UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

PIANO TEACHERS' ATTITUDES ABOUT PIANO PEDAGOGY COURSE TOPICS

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

SUZANNE MARIE SCHONS
Norman, Oklahoma
2005

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/826

UMI Number: 3161632



UMI Microform 3161632

Copyright 2005 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

PIANO TEACHERS' ATTITUDES ABOUT
PIANO PEDAGOGY COURSE TOPICS

A Dissertation APPROVED FOR THE
SCHOOL OF MUSIC

BY

_____
Nancy Barry, Major Professor

_____
Jane Magrath, Major Professor

_____
Barbara Fast

_____
Edward Gates

_____
Chung Kao

© Copyright by SUZANNE MARIE SCHONS 2005
All Rights Reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deep appreciation goes out to the nearly 600 piano teachers who took the time to provide the information that made this study possible. I also thank the teachers in New York and graduate students at the University of Oklahoma who assisted in the preliminary evaluation of the questionnaire.

My dissertation committee members Nancy Barry, Jane Magrath, Barbara Fast, Chung Kao, Edward Gates, and Kenneth Stephenson have been remarkably supportive and helpful. I thank them for their careful reading and stimulating questions. I am especially grateful to my co-chairs Dr. Magrath and Dr. Barry, who have patiently given me lots of encouragement and innumerable hours of their time. Their assistance throughout my graduate program has been invaluable, and I feel incredibly fortunate to have them as mentors.

I am forever grateful to my parents, Paul and Nancy Schons, for their support for my education and professional pursuits. I never could have gotten to this point without their love and sacrifices. I also thank my sister Mary Schons, as well as other friends and family members, for their ongoing calm words and encouragement.

Finally, I thank Dan Rosinski, my husband, best friend, and biggest cheerleader. His unwavering confidence in me and constant willingness to be my sounding board have helped me tremendously. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Need for the Study	2
	Purpose	3
	Organization of the Study	4
2	RELATED LITERATURE	5
	A Brief Overview of Historical Developments in Piano Pedagogy at American Colleges and Universities	5
	Curricular Guidelines in Piano Pedagogy	9
	Piano Pedagogy Textbooks	17
	Research on Piano Pedagogy Instruction and Course Content	18
	Research on the Pedagogical Training of Independent Piano Teachers	23
	Recent Developments in Piano Pedagogy	27
	New Student Groups	27
	Technological Developments	29
	Lesson Settings	31
	New Repertoire	32
	Functional Skills	33
	Teacher Professionalism	34
	Summary	36
3	METHODS AND PROCEDURES	37
	Introduction	37
	Population and Subjects	38
	Development of the Research Instrument	38
	Administration of the Research Instrument	39
	Data Analysis	40
	Summary	42
4	RESULTS OF THE STUDY	43
	Introduction to the Data	43
	Collection and Analysis of the Data	45
	Teaching Information	46
	Personal Information	54
	Information on College/University Piano Pedagogy Coursework	60
	Evaluation of Piano Pedagogy Course Content	70
	Open-Ended Responses	84
	Attitudes Toward the Value of Piano Pedagogy Courses	85
	Attitudes Toward the Importance of Specific Topics in Piano Pedagogy Curricula	86

Attitudes Regarding the Education, Experiences, Skills, and Traits Needed to be a Good Teacher..... 90
Summary of the Data..... 95
Personal and Teaching Information..... 95
College/University Piano Pedagogy Coursework..... 95
Evaluation of Piano Pedagogy Course Content..... 96

5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.... 98
Summary..... 98
Teaching Information..... 98
Personal Information..... 99
College/University Piano Pedagogy Coursework.....100
Evaluation of Piano Pedagogy Course Content.....101
Conclusions.....105
Piano Teachers' Teaching Careers.....105
Piano Teachers' Education and College/University Piano Pedagogy Coursework.....….. 106
Piano Teachers' Evaluation of Piano Pedagogy Course Content.....…….107
Recommendations for Piano Pedagogy Curricula and Professional Music Teacher Organizations..... 110
Recommendations for Further Research……... 115
Limitations of the Study.....115
Closing..... 116

REFERENCES..... 117

APPENDICES..... 124
A. Cronbach's Alpha Values for Questionnaire Item Clusters..... 124
B. Survey Questionnaire.....125
C. Cover Letter to Piano Teachers..... 133
D. Follow-Up Letter to Piano Teachers.....….135

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Teaching Location	46
2.	Primary Teaching Location	47
3.	Levels of Students Taught	48
4.	Ages/Groups of Students Taught	48
5.	Studio Location and Types of Students Taught: Significant Differences Among Age Groups	49
6.	Studio Location and Types of Students Taught: Significant Differences Between Degree Groups	50
7.	Primary Teaching Location, Displayed by Age Group	51
8.	Primary Teaching Location, Displayed by Degree Group	51
9.	Lesson Settings	52
10.	Number of Students	53
11.	Years of Teaching Experience	54
12.	State of Residence	55
13.	Age	56
14.	Sex	56
15.	Degree Level	57
16.	Major	58
17.	Primary Instrument	59
18.	Ways of Learning to Teach Piano	61
19.	Other Ways of Learning to Teach Piano	62
20.	Number of Pedagogy Courses	63
21.	Level of Pedagogy Courses	64
22.	Levels of Students Taught/Observed	65
23.	Ages/Groups of Students Taught/Observed	65
24.	Lesson Settings Taught/Observed	66
25.	Students and Lessons Taught/Observed: Significant Differences Among Age Groups	67
26.	Students and Lessons Taught/Observed: Significant Differences Between Degree Groups	67
27.	Helpfulness of Teaching and/or Observation Experience	68
28.	Themes of Open-Ended Responses to Question 16	70
29.	Teaching Techniques for Types of Students	72
30.	Teaching Strategies for Types of Lesson Settings	73
31.	Strategies for Teaching Kinds of Repertoire	74
32.	Teaching Techniques for Student Skill Areas	75
33.	Teacher Knowledge of Content Areas	77
34.	Uses of Technology in Teaching	78
35.	Knowledge of Business and Professional Issues	79
36.	Significant Differences Among Age Groups for Items in Questions 17-23	81

37. Significant Differences Between Degree Groups for Items in Questions 17-23..... 83
38. Internet Resources (relevance to career): Significant Differences by Interaction Between Age Group and Highest Degree Earned..... 84
39. Themes of Open-Ended Responses to Question 24..... 93

ABSTRACT

PIANO TEACHERS' ATTITUDES ABOUT
PIANO PEDAGOGY COURSE TOPICS

By: Suzanne Marie Schons

Major Professors: Dr. Nancy Barry
Dr. Jane Magrath

Piano teachers were asked to rate various piano pedagogy course topics as they related to relevance to participants' careers and importance to the preparation of new teachers. Data were obtained through a questionnaire that was mailed to 1200 members of the Music Teachers National Association who identified themselves as piano teachers. The questionnaire sought information on participants' teaching careers, personal information, college/university piano pedagogy coursework, and attitudes toward piano pedagogy course topics. Five hundred ninety-eight valid responses (49.83%) were used in analysis of the data.

