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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

The degree of variance in the musical preparation of the student enrolled in a program of class piano training is considerable. The absence of unified course and certification requirements, plus the fact that teaching requirements and practices differ to such a great degree between schools, has allowed class piano programs an almost unlimited amount of freedom in the formulation of instructional programs.

In the report prepared for the International Society for Music Education\(^1\) it was stated that:

The schools in the United States of America are not under federal control. There is, to be sure, a certain uniformity in the instructional program, but great latitude prevails as to the processes and the machinery in attempting to attain the desired objectives. If there is uniformity, and there is to some extent, it is by common consent and not by top level control.

Therefore, in fitting into the ever-widening and decentralized school program all over the United States of America, music education would also necessarily develop along lines of decentralization, with the result that we have a wide variety of materials, different philosophical applications concerning objectives and an appreciable variance in the acceptance of music as part of curricula.

The report continued and listed four questions as concerns:

(a) Where are we now—in the sense of quality, as well as quantity?
(b) What are our critical needs?  
(c) What are our next steps?
(d) What should be our goals?
In a comprehensive study of class piano programs, Vernezza concluded that piano study was closely associated with other music courses such as fundamentals, basic musicianship, theory, composition, music education, performance classes, and even music history, and that the music departments of American colleges had recognized the fact that the piano was one of the music students' most basic tools. She maintained that although the usefulness and importance of the course had been recognized, music educators now needed to establish new guidelines for how much could be taught in a reasonable time, where the emphasis should be, and what must be the core of basic piano study.

This investigator believed that some type of piano instruction was required as a part of music education programs at enough schools to warrant investigation into the exact nature and extent of these requirements.

Significance of the Study

In 1958 Webber stated that teacher training institutions had not been entirely successful in organizing curricula and adapting philosophies to meet demands created by changing times, and were being especially criticized for failure to develop functional skills needed by the music educator.

Lyke believed that no clear focus of instruction existed as to what constituted the ultimate aim of the class piano program in colleges and universities. He further stated that not only were the aims and philosophies in conflict, but that the shortage of qualified group piano specialists compounded the difficulties in this problem.
area of music education.

Richards maintained that current practices in teacher education were not equipping the teacher to fulfill the role of teacher of music.

In Ohio, the new "Standards for Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers" mandated a reappraisal of teacher education in all subject areas. The Ohio Music Educators Association (OMEA) Higher Education Committee advocated that music education programs in colleges and universities be concerned with the acquisition of certain basic skills and understandings rather than the completion of a specified sequence of courses by prospective music teachers. The committee formulated a statement on desirable personal qualities and essential musical and teaching competencies for school music teachers. The statement was based in large part on the recommendations of the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) Commission on Teacher Education, on the accreditations standards of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) and of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and on the Ohio "Standards for Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers."

This statement included the following section on "Musical Competencies":

A. Performance
   1. The music educator demonstrates skill in at least one major area of applied music and:
      a. Performs music from all style periods represented in the complete repertory of the particular performance medium.
      b. Possesses technical skills adequate to meet the needs of artistic self-expression.
      c. Performs music at sight.
      d. Performs artistically in a solo setting, in small ensembles, and in large ensembles.
2. The music educator with a teaching specialization in general and/or choral music possesses the following additional performance skills:
   a. Performs on keyboard and fretted instruments sufficient to employ these instruments as teaching tools.
   b. Transposes and improvises accompaniments.
   c. Uses the singing voice effectively.
   d. Accompanies others in performing music.

3. The music educator with a teaching specialization in instrumental music possesses the following additional performance skills:
   a. Possesses a technical knowledge of and performs on a variety of woodwind, brass, string, and percussion instruments sufficient to teach elementary and secondary school students effectively in heterogeneous or homogeneous groups.
   b. Performs on keyboard and fretted instruments sufficient to employ these instruments as teaching tools.
   c. Uses the singing voice effectively.

4. The music educator conducts and rehearses with sufficient skill to create accurate and musically expressive performances with various types of performing groups and in general classroom situations. He demonstrates his baton technique, aural perception skills, score reading ability, analytical skills, and knowledge of performance practices in laboratory and school-based settings.

Due to current emphasis toward "competency based teacher education," or "performance based teacher education," and the concern with producing quality teachers, it was hoped that this present study would prove significant in (a) clarifying the status of class piano programs in Ohio; (b) showing strengths and weaknesses of these programs; (c) reporting significant programs of class piano instruction in order to aid other persons involved in such instruction, and (d) serving as a springboard in an attempt to establish a more unified curriculum throughout the state.

An examination of these class piano programs should yield important findings which could identify current weaknesses and, hopefully,
strengthen existing instruction.

Statement of the Problem

The problem with which this study was concerned was a survey and analysis of class piano instruction for music education students enrolled in programs of music education training at selected colleges and universities in the state of Ohio.

The need for a higher degree of musical preparation in programs of music education prompted this investigation into the current practices and procedures of class piano requirements as part of the professional education of the music educator.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the current practices and procedures of class piano instruction required of music education students enrolled in the music education curricula of selected teacher training institutions of Ohio.

It was hoped that this study would provide a source which might be used as a basis for future planning by concerned piano class teachers. Among the questions which the study sought to answer were:

1. What minimum piano requirements have been recommended by national music teacher associations?

2. What types of pianistic skills are needed and used by the school music teacher?

3. What are the current practices in teacher training institutions in Ohio?
4. What improvements need to be made to the present situation?

**Definition of Terms**

Class piano or, as it is often called, piano class, refers to the piano instruction offered on either a required or elective basis for music majors whose primary performance area is other than piano, taught in a group situation (6 to 24 students) commonly called the piano laboratory or piano lab. Each student may have an instrument (conventional or electronic) or several students may share the same instrument.

Further, class piano is concerned with the total development of the student as an individual whose life may be enriched by an acquired knowledge of literature and an ease of facility in keyboard techniques. The cooperation of all participants in the class situation creates a spirit of group dynamics which fosters effective learning.

Functional and basic piano refer to the curriculum offered in the class piano setting. These course offerings provide the nonkeyboard music major with such functional or basic skills as sight-reading, score reading, harmonization, transposition, and improvisation (the ability to perform music spontaneously, without the aid of printed music or memory, or to create melodies over chordal or ostinato patterns) which best serve the practical needs of choir and instrumental directors and general music teachers. Emphasis is placed on musicianship, music fundamentals, and functional and technical skills.
Delimitation of the Study

This study was delimited to those colleges and universities in the state of Ohio that were (a) located within the geographical limits of the state; (b) four-year colleges and universities approved for Music Teacher Education by the state and listed as such in Laws and Regulations Governing Teacher Education and Certification\textsuperscript{8} and in the Ohio Educational Directory\textsuperscript{9}; (c) members, full or associate, of the National Association of Schools of Music as listed in the NASM Directory.\textsuperscript{10} In Ohio there were 30 colleges and universities meeting these requirements.

This study was not concerned with total course offerings in music, but rather with the extent and nature of class piano preparation of the music education student, in order to ascertain the present status or condition, and to identify the general course or direction class piano instruction was taking.
Reference Notes
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CHAPTER II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF FUNCTIONAL PIANO REQUIREMENTS

Functional piano facility is designed to provide the music education major with useable keyboard skills which may serve a practical need in his professional work.

As far back as 1929 the National Research Council of Music Education,¹ in its outline for a Standard Four-Year Training Course for Supervisors of Music, recommended in a special note that

a portion of the work in piano be devoted to such performance as reading accompaniments at sight and making transpositions from one key to another, improvising accompaniments to a melody and such other performance as is likely to enter into the work of a teacher of school music.

Impetus was given to the suggestion of functional piano facility by the published report resulting from the 1942-44 meetings of the MENC Teachers College Curriculum Committee,² which recommended certain basic minimum standards for intensive and extensive musical performance, musical theory, and musical culture. Among the recommendations for minimum standards was the stipulation that the training program should prepare the music education student in piano sufficiently "to play at sight material of the difficulty of hymn tunes" and "to execute fluently and with musicianly feeling material on the level of his contemplated teaching."³ In addition, under musical theory requirements it was recommended that the student should be able
to use the keyboard in modulating from any key to any key, transposing material of the level of simple song accompaniments from any key to any key, and extemporizing material of the level and general type of simple song accompaniments.  

About the time of the 1944 MENC Curriculum Committee Reports, NASM curricula began to be influenced by the functional idea. In 1942 a hint of change was forecast in the curriculum for the bachelor of music education degree prepared jointly by a committee from NASM and a committee from the American Association of Teachers Colleges (AATC). In the section defining "Preparation in Performance in Applied Music" it was stated that in addition to acquiring ability to have a "mature performing experience for the benefit of himself, his pupils, and his community," the student "must also acquire musical tools necessary for stimulating musical experiences at the level of his teaching."  

When the proposed NASM-AATC curriculum finally appeared in the NASM by-laws of 1945 and 1947, a definite change of outlook was revealed in the following statement included in the "Suggestions Concerning the Applied Music Requirements for the Degree in Music Education."  

Piano. Everyone knows the importance of this music instrument. Graduates of this curriculum must have sufficient knowledge of the piano to enable them to serve themselves and their communities. As a minimum this will include the ability to play simple accompaniments and to test the creative work of the teacher as well as of the student. Whether this is gained through keyboard harmony, private or class lessons in piano, or a combination of both, or whether it is a skill which has already been acquired, would seem to make little difference.
An important feature of this suggestion was that it included all graduates in music education and not just choral or general supervisors.

Subsequent developments of functional requirements were marked by collaboration of NASM and MENC. As a result of this collaboration, the most important recommendation to date evolved and appeared in the NASM by-laws of 1953 and the MENC standards of evaluation. Specifically the recommendation was as follows:

**Functional Piano Facility:** It is recommended that all music education majors be expected to demonstrate piano facility as follows:

a. Ability to sight-read songs of the type found in a song book.

b. Ability to harmonize at sight, improvising a simple piano accompaniment for songs requiring the use of I, IV, and V chords and some simple modulations; also to transpose the songs and harmonizations to other keys.

c. Ability to sight-read fairly fluently simple accompaniments, vocal or instrumental, and simple piano compositions of the type used for school rhythmic activities.

The significance of these requirements is seen in the following factors:

1. The requirements had been approved by the three recognized music teacher associations—MENC, NASM, and MTNA (Music Teachers National Association)—as well as by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE).

2. The recommendation was for all music education majors, not just for general and choral supervisors.

3. Stress was placed on functional piano facility rather than on study of a limited memorized repertoire and technical facility,
and on demonstration of pianistic facility rather than on mere completion of credit hours and course content.

