values related to class piano instruction. The result revealed that almost ninety-five percent of
instructors (287 or 94.4 percent) indicated teaching experience to be one of the factors.

Interaction with faculty colleagues (139 or 45.7 percent) and reports from former students
(124 or 40.8 percent) also played a major role in changing their attitudes regarding class
piano instruction. Table 16 shows this information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate coursework</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate coursework</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing education/workshop participation</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with faculty colleagues</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports from former students</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 5 or 1.6% did not respond to this question

Table 16: Educational Experiences that Changed Views and Values on Class Piano Instruction

Other factors supplied by the respondents included “appreciation of group
dynamics,” “desire to reinforce understanding of theory,” “doctoral coursework in music
education,” “knowing needs of music educators in the classroom,” “mentors in the group
piano field,” “NASM (National Association of Schools of Music) requirements (national
standards),” “reading published materials concerning group piano instruction” and
“survey of music educators in the field.”
Teaching Experience

Since so many instructors attributed teaching experience as an important factor in how one perceives class piano instruction, it was considered appropriate to look at the instructors’ length of teaching experience. Information gathered for teaching experience (in years) revealed that the largest number of class piano instructors (88 or 28.9 percent) had more than 20 years of teaching experience. Only two respondents (0.7 percent) indicated one year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Span of Years</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 1 year</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year to 5 years</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years to 10 years</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years to 15 years</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years to 20 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 20 years</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Length of Teaching Experience of Class Piano Instructors

Further information on teaching experience was cross-analyzed on full-time and part-time faculty as well as graduate teaching assistants. The majority of experienced teachers were full-time faculty (74 or 84.1 percent). Part-time faculty information indicated that the distribution was more spread out. Graduate teaching assistants had been teaching at most 5 to 10 years, but the majority of them (24 or 61.5 percent) fell in the range of 1 to 5 years teaching experience. This information is displayed in Table 18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Span of Years</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Graduate TA</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year to 5 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years to 10 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year to 15 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 year to 20 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 20 years</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 5 participants did not respond to the question.

Table 18: Years of Teaching Experience of Faculty and Graduate Teaching Assistants

**Current Teaching Assistants**

The following section is based on the number of graduate teaching assistants who responded to the questionnaire (N=39). Questions for current graduate teaching assistants pertained to their training as a class piano instructor. The number of observations provided by their class piano coordinators was reported to be ranging from 0 to 15 times annually. Of the 39 instructors who indicated their role as a graduate teaching assistant, about one-quarter (10 or 25.6 percent) stated that they received two observations from their coordinators per year. Eight (20.5 percent) received none at all, six (15.4 percent) received four observations, and five (12.0 percent) received one.

Teaching assistants generally received feedback from the coordinators in the form of written comments and/or verbal consultations. Thirty-two of them (82.1 percent)
stated that verbal comments were more popular. Fourteen (35.9 percent) received written comments while other means of feedback were from student evaluations.

While most of the teaching assistants felt that the amount of guidance from the supervisor was just adequate (28 or 71.8 percent), nine (23.1 percent) wished that they had received more guidance. Only a small portion (2 or 5.1 percent) thought that they had more guidance than necessary from their coordinator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed by supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Observed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written reports</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal consultation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance from supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More guidance preferred</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less guidance preferred</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Modes of Supervision for Graduate Teaching Assistants
Modes of Group Instruction

A question was designed to find out the various types of instructional modes frequently used in the class piano setting. Results revealed that class piano instructors most frequently use the following modes, in descending order:

a. Instructor presents new material to entire group, calling on individuals for short responses (261 or 85.9 percent)
b. Entire class performs in unison (236 or 77.6 percent)
c. Instructor gives mini lessons to individual students while other students practice independently (218 or 71.7 percent)

A moderate pool of participants treated the following modes of instruction to a fair amount:

a. Individual students perform assigned exercises or repertoire while other students listen (185 or 60.9 percent)
b. Using the headsets, individual students play along with the instructor hearing themselves and the instructor (163 or 53.6 percent)

The least popularly used instructional modes are as follows:

a. Entire class is divided into small groups playing different parts (139 or 45.7 percent)
b. Entire class is divided in half or small groups for antiphonal performances (129 or 42.4 percent)
c. Entire class is divided into small groups playing in unison (115 or 37.8 percent)

Respondents were also given some space to list other activities they use in the classroom. These included “balance of individual and group work,” “group improvisations led by teacher; one student teaches another in guided setting,” and “peer evaluation.” There were also those who included paired interaction/partner set ups: “students work as partners for specific assignments – improvisation, harmonization, transposition, etc.,” “students work in pairs and quiz each other” and “students perform individually or in
pairs while other students play muted.” Rather surprising, however, is the fact that a
couple of comments are as such: “each student receives private instruction,” and “private
individual mini-lessons.”

*Ratings of Functional Skills*

Respondents were requested to rate from one to five (one being the minimum and
five being the maximum) emphasis placed on eighteen functional skills in class piano
instruction. The means of these ratings were compared to the mean ratings of ideal skills
that class piano instructors should possess (Table 20).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Skills</th>
<th>Average Rating on Importance for the Ideal Instructor</th>
<th>Average Rating on Degree of Emphasis in Class / (Ranking)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sight Reading</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.59 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonization</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.44 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Listening</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.99 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chord Progressions</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.32 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Exercises</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.37 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.70 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repertoire Study</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.03 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Style Concepts</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.70 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble Playing</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.82 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Analysis</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.68 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposition of Keyboard Music</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.55 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.35 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Open Choral Scores</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.36 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing by Ear</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.11 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulation</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.94 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Open Instrumental Scores</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.97 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposing Instrumental Parts</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.97 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization of Figured Bass</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.81 (18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Instructor’s Ratings of Skills that They Believed are Important for an Ideal Class Piano Instructor and Their Degree of Emphasis on Functional Skills in Class
It can be observed that the functional skills that were most emphasized in class piano were: Sight reading (4.59), harmonization (4.44), technical exercises (4.37), chord progressions (4.32), repertoire study (4.03) and critical listening (3.99). The least emphasized functional skills included realization of figured bass (2.81), modulation (2.94), reading open instrumental scores and transposing instrumental parts (2.97), playing by ear (3.11), improvisation (3.35) and reading open choral scores (3.36).

The mean ratings of important skills for the ideal class piano instructor and mean ratings of emphasis on functional skills in class piano instruction were compared to each other using Pearson Product Moment Correlation procedures. Results revealed that a high positive correlation existed between the two mean ratings ($r = 0.97$). The correlation coefficient is significant at the .01 alpha level.

The questionnaire also asked instructors what functional keyboard skills they thought students would be most likely to use in the future. Instead of clicking on buttons, checking on boxes, and pulling down to select the correct response, instructors were requested to write in the space provided on the online questionnaire. Sight reading skill was repeatedly cited. Almost one-half of the respondents (46.38 percent) stated its importance for students. Instructors also thought that their students would find harmonization (90 listed) and accompanying skills (77 listed) to be beneficial. A complete listing can be found in Table 21.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Skills</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sight Reading</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>46.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonization</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>29.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Score Reading</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposition</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing by Ear</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chord Progression</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Exercises</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Analysis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Listening</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repertoire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style Concepts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble Playing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Practical Skills Class Piano Instructors Believed Students would be Most Likely to Use in the Future
Sight reading and harmonization were skills that appeared consistently on the top of the list. This is true for skills important for the ideal class piano instructor, most emphasized skills and skills that students need. It was very interesting to note, though, that most respondents were aware that playing repertoire is not a skill that their students in class piano would use after they graduated. Only five respondents listed repertoire study as a practical skill for their students. There was an apparent discrepancy between the degree of emphasis on repertoire and the opinion about how much students would need this skill. Apparently, class piano teachers did not teach skills that they knew were relevant or useful for their students, but (with exception to harmonization) taught skills that were similar to those covered in a typical private studio lesson. Accompanying ranked third in practicality but was ranked ninth down the list on the degree of emphasis in class piano. Also, open score reading that was ranked fourth in practicality was ranked twelfth (choral score reading) and sixteenth (instrumental score reading) in the degree of emphasis in class. The only two skills that remained consistent at the top two notches were sight reading and harmonization.

At the last part of the questionnaire, respondents were given a chance to make comments about their strengths and weaknesses related to functional skills. From the following comments, it appeared that instructors in general were least comfortable with improvisation. Weaknesses in improvisation came up repeatedly as respondents cited their areas that need improvement.