The typical piano teacher participating in this study was a woman above the age of 45 with a bachelor's degree in performance or music education, with piano as her primary instrument. Most teachers instructed elementary and intermediate students from ages 7 to 18 in private lessons in a home studio. Over 70% of teachers also taught advanced students and adult-hobby students, and over 60% taught pre-school students.

Results indicated that piano teachers find piano pedagogy courses important for teacher preparation. Teaching and observation experiences are valuable, and while not all pedagogy course topics are relevant to participants' careers, most are important for the preparation of new teachers.

Recommendations are presented in several areas for piano pedagogy courses and professional music teacher organizations. Suggestions for further research included: 1) recent pedagogy graduates' perceptions of the quality of their preparation to teach, 2) established teachers' attitudes on what topics of piano pedagogy they would like to learn more about, 3) workshop and conference session offerings by professional music teacher organizations, 4) uses of technology by independent piano teachers, 5) strategies for group teaching that piano teachers use in home studios, 6) development of a comprehensive course and/or textbook on business practices for independent piano teachers, and 7) origins and development of piano pedagogy programs in the U.S.A.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Piano pedagogy programs in America have grown tremendously in recent decades, as increasing numbers of colleges and universities offer courses, concentrations, and majors in piano pedagogy (Chronister & McBeth, 1989; Chronister & Meader, 1993, 1995). Although formal curricular guidelines for piano pedagogy programs have been in place since the mid-1980s, experts in piano pedagogy are continuing to explore and discuss appropriate curricular content, as the field adapts to changes in piano teaching. Many aspects of piano teaching are in a state of transition: New student groups for piano studies are emerging, including preschool students, adult students, and students with special needs; technology has provided teachers and students with new instruments and teaching tools not available until recently (Berr, 2000); group piano teaching, once found primarily in public schools and universities, is now being embraced by a growing number of independent piano teachers; new piano repertoire, including jazz and popular styles, has emerged; teaching philosophies have shifted from a primary emphasis on performance and technique, to include functional and creative skills such as sight reading, harmonization, transposition, playing by ear, score reading, and improvisation (Uszler, 2000); and teachers have become increasingly more professional, deriving a greater proportion of their income from teaching activities (Brubaker, 1996; Sturm, James, Jackson & Burns, 2000/2001; Uszler, 2000).

Research on piano pedagogy has taken place mostly in the last twenty years. Areas of research on American pedagogy courses and programs have included piano pedagogy curricula at the undergraduate and graduate levels (Uszler & Larimer, 1984;

Uszler & Larimer, 1986), and piano pedagogy course content at undergraduate and graduate levels (Johnson, 2002; Milliman, 1992). Studies on undergraduate pedagogy course content in other countries have taken place for programs in Thailand (Charoenwongse, 1998) and Korea (Won, 1999). Studies have also focused on the piano pedagogy instructor (Kowalchyk, 1989; Shook, 1993), teaching internships in piano pedagogy (Lyman, 1991), and role identification among university piano majors as teacher or performer (Gray, 1997).

Need for the Study

Research on piano teachers has included studies on pedagogical training (Music Teachers National Association [MTNA], 1990), piano teaching as a profession (Music Teachers National Association Foundation [MTNAF], 1990; Wolfersberger, 1986), and piano teachers' attitudes toward instruction of students (Crum, 1998). While some of these studies contain information on piano teachers' attitudes toward their own pedagogical training, that information is limited and is not a primary focus. Jacobson (1995) writes, "In order to assure relevancy, it is time for piano pedagogy instructors to be brutally honest in defining the most essential needs of the pianist who wishes to teach, and develop a curriculum that reflects those needs" (p. 186). However, a comprehensive study on piano teachers' attitudes toward pedagogical training has not taken place. It appears that there is a need for such a study.

The results of the study may be of value to the following:

1. Piano pedagogy instructors and piano pedagogy program coordinators.
2. Institutions interested in establishing or revising piano pedagogy courses and programs.

3. Authors of piano pedagogy textbooks, articles, and other materials for piano pedagogy instruction.
4. Individuals interested in developing pedagogy workshops for piano teachers.

Furthermore, it is anticipated that the comparison of findings from this study with findings from related studies provides insight into:

1. How piano teachers' perceptions of useful skills and understandings in piano pedagogy compare to the curricular offerings of piano pedagogy programs, as reported by Johnson (2002) and Milliman (1992).
2. How current piano teachers' attitudes toward piano instruction and pedagogical training compare to those reported in 1986 by Wolfersberger and in 1990 by MTNA.
3. How piano teachers' perceptions of useful skills and understandings in piano pedagogy compare to the content included in current piano pedagogy textbooks.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine piano teachers' attitudes toward pedagogical training. The scope includes piano teachers in a variety of settings, including independent teachers, college and university teachers, and teachers in schools and preparatory programs. It obtained information on the relevance of various piano pedagogy course topics to teachers' careers, and on their perceptions of useful skills and understandings for the preparation of new teachers. The primary research questions for this study were:

1. What are piano teachers' attitudes regarding the relevance of various piano pedagogy course topics to their careers?
2. What aspects of pedagogical training do teachers feel are important for the preparation of new teachers?

Organization of the Study

A summary of related literature is provided in the following chapter. The history of piano pedagogy, curricular guidelines for piano pedagogy, piano pedagogy textbooks, research in piano pedagogy, research on piano teachers, and recent developments in piano pedagogy are discussed. Chapter Three describes details pertaining to the methods of the study, including population and subject selection, the development of the survey questionnaire, administration of the questionnaire, and data analysis.

The data collected from the questionnaire are presented in Chapter Four in five main sections:

1. Teaching Information
2. Personal Information
3. Information on College/University Piano Pedagogy Coursework
4. Evaluation of Piano Pedagogy Course Content
5. Open-Ended Responses

Chapter Five contains a summary of the study, conclusions, recommendations for piano pedagogy curricula and professional music teacher organizations, recommendations for further research, and limitations of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

RELATED LITERATURE

A Brief Overview of Historical Developments in Piano Pedagogy at American Colleges and Universities

Piano pedagogy courses and programs at American colleges and universities have undergone a gradual development spanning from the late nineteenth century though the twenty-first century. Uszler and Larimer (1984) note that because no detailed study of the development of piano pedagogy courses and programs has taken place, it is difficult to identify their exact origins and early evolution. Piano teacher training programs appeared in the 1880s as part of two- or three-week summer sessions at normal institutes, and often consisted of recitals, private lessons, theory and history classes, and lectures on piano teaching (Sturm, James, Jackson & Burns, 2000; Uszler & Larimer, 1984).