4. Functional piano facility was given a definite place of importance by being listed as one of five areas of musical performance to be required.

5. In addition to functional facility at the piano as previously indicated, the recommendations for basic music include keyboard harmony.

Included in the MENC recommendations and standards were two additional items of importance. The first was the suggestion that precollege music training should include if possible the development of some degree of functional piano facility. The second was the inclusion of "Schedules for the Evaluation of College Curriculum and Instruction Patterns and Professional Laboratory Experiences in Music Education." Because these schedules were approved in 1953 by AACTE and added to their current intervisitation program, they became an important means of extending the concept of functional minimum piano requirements for music education majors. In addition to the functional requirements previously listed, one other requirement was included in the MENC schedules. It was the "ability to play a three or four staff choral score (where piano reduction was omitted) with reasonable facility." ⁹

With the appearance of the 1953 standards, functional minimum piano performance requirements received official recognition and authoritative support. The close correlation between the requirements recommended in the standards and those recommended as desirable
by related research studies would seem to indicate that the 1953 standards included pianistic skills needed by all types of inservice school music teachers. For that reason the standards may be considered an important guide for the formulation of functional minimum piano performance requirements for music education majors.

In presenting some of the foundations for minimum piano requirements for music education majors, it can be seen that the concept of functional minimum piano requirements has evolved as a direct result of attempts to define the curriculum for the music education major in terms of the skills and abilities needed by the well-qualified school music teacher. Robinson and Jarvis also recommended, in their 1967 MENC publication, that teacher training programs include in their minimum requirements demonstration of specific functional piano facilities such as sight-reading, harmonization, transposition, and improvisation.¹⁰

Viewpoints of More Recent Writers

That the aims and structure of class piano programs differ widely may be noted in recent literature on this subject. Buchanan¹¹ concluded from a survey she conducted in 1962 that more attention to functional skills was needed if college piano teachers were to have any effect on practical school music teaching situations. The respondents to her survey reported widespread dissatisfaction with the piano training they had received in college. What these people felt to be necessary to their present teaching situations were the keyboard skills of (a) accompanying; (b) score reading;
(c) sight-reading; (d) improvising; (e) playing by ear, and (f) harmonizing.

Buchanan dramatized the need to emphasize practical keyboard skills and de-emphasize the study of pieces and piano technique. She felt the functional piano skills listed above could best be developed in the piano class.

Other studies indicate agreement with Buchanan's report of dissatisfaction. Klein\textsuperscript{12} investigated 276 elementary school teachers' judgments of their preparation. The respondents generally showed a poor competency in singing and in piano playing. More than three-fifths reported no undergraduate instruction in class piano.

More specifically, Cassie\textsuperscript{13} found that elementary school vocal music teachers did not feel competent in the pianistic skills of improvisation, modulation, and transposition.

That pianistic skills were important to elementary classroom teachers was affirmed by DeVermond,\textsuperscript{14} who, in a survey of 205 elementary classroom teachers, found that those with piano experience felt that they were better able to carry on classroom music activities than did those without piano experience.

\textbf{Piano Instruction in the Music Education Curriculum}

A 1958 survey by Webber was concerned with minimum piano requirements for music education majors. She found strong support for functional piano. Her study showed that schools varied widely in their treatment of credits, minimum levels of playing and functional abilities. She found "evidence of a directional movement toward the
incorporation of functional ability into existing requirements.\textsuperscript{15}

Webber made the following recommendations for music education programs which involve piano instruction.\textsuperscript{16} Each department should:

1. Re-evaluate its philosophy and procedures of piano instruction for the music education major.
2. Incorporate as a definite part of its required standards for music teacher training functional minimum piano requirements for all music education majors.
3. State minimum piano requirements in terms of competencies or critical tasks needed by the well-qualified school music teacher.
4. Use as a guide for those requirements . . . NASM-MENC standards of training and the findings of research studies.
5. Require evidence of proficiency through the use of carefully administered proficiency examinations which must be passed at least in part before student teaching.
6. Evaluate piano proficiency at entrance, each semester of study, before entrance to student teaching, and before graduation.
7. Re-evaluate, re-define, and reorganize piano courses for music education majors in terms of providing functional piano experiences and the use of the piano as a basic tool.
8. Select properly qualified piano teachers who understand the basic philosophy and objectives of piano instruction for the music education major and who know how to get results in the shortest time possible.
9. Use every available means to secure faculty and student understanding of the importance of functional piano facility for the music education major.
10. Plan for the future by encouraging music education majors to introduce keyboard experiences and class piano instruction into their own future music programs.

Nicklett's study\textsuperscript{17} dealt with piano majors. While examining the piano major program at Ithaca College, Nicklett found that most music education majors worked in the field of vocal music after graduation. This type of teaching necessitated the acquisition of other piano skills (other than study of technique and piano repertoire) not available in the traditional half-hour private lesson. The additional
skills included ensemble playing, accompanying, and functional facility in sight-reading, harmonizing, and transposing songs, playing open scores, and improvising. She found that piano minors generally received functional piano training whereas little of this training was available to the piano major.

The study of Fisher\(^\text{18}\) suggested specific curricular changes in music teacher preparation on the basis of an analysis of the opinions of recipients of music education degrees from 1948 to 1967, and the current faculty at his institution. In his summary Fisher stated that

> course offerings in music teacher training should be more closely related to the needs of the public school music teacher including areas of performance skills, music theory, and music history; that current keyboard offerings do not allow enough learning opportunities in the skills and competencies of accompanying and improvisation.

Webber recommended the use of NASM guidelines, but research indicates that they are not frequently used or even met.

In a survey of functional skills for music educators, Freeburne\(^\text{19}\) found that larger schools and schools belonging to NASM were more aware of the necessity of requiring students to attain a certain degree of piano proficiency than were smaller schools and non-NASM members. The piano training of most public school teachers in the 19-state North Central area studied was determined to be inadequate.

Bulgin,\(^\text{20}\) investigating the programs of selected liberal arts colleges, found that 82% of his survey respondents (42 institutions) required a secondary medium of performance, usually piano. The responding institutions did not follow NASM recommendations for
proving competence in applied skills and gave little attention to the levels of achievement in these skills.

Borg, in an analysis of music education curricula, found that 88% of the 24 institutions he studied required a piano proficiency test for music education majors. Goertzmann, in a study of the minor performance area classes in music education curricula, reported that while piano proficiency tests were generally required, the requirements of NASM were not met in the minor instrument area by 40% of the 172 colleges studied.

That requirements are often not being met is reinforced by the findings of Lee and Bennett. Lee mailed questionnaires to 24 teacher training institutions selected by MENC and NASM for having made significant changes in their undergraduate music education curriculum during the ten-year period from 1955 to 1965. As a result of his investigation, he made 16 recommendations concerning curricular changes. One of the recommendations was that "there should be piano instruction which is more closely related to the needs of the public school music teacher."

Bennett's evaluation of the effectiveness of undergraduate training in music education revealed that his respondents were generally adequate in their preparation for teaching public school music, but he recommended that "classwork in all areas needs to relate to practical situations as much as possible" and that "subject areas should be interrelated but not at the expense of losing basic skills which are currently being taught through specialization."
Class Piano Instruction

Webber concluded that group piano instruction was the "most effective way of developing a functional piano facility for the music education major." The following supporting statements for class piano instruction are listed in her investigation.25

1. Class piano provides a ready-made laboratory situation for the testing, through constant use in a social setting, of the functional skills being developed.

2. It provides confidence in playing before others, develops rhythmic security through keeping going, provides a wide variety of experiences and contact with many materials, provides a chance for supervised practice, and a chance to compare individual accomplishments with those of others.

3. It provides experience with a type of piano instruction with which the public school music teacher should be familiar.

4. It provides opportunities for appraising learning situations, for seeing how the same concept may be approached in different ways, and for understanding how individual differences may be cared for in a group situation.

5. It stimulates more intense listening through experiences in following the printed score while others perform and through appraising the performance when they finish.

Webber stated that "a well organized class with a dynamic teacher is one of the best ways of promoting the development of a functional piano facility."26 Later she wrote, "The development of a functional facility cannot be taken for granted or left to chance. It requires a thorough, logical, and cumulative sequence of developmental musical experiences."27 She recommended playing by ear, improvisation, transposition, and sight-reading as valuable practical skills which can be developed in a piano class.
Richards' study\textsuperscript{28} of class piano trends traced the history of this form of piano teaching through methods and materials of the past. He defined class piano instruction as: "... a total means of instruction involving all areas of piano study" and found that class piano instruction could produce "superior results."

Richards also described in detail the class piano program at Montana State University and listed the following requisites for successful modern group teaching: (a) small classes; (b) trained teachers; (c) homogeneous groupings; (d) adequate facilities; and (e) ample time.

That group instruction has become an accepted medium of instruction is verified in the findings of a study by Goltz\textsuperscript{29} surveying class piano laboratories. His findings indicated that of his 224 respondents, 183 (81.7\%) included class piano in the curriculum. Of these, there were 113 electronic labs and 39 conventional labs, while 31 respondents indicated that they had both.

In the area of class piano instructor experience, 65\% had specialized training in class piano techniques and 51\% had specialized training in electronic piano usage.

Goltz further indicated that the functional skills taught by the respondents, ranked most to least, were: sight-reading, harmonization, transposition, technical development, chord progressions, critical listening, playing by ear, analyses, improvisation, and accompanying.

Trantham,\textsuperscript{30} in an experimental music theory approach to beginning piano instruction for the college music major, concluded that the
presentation of materials taught in keyboard harmony is more effectively administered in a course that follows the concepts of comprehensive musicianship in interrelating these materials with the study of music compositions. The fragmented instruction given by theory departments in colleges would gain more successful results if it were placed in a course in comprehensive piano facility.

In further support of comprehensive musicianship and keyboard skills, S. T. Burns and Kingsbury, in separate studies, found that the most frequently used method of studying harmony of a composition before rehearsal was its performance on the piano. Respondents also reported that in selecting music, reading silently ranked first, and that playing on the piano ranked second.

Webber recommended the piano class as ideal for the music education student. She wrote, "... class instruction seems to be a very logical, a most economical, ... a most effective way of developing a functional piano facility for the music education major."  

Not all piano educators, however, agreed that the purpose of class piano instruction should be only to equip the student with functional skills. Robert Pace believed that the study of repertoire and technique has a definite place in the college group piano program. Although he favored the development of keyboard skills as listed by Buchanan, he maintained that the study of literature and technique brought about a unified musicianship which was necessary in the training of a young music educator.