“I do not do much with structured improvisation because that is not one of my skills. I should do more. I do a lot of eartraining and melody harmonization. I emphasize keeping a steady beat no matter the skill level. I work with ensemble playing a lot. I also emphasize sightreading by intervals, not always reading the notes.”
“I’m not very comfortable with improvisation – it’s something the students enjoy and I wish I could provide them with more concrete suggestions on how they could feel comfortable with improvisation.”

“I would like to feel more comfortable teaching students to improvise. I feel most comfortable teaching skills and drills like scales, progressions, etc. Am also comfortable teaching sight reading.”

Even though this question asked for weaknesses and strengths relating to their personal functional skills, respondents took the opportunity to express their feelings about teaching class piano. As reflected by one comment below, not all class piano instructors enjoy teaching this medium of instruction.

“I think I’m on the whole quite good at teaching all the skills listed above but the truth is: I actually don’t enjoy teaching Class Piano. I have a D.M.A. in Piano Performance and did not set out to specialize in Class Piano. However, it comes with the territory, so to speak. I teach a rigorous course and expect students to work hard but I would be very happy not to have to continue to teach the course.”

One statement supported the fact that group piano instruction was not fully realized because it was conducted much the same as a private instruction:

“I am most pleased with the results I achieve in our Class Piano Program – working with individuals one on one is a vast improvement over the “class” approach. Our students become more competent in less time.”

The following comments from respondents indicated that personal weakness often affected the degree of emphasis on selected functional. In addition, respondents revealed their lack of experience in playing and teaching functional skills:

“In all honesty, the items which I ranked lower are probably those which I am least qualified to teach. However, they have not been emphasized in any of my coursework, nor in the three group piano programs in which I have taught, so I haven’t had as much chance to develop those skills. I also think these skills (improv., figured bass, modulation, playing by ear) are less useful to future music educators and performers than the other items listed.”
“Age and experience has a lot to do with competence and success. The longer I have worked at it the more I improve. The classroom is always a learning experience for the teacher. The things I feel weaker or more insecure on are the things I don’t spend as much time on. Unfortunately time is an element and you are limited to what you are able to accomplish in a one-semester class setting.”

“In teaching, I would like to improve transposition, ensemble playing, improvisation and harmonization skills in students. These areas are ones in which I have had less instruction and experience myself.”

“Strengths – analysis of scores, chord progressions and harmonization, transposition, repertoire. Weaknesses – ensembles, figured bass, transposing instruments, choral scores – I have had less experience with teaching these items.”

Ineffective use of class time was demonstrated by the comment below:

“I think that it would be good if I could spend more time “creatively.” Too often, I am checking homework, or helping individual students while others go on practicing, or are bored and start doing other things (write in their date book, do other homework …). I do feel that I am fairly good at stressing theory in what the students are learning, so it is easier for them to relate it to other music classes.”

Numerous respondents expressed concern over the limited amount of time available to teach all the skills equally well:

“I would like to do more with ensemble playing in the classes but time often does not permit that.”

“I am least comfortable with the areas of modulation and improvisation; however, I would like to move with these IF we had more class time.”

“I would improve the program by adding more semesters of study; there is no other way I can jam more into this time frame without risking solid skill building. My philosophy is this: I would rather students come away with a solid understanding of a few major concepts, than a fly-over experience in which they retain almost nothing.”

“I am able to do all the items listed well but find it difficult to try to do so many things in the time frame of the class. I have elected to eliminate some items from the list in order for students to have a higher level of competency at the items our music ed and piano faculty have agreed upon as being the most important skills.”
“I need to allow for more time for improvisation and playing by ear. We seem to always run out of time in class piano and these are the first activities that go.”

“There’s not time to do justice to each skill that is important. The teacher hopes that the students will take the skills practiced in class and develop them on their own for their own specific needs.”

“Weaknesses = try to do too much in a limited amount of time.”

“Strengths: Performing pianist, perfect pitch, all of these items above are no problem for me, but are not easy to teach in the short time allotted each semester (two 50 min classes per week, especially with non-keyboard students.”

“Weakness – feeling that we never have enough time to really cover as much as I would like to, or really well enough.”

“I wish I had more time in my course to be able to teach more in depth.”

“If we had more class time, I would love to include more improvisation.”
Analysis of the Data

An analysis of the sampling revealed that the response rate from each type of higher education institution was inconsistent when compared to the number of institutions from each category of the sample. There was notably a smaller return percentage from the associate’s colleges, probably because of the small number of institutions that offer group piano programs, a mixture of music and non-music majors within the class piano program (all of which were removed from the valid data), or perhaps that class piano instructors from this category were less interested in research and therefore did not choose to participate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Institutions</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires Received</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate-granting Institutions</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Colleges</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>3312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There was more than one instructor from each institution who answered the questionnaire. However, each institution was only considered/counted once.

Table 22: Validity Check on Responding Institutions
Educational Background on Skills Emphasis

Respondents with different areas of specialization were requested to rate from a five-point scale (one being the minimum emphasis and five being the maximum emphasis) the degree of emphasis they placed on the eighteen functional keyboard skills.

To determine if there was a significant difference among seven areas of specialization (performance, pedagogy, performance/pedagogy, theory/composition, musicology, music education and other) on the 18 functional skills, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted. A significant difference was found for sight reading among the seven areas: \( F(6, 284) = 2.08, p = .05 \) (please see Table 23). It should be noted, however, that only a small number of musicology majors were represented in this study and the finding might possibly be idiosyncratic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ANOVA on Sight Reading</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Specialization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: One-way ANOVA on Sight Reading by Area of Specialization
The sample means and standard deviations are presented in Table 24, which shows that participants with performance/pedagogy as their area of specialization rated significantly higher on sight reading emphasis than respondents with a musicology major (performance/pedagogy majors, \( M = 4.64, \text{SD} = 0.69 \) and musicology majors, \( M = 3.71, \text{SD} = 1.50 \)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Specialization</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance/Pedagogy</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Composition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24: Means and Standard Deviations of Sight Reading by Area of Specialization

An additional intent of the study was to find out if there was a significant difference in all 18 skills when instructors with music education major were compared to those with performance and combination of pedagogy and performance/pedagogy majors. The null hypothesis stated that there was no significant difference among the new areas of specialization. Results were analyzed using a one-way ANOVA.
Of the 18 skills tested, a significant difference due to academic background of the respondent was found for accompanying only: $F(2, 247) = 3.73, p = .03$ (please see Table 25).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ANOVA on Accompanying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Area of Specialization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25: One-way ANOVA on Accompanying by New Area of Specialization

Post hoc comparisons (Scheffe test) showed that music education majors placed higher priority on accompanying than did performance or combination performance/pedagogy majors. Means and standard deviations for these groups are found in Table 26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Area of Specialization</th>
<th>Accompanying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy + Performance/Pedagogy</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26: Means and Standard Deviations of Accompanying by New Area of Specialization
Music Education majors rated 3.94 on emphasizing accompanying skills in contrast to performance majors at 3.50. This indicated that respondents with music education as their major felt that accompanying skills should receive more focus than did other majors (performance majors, $M = 3.50, SD = 1.16$ and music education majors, $M = 3.94, SD = 1.39$).

To determine if there was a significant difference for emphasis on repertoire study between applied faculty and music education faculty, an independent-sample t test was conducted. Data were gathered from respondents who indicated they were either applied faculty or music education faculty. Data from instructors who stated they belonged to both faculty groups were not evaluated. The independent-sample t test analysis failed to reveal a significant difference for repertoire study between the two groups: $t(190) = .69, p = .29$. The sample means and standard deviations are displayed in Table 27 which shows that both applied faculty and music education faculty groups demonstrated similar degree of emphasis on repertoire study. Overall emphasis of repertoire study among all respondents was also 4.03 (please refer to Table 20), similar to the degree of emphasis placed by the applied faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Area</th>
<th>Repertoire Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Faculty</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education Faculty</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Means and Standard Deviations of Repertoire Study by Faculty Area
Instructors who had taken courses in group teaching techniques for class piano and courses that included specific training in how to teach functional skills showed a higher confidence in their ratings of competence compared to instructors who had not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Competence Rating in Group Techniques</th>
<th>Competence Rating in Functional Skills Performing</th>
<th>Competence Rating in Functional Skills Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n  M  SD</td>
<td>n  M  SD</td>
<td>n  M  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not taken</td>
<td>135  4.37  0.69</td>
<td>109  4.45  0.78</td>
<td>109  4.41  0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken</td>
<td>165  4.59  0.57</td>
<td>188  4.49  0.67</td>
<td>186  4.55  0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28: Comparison of Competence Ratings of Instructors who Had and Had Not Taken Courses in Group Teaching Techniques and Functional Keyboard Skills

From Table 28, it can be noted that instructors who had taken group techniques and functional skills courses felt slightly more competent in group teaching strategies and performing as well as teaching functional keyboard skills.