In the late nineteenth century and early decades of the twentieth century, instrumental pedagogy courses began to become a regular part of normal school curricula, but were usually intended to prepare teachers for elementary and secondary school teaching, rather than for independent teaching. Among the earliest normal schools to embrace music teacher training programs were Michigan State Normal School at Ypsilanti, and the Crane Normal Institute, founded in 1885 by Julia Ettie Crane at Potsdam, New York. Shook (1993) notes that the curriculum developed by Julia Crane emphasized an approach still valued in recent pedagogical thought, in which the development of teaching skills is integrated with the development of performance and musicianship skills. According to Uszler and Larimer (1984), such an approach was unusual at the time. They write:

> Throughout the last four decades of the nineteenth century…the conservatory produced the performer; the normal school trained the teacher; the university was the home of the scholar. The twentieth century has witnessed the gradual coalescence of these three separate institutional types making possible professional study which incorporates and combines training in performance, scholarship, and teacher education. (p. 5)

In the 1920s and 1930s pedagogy gained a stronger role at universities as it became a component of performance programs. Uszler and Larimer (1984) cite several figures as being instrumental to strengthening the role of pedagogy in university music departments, including Leon Itis and Peter Dykema at the University of Wisconsin-Madison; Charles Haake, Gail Martin Haake, and Osbourne McConathy at Northwestern University; and Raymond Burrows, Peter Dykema, and James Mursell at Teachers College, Columbia.

The first half of the twentieth century witnessed a strong interest in bringing piano classes into public school curricula, as educational philosophies at the time advocated experience-oriented learning and the use of group dynamics as an instructional tool (Uszler & Larimer, 1984). Monsour (1963) identifies the year 1930 as the height of the class piano movement in public schools, as 880 communities at that time included piano classes in school curricula. This resultant need for instructors of piano classes was reflected in higher education. According to Richards (1962), the number of higher education institutions offering courses in class piano pedagogy more than tripled between 1929 and 1931, growing from 43 to over 150. The number of class piano offerings in elementary and secondary schools began to decrease in the 1930s and 40s due to various

social, political, and economic forces, but in college and university music programs, class piano instruction became more widespread. Piano classes at colleges and universities became even more numerous after the invention of electronic keyboards and the emergence of electronic keyboard laboratory settings in the late 1950s. Uszler (1992) notes that college classes and even college majors in class piano teaching emerged as a result of group piano developments, but that such a specialized degree focus has not been sustained into recent years.

According to Larimer, it was typical for graduate students in piano in the 1950s to have developed skills in areas such as performing and accompanying, but not to have developed teaching skills (Kwon, 2002). However, in that same decade, the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) recognized the need for organized programs for the preparation of independent music teachers. At the 1953 NASM annual meeting, a panel discussion was held to consider establishing a curriculum for the preparation of the private music teacher. By the 1956 NASM meeting, a four-year curriculum for a Bachelor of Music with a teaching major in applied music was presented. The official action taken on this proposal is not clearly documented, but the prevalence and influence of private music teachers was acknowledged. Uszler and Larimer (1984) note:

> At the meeting, one speaker underscored the importance of this major, relative to the influence of the private music teacher, by offering the following statistics; 5,800 teachers of music in NASM schools; 55,000 music teachers in public schools; 150,000 private music teachers. (p. 10)

From the late 1950s to the 1970s, piano pedagogy offerings at American colleges and universities grew as institutes of higher education recognized the need for formal

training for piano teachers. College catalogs in the 1970s listed an assortment of classes in piano pedagogy for undergraduate and graduate students, and many schools offered a major or emphasis in piano pedagogy. Such titles included, "major in piano pedagogy; major in group piano pedagogy; major in performance with a pedagogy emphasis; major in music education with piano pedagogy emphasis; concentration in piano pedagogy and literature—to list only those in more general use" (Uszler & Larimer, 1984, p. 12).

Piano pedagogy programs have especially flourished since the early 1980s, largely due to the influence of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy (Baker-Jordan, 2003; Lyke, 1996; Montandon, 1998; Shook, 1993). Baker-Jordan also cites the following factors as playing a role in the increasing awareness of the need for strong piano teacher preparation programs:

1. The increased numbers of women taking up professional occupations
2. Acceptance of the home as a bona fide business environment
3. An increase in good teaching materials
4. More publisher-sponsored workshops and showcases demonstrating new materials. (p. 17)

The 1988 *Proceedings and Reference of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy* listed 189 schools that offered courses and/or degrees in piano pedagogy. In 1992, 324 schools were listed, and by 1995, that number grew to over 400 (Chronister & McBeth, 1989; Chronister & Meader, 1993, 1995). It appears that piano pedagogy is still a growing field.

Curricular Guidelines in Piano Pedagogy

Formal curricular guidelines in piano pedagogy first appeared in the mid-1980s through cooperative efforts from The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy (NCPP), and several other organizations. The NCPP was created in 1979 to address the inconsistencies in piano pedagogy curricula, as pedagogy programs continued to grow at colleges and universities. It then met biennially from 1980 to 1994, and published eight volumes of proceedings, which have served as an important resource for college piano pedagogy instructors, as well as others involved in the piano teaching field. Chronister remarked in the forward to the 1995 proceedings, "These accumulated 1350 pages represent the ideas, convictions, and tireless hard work of virtually all those in leadership positions in piano education in the United States during the crucial 15 years in which the Conference operated" (p. 2). An in-depth description and analysis of the meetings of the NCPP can be found in Montandon (1998).

At the 1984 meeting of the NCPP, in Columbus, Ohio, the Committee on Administration/Piano Pedagogy Liaison, headed by Marienne Uszler and Frances Larimer, presented the handbook, *The Piano Pedagogy Major in the College Curriculum, Part 1: The Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Major*. The National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) was informally involved in the development of the handbook, as its president, Thomas Miller, was a member of the committee. Input was also sought from other members of NASM, as well as the Music Teachers National Association, Music Educators National Conference, and the National Piano Foundation. The handbook, which was published in 1984, includes curricular guidelines for undergraduate piano pedagogy programs, based on five case studies selected and evaluated by the

committee. The handbook stated that piano pedagogy programs should include the following content areas:

1. An introduction to learning theories and their applications to piano teaching
2. A survey of literature, methods and materials for teaching, with an in-depth study of one method or approach
3. Observation of experienced teaching over an extended period of time
4. Group and individual lesson instructional techniques
5. Lesson and curricular planning, in relationship to observation and student teaching
6. Directed student teaching for at least one academic year. The focus of undergraduate student teaching should be on instruction at elementary and intermediate levels, rather than advanced levels.