It is obvious from these limited statements on the subject of piano instruction in the college that confusion exists with regard to
the role of class piano in the college. Added to this confusion are the differing views of applied piano teachers who often teach some sections of class piano. They favor more traditional approaches to study and are not always prepared to teach groups. The class piano program is a victim of opposing forces. Music educators favor more practical skills while piano teachers are distressed to see repertoire and technique neglected.

In a study of the effect of group and individual piano instruction on selected aspects of musical achievement, Rogers designed a test to measure aural discrimination, knowledge of music symbols, sight-reading, transposition, and improvisation. Sixty-four students, ages six to nine, were taught in groups or individually. His major findings revealed that:

1. Students who had received group piano instruction scored significantly higher on all five variables measured.
2. Responses from the teachers revealed that they unanimously favored group piano for teaching/learning behaviours as compared with individual piano instruction.

Lowder's studies, published in 1970 and 1974, focused entirely on sight-reading skills which were complex for the piano student as the music was written on two staves instead of one staff. He concluded that the type of keyboard skill gained was not as important as the amount of experience achieved, and that only one quarter or semester of study was insufficient for the development of the tactual memory needed for effective sight-reading.

In the eyes of many, class instruction is viewed as an inferior method of teaching, a stigma which carries over from the 1920's, when
piano manufacturers tended to commercialize this movement. Criticism of class piano results and methods usually stems from inferior group teaching. Richards found that where class programs failed, the fault usually could be traced to inadequate preparation of the teacher. Far too few schools offer specialized work in this area and the supply of teachers has not kept pace with the expansion of class piano programs in the college.

The study of Pounds perhaps indicated other problems. In a study of the comparative performance of freshman music majors in the first course of basic piano taught by contrasting teaching treatments involving conventional and electronic piano facilities, he sought to discover whether the electronic piano system as an instructional medium was as effective in teaching basic piano skills as was the use of conventional pianos. His findings revealed that:

1. Electronic and conventional piano students whose teachers instructed on only one piano system significantly outscored those students whose teachers instructed on both piano types.
2. Students who received instruction on conventional pianos scored significantly higher in final measured achievement than did the students who were taught basic piano skills on electronic pianos.

The purpose of a study by Lyke was to investigate first- and second-year class piano programs so that they could be judged as adequate or inadequate in meeting the needs of music education majors. The criteria set minimum standards in a variety of instructional areas. Each school's program was evaluated according to the criteria through observations and interviews with class piano faculty. Other data, including syllabi, general objectives, and piano proficiency, were
collected and compared.

Evaluations of programs against the established criteria generally pointed up that instruction was weak in the following areas: (a) basic keyboard patterns including the construction of scales and modes; (b) improvisation; (c) aural dictation; (d) musical analysis; and (e) vocal and instrumental score reduction.

On the basis of his findings, Lyke made recommendations for improving class piano instruction in the six state universities. Four of those recommendations are listed:

1. A class piano conference involving all the teachers in the study should be held. This should result in a definition of competencies at each level and insure more uniform standards in class piano programs throughout the state.

2. The subject structure of class piano should be organized around practical skills and literature which could have relevance for future needs of music education majors.

3. Class piano teachers should improve their techniques, especially in those areas where minimum standards were not met according to the criteria.

4. Piano pedagogy courses should begin to emphasize problems and approaches to group piano teaching in the college.

Class Piano for Elementary Education Majors

Rast's investigation was concerned with piano requirements for elementary education majors rather than for music education majors. He sent an initial questionnaire to those concerned with teaching piano to the elementary education major. Following this, he interviewed each respondent, investigated facilities for instruction, observed classes available to him, and evaluated his personal visits.
Rast found the following skills to be most frequently stressed in piano courses he observed.\(^{43}\) Students were required to:

1. Play I, IV, V\(_7\) chords in major and minor keys.
2. Play major and minor triads in all keys.
3. Play major and minor scale patterns in all keys.
4. Play single-line elementary music text melodies at sight.
5. Play blocked chords to single-line elementary music text melodies at sight.
6. Play varied accompaniments for single-line melodies using I, IV, V\(_7\) chords (varying the style).
7. Play two- and three-part elementary songs from standard music series accompaniment books at sight.
8. Play four-part compositions (hymn style) at sight.
10. Play prepared accompaniments from standard classroom music accompaniment texts.
11. Improvise and harmonize short melodic phrases.

In summarizing his study, Rast noted that "creativity and improvisation were almost totally ignored as areas of instruction."\(^{44}\) Rast generally found a poor organization of courses and materials of study that were all too often unrelated to future needs. He found great differences of ability and achievement within classes observed. He noted wide disparity between the situations he personally observed and answers to questionnaires pertaining to those situations. Rast agreed with Webber that the most successful classes were those taught by class piano specialists who were familiar with the broad objectives of music education.

**Summary**

The foundations and importance of minimum functional piano requirements for music education majors have been established through the investigation of minimum piano requirements as recommended by
national music teacher organizations.

The viewpoints of more recent writers would seem to indicate that despite the recommendations, a state of widespread confusion and dissatisfaction still exists as to the piano training received in college by the music education major.

Aims and structure of class piano programs differ widely. Criticisms of class piano as an inferior method of teaching piano are still heard, even though there is growing support for functional class piano.

Class piano instruction has been shown to be effective at all levels of instruction, including class piano for the music education major, upper-level piano classes for piano majors, and instruction for elementary education majors. Class piano has been shown to be a most effective way of developing and improving the general musicianship and functional piano facility of the music education major.

It is not known, however, just what the content of these class piano courses are. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to determine the current practices and procedures of class piano instruction required of music education students enrolled in the music education curricula of selected teacher training institutions of Ohio.
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CHAPTER III
SELECTION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

In order to develop a systematic and thorough investigation of the selected class piano programs of Ohio, the recommendations of NASM and MENC were selected as the criteria against which the programs were compared. These recommendations reflected the findings of many research studies—already completed and fully developed and delineated by music educators, class piano specialists, and other educational authorities in the field—on which keyboard skills were considered the most important and which skills should be taught. The published guidelines were listed in: (a) the NASM Handbook, "Standards for Undergraduate Degrees in Music,"¹ and (b) Teaching Piano in Classroom and Studio, "Guidelines for University, College, and Other Adult Piano Classes."²

The initial phase of the study involved the selection of schools with programs of music teacher training and accredited by the North Central Association of Schools as listed in the Education Directory, Colleges and Universities 1977-78.³ The schools selected offered a four-year program leading to the bachelor's degree or to the first professional degree and met the requirements as stated in Chapter I, Delimitation of the Study. Junior colleges were not included in the study. Nor were theological seminaries included unless it was clearly
stated that a program of music teacher training was a part of the educational program of the institution. Liberal arts schools were included in the study because they offered programs for the preparation and certification of music teachers.

Although the Education Directory listed membership in NASM, the NASM Directory, 1979 was also used to determine which of the selected schools were full or associate members of NASM. The Ohio Educational Directory, 1978-79 was examined for a listing of four-year teacher training institutions accredited by the state of Ohio. Although 51 institutions were found to be accredited as four-year teacher training institutions, only 30 were also members of NASM. Of these 30 institutions, four were designated by NASM as: institutions provisionally accredited; or institutions accredited with some reservation; or institutions approved but on probation. Six state universities supporting a total of 19 regional or branch campuses were included in the study, but only data from the main campuses were included in this study.

Using these criteria for selection, the writer selected 30 colleges and universities for inclusion in the study. The following data relating to the 30 institutions were abstracted from the Education Directory and the NASM Directory. Institutions listed in the directories as both liberal arts and teacher preparatory institutions were included under the single heading of liberal arts.
TABLE 1

Types and Control or Affiliation of Selected Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Independent/non-profit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. State supported</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Church related</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liberal Arts Colleges</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Independent/non-profit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Church related</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                                | 30  |

Although not listed as a separate category above, three conservatories were included in the study. One conservatory was a music division of a church-related college, one a music division of an independent/non-profit college, and one a music division of a church-related university.

The 15 church-related institutions were affiliated with or supported by 11 religious denominations: American Lutheran, Brethren, Church of God of North America, Friends, Lutheran Church of America, Mennonite, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, United Church of Christ, United Methodist Church (5), and United Presbyterian, U.S.A.
Distribution of Schools by Counties

The state of Ohio is divided into 88 counties. The schools selected for the study were located in 24 of these counties: 19 counties each supported one institution, 4 counties each supported two institutions, and 1 county supported three institutions.

Enrollment of the Schools

The student enrollment of the sample ranged from 807 students in a small liberal arts college to 49,982 students in a large state university. The 30 institutions had a combined total student enrollment of 266,669. Of these, 6,202 were enrolled as music students, supported by a faculty that totaled 903. (The music faculty of these 30 institutions was comprised of full- and part-time, adjunct, and visiting faculty members.)

Highest Level of Degree Offering

The following categories had been established by the Education Directory to designate institutions by highest level of degree offering:

4- or 5-year baccalaureate--includes those institutions offering programs of studies leading to the customary bachelor of arts or bachelor of science degree, requiring at least 4 but less than 6 years.

First professional degree--includes those institutions that offer the academic requirements for selected professions based on programs that require at least 2 academic years of previous college work for entrance and a total of at least 6 years of college work for completion; e.g., medicine (M.D.), law (LL.B., J.D.), theology (B.D., M.Div., Rabbi),
dentistry (D.D.S.), veterinary medicine (D.V.M.), osteopathic medicine (D.O.).

Master's--includes those institutions offering the customary first graduate degree, master of arts or master of science degree in the liberal arts and sciences, or the next degree in the same field after the first professional degree; eg., Master of Science in Surgery (M.S. in Surgery), Master of Law (LL.M.), and Master of Science in Dentistry (M.S.D.).

Doctorate--includes those institutions offering the Ph.D. or its equivalent in any field; eg., Doctor of Education, Doctor of Juridical Science, Doctor of Public Health.

**TABLE 2**

Highest Level of Degree Offering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Degree</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4- or 5-year baccalaureate</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First professional degree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Types of Programs**

The designation used by the Education Directory of the types of programs were explained as follows:

Terminal-occupational below bachelor's--refers to programs of at least 2 but less than 4 years beyond high school designed to provide students with knowledge and skills necessary for immediate employment but for which credits are not ordinarily acceptable toward baccalaureate degree programs.

Liberal arts and general--refers to 4- or 5-year baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate degree programs in the liberal arts and sciences. It may also include preprofessional programs (such as prelaw, prelibrary science, presocial work, and premedicine).

Teacher-preparatory programs--as used here must be of at least 4 years' duration.
Professional programs—as used here are separate programs of at least 4 years beyond high school, outside liberal arts and organized around a professionally oriented academic discipline. Included are 4- or 5-year degree programs in agriculture, business administration, and engineering as well as those programs leading to the 6-year or more first-professional degree defined in the section on highest level of offering.

### TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Institutions and Types of Programs Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Terminal—occupational below bachelor's  
B Liberal arts and general  
C Teacher—preparatory  
D Professional programs

As can be determined from Table 3, 29 (96.6%) of the institutions selected for the study offered more than one type of degree program; 14 (46.6%) of the institutions offered liberal arts, teacher-preparatory, and professional programs; 10 (33%) of the institutions offered both liberal arts and teacher-preparatory programs; 5 (16.6%) of the institutions offered all four categories of degree programs, while only one institution was designated solely as liberal arts and general.
The Questionnaire

In order to make a comparative study and analysis of minimum piano requirements for undergraduate music education majors in Ohio teacher training institutions, it was necessary to consider the means of acquiring the data. At first it was thought that a careful examination of college catalogues would provide the necessary information for such a survey. This, however, proved impractical: a preliminary examination showed that while some catalogues gave detailed statements of minimum requirements, others either gave vague statements or failed to mention requirements at all. Moreover, none of the catalogues provided any of numerous administrative details, the knowledge of which was necessary for a clear analysis of existing requirements. Consequently, it was decided that a method other than catalogue examination was needed in order to provide an accurate and detailed analysis of existing requirements.

Despite the many problems involved in the use of a questionnaire, it was concluded that this type of investigation would provide the most likely means of determining the nature of existing minimum piano requirements for music education majors.

The questionnaire used for this study was modeled after the questionnaire developed by Webber in her study of minimum piano requirements for music education majors in 1958. (See Appendix A for a reproduction of the questionnaire.)

The following changes were made to align the questionnaire for the needs of the present study:
1. Wording was changed where necessary to shape the questionnaire specifically for use in Ohio.

2. References to "piano teachers" were changed to read "class piano teachers."

3. References to "minimum piano requirements" were changed to read "minimum class piano requirements."

4. Three items were deleted from the original questionnaire: ways of informing students and teachers of minimum piano requirements; name and address of a person known to be very successful in piano instruction for the music education major; names of teacher(s) in charge of piano instruction, since this information had already been obtained from the OMEA Directory of Music Teachers (see below).

5. Added to the original questionnaire were sections questioning the physical arrangements (V in the questionnaire) and adult continuing education programs (IX in the questionnaire).

6. Finally, the query "Do you wish to receive a digest of the findings of the questionnaire?" was moved from the beginning to the end of the questionnaire.

After the questionnaire as used for this study was developed, the OMEA Directory of Music Teachers in Public, Private, and Parochial Schools and Colleges and Universities, 1977-78 was used to determine the names of the persons who taught class piano in the selected institutions. In cases where uncertainty existed, telephone calls were made to the music departments of the institutions to determine the name of the person responsible for class piano instruction. In this way, a list of individual names and addresses was developed. It
was thought that mailings directly to a specific person, rather than mailings to music departments in general, would bring about a more prompt and complete return. Permission was granted by this writer's university to send the cover letter under the university letterhead.

Thirty cover letters and questionnaires were mailed, with a request for return within four weeks. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was included with each letter to facilitate return of the questionnaire.

Six weeks after the initial mailing, a second cover letter, questionnaire, and return envelope were mailed to those persons not responding to the first request. Two weeks were allowed for these returns. After this total period of eight weeks, personal telephone calls were made to several persons who still had not responded to the two previous requests.

It was through this persistence that 28 of the 30 questionnaires sent were finally returned—a return of 93.3%. Three of the replies were discarded because it was stated that these institutions did not offer class piano. Another return was discarded because it was stated that although they did have an electronic piano lab, it was rarely used, and then only for an occasional keyboard harmony class. Therefore, the results reported in this study are based on replies from 24 (80%) of the teacher training institutions in Ohio selected for this study. A list of the participating institutions may be found in Appendix D of this study.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Types of Bachelors Degrees Offered with a
Major in Music Education

Analysis of the data revealed that eight different baccalaureate
degrees with a music education major were offered by the 24 institu-
tions included in this study. Table 4 shows the number of institu-
tions offering each type of degree. The two degrees with a music
education major most frequently offered by the participating institu-
tions were the Bachelor of Music (45.8%) and the Bachelor of Music
Education (41.6%).

TABLE 4

Types of Bachelors Degrees Offered with a
Major in Music Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Fine Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Music</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Music Education</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of School Music</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Music in Music Therapy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further analysis of the questionnaire indicated a total of 18 institutions offered only one degree with a music education major, while 4 offered two degrees; 1, three degrees; and 1, five degrees.

Degrees Meeting Certification Requirements

In answer to this question, 18 institutions stated that they offered at least one degree with a music education major that met state certification requirements; 3, two degree; 1, three degrees; and 1, five degrees.

Size of Music Departments

That the sample represented music departments of different sizes was shown by the number of music faculty members and the number of music education majors enrolled. Not all schools supplied this information, but there were sufficient replies to indicate that the sample represented music departments with as few as four music faculty members to those with as many as 80 music faculty members. Table 5 reports the distribution of institutions by number of full-time music faculty members.
TABLE 5

Number of Full-Time Music Faculty in the Participating Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Music Faculty Members</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Class Piano Teachers in Each Institution

An analysis of the data to this question revealed that 17 (73.9%) of the institutions used the services of a full-time class piano instructor; 16 (69.5%) part-time; 7 (30.4%) graduate assistants; and 1 undergraduate assistant. Only one institution indicated that they did not have a class piano instructor on the faculty, even though class piano was offered for music education majors. It must be assumed that class piano was taught by a member of the applied music faculty at that institution. Table 6 reports the number and type of class piano teachers in the participating institutions.
TABLE 6

Number of Class Piano Teachers in Each Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Class Piano Teacher</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate assistants</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate assistants</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That class piano instruction has become an integral part of the music education curriculum is evident when it is realized that a total of 73.9% of the participating institutions in this study used the services of a full-time class piano faculty member.

**Number of Music Majors Enrolled This Term**

Institutions vary in the time at which declaration of a major is required, and the number of majors change from term to term. Therefore, it must be realized that the reported data for Table 7 can only be an approximation.
TABLE 7

Number of Music Majors Enrolled This Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Music Education Majors</th>
<th>Other Music Majors</th>
<th>Total of All Music Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1,712                          Total 2,177                   Total 3,889
The data are interesting from the standpoint of the relative proportions of music education majors as contrasted with other music majors. It can be seen that the 21 institutions answering this item enrolled an approximate total of 1,712 (44%) music education majors as compared to a total of 2,177 (55.9%) other music majors. Combined, a total music major enrollment of 3,889 was reported.

While one institution did not complete this item, two institutions gave only the total music major enrollments of 300 and 325, which brought the number of music majors enrolled in the participating institutions to 4,514. Therefore, the enrollment categories of music education majors and other majors were undoubtedly also larger than shown and may possibly lead to distortion in any analysis.

**Existing Minimum Piano Requirements for Music Education Majors**

Analysis of the data from the 20 respondents to this item indicates that the participating institutions had one or more of the following types of minimum piano requirements for music education majors: semester hours credit; levels of advancement; skills/functional abilities.

Data are presented in terms of (1) requirements showing no differentiation in minimum piano requirements according to type of music education major, and (2) requirements showing such differentiation.
Minimum Credit Requirements

These requirements may be classified according to two general patterns:

I. Same amount of credit required for all types of music education majors.

II. Different amounts of credit required according to the special type of music education major.

Pattern I. The most prevalent way of dealing with the problem of piano credit for music education majors was to require the same amount of credit for all music education majors regardless of the area of specialization. Seventeen (85%) of the respondents approached the problem in this manner. Nine institutions listed the amount of credit required: one, 2 semester hours; one, 3 semester hours; and seven, 4 semester hours.

Pattern II. Three respondents indicated that they required amounts of credit according to the special type of music education major.

Different amounts of semester credit hours:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Choral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where institutions differentiated between credit requirements according to major, the credit requirements for choral majors tended to be higher than for instrumental majors. This small sample of institutions does not indicate a trend in the use of differentiated credit requirements for the different types of music education majors.
Minimum Levels of Advancement

Of the 24 participating institutions, 22 (91.6%) indicated that at least a part of their minimum piano requirements for all music education majors was stated in terms of levels of advancement. Table 8 (page 48) shows the minimum level of advancement for all music education majors. Further analysis of Table 8 revealed that the level of advancement most frequently required was Level 4—advanced enough to perform easy sonatinas and easiest pieces of Bach.

Differentiation According to Major

Of the nine institutions making a differentiation in levels of advancement according to teaching emphasis, all indicated a higher level of advancement was required of choral majors than of instrumental majors.

Table 9 (page 49) shows the level of advancement required by the nine institutions which differentiate according to type of music education major. From the data given in Table 9, it will be noted that the range of required levels of advancement according to type of major is as follows: Levels 2 to 4 for instrumental majors and Levels 4 to 5 for choral majors, where a rank of 1 is the lowest and a rank of 5 is the highest.

Minimum Skills and Functional Abilities

Analysis of the data concerning skills and functional abilities revealed a wide variation in the kind and number of skills required by the 24 participating institutions. While some institutions required only a few skills of all music education majors, others required many
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Advancement</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Requiring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Elementary knowledge of piano</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Advanced enough to play a simple melody with a simple accompaniment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advanced enough to play music of hymn-tune difficulty</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Advanced enough to perform easy sonatinas and easiest pieces of Bach</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Advanced enough to perform Bach Two-Part Inventions or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Preludes and Fugues; easier sonatinas of Haydn,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart, and Beethoven; easier romantic and modern pieces</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9

Minimum Levels of Advancement in Piano by Nine Institutions Differentiating According to Type of Music Education Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Institutions</th>
<th>Type of Major with Numbers Indicating Level of Advancement*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers in each column refer to level of advancement as follows: 2--advanced enough to play a simple melody with a simple accompaniment; 3--advanced enough to play music of hymn-tune difficulty; 4--advanced enough to perform easy sonatinas and easiest pieces of Bach; 5--advanced enough to perform Bach Two-Part Inventions or Little Preludes and Fugues, easier sonatas of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and easier romantic and modern pieces.
in a variety of combinations. Some institutions differentiated even further in the skills required of special types of music education majors. Each skill and functional ability will be considered as a unit in terms of its frequency as related to other skills and functional abilities. Table 10 (page 51) provides the data for all of the following analyses.

**Item 1: Technical proficiency in scales, arpeggios.** Eighteen (75%) of the institutions required this skill of all music education majors. Two institutions required it of choral majors only. These figures indicate that 20 (83.3%) required technical proficiency in scales or arpeggios of some type of music education major.