One question assessed the variety of instructional modes to which class piano students were exposed. The following is the question and the list of items that served to find out the activities used in the classroom:

What modes of group instruction do you use most often in your teaching? (Please check all that apply)

M1. ___ instructor presents new material to the entire group, calling on individuals for short responses.
M2. ___ using the headsets, individual students play along with the instructor hearing only themselves and the instructor.
M3. ___ instructor gives mini-lessons to individual students while other students practice independently.
M4. ___ entire class is divided into small groups playing in unison for ensemble practice (students hear only members of the small group).
M5. ___ entire class is divided into small groups playing different parts (students hear only members of the small group).
M6. ___ entire class is divided in half or small groups for antiphonal performances.
M7. ___ individual students perform assigned exercises or repertoire while other students listen.
M8. ___ other (please specify).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Techniques</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>M5</th>
<th>M6</th>
<th>M7</th>
<th>M8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taken</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Taken</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: Comparison of Most Frequently Used Instructional Modes Between Instructors who Had and Had Not Taken Courses in Group Teaching Techniques

M4, M5 and M6 are modes of instruction that promote peer group interaction.

Generally, participants who had not taken any group teaching techniques make less use of small ensemble work as evidenced by lower percentages in M4, M5 and M6. Also notable was the increased use of M3, the mini-lesson approach (from 63.7 percent to 81.6 percent).

Relevance of Skills Emphasized in Class Piano

One question was designed to ask respondents which skills they believed students would most likely use in the future. This was an open-ended question in which respondents listed the skills. Based upon the information provided, the skills were then ranked from the most to the least cited. Table 30 displays that information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Skills</th>
<th>Number of Responses of Skills Class Piano Instructors Think Students Will Most Likely Use</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sight Reading</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonization</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Score Reading</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposition</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing by Ear</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chord Progressions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Exercises</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Analysis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Listening</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repertoire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style Concepts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble Playing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30: Number and Percentage of Responses that Instructors Believed Students Would Most Likely Use
This information was compared to the number of respondents who rated maximum emphasis (5 on the five-point Likert scale) on skills in class piano to see if the degree of emphasis corresponded to skills that instructors believed students would most likely use in future. Based on the average ratings, the skills were ranked according to the number of responses from highest to lowest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Skills</th>
<th>Number of Responses which Instructors rated 5 on a Five-Point Rating Scale</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sight Reading</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonization</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Exercises</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chord Progressions</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Listening</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repertoire</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Analysis</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble Playing</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Style Concepts</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31: Number and Percentage of Responses Regarding Degree of Emphasis on Keyboard Skills
Table 31 cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Skills</th>
<th>Number of Responses which Instructors rated 5 on a Five-Point Rating Scale</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transposition</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20.7 (Ave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Scores</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20.7 (Ave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulation</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing by Ear</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 304 respondents, almost one-half (141 or 46.4 percent) stated that sight reading skill was most important for class piano students. Apart from that, harmonization, accompanying, open score reading, and transposition were other skills that respondents thought their students would draw upon in future. On the other hand, the instructor’s priority of emphasis on functional keyboard skills in class piano instruction in order of maximum emphasis to minimum emphasis was sight reading, harmonization, technical exercises, chord progressions, critical listening and repertoire study. This indicated a strong agreement between sight reading and harmonization skills but weak agreement between accompanying, open score reading, transposition, chord progression, critical listening and repertoire study.
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Group Dynamics and Institutional Information

In the process of analyzing data to find out instructional practices among the various types of institutions, an interesting finding was discovered. This finding pertained to the number of enrollees in class piano. As presented in the earlier section of Chapter 4, maximum enrollment of students in class piano fell in the category of 7 – 12 students (please refer to Table 11). When the two higher percentages are added in each category of institutions (Table below), all types of institution except the baccalaureate colleges showed that maximum enrollment was more than seven students: 96 percent of respondents from doctoral-granting institutions, 93.3 percent from master’s colleges, 84.9 percent from associate’s and 75 percent from specialized institutions. (It should be noted, however, that there were only four respondents from the specialized institutions category). The majority of respondents (97.7%) from the baccalaureate colleges, on the other hand, noted that maximum enrollment is 12 or less.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Enrollment</th>
<th>Doctorate (%)</th>
<th>Master’s (%)</th>
<th>Baccalaureate (%)</th>
<th>Associate’s (%)</th>
<th>Specialized (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 – 6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 12</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 and above</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32: Maximum Enrollment in One Section of Class Piano in All Types of Institution
Apparently the baccalaureate colleges favored smaller groups for class piano
instruction. Only 2.3 percent of respondents indicated that their maximum enrollment
was more than 13 students.

In an attempt to find out the number of class piano instructors in the various types
of institutions, results revealed that an average of four instructors taught in each
doctorate-granting institution, two each in master’s colleges and universities,
baccalaureate colleges and associate’s colleges. There was only one instructor in
specialized institutions. Average enrollment in doctorate-granting institutions and
associate’s colleges was 12, eleven in master’s colleges and universities, and eight in
baccalaureate colleges. Information on the number of instructors in each type of
institution is displayed in Table 33.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Institutions Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Instructors per Institution</th>
<th>Average Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate-granting Institutions</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>12.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>7.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Colleges</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>11.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Institutions</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33: Number of Class Piano Instructors in Different Types of Institutions
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The questionnaire also asked for information on the use of instructional modes among the various types of institutions. The following data refers to the different dimensions of instructional modes as described below:

M1. ____ instructor presents new material to the entire group, calling on individuals for short responses.
M2. ____ using the headsets, individual students play along with the instructor hearing only themselves and the instructor.
M3. ____ instructor gives mini-lessons to individual students while other students practice independently.
M4. ____ entire class is divided into small groups playing in unison for ensemble practice (students hear only members of the small group).
M5. ____ entire class is divided into small groups playing different parts (students hear only members of the small group).
M6. ____ entire class is divided in half or small groups for antiphonal performances.
M7. ____ individual students perform assigned exercises or repertoire while other students listen.
M8. ____ other (please specify).

Item M4 revealed a difference compared to other items: while more than fifty percent of the respondents indicated frequent use on other items, a higher percentage of respondents across the institutional type did not use this dimension of instructional mode. Only a small percentage of respondents from the baccalaureate colleges (44.2 percent) and associate’s colleges (27.3 percent) stated that they integrated M5 into group piano teaching. M6 was also not a favored instructional mode among the participants from the baccalaureate (37.2 percent) and associate’s colleges (33.3 percent). It seems that group interaction is still not yet integrated fully into the concept of class piano in the baccalaureate and associate’s colleges.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Institutions</th>
<th>M1 (%)</th>
<th>M2 (%)</th>
<th>M3 (%)</th>
<th>M4 (%)</th>
<th>M5 (%)</th>
<th>M6 (%)</th>
<th>M7 (%)</th>
<th>M8 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate-granting Institutions</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Colleges</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Institutions</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34: Use of Multi-Dimensional Modes of Instruction Among the Various Types of Institutions

Types of institutions were divided into five categories, namely doctoral-granting institutions, master’s colleges and universities, baccalaureate colleges, associate’s colleges and specialized institutions. However, because of the small sample size and diversity of programs of the specialized institutions, conclusions are tentative at best. Therefore, specialized institutions will be omitted from inferential statistics (ANOVA). To determine if there was a significant difference among the four categories of institutional types on the 18 functional skills, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted.

A significant difference was found for open choral score reading: \( F(3, 214) = .42, p = .02 \) (please see Table 35) and improvisation: \( F(3, 216) = 4.05, p = .008 \) (please see Table 36) among the four categories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Institutions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35: One-way ANOVA on Open Choral Score Reading by Types of Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Institutions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36: One-way ANOVA on Improvisation by Types of Institutions

Means and standard deviations of emphasis on open choral score reading are displayed in Table 37. Post hoc comparisons (Scheffe test) showed that the master’s colleges and universities placed higher priority on open choral score reading (3.58) than did the associate’s colleges (2.94). Means and standard deviations of emphasis on improvisation are displayed in Table 38. Post hoc comparisons (Scheffe test) showed that the master’s colleges and universities placed higher priority on improvisation (3.60) than did associate’s colleges (2.97).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Institutions</th>
<th>Open Choral Score Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37: Means and Standard Deviations of Open Choral Score Reading by Types of Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Institutions</th>
<th>Improvisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38: Means and Standard Deviations of Improvisation by Types of Institutions

It is also interesting to note that among the five different types of institutions, the doctoral-granting institutions had 66.7% respondents who had taken group techniques. In other institutional types, 50% of the respondents had taken group techniques courses and about 50% had not.
Among the 66.7% respondents from the doctoral-granting institutions who reported having taken group teaching techniques for class piano, more variety of group interaction among students was reported. Every dimension showed a higher percentage of use with an exception of M3 (instructor gives mini-lessons to individual students while other students practice independently). Respondents in doctorate-granting institutions focused less than other respondents on giving mini-lesson instructions in a group class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Techniques</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>Use of Instructional Modes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Taken</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39: Comparison of Instructional Modes Frequently Used by Respondents Who Had and Had Not Taken Group Techniques (Doctorate-Granting Institutions).