The handbook also described resources that institutions with undergraduate piano pedagogy programs should possess, and provided a list of practical questions for pedagogy teachers, keyboard faculty, and administrators to consider when preparing or revising an undergraduate degree program for the piano pedagogy major.

In 1986 Uszler and Larimer published the handbook *The Piano Pedagogy Major in the College Curriculum, Part II: The Graduate Piano Pedagogy Major*. The NCPP Administration/Piano Pedagogy Liaison Committee examined master's programs in piano pedagogy for the purpose of developing curriculum recommendations. The authors concluded that students come into master's programs with a variety of educational and professional experiences, and therefore recommended a "flexible curriculum" to accommodate those differences. The handbook also discussed the qualifications and

responsibilities of graduate teaching assistants at the schools selected for the three case studies, and provided a list of practical questions for schools to take into account when considering a graduate piano pedagogy major.

The two NCPP handbooks were written "at the suggestion of NASM" (Uszler & Larimer, 1984, p. 2), but were not meant to represent NASM or serve as a statement of standards for accreditation for that organization. NASM first printed guidelines for the Bachelor of Music in Pedagogy and Master of Music in Pedagogy in the 1985 NASM *Handbook*. The 1985 recommendations, as well as recommendations in subsequent NASM Handbook publications, include curricular structure, guidelines for general studies, and essential competencies, experiences, and opportunities related to pedagogy. The following recommendations are made regarding curricular structure in the *National Association of Schools of Music: 2003-2004 Handbook* (2003), which is the most recent handbook publication to date:

> Study in the major area of performance, including ensemble participation throughout the program, independent study, and electives, should comprise 20% to 30% of the total program; supportive courses in music, 20% to 30%; courses in pedagogy, including comparative methodology and internships, 15% to 20%; general studies, 25% to 35%; and elective areas of study, 5% to 10%. Elective courses should remain the free choice of the student. Studies in the major area and supportive courses in music normally total at least 65% of the curriculum. (p. 92)

Specific requirements are not made regarding General Studies, but it is stated, "Study in such areas as psychology, learning theory, and business is strongly recommended" (p.

92). Four areas are addressed under the heading, "Essential Competencies, Experiences, and Opportunities":

a. Ability to organize and conduct instruction in the major performing medium, including performance at the highest possible level and understanding of the interrelationships between performance and teaching; knowledge of applicable solo, ensemble, and pedagogical literature; and the ability to apply a complete set of musicianship skills to the teaching process.

b. Solo and ensemble performance experience in a variety of formal and informal settings. A senior recital is essential, and a junior recital may be appropriate.

c. Knowledge of pedagogical methods and materials related to individual and group instruction in a principal performing medium and opportunities to observe and apply these in a variety of teaching situations. This includes an understanding of human growth and development and understanding of the principles of learning as they relate to music teaching and performance. It also includes the ability to assess aptitudes, backgrounds, interests, and achievements of individuals and groups of students, and to create and evaluate specific programs of study based on these assessments.

d. Opportunities for teaching in an organized internship program. Such programs shall involve a specific program of regular consultation between students and supervising teachers. At least two semesters or three quarters of supervised teaching are an essential experience. (p. 92)

In 2001, the National Conference for Keyboard Pedagogy (NCKP), sponsored by the Frances Clark Center for Keyboard Pedagogy, met for the first time in Oak Brook, Illinois, and continues to meet biennially. Committees of the conference examine the following areas of piano pedagogy: Future Trends, Historical Perspectives, Independent Teachers, Internships/Practica, Music in Early Childhood, Research, Teaching Adults, Technology, the Pedagogy Student, and Wellness for the Pianist. The Task Force on Pedagogy Curricula also was formed through the conference to write guidelines for college/university undergraduate and graduate pedagogy programs, and NCKP published those guidelines in 2004. The guidelines are based on NASM recommendations, but also provide more specific recommendations for coursework, experiences, and competencies.

The NCKP Task Force on Pedagogy Curricula undergraduate guidelines include two tracks: one for a Bachelor of Music degree in Piano Performance, and one for an undergraduate major, emphasis, or concentration in piano pedagogy. The guidelines for the B.M. in Piano Performance state that coursework emphasis should be, "teaching pre-college age students, beginners through early intermediate levels, and group and individual lesson settings" (NCKP, 2004c, p. 1). The skills and understandings students should acquire include those in areas such as pedagogical materials and methods, teaching repertoire and functional skills, lesson planning, basic educational technology, professional resources, communication skills, learning styles, professional independent studio issues, and familiarity with early childhood music programs. Observation and intern teaching guidelines include observation of an experienced teacher and exposure to different teaching situations, and regular evaluation and feedback from teaching

supervisors. The undergraduate guidelines for a major, emphasis, or concentration in piano pedagogy are similar to those for the B.M. in Piano Performance, but also state that universities must offer certain resources to pedagogy students, including a minimal number of courses in pedagogy, as required by NASM, and observation and intern teaching opportunities (at least two semesters or three quarters of supervised teaching). The guidelines for the undergraduate major/emphasis concentration also include recommendations for preparation for a master's-level graduate assistantship (NCKP, 2004d).

The NCKP Task Force graduate guidelines include recommendations for a Master of Music degree in Piano Pedagogy and Performance, and guidelines for a Doctor of Musical Arts degree in Piano Pedagogy and Performance. Both sets of graduate guidelines include some of the features of the undergraduate guidelines in terms of coursework, observation, and experience, but the graduate guidelines are more far-reaching. The M.M. guidelines outline specific knowledge and skills to be gained that pertain to teaching pre-college students, and also for teaching college-age and adult students. The coursework guidelines for the D.M.A. degree call for a considerable amount of individual study and research, and contain the broadest range of teaching experiences, which include the teaching of: piano classes for music majors, non-music majors and adults; advanced private lessons for non-music majors; apprenticeships with applied piano faculty and pedagogy faculty; observations and critiques of undergraduate and master's pedagogy students' teaching; and an option of one term of supervised teaching in another area, such as music theory for non-music majors, music appreciation, or chamber music coaching.