**Item 2: Performance from memory of a representative number of pieces in various styles.** Performance of representative literature was required for all music education majors by 15 (62.5%) of the participating institutions. One institution required it of choral majors only and one of choral and instrumental majors only. A combination of these figures indicates that this facility was required of some type of music education major by 17 (70.8%) of the participating institutions. Three institutions indicated that memorization was no longer required.

**Item 3: Performance of patriotic songs from memory.** Thirteen (54.1%) of the participating institutions required performance of patriotic songs of all music education majors while one institution required it of choral majors only, and one institution required it of instrumental majors only. Another institution required it of instrumental and choral majors only. A total of 16 (66.6%) of the
TABLE 10
Minimum Skills and Functional Abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill or Functional Ability</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Requiring According to Type of Major*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Technical proficiency in scales, arpeggios</td>
<td>I   C   G   IC  IG  CG   ICC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Performance from memory of a representative number of pieces in various styles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Performance from memory of patriotic songs: &quot;Star Spangled Banner,&quot; &quot;America,&quot; &quot;America the Beautiful&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sight-reading of hymns or community songs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sight-reading vocal accompaniments or pieces of the type found in school music books</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sight-reading simple instrumental accompaniments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sight-reading three- or four-staff choral score</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Harmonization of melodies at sight using simple chords and styles of accompaniment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Improvisation of music suitable for rhythmic activity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Playing by ear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Transposition of easy songs and accompaniments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* I--Instrumental majors; C--Choral majors; G--General majors
participating institutions required this item of some type of music education major. Three respondents indicated that memorization was no longer required.

Item 4: Sight-reading of hymns or community songs. Twenty-one (87.5%) of the participating institutions required this skill of all music education majors. One institution required it of instrumental majors only, while another of instrumental and choral majors only. A third institution required this of choral and general majors only. A total of 24 (100%) of the institutions required this skill of some type of music education major.

Item 5: Sight-reading vocal accompaniments or pieces of the type found in school music books. Fifteen (62.5%) of the participating institutions required this ability of all music education majors. One institution required it of choral and general majors only, while five institutions required it of choral majors only. A total of 21 (87.5%) of the participating institutions required this type of sight-reading of some type of music education major.

Item 6: Sight-reading simple instrumental accompaniments. Nineteen (79.1%) of the institutions required this reading skill of all music education majors. Four institutions required it of instrumental majors only. A total of 23 (95.8%) of the participating institutions required this skill of some type of music education major.

Item 7: Sight-reading three- or four-staff choral score. Only seven (29.1%) of the participating institutions required choral score reading of all music education majors. An additional six institutions required it of choral majors, four of choral and general, and
one institution required it of instrumental and choral majors only. The total number of institutions requiring this skill was 18 (75%).

**Item 8: Harmonization of melodies at sight using simple chords and styles of accompaniments.** Twenty-one (87.5%) of the institutions required harmonization of melodies at sight of all music education majors. One institution required it of choral majors only, while another required it of instrumental and choral majors only. A total of 23 (95.8%) of the participating institutions required some type of music education major to harmonize melodies at sight.

**Item 9: Improvisation of music suitable for rhythmic activity.** Only 12 (50%) of the institutions required this skill of all music education majors, while one required it of choral and general majors only and one of general majors only. Another required it of instrumental and choral majors only. The total number of institutions requiring some type of music education major to improvise music suitable for rhythmic activity was 15 (62.5%).

**Item 10: Playing by ear.** Thirteen (54.1%) of the participating institutions required this ability of all music education majors, while one required it of instrumental and choral majors only. A total of 14 (58.3%) of the participating institutions required playing by ear of some type of music education major.

**Item 11: Transposition of easy songs and accompaniments.** The data reveal that 17 (70.8%) of the institutions required transposition of all music education majors, while two required it of choral majors only, and one of general majors only. Thus a total of 20 (83.3%) of the participating institutions required transposition of easy songs
and accompaniments of some type of music education major.

**Item 12: (not shown in Table 10).** Six participating institutions responded to this item, listing additional skills and functional abilities required at their institutions beyond the 11 listed in the questionnaire.

Two institutions listed as an additional requirement for instrumental music education majors the "transposition to concert pitch of E♭, B♭, and F instrumental parts."

Four other respondents indicated that the following skills and functional abilities were required of all music education majors:

- Improvise a melody and accompaniment using pop/jazz chords.
- Transpose a melodic line at sight.
- Prepare and perform a piano solo of own choosing in two weeks.
- Prepare an easy accompaniment with a soloist in the piano class, performing two weeks after assignment for class.

**Comparative Frequency of All Skills and Functional Abilities**

Analysis of the data of Table 10 indicates that the skills required of all music education majors in order of frequency were:

1. sight-reading hymns or community songs and harmonization of melodies at sight using simple chords and styles of accompaniments;
2. sight-reading simple instrumental accompaniments;
3. technical proficiency in scales, arpeggios;
4. transposition of easy songs and accompaniments;
5. performance from memory of a representative number of pieces in various styles and sight-reading vocal accompaniments or pieces of the types found in school music books;
6. performance from
memory of patriotic songs and playing by ear; (7) improvisation of music suitable for rhythmic activity; and (8) sight-reading three- or four-staff choral scores.

The small percentage of institutions requiring sight-reading three- or four-staff choral scores would seem to indicate that this competency was not generally required of music education majors.

Where differentiation was made according to music education major, the following fact seemed evident: The greatest amount of differentiation was made in terms of choral and general majors with fewer requirements being made of the instrumental major. Choral majors were expected to demonstrate more piano competencies than instrumental majors.

It is most interesting to note the relative change in the ranking of the 11 items when the skills and functional abilities required of all music majors are combined with the skills and functional abilities required of instrumental, choral, and general music majors only. This comparison is shown in Table 11 (page 56), where a rank of 1 is the highest, and a rank of 10 is the lowest.

An analysis of Table 11 shows that while no dramatic changes occurred in the relative ranking of each item, some change did take place. Two items moved higher, six moved lower, and three remained the same.

Sight-reading of hymns/community songs, instrumental and vocal accompaniments, and harmonization remained high in the ranking. The skills of transposition, technical proficiency, and performance of representative pieces remained near the center of the ranking. The
### TABLE 11

Ranking of the Eleven Skills and Functional Abilities when Combining Those Listed for All Music Education Majors with Those Required of Instrumental, Choral, and General Music Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill or Functional Ability</th>
<th>Ranking of Items Required of All Music Education Majors</th>
<th>Ranking of Items Including All Instrumental, Choral, and General Music Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Technical proficiency in scales, arpeggios</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 (lower) (tied with item 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Performance from memory of a representative number of pieces of various styles</td>
<td>5 (tied with item 5)</td>
<td>6 (lower)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Performance from memory of patriotic songs</td>
<td>6 (tied with item 10)</td>
<td>7 (lower)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sight-reading of hymns/community songs</td>
<td>1 (tied with item 8)</td>
<td>1 (same)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sight-reading vocal accompaniments</td>
<td>5 (tied with item 2)</td>
<td>3 (higher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sight-reading instrumental accompaniments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (same) (tied with item 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sight-reading three- or four-staff choral scores</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 (higher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Harmonization of melodies at sight</td>
<td>1 (tied with item 4)</td>
<td>2 (lower) (tied with item 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Improvisation of music for rhythmic activity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8 (lower)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Playing by ear</td>
<td>6 (tied with item 3)</td>
<td>9 (lower)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Transposition of songs and accompaniments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (same) (tied with item 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
skill of sight-reading three- or four-staff choral scores, three rankings higher, is now in the center of the rankings. The skills of playing by ear and improvising music for rhythmic activity and the performance of patriotic songs ranked low. It would appear that a majority of class piano instructors were quite concerned with reading skills and technical proficiency.

**Existing Administrative Procedures for Minimum Piano Requirements**

**Method of Determining Requirements**

In determining minimum piano requirements for music education majors, 19 (82.6%) of the institutions indicated that they had stated minimum class piano requirements for music education majors, while four (17.3%) indicated that they did not have such stated requirements. One of the respondents, who indicated that they did not have stated minimum class piano requirements for music education majors, said that "the students must pass an entrance test. If they do not pass it, they take class piano—as much as needed. They must take private lessons and keyboard harmony (usually taught in the Class Piano Lab) if they pass the entrance test."

Most of the participating institutions used a faculty group rather than an individual to determine the requirements. The 21 (87.5%) replies to this item indicated the use of various faculty groups as follows:
Entire music faculty 6 schools
Piano faculty 1 school
Music education faculty 1 school
Music education and piano faculty 5 schools
Various combinations of the preceding, plus department head, dean, individual piano teacher or graduate assistants 7 schools

In contrast, only one school indicated that one individual, the class piano teacher, determined minimum piano requirements for music education majors.

Comments from those institutions indicating the use of various faculty group combinations include:

We discuss as an entire faculty the needs and results of our program. It is flexible and subject to variance as each year is appraised.

Although I determine the requirements, voice, piano, and music education faculty members have copies of my course requirements, which have been openly discussed and generally agreed upon.

The one institution which offered a Bachelor of Music in Music Therapy degree included the Director of the Music Therapy Program in their discussions.

Enforcement of Requirements

Time requirements must be met and examination must be passed.

Statements of 22 institutions concerning the time at which the piano examination must be passed were categorized as follows:

before graduation 5 institutions
before student teaching 6 institutions
end of sophomore year 5 institutions
end of junior year 2 institutions
Other scattered replies included the statements:

At the end of five quarters.
At the end of each quarter.
At the end of two years for instrumental majors and
three years for vocal majors.
At the end of two terms for instrumental majors and
four terms for vocal majors.

It is indicated that vocal majors are required more piano training than instrumental majors.

Another respondent provided the following information:

The students meet minimum course requirements by working at their own rates of speed, recording weekly grades on a checklist throughout the quarter. Final grade is determined primarily by the average of these grades. Passing the course with at least a B- average indicates that the student possesses at that time average abilities. If we find that more of our students allow two or more quarters without review of their keyboard skills prior to student teaching, we may decide to implement a proficiency exam before student teaching.

**Proficiency Examinations in Piano for Music Education Majors**

**Number of institutions giving examinations.** That piano proficiency examinations are given is evidenced by the fact that 21 (87.5%) of the institutions administered piano proficiency examinations to music education majors. One institution, however, indicated that the proficiency examination was to be eliminated.

Another institution replied that while the students must pass a required number of semesters in piano class, the music education department administered its own test of skills.