**Faculty and Teaching Assistants**

Of interest in this study was to find out if there was any significant effect of academic appointment (full-time faculty, part-time faculty and graduate teaching assistants) on functional skills emphasis. One-way ANOVA shows that there was a significant difference in emphasis on repertoire study and technical exercises for full-time faculty, part-time faculty and teaching assistants, $F(3, 286) = 3.50$, $p = .02$ for repertoire study and $F(3, 284) = 2.87$, $p = .04$ for technical exercises. Descriptive statistics indicating means and standard deviations for repertoire study and technical exercises are presented in Table 40.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Appointment</th>
<th>Repertoire</th>
<th>Technical Exercises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40: Means and Standard Deviations of Emphasis on Repertoire Study and Technical Exercises by Academic Appointment.

Graduate teaching assistants (4.41) showed a tendency to emphasize repertoire more than full-time faculty (3.91). Technical exercises were emphasized more among part-time faculty (4.66) compared to full-time faculty (4.30).

To determine the differences between faculty and graduate teaching associates in the frequency of use of instructional modes, the results were examined between full-time and part-time faculty members, as well as the average of the faculty members compared to graduate teaching associates. Part-time faculty tended to use more frequently all the modes of instruction compared to full-time faculty. In every mode, a higher percentage of part-time faculty respondents stated that they employed them in their instruction compared to full-time faculty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Appointment</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>Modes of Instruction (%)</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>M5</th>
<th>M6</th>
<th>M7</th>
<th>M8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Ave.</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41: Faculty and Graduate Teaching Associate’s Use of Different Dimensions of Instructional Modes

Even though it is interesting to note that graduate teaching assistants had a tendency to use the three dimensions of M4, M5 and M6 more frequently than faculty, caution should be noted because of the small number of graduate teaching assistants who responded to the survey. The use of instructional modes among faculty and graduate teaching assistants in the order of frequency is as follows: M1 – M8 – M3 – M7 – M2 – M5 – M6 – M4.

From the overall average as presented in the table above, it is evident that M4, M5 and M6 were modes of instruction least used by faculty and graduate teaching assistants. These dimensions involved peer interaction in a group learning environment, an instructional strategy that seemed to be used infrequently in the piano class.
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CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Summary

The purpose of the study was to profile class piano instructors in higher education institutions in the United States in terms of their educational background, teaching experiences and current instructional practice particularly in group teaching techniques and functional keyboard skills. More specifically, this study sought to (1) determine whether the instructor's educational background affects the amount of emphasis on particular functional keyboard skills, (2) determine the particular skills emphasized by class piano instructors that students would most likely use in the future, (3) find out what types of teacher-student interactions and peer interactions students experience in the group setting, (4) compare instructional practices among instructors in the different types of institutions as classified by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, and (5) ascertain the amount of emphasis on functional keyboard skills and use of group teaching techniques among faculty and teaching assistants.

A survey of literature revealed that functional skills at the keyboard are important to non-keyboard music majors, particularly to the music education majors because of the utilitarian nature of the instrument. However, because all music students, regardless of
area of specialization, are generally grouped in the same class, this study examined the
typical class piano program with heterogeneous groups of students. While past
researchers have identified the various functional skills considered vital to the overall
development of the student, studies also found that these skills were lacking and
graduates of class piano did not feel prepared to use those skills in their professional
career. Experts in the field repeatedly identified the source of the problem as the class
piano instructors who might not have understood the objectives of the class piano
program and who were not trained to teach in a group piano setting. Many class piano
instructors had been trained only for individual applied instruction. These teachers were
more likely to emphasize performance skills such as repertoire and technique rather than
practical functional skills such as transposition, improvisation, score reading, playing by
ear, and accompanying.

Skroch (1991) profiled class piano instructors about a decade ago, but did not
determine specific instructional modes employed in the classroom. The current study
investigated whether or not instructors are employing multi-dimensional modes of
instruction in their instruction. Students in class piano benefit from group dynamics and
peer interaction which enhance learning of functional skills.

The research was conducted by means of an online questionnaire sent to group
piano instructors listed in the “Group Piano” list in the College Music Society Directory
of Music Faculties in Colleges and Universities, U.S. and Canada (2000-2001). Due to
the scope of the study, teachers in Canada and Puerto Rico were omitted from the study.
In order to obtain a good representation of class piano instructors across the United States, a random sampling was conducted using the Random Access Generator from a scientific calculator.

Question 1: To what extent does the instructor's educational background affect the amount of emphasis on functional keyboard skills?

There was a significant difference in the emphasis on sight reading skill among instructors who specialized in performance/pedagogy from those who specialized in musicology. The former tended to emphasize the skill more (4.61) compared to their counterparts in musicology (3.71).

Pedagogy and performance/pedagogy majors were combined into one category and a one-way ANOVA was conducted with music education majors and performance majors and the combination of pedagogy and performance/pedagogy majors. The results of this new category of specialization revealed that there was a significant difference in the emphasis on accompanying skill. Instructors who specialized in music education placed a higher priority on accompanying (3.94) compared to instructors who specialized in performance (3.50).

In order to determine if there was a significant difference in emphasis on repertoire study between the applied faculty and the music education faculty, an independent-sample t test was conducted. The analysis failed to reveal a significant difference between the applied faculty and the music education faculty (p = .29).

In terms of teacher training, 55.3 percent of the respondents had taken group teaching techniques for class piano and 63.2 percent of the respondents indicated that they had taken courses that include specific training in how to teach functional piano.
skills. Those who had taken courses in both areas felt more competent in their teaching compared to those who had not taken any of these courses. Additionally, respondents with group training encouraged more use of small ensemble work and less use of one-on-one mini lesson instruction in group piano compared to those without group training.

Question 2: What are the particular skills emphasized by class piano instructors that students would most likely use in the future?

Only sight reading and harmonization skills were emphasized highly in class piano that are also practical for students. Other important skills for students such as accompanying, open score reading and transposition were not emphasized accordingly as they appeared in the bottom half of a prioritized list of emphasis. Technical exercises, chord progressions, critical listening and repertoire study were emphasized instead.

Question 3: What are the types of teacher-student interactions and peer interactions students experience in the group setting?

Instructors most frequently use the following modes, in descending order:

a. Instructor presents new material to entire group, calling on individuals for short responses (261 or 85.9 percent)
b. Entire class performs in unison (236 or 77.6 percent)
c. Instructor gives mini lessons to individual students while other students practice independently (218 or 71.7 percent)

A moderate pool of participants treated the following modes of instruction to a fair amount:

a. Individual students perform assigned exercises or repertoire while other students listen (185 or 60.9 percent)
b. Using the headsets, individual students play along with the instructor hearing themselves and the instructor (163 or 53.6 percent)
The instructional modes used least often are as follows:

a. Entire class is divided into small groups playing different parts (139 or 45.7 percent)
b. Entire class is divided in half or small groups for antiphonal performances (129 or 42.4 percent)
c. Entire class is divided into small groups playing in unison (115 or 37.8 percent)

**Question 4:** How do instructional practices differ among instructors in the different types of institutions as classified by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education?

There was a significant difference in the emphasis on open choral score reading and improvisation among the various types of institutions. Instructors teaching in the master's colleges and universities placed a higher emphasis on both skills; open choral score reading (master's colleges and universities, 3.58; associate's colleges, 2.94) and improvisation (master's colleges and universities, 3.60; associate's colleges, 2.97).

Small group work that promotes peer interaction and discovery learning seemed to be lacking in piano classes from all types of institutions. Class piano instructors teaching in baccalaureate colleges and associate's colleges in particular showed a lower frequency of small group work in their classes.