The NCKP guidelines for the M.M. and D.M.A. degrees include expected competencies to be accomplished by the end of the degree program, which reflect the content called for in coursework, observation, and teaching guidelines. The M.M. competencies are:

1. Demonstrated skill in teaching children, adolescents and adults about music through the piano, in group and private lesson settings
2. Knowledge of a broad range of music and other educational materials and technologies
3. Demonstrated ability to select, plan, sequence and use these resources to develop musicality and technical skill in students
4. A high level of performance skill across a wide variety of repertoire and styles. (NCKP, 2004d, p. 1)

The expected competencies for the end of the D.M.A. degree include:

1. Demonstrated ability to create curriculum designs for undergraduate and master's degree piano majors, keyboard skills classes, preparatory departments, pedagogy courses and degree programs
2. Demonstrated ability to teach children and adults from elementary though advanced levels in individual and group settings
3. Demonstrated creative scholarship through research projects
4. A high level of performance skill across a wide variety of repertoire and styles. (NCKP, 2004a, p. 1)

Less formal guidelines for piano pedagogy curricula have also been put forth in recent years. Participants at the 2001 NCKP meeting discussed components that

should be included in undergraduate and graduate piano pedagogy degree programs. The report on the discussion on undergraduate programs emphasized the following areas: "the importance of having practical experience with both individual and group instruction; acquaintance with methods and repertoire; strong playing skills; and the ability to diagnose and remedy problems" (Snyder 2001-2002, p. 16). The report for the master's degree included four suggestions to "boost" the master's degree program in piano pedagogy:

1. Graduate students should teach as much as possible
2. Graduate students should be trained in learning theories
3. Graduate students should develop the skills of sequencing material and planning lessons with short-term and long-range goals
4. Piano pedagogues must collaborate with music educators, to broaden an otherwise exclusive focus. (Short, 2001-2002, p. 18)

The committee on the doctoral degree did not recommend specific curricular guidelines, but stated that the doctoral years, "provide the opportunity to explore the broad philosophies, ideas, concepts, historical precedents, and theories that shape our profession and will help lead the profession into the future" (Jutras, 2001-2002, p. 20).

In a study by Beres (2003), Marienne Uszler made an informal list of points she wanted her students to gain from piano pedagogy classes. Uszler mentioned seven areas:

1. Students need to realize they should make a commitment to teaching as they would to performing.

2. Students should, "gain a solid understanding of what is possible in American pedagogy in terms of involving the student in learning through ear training, asking questions, and improvisation" (p. 70).
3. "Proficiency in teaching in a group piano setting, including being able to function in a lab situation with electronic equipment" (p. 70).
4. "Knowledge of intermediate piano literature in all styles and periods" (p. 71).
5. "Thorough knowledge of many different methods before selecting materials" (pp. 71-72).
6. "Understanding how to present a new piece of piano literature to a student. Included in this commitment was an awareness of how to select literature of an appropriate level for each individual student and how to work with the particular learning capabilities of the student" (p. 72).
7. Pedagogy students should become well rounded professionals.

Piano Pedagogy Textbooks

Textbooks used for piano pedagogy courses provide further insights into the content of piano pedagogy courses. According to Johnson (2002), the three most commonly used textbooks in undergraduate pedagogy courses are *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* (2nd ed.) by Marienne Uszler, Stewart Gordon, and Scott McBride Smith (2000), *How to Teach Piano Successfully* (3rd ed.) by James Bastien (1995), and *Creative Piano Teaching* (3rd ed.) by James Lyke, Yvonne Enoch, and Geoffrey Haydon (1996). All three of these books contain information on the elementary student, the intermediate student, the preschool student, the adult beginner, teaching methods and literature, business aspects of running a studio, and uses of technology in teaching.

Bastien (1995) and Lyke, Enoch and Haydon (1996) discuss benefits of private and group instruction. The recently published piano pedagogy textbook *Practical Piano Pedagogy* by Baker-Jordan (2003), includes little information on pre-school and adult students, but it does contain more extensive information on studio business procedures, technology, and group teaching than previous pedagogy texts, and also devotes a large chapter to teaching jazz repertoire. *Practical Piano Pedagogy* also comes with a CD-ROM with modifiable, downloadable teaching and business forms for piano studios. *The Art of Effective Piano Teaching* by Dino Ascari (2003), another recently published piano pedagogy textbook, is somewhat smaller in scope than the others mentioned in this paragraph, but it does contain some information on studio business procedures and a short chapter on the place of popular music in the piano lesson. The book is practical in nature and contains many specific techniques for communicating with students and fostering motivation.

Research on Piano Pedagogy Instruction and Course Content

Most of the important research on piano course content and instruction has taken place in the past two decades. Kowalchyk (1989) and Shook (1993) conducted studies to obtain information on piano pedagogy instructors. Kowalchyk developed a descriptive profile of piano pedagogy instructors. She found that at the time of her research, piano pedagogy instructors were typically trained in performance, with a master's as the highest degree. Most of the instructors were not trained to teach piano pedagogy, and many were not originally hired to teach it. Teaching piano pedagogy constituted 24% or less of the instructors' teaching loads, but the pedagogy teaching responsibilities were a high priority for them. Although most of the respondents in this study did not have doctoral

degrees, they indicated that the college and university job market would require future piano pedagogy instructors to hold doctorates. Research by Johnson (2002), while not principally focused on the piano pedagogy instructor, affirms the predictions of respondents in Milliman's study regarding degree requirements for piano pedagogy instructors. Johnson found that by the time of her study, just over 70% of piano pedagogy instructors held doctorates, the majority of them in performance.

Shook (1993) developed and evaluated competencies and experiences for teaching undergraduate piano pedagogy courses in four areas in which undergraduate piano pedagogy instructors have responsibilities: administration, general knowledge, studio management, and studio teaching. Shook surveyed American piano pedagogy instructors and interviewed instructors identified as experts in training teachers of piano pedagogy. He found that for the majority of the objectives, graduate study was thought to be the best experience for achieving the objectives. Teaching experience was also identified as important, especially college class piano teaching and pre-college independent teaching.

Gray (1997) examined role identification as teacher or performer among piano majors at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Piano majors at the University of Oklahoma were studied using a combination of a questionnaire, group discussions, and individual interviews. Gray found that differences in role identification as teacher or performer were present according to the level of study and type of degree. Levels of study included were undergraduate, master's, and doctoral. Types of degrees included the Bachelor of Musical Arts, Music Education/Piano Pedagogy (master's and doctoral levels), Piano Performance (undergraduate, master's, and doctoral levels), and Piano

Performance/Pedagogy (undergraduate, master's, and doctoral levels). Doctoral students reported the strongest identification with the teaching role, compared to students at other levels of study, while undergraduates revealed the weakest identification with the teaching role. Within degree plans, performance majors exhibited the weakest identification with the teaching role, while music education/pedagogy majors identified most strongly with the teaching role, and performance/pedagogy majors revealed a balanced interest in both teaching and performing.