**Method of administering examinations.** Analysis of the method used to administer piano proficiency examinations for music education
majors showed that of the 17 respondents to the item, seven gave the examination in its entirety the first time, while eight allowed sections of the examination to be taken at different times. One institution using the whole method indicated that a student who failed a section of the examination was allowed to repeat that section without repeating the entire examination.

Penalties for failure to pass examination. Penalties for failure to pass the examinations were reported by 21 institutions as follows:

7 not allowed to graduate and required to study more piano (with credit, 4) until proficiency is passed
5 not allowed to student teach until proficiency is passed
7 not allowed to student teach or graduate until proficiency is passed (with credit, 3)
2 required to study more piano until proficiency is passed (with credit, 2)

Faculty administering examination. The responsibility for administering the proficiency was allocated as follows by 20 institutions:

1 individual piano teacher
9 piano faculty
2 music education faculty
7 music education and piano faculty
1 individual piano teacher and theory faculty
Number of attempts allowed. In stating the number of times that the examination could be taken, 15 (62.5%) stated "as many times as necessary, until the desired proficiency is reached." In contrast, two institutions allowed the examination to be taken only once; one institution allowed it to be taken twice. Two institutions indicated that they had three and four professional examinations. The total number of replies for this item was 20.

Comments concerning the statement, "As many times as necessary," reveal that in certain institutions: (1) examinations may be retaken for credit and examination fee; (2) if failed, the examination must be retaken at end of each quarter until the jury is passed; (3) re-examination is dependent upon the specific area failed at first examination; and (4) no one has repeated the examination more than one time.

Methods of Offering Piano Instruction for Music Education Majors

Backgrounds of piano teachers. Analysis of the replies of 24 institutions indicating the types of piano teachers to teach music education majors shows:

- Specialist in class piano: 10
- Applied music faculty: 3
- Music education specialist: 2
- Combination of specialist in class piano and applied music faculty: 9

It is interesting to note that 10 (41.6%) of those persons involved in teaching class piano to music education majors were class piano specialists. It is uncertain whether the nine combinations of
class piano and applied faculty included the same class piano specialists or additional ones.

**Physical arrangements for teaching class piano to music education majors.** Analysis of the replies of the 24 participating institutions indicated that all of the respondents have and made use of an electronic piano lab. Several institutions had more than one lab. Nine of the respondents indicated that the piano lab was used in conjunction with a private studio, while one lab was used in conjunction with a private studio and a regular classroom with one piano.

**Levels of piano instruction offered for music education majors.** The 24 institutions participating in the study offered both private and class instruction. Analysis of the levels at which class piano instruction was offered revealed that all 24 institutions offered class piano instruction for music education majors at the beginning level; 18 at the intermediate level; and seven at the advanced level. These same seven institutions offered class piano at all three levels.

Where institutions offered both private and class piano there were many variations as to the combinations of levels at which the two types of piano instruction were offered.

The most frequently occurring combinations of the two types of instruction were: (1) class piano for beginning and intermediate, and private for advanced—7; (2) class piano for beginning only and private piano offered at all levels—4; (3) class piano at all levels and private for intermediate and advanced—4; (4) class and private at all levels—3; (5) class piano for beginning and intermediate with private also for intermediate and advanced—2.
Keyboard harmony. The most prevalent method of offering keyboard harmony for music education majors was to include it in an integrated theory course required of all music majors. Eight (38%) of the 21 institutions responding to this item indicated that this was the only way in which keyboard harmony was offered for music education majors. An additional five (23.8%) of the institutions used this method in combination with one or more other plans. Separate courses in keyboard harmony were offered as follows:

1. Offered as a separate course with music education majors and applied music majors in the same class—2 institutions.

2. Offered as a separate course designed specifically for music education majors—2 institutions.

3. Offered as a separate course to those able to meet a certain proficiency in piano—2 institutions.

4. Basic class piano instruction substituted for keyboard harmony where student is unable to meet the required proficiency—2 institutions.

Other types of piano classes. Most of the other types of piano classes (besides regular piano class and keyboard harmony) offered by the participating institutions were available to the music education major only when piano was the principal instrument or when a desirable proficiency was demonstrated. A total of 17 institutions offered classes in accompanying, some of which were required (three) and some that were elective (14). Other special types of piano classes offered included those in functional piano techniques for piano and organ, music education majors, literature, piano pedagogy, and beginning
piano for non-majors. One institution indicated a one-hour-per-week class for non-music majors enrolled in voice class.

Thirteen institutions attempted to acquaint music education majors with methods of teaching class piano as a regular part of a piano pedagogy course.

Thirteen institutions also offered class piano for adults as a part of a continuing education program, though two mentioned that no one enrolled in the course.

Outlines of Course Study

A total of 19 (79.1%) of the participating institutions indicated that they had course outlines showing standards of achievement and/or types of materials used at various levels of piano instruction for the music education major. Four institutions sent copies of their course outlines for examination. One included the form of the catalogue description, and one made reference to the NASM outline.

Analysis of Personal Comments Section of the Questionnaire

This section will consider the personal comments and opinions given by 17 (70.8%) of the respondents in the space provided on the back of the questionnaire.

Involvement in the subject of class piano and minimum piano requirements for music education majors was demonstrated by the variety of comments given by the respondents.

Since the comments dealt with basic issues and problems, they seemed to be of value in providing: (1) a cross-section of opinion by
music educators directly concerned with the problem; (2) insights into the problems of individual institutions; and (3) judgments concerning the adequacy of existing programs.

The significance of the study seemed apparent as 20 respondents replied to the question "Do you wish to receive a digest of the findings of this questionnaire?" affirmatively and with additional comments such as "Oh, yes," "Please," and "I thought you would never ask."

The comments have been generally classified according to topic and content, and examples will be quoted to illustrate the topics mentioned. The topics are: (1) The importance of minimum piano performance requirements; and (2) Inadequacies and basic problems of existing programs.

The Importance of Minimum Piano Performance Requirements

One respondent emphasized the importance of piano study for the music education major by writing:

95% of students enter the university as music majors with no prior background. This deficiency follows them after they graduate, enter the teaching field and regretfully realize how important keyboard skills are in successful classroom teach.

Another respondent gave support to the concept of functional piano training and further argued the need for stricter and more uniform requirements for all music education majors, stating:

I feel that piano skills are an integral part of the music education majors' essential competence in teaching. Piano requirements should be strictly and uniformly applied to all music education majors.
The comment "Must be established and maintained by all institutions" reflects the stated and implied attitude toward functional piano skills for music education majors of the majority of the respondents.

Though supportive of the importance of minimum piano requirements for all music education majors, one respondent reflected:

all music education majors should study privately after one year of class piano. Class piano is just not adequate at our college.

While not doubting the value of minimum requirements, this respondent seemed to indicate doubt in the ability of class piano instruction in fulfilling the necessary functional piano requirements of the music education major.

Inadequacies and Basic Problems of Existing Programs

It seemed significant that 82% of the respondents called attention to inadequacies in existing requirements and to various problems hindering the success of present programs. The following comments describe the institution's inability to establish adequate minimum piano performance requirements.

Our minimum requirements are not as advanced as they should be; however, until we have additional faculty there is no possibility of increasing the proficiency level which would necessitate our having additional classes and class times.

Another respondent explained his school's lack of requirements as:

Inadequate, because of necessary adjustments in our expectations of entering proficiency; because the attitude of the faculty tends to subvert goals achievable; because current focus on competencies tends to concentrate on minimums and
as a consequence gets exactly that.

In a more optimistic tone, another respondent stated:

Too minimum; would like to have 3-4 year program; happy to have at least 2 years though. Like class piano teaching very much.

That the length of time available to many institutions for the teaching of functional skills was considered a problem is indicated by the comment: "When we revert to the semester system it will be better. Quarters are not long enough."

There was much concern about the level of advancement versus the ability of the beginning music education major. This concern was reflected in the statement:

The level of proficiency varies with instrumental and vocal majors. It can never be as high as it should be. Individual levels of attainment always vary. I find still too many not studying keyboard before college entrance.

One respondent felt that requirements were not strict enough.

I feel it would be to the students' advantage for our minimum requirements to be tougher (although there are always a few who can barely struggle through the way it is!).

Another felt that requirements were too strict in certain areas.

I agree with all the minimum piano requirements at my school with the exception of two: community songs and condensed scores for the instrumental music education major. For a beginner I feel it is too difficult, and in pushing to learn this, bad piano techniques develop, plus the music is not worthy of the time.
Perhaps aware of these problems, two respondents indicated that:
"We have just switched over to a new keyboard requirement which (I hope) will better prepare our students for public school teaching."

No indication was given as to what the new keyboard requirements would be.

Indicating further change, another respondent stated:

Our music education department will soon institute a course for the refinement of various skills beyond the required courses so that their students will be better prepared to pass the music education proficiency exam. This course will be an elective course.

Again, no indication was given as to the changes in the program.

In supporting functional piano requirements, four respondents summarized desirable proficiencies as follows:

More emphasis must be placed upon those skills which are germane to the typical classroom situation and expectations, and less upon performance skills per se.

The requirements should be realistic in so far as the student will use his skills in an actual teaching experience. Repertoire is not an extremely important part of this training. More important is the ability to harmonize a given melody or to improvise. Ensemble and accompanying skills should be developed along with sight-reading.

A very clear objective should be set for minimum skill in sight-reading. Good sight-reading reflects knowledge in some of the other areas—scales, chords, arpeggios, a little bit of improvisation and playing by ear—, and is also one of the most useful skills.

I believe the four most important skills to improve, in order of importance are, sight-reading, harmonization, improvisation, and transposition. We expose our students to all types of music and experiences in the piano class, and we strive to improve their "total musicianship."
Summary

Concern was indicated by the respondents' expressed interest in improving existing minimum piano performance requirements for music education majors. It was apparent that respondents not only recognized the importance of functional piano training and functional minimum piano performance requirements for music education majors, but also that they were very aware of the need for overcoming the many problems and inadequacies of existing programs.

It seems significant that not one comment raised doubt concerning the desirability of minimum piano requirements or the importance of piano study for the music education major. Differences of opinion concerned not the value of minimum piano requirements themselves, but rather the types of requirements and the methods to be used in achieving them.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has not been concerned with the total course offerings in music, but rather with the amount and type of class piano preparation of the music education major, in order to ascertain the present status, or condition, of class piano instruction in the state of Ohio, and to identify the general course, or direction, it is taking.

Music departments of American colleges and universities have generally agreed that the piano is one of the music teacher's most important tools. The need for functional piano facility has long been recognized and instruction in functional piano long recommended by such national organizations as MENC, AATC, MTNA, and NASM. Numerous research studies and journal articles have also indicated the need for and the usefulness and importance of such functional facility.