While about 50 percent of teachers from other types of institutions noted that they had studied group techniques, 66.7 percent of respondents from the doctorate-granting institutions reported having taken courses in group teaching techniques. These respondents indicated more frequent use of a variety of instructional modes except for the mini-lesson approach in a group class.
Question 5: How do faculty and teaching assistants differ in the amount of emphasis on functional keyboard skills and use of group teaching techniques?

Graduate teaching assistants showed a tendency to place higher emphasis on repertoire study (4.41) compared to full-time faculty (3.91). Technical exercises were given more priority by part-time faculty (4.66) in contrast to full-time faculty (4.30).

Even though teaching assistants were found to use instructional modes that facilitate peer interaction more often than faculty members, this conclusion is not definitive due to the small number of teaching assistants who responded to the survey.

*Summary of Descriptive Data*

Almost all the respondents used electronic keyboards in a lab for class piano instruction (98.4 percent). There were on average 13.8 pianos in the lab and maximum enrollment of 7 to 12 students was typical in one section of class piano. Average class size was 9.9 students. About one-third (34.1 percent) of the class piano coordinators stated that there is one class piano instructor in their institution.

Respondents typically came from a performance background (40.1 percent). 46.1 percent of the respondents held a master’s degree and 44.7 percent held a doctoral degree. 84.1 percent of instructors with teaching experience of more than 20 years were full-time faculty. About 61 percent of all class piano instructors were full-time faculty. 74.2 percent of the class piano coordinators belonged to the applied faculty while hardly ten percent (9.3 percent) of them were from the music education faculty. Of the 59.9 percent who identified themselves as class piano coordinators, 39.0 percent of them had a
performance degree and only 4.9 percent had a music education degree. Only 9.2 percent
of all respondents taught exclusively class piano, where 46.4 percent was part-time
faculty. About one-third (36.6 percent) of the respondents indicated that class piano is
less than 24 percent of teaching load. Also approximately one-third (33.9 percent) of the
respondents stated that they were teaching one section of class piano only. Besides class
piano, 68.8 percent of the respondents reported that they also teach applied piano.

A survey of educational materials and repertoire was the most common topic
covered in pedagogy courses (82.2 percent). Only one-half of the class piano instructors
stated that peer teaching (51.3 percent) and supervised internship (49.3 percent) were
included in the pedagogy courses that they had taken. Among the keyboard-related
courses taken by the respondents, 94.4 percent noted that they had taken applied piano.
However, only 18.4 percent of the respondents stated that they had learned applied piano
in a group environment.

Graduate teaching assistants typically received two observations from their
coordinator annually (25.6 percent). Comments and feedback appeared in the form of
verbal consultation (82.1 percent) and 71.8 percent of the teaching assistants felt that the
amount of guidance from their coordinator was adequate.

94.4 percent of the respondents stated that teaching experience was the factor that
changed their attitudes towards class piano instruction. Important skills for an ideal class
piano instructor were sight reading, harmonization, critical listening, chord progressions
and technical exercises. Skills that were emphasized heavily within the group instruction
included sight reading, harmonization, technical exercises, chord progressions and
repertoire study. An almost perfect match was found when skills important for the ideal
class piano instructors were correlated with skills most emphasized in class piano \( (r = 0.97) \). The top five skills that instructors believed students would most likely use in the future were sight reading, harmonization, accompanying, open score reading and transposition.

**Discussion**

Several studies claimed that there was too much emphasis on repertoire by the applied faculty who may not understand the objectives of class piano program. While the present study found that repertoire was still being stressed, there was no significant difference in emphasis given by the music education faculty compared to the applied faculty. A possible reason for this finding could be the differences in level of repertoire choices made by music education faculty and applied faculty. While the latter might favor assigning repertoire that is too difficult for non-keyboard players (Clementi’s Sonatina or Bach’s two-part inventions) in group piano, the former might have chosen repertoire based on simple patterns that reinforce the learning of other functional skills. For example, repertoire built on patterns by Kabalevsky, Lynn Freeman Olson, Paul Sheftel, and Susan Ogilvy and other contemporary educational repertoire are more appropriate for this type of student.

However, when the percentage of respondents who rated maximum emphasis (a 5 on a five-point scale) on repertoire study was compared with that found by Skroch (1991), a higher percentage was reported in the present study. Over the past 10 years, the percentage of instructors who emphasized repertoire study highly in class piano has
increased from 28.0 percent to 38.2 percent. It has been found that full-time faculty placed less emphasis on repertoire study compared to teaching assistants. Full-time faculty also had a lower rating of emphasis on technical exercises compared to part-time faculty.

Other relevant functional keyboard skills such as sight reading and accompanying showed significant differences when examined with instructor’s educational background. Instructors with a musicology degree had a tendency to emphasize sight reading less compared to those with performance/pedagogy degree. The degree in musicology is an academic and scholarly degree in which students tend to be less involved in performance. This may account for the fact that instructors with musicology backgrounds emphasized sight reading less in contrast to performance/pedagogy majors. It should be noted, though, that it is rare for musicologists to teach class piano, as can be observed by the very small number of respondents from this area of specialization.

Class piano instructors with a music education background placed a higher priority on accompanying skill more so than their counterparts who specialized in performance. Music education majors receive first-hand knowledge during their student teaching experiences that accompanying skills are essential if they were to meet the expectations of their jobs. The actual teaching experience becomes the factor that encourages the music education faculty to instruct and emphasize relevant skills in class piano.

Over one-half of the respondents indicated that they had taken group teaching techniques course and functional keyboard skills courses. 55.3 percent stated that they had group techniques while 63.2 percent noted that they had taken courses that include
specific training in how to teach functional keyboard skills. Class piano instructors who had not enrolled in group techniques showed a marked increase in conducting the class piano as a mini-lesson and an overall decrease in allowing group interaction among students in small ensembles. Apparently, the lack of knowledge in group techniques is compensated with employment of more frequent one-on-one instruction within the group class. Chronister (1976) stated, “The group lesson is a failure if it is turned into a series of short private lessons given students in turn” (p. 40). This finding demonstrated that teacher training in group techniques has an impact on instructional practices.

In addition, results from this study showed that participating class piano instructors were well aware of the skills needed by their students. Respondents cited sight reading, harmonization, accompanying, open score, and transposition as the most useful skills for class piano students. Lowder’s study in 1983 revealed that cadences, sight reading, score reading, harmonization and accompanying are important to the class piano curriculum. However, only sight reading and harmonization were emphasized in class. Besides those two skills, instructors placed emphasis on technical exercises, chord progressions, critical listening and repertoire within the class piano instruction. It appears that instructors are still not devoting enough time to accompanying, open score reading and transposition skills that are deemed important for class piano students.

When respondents were asked to rate the skills most important to an ideal class piano instructor, they identified sight reading, harmonization, critical listening, chord progressions and technical exercises to be the top five skills. Results from respondents who rated maximum emphasis (a 5 on a five-point scale) on functional skills showed that the same five skills they regarded as important for an ideal class piano instructor (sight
reading, harmonization, technical exercises, chord progressions and critical listening) were emphasized by most of the respondents. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation procedure showed that there was a high positive correlation ($r = 0.97$) between the two ratings. This apparently indicated that what instructors choose to emphasize in their teaching is consistent with the skills that they regard are important for ideal class piano instructors and not for prospective music teachers in public schools. Instructors in class piano need to evaluate their priority in order that skills taught and emphasized are relevant to college graduates. Buchanan (1964) stressed the necessity to consider the needs of the class piano students and teach accordingly (p. 138).

This study revealed that class piano students were generally not given enough exposure to and experience in group dynamics within the class piano instruction. Instructors were either more used to conducting the class in a “typical” class session manner (with teacher talking and students listening or students working together as an entire class) or excessive talk on the teacher’s part that the students were not given ample time to work on the piano. This is evidenced by a comment as such: “I must remember not to talk so much and have the students play more, both individually and as a group (small and large).”

Additionally, this study showed that instructors teaching in baccalaureate and associate’s colleges did not provide enough opportunity for their students to interact in class. Instructors teaching in the associate’s colleges rated open choral score reading and improvisation significantly lower than those teaching in master’s colleges and universities.
Two-thirds of the respondents from the doctorate-granting institutions stated that they underwent training in group techniques. Among these respondents, more variety of group interaction and more frequent opportunity for small group work were given to students. This seems to suggest that training in group techniques enables the instructors to vary their approach to group work and reduce the likelihood of treating the group class like a private studio lesson.