Gray (1997) also examined piano students' attitudes toward the most helpful aspects of pedagogy studies, as well as what they would most like to change about pedagogy coursework. The study of method books was the topic most often cited as helpful in pedagogy coursework. Frequently suggested changes to pedagogy coursework included more practice teaching experience, and fewer assignments/less busywork.

Studies by Milliman (1992), Charoenwongse (1998), Won (1999) and Johnson (2002) gathered information on the content of piano pedagogy courses. Milliman surveyed piano pedagogy instructors at colleges and universities to identify the content of graduate piano pedagogy core course offerings, including the topics addressed in the courses, and teaching and observation experiences for students. Respondents indicated that teaching strategies for pre-college intermediate students and advanced private students were addressed by graduate piano pedagogy instructors more frequently than teaching strategies for other types of students, but that private lessons for elementary and intermediate students received the most emphasis. Teaching strategies for learning disabled students and physically impaired students were addressed with the least frequency, by approximately one-third of respondents. Teaching techniques were

addressed in a wide variety of areas, but most often in music reading, rhythm, and technique. The least frequently addressed topics were playing by ear, ear training, jazz/blues/pop music, electronic keyboard technology, computer technology, and score reading, although the majority of the respondents believed those areas are important to include in the core course(s). In the area of experiences, Milliman found that over three-fourths of graduate piano pedagogy instructors require students to observe teaching as part of the core course(s), and over three-fourths of instructors require students to student teach.

Charoenwongse (1998), Won (1999), and Johnson (2002) researched core piano pedagogy offerings in undergraduate programs, using Milliman's (1992) questionnaire as a model. Charoenwongse studied undergraduate piano pedagogy offerings in Thai universities, Won studied Korean universities, and Johnson focused on American universities. Johnson found that at the undergraduate level, teaching strategies for pre-college elementary students in private lessons and pre-college intermediate students in private lessons were more frequently addressed than strategies for other types of students. However, over 80% of schools also included teaching strategies for pre-college elementary students in a group setting, preschool students, and adult hobby students. Group piano for college non-music majors and group piano for pre-college advanced students were addressed with the least frequency. Teachers were also asked to rate the amount of time and emphasis given to each topic on a Likert-type scale from 1-4. The highest ratings for time and emphasis were given to techniques for teaching pre-college elementary students in private lessons and pre-college intermediate students in private lessons, at 3.67 and 3.52, respectively. The lowest ratings for time and emphasis were

given to pre-college advanced students in group lessons at 2.08, followed by adult/hobby at 2.33, and pre-school at 2.41. This suggests that although teaching techniques for new student groups of adults and pre-school students are being addressed at many schools, they are not given as much time and emphasis as teaching techniques for more traditional student groups.

The frequency of inclusion of various teaching techniques in undergraduate pedagogy courses reported by Johnson (2002) was similar to that found in graduate courses (Milliman, 1992). Many teaching techniques were included at more than 90% of undergraduate programs. Those addressed in 98% or more schools were rhythm, technique, hand position, practicing, dynamics, fingering, and pedaling. The least frequently addressed topics were transposition (79.67%), ear training (77.24%), playing by ear (76.42%), computer technology (71.54%), electronic keyboard technology (69.92%), jazz/blues/pop music (69.11%), and score reading (40.65%). Music reading received the highest rating for time and emphasis at 3.70, while jazz/blues/pop music received the lowest rating at 2.01. Both undergraduate and graduate pedagogy programs place high priority on the content areas of selecting teaching literature, qualities of a good teacher, lesson planning, establishing goals and objectives, and motivating students. Observation of teaching was required at over 91% of undergraduate programs, and student teaching was required at approximately three quarters of institutions.

Johnson (2002) found that undergraduate piano pedagogy courses generally meet curricular guidelines established by NASM (National Schools of Music, 2003) and NCPP (Uszler & Larimer, 1984), but that the areas of learning theories and group teaching, which are emphasized in both sets of guidelines, are not given highest

priority by pedagogy instructors. Although Uszler and Larimer (1984) held that undergraduate piano pedagogy programs should focus on the teaching of elementary and intermediate students, Johnson recommended that the teaching of advanced students be included in the curriculum. She writes, "This training is of particular necessity for pedagogy students who do not pursue graduate degrees, as many of these students become independent teachers" (p. 111). She also recommended that the following topics be given priority in undergraduate piano pedagogy courses: an orientation to teaching pre-school and adult students; technology; and teaching techniques for improvisation, functional skills, and jazz/pop/blues music. Johnson recommended future research regarding independent piano teachers' perceptions of useful skills and understandings in pedagogy.

Research on the Pedagogical Training of Independent Piano Teachers

Recent research on the pedagogical training of piano teachers is limited. The most comprehensive study on this topic was carried out by MTNA in 1989 and published in 1990, under the title, *Pedagogical Training of Music Teachers: A Survey Report*. MTNA received completed questionnaires from 569 teachers (42.5% response rate), 93% of whom taught piano. Teachers were asked questions regarding their training prior to teaching and after beginning to teach, as well as questions about their involvement in professional organizations.

The survey reported that 87% of respondents held a bachelor's degree or higher. Forty-two percent reported a bachelor's degree as their highest degree earned, 36% reported a master's and 9% reported a doctorate. Two percent reported a degree in progress. Over 77% of all respondents had at least one degree with a major in music.

Fifty-five percent of respondents had received pedagogical training before beginning to teach. Those teachers were more likely than teachers without pedagogical training before beginning to teach to hold higher degrees and to be affiliated with an institution. Most of them received their training at the undergraduate level. Forty-five percent of respondents had no pedagogical training prior to teaching, but of those, 58% took pedagogy classes later in their career.

Over 70% of teachers with pedagogical training had observation experience with an experienced teacher. Younger teachers were more likely to have had observation experience than older teachers. For 75% of teachers with observation experience, the observations lasted for a period of one year or less. Two-thirds of teachers with pedagogical training experienced supervised teaching as part of their training. Forty-five percent of teachers reported teaching experience at the beginning level, 41% taught at the intermediate level, and 14% taught advanced students. However, the survey instrument did not specify if respondents could indicate more than one level or not, so some teachers may have taught at more than one level as part of their pedagogical training, but not reported it. Teachers in the 40-49 year age group taught private and group lessons under supervision with equal frequency, but older teachers and younger teachers were more likely to teach private lessons than group lessons as part of their pedagogical training.