Teacher training institutions, however, have not been entirely successful in organizing and adapting philosophies to meet demands created by changing times; they are being criticized for failure to develop the necessary functional skills needed by the prospective music educator. In fact, surveys of music educators regarding piano study in their preparation as music teachers indicate that more piano training is needed than is now being offered or required.
It was believed that enough schools required some type of piano instruction as part of music education programs to warrant investigation into the exact nature and extent of these requirements. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to determine current practices and procedures of class piano instruction required of music education students enrolled in the music education curricula of selected teacher training institutions of Ohio.

Given the current emphasis on "competency based education" and the concern for producing quality teachers, it was anticipated that this study of class piano instruction in Ohio would prove significant in (a) clarifying the status of class piano programs in college curricula and requirements; (b) indicating strengths and weaknesses of these programs; (c) reporting significant programs of class instruction in order to aid other persons involved in such instruction; and (d) serving as a springboard in an attempt to establish more unified requirements within Ohio.

The investigator based his conclusions on research of related literature and on the results of a questionnaire—modeled, with necessary changes, on that used by Webber in 1958—sent to 30 Ohio colleges and universities accredited by the state for music teacher education certification and members of NASM. Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What minimum piano requirements have been recommended by national music teacher associations?

2. What types of pianistic skills are needed and used by the school music teacher?
3. What are the current practices in teacher training institutions in Ohio?

4. What improvements need to be made to the present situation?

It is hoped that the answers to these questions may provide a source for future planning.

Piano Requirements Recommended by National Music Associations

Minimum piano requirements recommended by national music teachers associations for the keyboard training of the music education major establish comprehensive goals for all students, at all levels, and whether the instruction is received individually or in class. The goals outlined in the 1967 MENC guidelines are as follows:

1. To develop the student's musicianship by imparting a knowledge of the fundamentals of music, using notation and terminology as tools; an understanding of the structural and expressive elements of music and their function in contributing to the effect of the compositions; a familiarity with a variety of styles and forms of . . . repertoire of all periods; a knowledge of the techniques of playing the piano; and a knowledge of the principles of interpretation of music.

2. To develop the student's musical skills at the piano according to his needs and goals, by teaching him to listen perceptively and discriminately, read music accurately and rapidly, perform rhythmically, use effective mechanics and techniques of playing, interpret compositions artistically and stylistically, play by ear, harmonize melodies, transpose, memorize music, modulate, sing a melody and a harmonic part, write melody, rhythm, and harmony, and create musical effects by improvising chord accompaniments, counterpoint, melodies, rhythms, and words.

3. To develop desirable musical attitudes and habits by instilling a love of music and enjoyment of the piano as a performing medium; a taste for the best quality of musical composition; an appreciation of good performance;
and interest in music history, biography, and other information related to music; a striving to improve personal musicianship and performance skill; and by teaching students to use music in their daily life.

Types of Pianistic Skills Needed by the Music Educator

Related literature pertaining to the pianistic skills needed and used by the in-service school music teacher is in general agreement with national music teacher associations. Research suggests that course offerings in music teacher training institutions must be more closely related to the needs of the school music teacher; more emphasis must be placed upon all reading skills, including the reading of single lines, score reduction, three- and four-staff choral scores, and simple accompaniments. The ability to harmonize at sight, improvise, transpose, and modulate are also considered important as skills needed by the competent music educator.

The basic competencies needed, then, are not those to be gained from intensive study of a limited memorized repertoire but are, rather, functional in nature.

Current Practices in Teacher Training Institutions in Ohio

In view of the large number of music education majors enrolled in the participating institutions, the responsibility of each institution in providing a desirable type of piano training for all music education majors becomes quite clear. In evaluating current practices, many factors must be taken into consideration. Outstanding characteristics must be noted, and their relative value must be weighed.
Present practice does not necessarily indicate correct practice, nor
does it necessarily indicate a desirable norm. It may, however, serve
as a gauge of directional movement and of strengths and weaknesses in
existing programs.

The survey of minimum piano requirements in the 24 responding
teacher training institutions in the state of Ohio revealed that:

1. All of the participating institutions offer class piano for
music education majors. All have at least one electronic piano lab,
and some have more than one. Most employ a full- or part-time class
piano teacher, either singly or in combination.

2. While most of the institutions have some type of minimum
piano requirements stated either in terms of credit, levels of ad-
vancement, skills, or functional abilities, the exact nature of these
requirements shows variation, lack of uniformity, and lack of standard-
dization. Complete uniformity is not necessarily a highly desirable
characteristic and, it is true, may at times even be detrimental.
Nevertheless, it is also true that a certain degree of uniformity in
standards of music teacher training is desirable. The statistics of
this study show, for example, that not one single piano requirement of
any type is universally prescribed by the participating institutions.

Variations in practice are found in minimum credit requirements
in piano for music education majors ranging from two to six semester
hours. A comparison of the combination of requirements used by the
various institutions reveals a multitude of patterns with some insti-
tutions having few minimum piano requirements and some having just a
credit requirement.
Further variation is found in required minimum levels of advancement, which range from advanced enough to play a simple melody with a simple accompaniment to advanced enough to perform two-part inventions of Bach, classic sonatas, and easier romantic and modern compositions. Some institutions require a level of advancement at entrance that is comparable to that required by others at graduation.

Variation in practice is also evident in the required skills and functional abilities, which range from four to eleven. Some institutions use a modified conservatory-functional type of requirement and a few institutions an entirely functional approach.

With such a widespread lack of uniformity it appears that minimum piano requirements for music education majors are far from being standardized in present practice.

3. While there seems to be a great movement toward the incorporation of functional abilities into existing requirements, there is not one functional ability common to the requirements for all music education majors of the participating institutions. Significantly, though, all of the participating institutions include at least one or more functional ability in their requirements for all music education majors.

The fact remains, however, that although many institutions adhere to the standards recommended by NASM, their course outlines and catalogue descriptions seem to indicate that they really have not made the transition from piano programs designed to prepare performers to those designed to prepare public school music teachers. Demonstration of technique and memorized repertoire in different styles
and periods (two typical requirements for applied music majors) are not over-emphasized in the stated requirements of most institutions, but a great deal of emphasis is placed on levels of advancement in terms of ability to perform various types of standard literature. Because of the limited entrance requirements in piano and the limited time for study, 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 education majors.

These data seem to indicate that the emphasis being accorded specific functional minimum piano requirements is inconsistent with the importance attached to them by related research studies, recommended standards of training, and respondents' comments.

4. Close analysis of specific requirements and piano programs reveals that functional piano requirements for the music education major are still not standardized among the 24 participating institutions. Functional abilities most frequently required are sight-reading of hymns and community songs, harmonizing melodies, sight-reading instrumental accompaniments, and transposition.

While the three frequently occurring functional requirements of sight-reading of hymns and community songs, harmonization of melodies, and transposition are recognized as extremely important, they are not required for all music education majors by 13%, 13%, and 29% of the participating institutions respectively. Playing by ear and improvisation are not required by 46% and 50% of the institutions respectively. Sight-reading of three- and four-staff choral scores is omitted
in the stated minimum piano requirements for all music education majors by 71% of the participating institutions.

Functional abilities less frequently required are sight-reading vocal accompaniments, playing by ear, and improvisation; and least frequently required is sight-reading a three- or four-staff choral score.

5. Most institutions require music education majors to demonstrate piano competencies through proficiency examinations. These range from vague and loose proficiency requirements to clearly defined proficiency requirements which preclude student teaching or graduation if not met. Some institutions, however, are doing away with piano proficiencies completely.

6. Most institutions do not have entrance requirements in piano for music education majors.

7. Most institutions do not differentiate in the piano requirements made of different types of music education majors (instrumental, choral, and general).

8. Most institutions offer keyboard harmony in an integrated theory course required of all music majors.

9. Most questionnaire respondents support the basic concept of functional minimum piano requirements for music education majors, but their comments reveal that even when their institutions succeed in including functional abilities in their minimum piano requirements, they are not always successful in implementing and enforcing them.

10. Administrative practices used to implement and enforce requirements vary from poorly developed ones to extremely well-organized
functional programs with carefully prepared statements of requirements, types of materials to be used, and policies to be utilized.

There is still, then, a lag between theory and practice. Though results of the investigation indicate that much progress has been made in the adoption of minimum piano requirements for all music education majors, much remains to be done in making these requirements truly functional and effective.

**Recommended Improvements**

By comparing present practice with desirable practice (as indicated by related research studies, recommended standards of training, and respondents' personal comments), inadequacies may be noted and recommendations for improvement may be made. It is recommended that each teacher training institution involved with the education of music education majors should:

1. Continually re-evaluate the requirements and procedures of piano instruction for the music education major, based on skills needed by public school music teachers.

2. Include as a definite part of its requirements for music teacher training functional minimum piano performance requirements for all music education majors.

3. Use as a guide for these requirements the NASM-MENC standards of training.

4. State minimum piano requirements in terms of competencies needed by the qualified school music teacher.
5. Require a basic piano competency for entrance and acceptance into the institution.

6. Thereafter evaluate piano proficiency each term of study, before entrance to student teaching, and before graduation, based on demonstrated pianistic facility rather than on completion of credit hours and course content.

7. Select properly qualified piano teachers who understand piano instruction for the music education major and know how to get the best results in the limited time available.

It is further recommended that:

8. Local and state organizations attempt to build a basic understanding of the needs for functional minimum piano performance requirements for all music education majors.

9. Music teacher organizations and college music departments encourage state certification departments to include functional minimum piano performance requirements in their certification standards for all school music teachers.

10. A continuing attempt be made to organize and form a group piano association within the state to strengthen and improve group piano instruction.

**Suggestions for Further Research and Study**

The findings of the study indicate the need for further research through investigation of the:
1. Feasibility of entrance requirements in piano for music education majors.

2. Relationship of pre-college piano experience and success in meeting functional requirements.

3. Relative amount of instruction time required by music education majors with no pre-college piano experiences in order to meet the requirements.

4. Best way to organize piano classes for optimum effectiveness.

5. Introduction of functional piano into summer high school music camps as a part of the theory program; this would help students achieve minimum piano proficiency for future college entrance.