Concerning the use of instructional modes among faculty and graduate teaching assistants, the latter indicated a tendency to use group dynamics more frequently than the faculty; however, both categories have been found to be lacking in employing small group work among their students. Not only did teaching assistants tend to use small group work more frequently, they also employed more instructional modes compared to faculty members. Recent teacher training could play a role in educating these teaching assistants to use updated modes of instruction compared to full-time faculty who demonstrated the lowest frequently of peer interaction group work. Full-time faculty members were mostly experienced class piano teachers (those with more than 20 years of teaching experience). There is perhaps an improvement in offerings of group dynamics in teacher training institutions. Results involving comparison between faculty members and teaching assistants should be interpreted with care because of the small number of graduate teaching assistants. The small number of respondents who are teaching assistants does not warrant a definitive conclusion that could be generalized beyond the larger population. Full-time faculty comprised 60.9 percent while part-time faculty comprised 20.7 percent. Only slightly more than ten percent (12.8 percent) represented teaching assistants.
Peer teaching and supervised internship are two components of teacher training that should be encouraged and promoted. Ideally, graduate teaching assistants should be given more periodic observations and supervised teaching. Nothing can be compared to real-life teaching experiences with constant constructive feedback from the coordinator in the process of generating an effective class piano instructor.

This study also revealed that students taking applied lessons did not typically experience group interaction among peers during lessons. Independent studio teachers should seek ways to include group lessons in addition to the traditional private lessons.

In Lyke's study (1968), he noted that none of his participants had any training in the presentation of functional keyboard skills within the class piano framework (p. 74). With regard to preparation for group dynamics, Lyke further added, "only one teacher had studied the principles of group dynamics through a specialized course with a view to adapting ideas for college group piano instruction. Some were acquainted with a few group dynamics concepts, but these were not "in depth." These few teachers reported that group process was given only superficial treatment in pedagogy courses" (p. 78). The present study indicated that there is a heightened awareness of teacher training in group dynamics and functional skills compared to three decades ago: 55.3 percent of respondents had taken courses in group techniques and 63.2 percent had taken courses that specifically trained them how to teach functional piano skills. It had been demonstrated in the present study that a well-informed instructor in group techniques has a tendency to increase interaction among students and decrease the use of conducting class piano with the private lesson approach. Past studies that resulted in suggestions for more functional skills training motivated more class piano instructors to receive training.
in this area. It might be stressed that more coursework for group teaching techniques should be offered to encourage more use of group dynamics.

According to Hunter (1973), some class piano instructors were neglecting important skills such as transposition and accompanying. This study found that these skills were still not emphasized enough in the class piano instruction. Transposition of keyboard music was ranked 11 while transposition of instrumental parts was ranked 15; accompanying skills considered important for class piano students was ranked 9 in the current study.

Information was gathered concerning maximum enrollment, size of instructional staff and average enrollment. Teaching class piano in baccalaureate colleges is likely to be more manageable because class size tends to be smaller. Typical baccalaureate colleges have maximum enrollments of less than 12 students. Only 2.3 percent of the instructors in baccalaureate colleges indicated that they have more than 13 students. Results also revealed that there are larger instructional staffs in doctorate-granting institutions. The average size of the instructional staff for a class piano program is two instructors in all types of institutions, with one exception of doctorate-granting institutions where there are four class piano instructors. The baccalaureate colleges have an average enrollment of eight class piano students in one section while twelve were reported in doctoral-granting colleges and universities as well as in associate’s colleges and eleven in the master’s colleges.

Further information gathered from all responding instructors in this study indicated that class size of 10 students showed consistency with Skroch’s (1991) finding about a decade ago (p. 68). According to Page (1973), groups consisting of more than
twelve students could be unmanageable (p. 21). In fact, Lyke (1968, p.118) recommended limiting the size of classes to six students at the beginning class and four students in the second year level for more effective instruction. Because of budget constraints faced by educational institutions, Lyke’s suggestion is not adopted to date.

This study showed that over fifty percent of the responding class piano instructors directed the program (59.9 percent). Of this number, about three-quarter (74.2 percent) belonged to the applied faculty and less than ten percent (9.3 percent) belonged to the music education faculty. Skroch’s study (1991) revealed that two-thirds of her respondents (66.48 percent) were in charge of class piano at their institution. This present study indicated that class piano teachers were predominantly applied teachers (68.8 percent). Class piano was also taught by piano pedagogy instructors (25.3 percent), music theory instructors (21.7 percent) and piano literature instructors (12.2 percent), a finding consistent with Skroch’s finding (68.17 percent, 40.56 percent, 20.85 percent, and 18.59 percent respectively) ten years ago. However, there was a decrease in class piano instructors being piano pedagogy instructors, from 40.56 percent to 25.3 percent.

Conclusions

The following conclusions could be drawn from the analysis of the data:

1. The instructor’s area of specialization did not seem to affect the emphasis on repertoire study as previously assumed. Only emphasis on sight reading skills indicate a significant difference between instructors with backgrounds in performance/pedagogy majors compared to those with backgrounds in musicology.
2. Instructors with specialized training in pedagogy (pedagogy major and performance/pedagogy major) have developed a certain balance in emphasizing accompanying skill. There was a significant difference in emphasis on accompanying skill between performance majors and music education majors. This situation could be due to a clearer understanding among music education faculty of their professional needs of their graduates.

3. When the applied faculty were compared with music education faculty on the emphasis on repertoire study, results revealed that there was no significant difference. On the other hand, graduate teaching assistants were found to emphasize repertoire study much more than full-time or part-time faculty.

4. Instructors who had taken courses in group teaching techniques and courses that include specific training in how to teach functional skills showed a higher confidence in their ratings of competence compared to those who had not taken those courses. Also, instructors with group training made more use of small ensemble work within the class piano setting and a remarkable decreased use of the mini-lesson approach. Training in group techniques is essential. Findings showed that instructors who had such training tended to use more frequently a variety of instructional modes and incorporate more ways for student interaction.

5. Sight reading and harmonization were two skills that class piano instructors emphasized that students would most likely use in the future. Even though instructors identified accompanying, open score reading and transposition as other skills important for their students, these skills were not emphasized sufficiently in class piano. Instead,
technical exercises, chord progressions and repertoire study ranked high in their emphasis after sight reading and harmonization.

6. Baccalaureate colleges seemed to favor a smaller number of students in class piano. Only 2.3 percent of the instructors teaching in baccalaureate colleges stated that maximum enrollment is 13 and above.

7. The concept of group dynamics was not integrated in the baccalaureate and associate’s colleges. Both types of institutions had lower percentages of respondents using smaller ensemble grouping methods for interaction. In the doctorate-granting institutions, however, two-thirds of its respondents had taken group teaching techniques for class piano and among these instructors, more opportunities for group interaction were reported. All modes of instruction were more frequently used except for the mini-lesson approach.

8. Class piano instructors teaching in master’s colleges and associate’s colleges showed a significant difference in the emphasis on open choral score reading and improvisation. Both skills were given significantly lower emphasis among instructors teaching in associate’s colleges. Respondents’ comments regarding competence in teaching improvisation indicated that many instructors felt poorly prepared to teach improvisation.

9. Graduate teaching assistants placed higher emphasis on repertoire study compared to full-time faculty. Technical exercises were given more emphasis by part-time faculty in contrast to full-time faculty.

10. A higher percentage of graduate teaching assistants used small ensemble grouping in the classroom compared to faculty members. However, the overall average
of instructional modes used by faculty and graduate teaching assistants indicated that peer interaction in smaller groups was still lower than the other modes of instruction.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

The present study examined group dynamics from a descriptive point of view. Further research using live and videotaped observation should be done to document the group activities.

A specific study should focus on graduate teaching assistants, the degree to which they emphasize particular skills and their use of group dynamics. Due to the small number of responding teaching assistants in this study, the current study can provide no conclusive assertions regarding the experiences of graduate teaching assistants.

Class piano instructors teaching in the associate's colleges have been found to use group dynamics far less frequently than their peers in other institutions. Further research should be conducted to find out the faculty recruiting procedures for class piano instructors in the associate's colleges. There should be more stringent requirements for training and experience in group teaching. On the other hand, the doctorate-granting institutions reported that two-thirds of the class piano instructors had taken group teaching techniques. An exploratory study of the hiring process in this type of institution might be interesting.
It should be noted that faculty might not teach at the same types of institution from which they graduated. Therefore, it is somewhat difficult to conclude the bases for their points of view. Thus, further research should be done to determine what, if any, impact the type of institution has on a teacher's competence in group piano teaching.