Teachers who received pedagogical training <u>before</u> teaching were asked to rate their level of preparation in the following nine areas: (a) knowledge of method books and materials, (b) psychology of learning, (c) studio business procedures, (d) sequencing of materials, (e) presentation of materials, (f) learning to deal with pre-school students, (g) learning to deal with adult students, (h) group teaching techniques,

and (i) intermediate literature. Teachers without pedagogical training were asked to evaluate their shortcomings in these same areas when they began teaching, and teachers who received pedagogical training after beginning to teach were asked to rate the helpfulness of these categories in their pedagogy classes. No reasons were given by the authors of the report as to why they chose these particular categories for the survey. However, it would appear that some items were selected based on their inclusion in standard curricular guidelines for piano pedagogy (knowledge of method books and materials, psychology of learning, sequencing of materials, and presentation of materials), and some for their status as emerging trends in piano pedagogy (learning to deal with pre-school students, learning to deal with adult students, and group teaching techniques).

Teachers with pedagogical training before beginning to teach reported feeling most prepared in the areas of knowledge of method books and materials, the presentation and sequencing of materials, psychology of learning, and intermediate literature. They felt less prepared in studio business procedures, learning to deal with adults, group teaching techniques, and learning to deal with pre-schoolers. Learning to deal with pre-schoolers was identified as the category in which *all* groups of teachers felt least prepared, regardless of whether they received pedagogical training. Seventy-five percent of teachers with pedagogical training felt prepared to begin their teaching career after their pedagogy coursework. Yet, only 40% of teachers felt that the most important aspects of music teaching preparation were included in their training. Teachers were asked to list one or two of the most important aspects of any music teaching preparation, other than their own performance training. The most frequent responses included:

supervised teaching and observation of good teaching, sequencing and knowledge of materials, student motivation, how to teach technique, and studio business practices. Other responses included: knowledge of preschool methods, skills in teaching accompanying and ensemble playing, psychology, and motor development in children.

Teachers with no pedagogical training prior to teaching reported shortcomings with the smallest frequency in the areas of psychology of learning, how to present materials, learning to deal with adults, and intermediate literature. More teachers reported shortcomings in the areas of knowledge of method books and materials, studio business procedures, learning to deal with preschoolers, and group teaching. However, for all categories, many teachers chose either "neutral" or "not applicable," which resulted in a relatively small percentage of definite feelings one way or another being reported.

Of teachers who received pedagogical training after beginning to teach, the highest rated topics in terms of helpfulness in pedagogy classes were knowledge of method books and materials (this is consistent with Gray, 1997), presentation of materials, and intermediate literature. The lowest rated topics for helpfulness were group teaching techniques, learning to deal with adults, and learning to deal with pre-schoolers. The survey instrument did not incorporate a way to determine if teachers were rating the topics based on how much they have used the knowledge and skills in these areas in their careers, or on how well the topics were taught in their pedagogy classes. Further research is needed to measure how relevant various course topics are to teachers' careers. Also, the number of pedagogy topics examined in the MTNA survey is limited; a more comprehensive survey that includes current teaching issues (e.g. technology) is due.

Recent Developments in Piano Pedagogy

In the introduction to *The Well Tempered Keyboard Teacher* (2nd ed.) (2000), Uszler discusses recent changes in the piano teaching field, under the heading, "Into the Twenty-First Century." The eight topics she specifically highlights are: (a) new student groups, (b) technology, (c) lesson settings, (d) new repertoire, (e) functional skills, (f) teacher professionalism, (g) technique and injury prevention, and (h) the role of the teacher as "piano educator." The review of related literature suggests that her choice of these particular topics as new developments is widely shared by others in the field, especially regarding the first six items listed. It is clear that piano teaching is an ever-changing field, and that piano pedagogy programs should equip teachers to deal effectively with new developments in teaching.

New Student Groups

Although piano pedagogy courses have traditionally focused on preparing instructors to teach pre-college children from Kindergarten to high school, more programs are recognizing the growing need for teachers of students who fall outside of this age range. Jacobson (1995), Johnson (2002), Sturm, James, Jackson and Burns (2000/2001), and Uszler (1992, 2000) all identify both preschool and adult students as important new populations for piano instruction. Several piano pedagogy textbooks, including *How to Teach Piano Successfully* (Bastien, 1995), *Creative Piano Teaching* (Lyke, Enoch & Haydon, 1996), and *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* (Uszler, Gordon & McBride Smith, 2000), have responded to this trend by including sections or chapters on preschool and adult instruction. Collins (1996) writes, "It is very likely that

in the next few years, the 'average-age beginner' will be four instead of seven. Are we ready to accept that challenge?" (p. 37)

Uszler, Gordon and McBride Smith (2000) identify two main factors influencing the growing trend in early-age piano instruction, both resulting from increased availability of information in the fields of medical science and educational psychology: (a) Music educators are more aware of how young children perceive music, and have developed more organized programs of musical instruction for them, and (b) parents are increasingly interested in enrichment activities for their young children. Uszler (2000) also notes that organized activities for pre-schoolers provide a means of care for children while parents are working. While some methods have been available for many years for early-age instruction, such as *Music for Moppets* (Pace & Pace, 1971) and *Sing and Play* (Collins & Clary, 1981, 1987), others have been created more recently in response to this trend, such as *Bastien's Invitation to Music* (Bastien, Bastien & Bastien, 1993-1994), *Music Magic* (Noona & Noona, 1997), and *Music for Little Mozarts* (Barden, Kowalchyk & Lancaster, 1999-2000).

Edwards (1996) cites several factors influencing the growing population of adult piano students, including adults' increased life expectancy, available discretionary income, interest in life-long learning, and the availability of inexpensive electronic keyboards. Graessle (2000) addresses the concept of "andragogy" as it relates to piano instruction, and identifies several areas of teaching that may require different strategies for adult students than younger students: sharing responsibility for learning with adult students, creating a supportive learning environment, being flexible in lesson times, adding a social component, and choosing appropriate music. Research by Conda (1997),

Graessle (1998), and Pike (2001) has focused specifically on piano instruction for adults. Piano periodicals such as *American Music Teacher*, *Clavier*, and *Piano Pedagogy Forum* have featured many articles on teaching adult students, and *Keyboard Companion* includes articles under the heading "Adult Piano Study" in every issue.