6. Contributions of keyboard harmony in an integrated piano facility.

7. Development of effective measures for enforcing minimum piano requirements.

Perhaps the greatest need in piano instruction for the music education major is research to determine the most efficient ways of organizing and presenting materials in piano instruction for the music education major. The subject of piano teaching is so broad that even the most intimately involved teacher can never know more than a portion of it. It would appear that all areas of functional keyboard skills would be susceptible to the probes of the research oriented investigator. It is suggested that computer-assisted instruction may eventually provide the answer to competent and challenging innovation in the teaching of these skills.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

ON

MINIMUM CLASS-PIANO PERFORMANCE FOR MUSIC EDUCATION MAJORS

Your name and position ____________________________________________

College or university ____________________________________________

Person to whom further requests for information should be directed (if
other than above) _______________________________________________

Position _________________________________________________________

Directions: In answering the questionnaire, please check all items
which apply to your situation.

I. Types of Bachelors Degrees offered with a major in Music Education

B.A. _______   B.M.E. _______   B.S.Ed. _______

B.F.A. _______   B.S.M. _______   B.Ed. _______

B.M. _______   B.S. _______   Others _______

Which of your undergraduate degrees meet music certification
requirements for the state of Ohio?

II. Number of full-time music teachers in your school ________.
Number of class piano teachers in your school:

   Full-time _______  Graduate assistants ________
   Part-time ________ Undergraduate assistants ___

Number of music majors enrolled this term:

   Undergraduate music education majors ________
   Other music majors ________

III. Do you have stated minimum class piano requirements for music education majors?

   Yes ________  No ________

   If so, by whom are they determined?

      ___ Individual class piano teacher
      ___ Entire music faculty
      ___ Piano faculty
      ___ Music education faculty
      ___ Music education and piano faculty
      ___ Department Head or Dean
      ___ Others (please explain)
Please check the appropriate column to indicate whether your requirements are stated as required semester/quarter hours credit, levels of advancement, and/or skills or abilities to be attained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required for:</th>
<th>Required of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Mus. Ed. Majors</td>
<td>Mus. Ed.: Vocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mus. Ed.: Instrumental</td>
<td>Mus. and Vocal Majors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. Minimum Piano Requirements

**A. Required semester/quarter hours credit**

B. Levels of advancement

| Advanced enough to play a simple melody with simple accompaniment |

| Advanced enough to play music of hymn tune or community song difficulty |

| Advanced enough to perform easy sonatinas and easiest pieces of Bach |

| Advanced enough to perform Bach two-part inventions; easier sonatas of Beethoven, Haydn, Mozart; easier romantic and contemporary pieces |

**C. Skills and functional abilities**

<p>| Technical proficiency in scales, arpeggios |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required for:</th>
<th>Required of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Mus. Ed. Majors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mus. Ed.: Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mus. Ed.: Vocal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mus. Ed.: General (Inst. and Vocal Majors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance from memory of a representative number of pieces in various styles

Performance from memory of patriotic songs: "Star Spangled Banner," "America," "America the Beautiful" (circle those required)

Sight-reading of hymns or community songs

Sight-reading vocal accompaniments or pieces of the type found in school music books

Sight-reading simple instrumental accompaniments

Sight-reading three- or four-staff choral score

Harmonization of melodies at sight using simple chords and styles of accompaniment

Improvisation of music suitable for rhythmic activity

Playing by ear

Transposition of easy songs and accompaniments

Others (please explain)
V. Physical arrangements

Special instruction areas:

Private studio __________
Class piano room with multiple pianos __________
Regular classroom with one piano __________
Other __________

VI. Do you have proficiency examinations in piano for music education majors?

Yes __________ No __________
If so, who does the examining?

_____ Individual piano teacher _____ Music education faculty
_____ Piano faculty _____ Music education and piano faculty
_____ Music faculty _____ Others

How many times may the examination be taken?

_____ As many times as necessary
_____ Only once
_____ Other number

Does the student have to meet all the piano proficiency requirements in their entirety, or may sections of the examination be taken at different times? (Underline correct response.)

When must these examinations be passed? _________________
What happens if a student fails to pass the examination?

___ Not allowed to practice teach until he does
___ Not allowed to graduate until he does
___ Required to study more piano with/without credit (circle which) until desired proficiency is reached
___ Other result as follows:

VII. Type of piano instruction offered for music education majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level at which offered</th>
<th>Beginner</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of Class and Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of teacher giving the instruction:

___ Specialist in class piano
___ Applied music faculty
___ Music education specialist who is regular instructor for music methods course
___ Other
VIII. Other types of piano classes offered for music education majors
(Check course by placing in blank: _R if required; _E if elective)

A. Keyboard Harmony offered as follows (please check):
   ____Included in an integrated theory course required of all music majors
   ____Offered as a separate course with music education majors and applied music majors in the same class
   ____Offered as a separate course designed specifically for music education majors
   ____Offered as a separate course to those able to meet a certain proficiency in piano
   ____Basic class piano instruction substituted for keyboard harmony where student is unable to meet the required proficiency

B. ____Class in accompanying

C. ____Other special classes in piano as follows:

Is any attempt made to acquaint the music education major with methods of teaching class piano?
Yes_______  No_______

If so, please explain:

IX. Request for additional information

A. If piano for music education majors is a regular part of your instructional program, do you have a course outline showing standards of achievements and/or types of materials used at various levels?
Yes_______  No_______
Would you be willing to send a copy of this for examination by the writer of this questionnaire? Please indicate by checking:

_____ Will send course outline
_____ Cannot send course outline
_____ Writer requested to pay postage

B. Do you offer class piano for adults as a part of a Continuing Education Program?

Yes_________     No__________

C. Your personal comments concerning minimum piano requirements for music education majors:

D. Check here if you wish to receive a digest of the findings of this questionnaire

Yes_________     No__________

Thank you for your cooperation and help. Please return the questionnaire within four weeks in the enclosed stamped envelope to:

Werner Sonntag
APPENDIX B

ACCOMPANYING LETTER

Dear Colleague:

A survey of class piano requirements for students enrolled in programs of teacher training in music education at selected colleges in the state of Ohio is being made with the intent of discovering the extent and nature of these requirements. The enclosed questionnaire is requesting specific information from teachers of class piano. The survey is being conducted as a doctoral study in Music Education at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

It is hoped that you will spare a small amount of your valuable time to answer the enclosed questionnaire, as it is being sent to a limited number of Ohio colleges. Your reply will be treated confidentially. If at all possible, I would appreciate receiving your reply within four weeks.

Your cooperation in answering the following questions will be greatly appreciated. A self-addressed envelope has been enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Werner Sonntag
APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Dear Colleague,

If you have not had an opportunity to answer the questionnaire on Minimum Piano Performance Requirements for Music Education Majors sent to you in May, won't you please do so as soon as possible. It is still not too late for your reply to be included in the study and your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you,

Werner Sonntag
APPENDIX D

LIST OF SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

Ashland College
Baldwin-Wallace College
Bluffton College
Bowling Green State University
Capital University
Central State University
Findlay College
Hiram College
Kent State University
Malone College
Miami University
Mount Union College
Oberlin College
Ohio Northern University
Ohio State University
Ohio University
Otterbein College
University of Akron
University of Cincinnati
University of Dayton

Ashland
Berea
Bluffton
Bowling Green
Columbus
Wilberforce
Findlay
Hiram
Kent
Canton
Oxford
Alliance
Oberlin
Ada
Columbus
Athens
Westerville
Akron
Cincinnati
Dayton
University of Toledo
Wittenberg University
Wright State University
Youngstown State University

Toledo
Springfield
Dayton
Youngstown
### APPENDIX E

**MATERIALS FOR CLASS PIANO INSTRUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esther Abrams</td>
<td>Meet Modern Music</td>
<td>Mercury Music Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denes Agay</td>
<td>Music for Millions Series; Vol. 17, Easy Classics to Moderns; Vol. 27, More Easy Classics to Moderns; Vol. 37, Classics to Moderns</td>
<td>Consolidated Music Publishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. S. Bach</td>
<td>Short Preludes and Fugues</td>
<td>Kalmus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bela Bartok</td>
<td>Mikrokosmos, Vols. I &amp; II</td>
<td>Boosey &amp; Hawkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James &amp; Jane Bastien</td>
<td>Beginning Piano for Adults</td>
<td>General Words &amp; Music Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winifred Chastek</td>
<td>Keyboard Skills</td>
<td>Wadsworth Publishing Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Dello Joio</td>
<td>Family Album--Duets</td>
<td>Marks Music Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsche</td>
<td>For Sight Reading, Book I</td>
<td>Heritage Music Publishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anton Diabelli</td>
<td>Sonatinas for Piano, Four Hands</td>
<td>Kalmus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diller-Quaille</td>
<td>Solo, Book I</td>
<td>G. Schirmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Duckworth</td>
<td>Keyboard Musicianship</td>
<td>The Free Press (Div. of Macmillan Co.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Fiske</td>
<td>Score Reading, Books 1-4</td>
<td>Oxford University Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Frackenpohl</td>
<td>Harmonization at the Piano</td>
<td>William C. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dmitri Kabalevsky</td>
<td>15 Children's Pieces, Opus 25</td>
<td>MCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Lowder</td>
<td>Adventures of Ivan</td>
<td>MCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lyke</td>
<td>Basic Piano Skills</td>
<td>Wadsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lyke &amp; Elizabeth</td>
<td>Ensemble Music for Group Piano</td>
<td>Stipes Publishing Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyse Mach</td>
<td>Keyboard Musicianship, Books I &amp; II</td>
<td>Stipes Publishing Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Melcher &amp; Willard</td>
<td>Contemporary Class Piano</td>
<td>Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warch</td>
<td>Music for Score Reading</td>
<td>Prentice-Hall, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Owyang &amp; Linda Ostrander</td>
<td>Creative Piano: A Modular Approach for Adult Beginners</td>
<td>Houghton Mifflin Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Older Beginner</td>
<td>Oxford University Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technic, Book II</td>
<td>Lee Roberts Music Publications, Inc. (Selling agent, G. Schirmer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee Roberts Music Publications, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Page</td>
<td><em>Ensemble Music for Group Piano</em></td>
<td>Canyon Press, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Laboratory Piano Course, Books One, Two, &amp; Three</em></td>
<td>Dodd, Mead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Persichetti</td>
<td><em>Little Piano Book</em></td>
<td>Elkan-Vogel, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Podolsky</td>
<td><em>Duet Playing, Vols. I-V</em></td>
<td>Belwin, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hershal Pyle</td>
<td><em>The University Piano Series, Vols. 1-4</em></td>
<td>Campus Publishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene Robinson</td>
<td><em>Basic Piano for Adults</em></td>
<td>Wadsworth Publishing Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dmitri Shostakovich</td>
<td><em>Six Children's Pieces for Piano</em></td>
<td>Leeds Music Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountney Squire</td>
<td><em>Class Piano for Adult Beginners</em></td>
<td>Prentice-Hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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