A more thorough study should be conducted on the teacher training of class piano teaching assistants for music majors. They need periodic guidelines and supervision from the class piano coordinator. They too need to understand the basic objective of class piano so that the appropriate skills are emphasized. Also, they need to explore every possible interaction to allow students to communicate, assume leadership roles and participate actively within the group situation to ensure appropriate musical and education outcomes.
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APPENDIX A

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
GROUP PIANO INSTRUCTION FOR MUSIC MAJORS IN THE UNITED STATES: A STUDY OF INSTRUCTOR TRAINING, INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE, AND VALUES RELATING TO FUNCTIONAL KEYBOARD SKILLS

Please respond to the following questions.

1. Name of institution (Optional): ________________________________

2. Does your institution offer courses specially designed to develop functional keyboard skills for non-keyboard music majors?
   1. ___ Yes
   2. ___ No

3. Do you currently teach class piano?
   1. ___ Yes
   2. ___ No

A. Academic Credentials

1. What is the highest degree you hold?
   1. ___ Bachelor’s
   2. ___ Master’s
   3. ___ Doctorate

2. Area of emphasis:
   1. ___ Performance
   2. ___ Pedagogy
   3. ___ Performance and Pedagogy
   4. ___ Theory/Composition
   5. ___ Musicology
   6. ___ Music Education
   7. ___ Other (please specify)
B. Teaching Responsibilities and Program Information

3. Please indicate the type of academic appointment you hold:
   1. ___ Full-time faculty
   2. ___ Adjunct (part-time) faculty
   3. ___ Graduate teaching assistant/associate
   4. ___ Other (please specify)

4. Please check all items in the following that describe your responsibilities:
   1. ___ Coordinator/supervisor of class piano
   2. ___ Pedagogy instructor
   3. ___ Applied piano faculty
   4. ___ Music education faculty
   5. ___ Other (please specify)

If you are the coordinator/supervisor of class piano, please answer questions 5 – 6. If not, please proceed to question 7.

5. How many class piano instructors are there at your institution? (Please also include yourself if you are teaching class piano).
   1. ___ One
   2. ___ Two
   3. ___ Three
   4. ___ Four
   5. ___ Five
   6. ___ Six and more

6. What is the average enrollment for a typical class piano section? _____ students

All respondents please reply to the following questions.

7. Do you use an electronic piano lab for class piano?
   1. ___ Yes
   2. ___ No

8. If yes, how many electronic pianos are there in the piano lab? _____
9. How many sections of class piano are you teaching in the current semester/quarter?

1. ___ One
2. ___ Two
3. ___ Three
4. ___ Four or more

10. What is the maximum number of students enrolled in one section of class piano?

1. ___ 2-6
2. ___ 7-12
3. ___ 13 and above

11. Class piano comprises what percentage of your teaching load?

1. ___ 100%
2. ___ 75 – 99%
3. ___ 50 – 74%
4. ___ 25 - 49%
5. ___ 24% or less

12. What other courses do you teach? (Please check all that apply).

1. ___ Applied Piano
2. ___ Piano Pedagogy
3. ___ Piano Literature
4. ___ Music Education
5. ___ Music Theory
6. ___ Music History/Appreciation
7. ___ Accompanying/Chamber Music
8. ___ Other (please specify)
C. Questions Regarding Teacher Preparation

13. How long have you been teaching class piano?
   1. ___ Less than 1 year
   2. ___ 1 year
   3. ___ More than 1 year but less than 5 years
   4. ___ More than 5 years but less than 10 years
   5. ___ More than 10 years but less than 15 years
   6. ___ More than 15 years but less than 20 years
   7. ___ More than 20 years

14. Have you taken courses in group teaching techniques for class piano? (This does not include workshops or seminars).
   1. ___ Yes
   2. ___ No

15. Have you taken courses that include specific training in how to teach functional piano skills?
   1. ___ Yes
   2. ___ No

16. Which of the following keyboard-related courses have you taken? (Please check all that apply).
   1. ___ Applied piano
   2. ___ Piano pedagogy
   3. ___ Keyboard harmony
   4. ___ Piano sight reading
   5. ___ Accompanying
   6. ___ Chamber music (including piano ensemble)
   7. ___ Other (please specify)
17. Check courses in which you learned as a member of a group.

1. ___ Applied piano
2. ___ Piano pedagogy
3. ___ Keyboard harmony
4. ___ Piano sight reading
5. ___ Accompanying
6. ___ Chamber music (including piano ensemble)
7. ___ Other (please specify)

18. How would you rate your competence/skill in group piano teaching on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being the least competent, and 5 being the most competent)?

   1  2  3  4  5

19. How would you rate your competence in performing and teaching functional keyboard skills on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being the least competent, and 5 being the most competent)?

   Performing  1  2  3  4  5
   Teaching    1  2  3  4  5

20. Please check all areas that were included in the piano pedagogy courses you have taken:

1. ___ Survey of materials and repertoire
2. ___ Peer teaching
3. ___ Supervised internship
4. ___ Observation of a group master teacher
5. ___ Other (please specify)

If you are a Graduate Teaching Assistant/Associate, please respond to questions 21 – 23. If not, please proceed to question 24.

21. How many times per year is your teaching observed by the coordinator/supervisor of class piano? _____ times
22. What form of feedback do you receive from the class piano coordinator/supervisor? (Please check all that apply).

1. _____ Written reports
2. _____ Verbal consultations
3. _____ Other (please specify)

23. Regarding the frequency of observations and feedback from the supervisor, would you prefer:

1. _____ More guidance
2. _____ No change
3. _____ Less guidance

D. Current Instructional Practice and Values Relating to Functional Keyboard Skills

24. What factors have had the greatest impact on your attitudes regarding class piano instruction?

1. _____ Undergraduate coursework
2. _____ Graduate coursework
3. _____ Continuing education/workshop participation
4. _____ Teaching experience
5. _____ Interaction with faculty colleagues
6. _____ Reports from former students
7. _____ Other (please specify)

25. What modes of group instruction do you use most often in your teaching? (Please check all that apply).

1. _____ Instructor presents new material to the entire group, calling on individuals for short responses
2. _____ Using the headsets, individual students play along with the instructor hearing only themselves and the instructor
3. _____ Instructor gives mini-lessons to individual students while other students practice independently
4. _____ Entire class is divided into small groups playing in unison for ensemble practice (students hear only members of the small group)
5. _____ Entire class is divided into small groups playing different parts (students hear only members of the small group)
6. _____ Entire class is divided in half or small groups for antiphonal performances
7. __ Individual students perform assigned exercises or repertoire while other students listen
8. __ Entire class performs in unison
9. __ Other (please specify)

26. What skills are most important for the ideal class piano instructor? Please rank the following skills as 1 = least important, 5 = most important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Transposition of keyboard music</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Transposing instrumental parts</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Playing by ear</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Repertoire study</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Reading open choral scores</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Improvisation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Technical exercises (including scales)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Sight reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Accompanying</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Harmonization of melodies</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Reading open instrumental scores</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Critical listening</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Development of style concepts</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Chord progressions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Ensemble playing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Realization of figured bass</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Modulation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Score analysis (melody, harmony and form)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. What functional keyboard skills do you think music majors will use most often after graduating?

28. Please indicate the amount of emphasis you place on each of the following skills in your classes: (1 = minimum emphasis; 5 = maximum emphasis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Transposition of keyboard music</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Transposing instrumental parts</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Playing by ear</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Repertoire study</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Reading open choral scores</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Improvisation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical exercises (including scales)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Referring back to the items in Question 28, how would you describe your strengths and areas that you would like to improve?

Thank you for your time and effort. If you are interested in receiving the results of this study, please fill out the appropriate information below:

Name: __________________________
Email address: ___________________
APPENDIX B

LETTER TO THE GROUP PIANO INSTRUCTORS
Dear Professor:

My name is Huei Li Chin, a doctoral candidate working towards a Ph.D. in Music Education with emphasis on piano pedagogy at The Ohio State University. I am currently involved in a research study to profile class piano instructors specifically regarding instructor training, instructional practice and values relating to functional keyboard skills.

I am requesting for your assistance to participate in this study and also forward this website of questionnaire, http://65.24.175.56/hchin/qa.asp, to the instructors of class piano program in your university or college (which includes adjunct faculty and Graduate Teaching Assistant/Associate). Please be assured that the information you provide will be held in the strictest of confidence. Under no circumstances will your responses be reported on an individual basis because data collected will be analyzed as a group.

The questionnaire should take only about 10-15 minutes to complete. I would greatly appreciate it if you could have the appropriate individuals respond by February 13, 2002. Should you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact me at hchin15@yahoo.com or call (614) 291-9148.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Huei Li Chin
School of Music
The Ohio State University
1866 College Road
Columbus, OH 43210
APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP LETTER
Dear Professor:

You were recently invited to assist in my research to profile class piano instructors specifically regarding instructor training, instructional practice and values relating to functional keyboard skills. If you have not yet had an opportunity to respond to the survey, please take a few moments to complete it and submit your response to me by **February 28, 2002**. You may participate by clicking on this link, http://65.24.175.56/hchin/qa.asp. Your response is very crucial and significant to the success of this study.

If there are class piano teaching associates or assistants at your institution, please encourage them to complete the questionnaire at their earliest convenience. Your assistance and cooperation is most appreciated.

Thank you once again for your willingness to participate. Please feel free to contact me at hchin15@yahoo.com or call (614) 291-9148 if you have any questions about this study.

Sincerely,

Huei Li Chin  
School of Music  
The Ohio State University  
1866 College Road  
Columbus, OH 43210
APPENDIX D

LIST OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS
PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

1. Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX
2. Anderson College, Anderson, SC
3. Anderson University, Anderson, IN
4. Angelo State University, San Angelo, TX
5. Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ
6. Asbury College, Wilmore, KY
7. Augustana College, Rock Island, IL
8. Austin Peay State University, Clarksville, TN
9. Baylor University, Waco, TX
10. Benedictine College, Atchison, KS
11. Berea College, Berea, KY
12. Berry College, Mount Berry, GA
13. Bloomsburg University, Bloomsburg, PA
14. Bob Jones University, Greenville, SC
15. Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH
16. Bradley University, Peoria, IL
17. Brevard College, Brevard, NC
18. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, CA
19. California State University, Fullerton, CA
20. Capital University, Columbus, OH
21. Carl Sandburg College, Galesburg, IL
22. Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City, TN
23. Casper College, Casper, WY
24. Cedarville University, Cedarville, OH
25. Central Methodist College, Fayette, MO
26. Chicago State University, Chicago, IL
27. Chipola Junior College, Marianna, FL
28. Clarion University, Clarion, PA
29. Coastal Carolina University, Conway, SC
30. College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA
31. The Community College of Baltimore County - Essex, Baltimore, MD
32. Del Mar College, Corpus Christi, TX
33. Delta State University, Cleveland, MS
34. DePaul University, Chicago, IL
35. DePauw University, Greencastle, IN
36. Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, KY
37. Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, MI
38. Eastern Washington University, Cheney, WA
39. Eastman School of Music, Rochester, NY
40. Edison Community College, Fort Myers, FL
41. Elizabethtown Community College, Elizabethtown, KY
42. Fitchburg State College, Fitchburg, MA
43. Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL
44. Florida College, Temple Terrace, FL
45. Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA
46. Grand Rapids Community College, Grand Rapids, MI
47. Hamline University, Saint Paul, MN
48. Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, TX
49. Hartwick College, Oneonta, NY
50. Hastings College, Hastings, NE
51. Hesston College, Hesston, KS
52. Houghton College, Houghton, NY
53. Howard Payne University, Brownwood, TX
54. Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA
55. Huntingdon College, Montgomery, AL
56. Illinois State University, Normal, IL
57. Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA
58. Indiana Wesleyan University, Marion, IN
59. Iowa State University, Ames, IA
60. Ithaca College, Ithaca, NY
61. John Brown University, Siloam Springs, AR
62. Joliet Junior College, Joliet, IL
63. Jones County Junior College, Ellisville, MS
64. Keene State College, Keene, NH
65. Kentucky State University, Frankfort, KY
66. LaGrange College, LaGrange, GA
67. Lake Michigan College, Benton Harbor, MI
68. Lake Tahoe Community College, South Lake Tahoe, CA
69. Lawrence University, Appleton, WI
70. Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA
71. Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory, NC
72. Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA
73. Loyola University, New Orleans, LA
74. Manatee Community College, Bradenton, FL
75. Martin Luther College, New Ulm, MN
76. McLennan Community College, Waco, TX
77. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI
78. Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, TN
79. Millersville University, Millersville, PA
80. Montreat College, Montreat, NC
81. Moorpark College, Moorpark, CA
82. Morningside College, Sioux City, IA
83. Multnomah Bible College, Portland, OR
84. Nassau Community College, Garden City, NY
85. Nazareth College, Rochester, NY
86. Niagara County Community College, Sanborn, NY
87. Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA
88. North Carolina Central University, Durham, NC
89. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC
90. Northern Kentucky University, Highland Heights, KY
91. Northern Michigan University, Marquette, MI
92. Northern Virginia Community College, Annandale, VA
93. Northwest Missouri State University, Maryville, MO
94. Northwestern Oklahoma State University, Alva, OK
95. Northwestern University, Evanston, IL
96. Oakland University, Rochester, MI
97. The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH
98. Ohio University, Athens, OH
99. Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, OH
100. Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, OK
101. Onondaga Community College, Syracuse, NY
102. Oral Roberts University, Tulsa, OK
103. Otterbein College, Westerville, OH
104. Our Lady of the Lake University, San Antonio, TX
105. Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA
106. The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA
107. Piedmont College, Demorest, GA
108. Plymouth State College, Plymouth, NH
109. Point Loma Nazarene University, San Diego, CA
110. Reinhardt College, Waleska, GA
111. Rice University, Houston, TX
112. Roosevelt University, Chicago, IL
113. Rowan University, Glassboro, NJ
114. Saint Louis University, Saint Louis, MO
115. Saint Mary’s University of Minnesota, Winona, MN
116. Saint Norbert College Depere, WI
117. Saint Olaf College, Northfield, MN
118. Salem State College, Salem, MA
119. Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, TX
120. San Antonio College, San Antonio, TX
121. San Diego Mesa College, San Diego, CA
122. San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA
123. San Jacinto College South, Houston, TX
124. Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA
125. Shasta College, Redding, CA
126. Shenandoah Conservatory, Winchester, VA
127. Shepherd College, Shepherdstown, WV
128. Shoreline Community College, Seattle, WA
129. Silver Lake College, Manitowoc, WI
130. Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania, Slippery Rock, PA
131. Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA
132. Southeastern Louisiana University, Hammond, LA
133. Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX
134. Southern Oregon University, Ashland OR
135. Southwest Baptist University, Bolivar, MO
136. State University of New York at Potsdam, NY
137. Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, PA
138. Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, VA
139. Temple College, Temple, TX
140. Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, TX
141. Toccoa Falls College, Toccoa, GA
142. Troy State University, Troy, AL
143. Tulane University, New Orleans, LA
144. University of Alaska, Anchorage, AK
145. The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ
146. University of Arkansas at Little Rock, AR
147. University of Central Arkansas, Conway, AR
148. University of Denver, Denver, CO
149. University of Florida, Gainesville, FL
150. University of Idaho, Moscow, ID
151. University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS
152. University of La Verne, La Verne, CA
153. University of Massachusetts at Darmouth, MA
154. University of Memphis, Memphis, TN
155. University of Miami, Miami, FL
156. University of Michigan, Dearborn, MI
157. University of Missouri, Columbia, MO
158. University of Montana, Missoula, MT
159. University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM
160. University of New Orleans, New Orleans, LA
161. University of North Carolina at Greensboro, NC
162. University of North Carolina at Wilmington, NC
163. University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO
164. University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, IA
165. The University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK
166. University of Oregon, Eugene, OR
167. University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI
168. University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma, Chickasha, OK
169. University of South Alabama, Mobile, AL
170. University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC
171. University of South Dakota, Vermillion, SD
172. University of Southern Maine, Gorham, ME
173. University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS
174. University of Tennessee at Knoxville, TN
175. University of Texas at Brownsville, TX
176. University of Texas at El Paso, TX
177. University of Texas-Pan American, Edinburg, TX
178. The University of West Florida, Pensacola, FL
179. University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire, WI
180. University of Wisconsin Marathon County, Wausau, WI
181. University of Wisconsin-Stout, Menomonie, WI
182. Valley City State University, Valley City, ND
183. Vanguard University of Southern California, Costa Mesa, CA
184. Victoria College, Victoria, TX
185. Wake Forest University, Winston Salem, NC
186. Waldorf College, Forest City, IA
187. Warner Pacific College, Portland, OR
188. Washington State University, Pullman, WA
189. West Texas A & M University, Canyon, TX
190. West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV
191. Western Nevada Community College, Carson City, NV
192. Westminster Choir College of Rider University, Princeton, NJ
193. William Carey College, Hattiesburg, MS
194. William Paterson University, Wayne, NJ
195. Wingate University, Wingate, NC
196. Winthrop University, Rock Hill, SC
197. Wright State University, Dayton, OH