The increasing frequency of discussions on teaching piano to students with special needs suggests that this is also a new student group in the piano teaching profession. Maris (2001) mentioned students with special needs several times in her report on discussions at the 2001 National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy, and articles on teaching students with special needs by Price (2002) and Zdzinski (2002) have appeared recently in the on-line publication *Piano Pedagogy Forum*. The 2001 MTNA National Convention featured a Pedagogy Saturday panel discussion titled, *Relating to the Special Learner* (MTNA, 2001). Research by Bauer (2003) focused on piano instruction for students with Down syndrome, but little other research exists on piano instruction for students with special needs. Milliman (1992) found that only one-third of graduate piano pedagogy instructors included teaching strategies for learning disabled students and physically impaired students in piano pedagogy core courses. Information on the extent to which teaching strategies for students with special needs are included in the content of undergraduate piano pedagogy courses is not available. There is a need for research on how piano teachers feel about the importance of learning to teach students with special needs.

Technological Developments

Developments in technology have quickly and dramatically changed the piano pedagogy field in recent years. Instruments and equipment such as electronic keyboards,

computers, and the Internet have provided piano teachers and students with a multitude of new options and possibilities for instruction. Many people in the piano pedagogy field realize that pedagogy programs must respond to these changes and prepare future teachers to take advantage of new technology. The textbook *Practical Piano Pedagogy* (Baker-Jordan, 2003) devotes an entire chapter to technology in the piano studio.

Technology was specifically addressed at the 2000 and 2002 meetings of the National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum (abbreviated "GP3"). GP3 was created for college and university group piano and piano pedagogy teachers in 2000, and meets biennially. Participants meet in both large and small groups to discuss a variety of topics pertinent to group piano and piano pedagogy teaching. Keithley (2003) reported on the technology-related discussion at the 2002 meeting titled, "Share your favorite technology and non-technology projects." Technology projects described by teachers fell into the following categories: equipment explorations, sequencing projects, MIDI accompaniments, software, and business applications. Morenus (2001) reported on a similar topic at the 2000 National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum:

> There is no longer any question about whether or not to include technology in pedagogy study. The challenge is deciding what to cover in classes, and what students must discover for themselves. Teaching an awareness and openness to new technological developments is the most important thing we can offer our students. (Miscellany section, ¶ 4)

However, according to Johnson (2002), technology-related topics are not given especially high priority by undergraduate piano pedagogy instructors.

Lesson Settings

Although group piano teaching in public schools and in college keyboard laboratories has been prevalent throughout much of the twentieth century, it is only in recent decades that many independent piano studio teachers have begun to explore group piano teaching. Group piano teaching is often defined as lessons with three or more students present (MTNA, 1999). Articles and conference sessions emphasizing the benefits of group piano teaching for both teachers and students are now abundant. Commonly cited benefits of group teaching to students include: performing experience, ensemble performance opportunities, increased motivation through group dynamics, and development of communication skills. Among the benefits to teachers are increased teaching efficiency and effectiveness, and increased income. Kowalchyk and Lancaster (n.d.) provide an extensive list of advantages of group instruction, as well as information on techniques for organizing, managing, and teaching group piano classes. At its 1999 National Conference, MTNA devoted an entire day to the topic of "Three or More" teaching. The published proceedings describe sessions that addressed pedagogical and practical advantages of three or more teaching, teaching skills, and teacher preparation (MTNA, 1999).

Johnson (2002) found that 86% of undergraduate piano pedagogy programs address group lesson teaching strategies for pre-college students. Eighty-four percent of programs require pedagogy students to observe both group and private instruction, but far fewer require student teaching of group lessons. The most common group teaching experience is for average-age beginners, available at 44% of institutions. Group teaching for other levels and ages of students is less common. Milliman (1992) found that 90% of

graduate programs in piano pedagogy include instruction on group teaching techniques, and 100% of institutions required student observation of both group and private instruction. Student teaching of college non-music majors was the most common group teaching experience, at 65% of universities, and college non-keyboard music majors were next, at 61%. Group instruction of average-age beginners (7-10 years old), adult/hobby, older beginners (11-17 years), and pre-school beginners was reported at 50%, 44.7%, 28.9%, and 23.7%, respectively. According to Wolfersberger (1986) and MTNA (1990), piano teachers in the 1980s did not feel well equipped for group teaching. Crum (1998) notes that although a large body of literature suggests that group lessons are superior for teaching a number of skills, most piano teachers prefer private lessons to group lessons.

New Repertoire

New teaching repertoire in a variety of styles has emerged throughout the last century. Educational and concert composers have written a large amount of repertoire in divergent styles. Recent years have especially seen an increase in music and materials for jazz and popular styles. Recently published jazz and popular methods include *Alfred's Basic Adult Jazz/Rock Course* by Burt Konowitz (1992), and *Jazz Works* by Ann Collins (2000). A great deal of pedagogical sheet music and collections of music in jazz and popular styles have been published and made widely available by major publishers. Yet, only 69% of undergraduate piano pedagogy programs address techniques for teaching *jazz/blues/pop* music, and many that do include it do not give it much time and emphasis (Johnson, 2002). Few piano pedagogy textbooks address jazz repertoire and techniques extensively, if at all, with the notable exception of *Practical Piano Pedagogy* (Baker-Jordan, 2003), which includes a chapter authored by celebrated jazz pedagogue

Lee Evans. Wolfersberger (1986) reported that the typical independent piano teacher did not have much, if any, training with jazz or popular music, but also that teachers did not consider such music very important in piano instruction. A current study is needed to determine if teachers find it important to receive instruction in teaching jazz and popular materials.

Functional Skills

While piano studies once involved primarily repertoire and technique, they have come to include many more areas as well, for the goal of creating well-rounded musicians. Uszler (2000) writes:

> Piano teachers who once thought they were doing their job if they taught pieces and technique are now concerned not only with meeting those goals but also with teaching students to harmonize, transpose, memorize, improvise, ornament, analyze, and create. The piano teacher is a music educator who uses the keyboard as a tool, who is more aware of process than product, and who leads the student to integrate assorted skills. (p. xv)

The trend in teaching group piano is related to the trend in teaching functional skills, as a primary goal of group teaching is often to teach functional skills including sight reading, harmonization, transposition, improvisation, ensemble playing, and score reading (Kasap, 1999). Pace (1999) also notes that functional skills can be taught much more efficiently in groups, as the teacher can present the same information to several students at once. Johnson (2002) and Milliman (1992) found that undergraduate and graduate pedagogy programs do not emphasize teaching techniques for functional skills and

improvisation/creative skills as strongly as they do for techniques related to technical development, reading, performance, and musicality.

Teacher Professionalism

Piano teachers are becoming increasingly professional in their teaching, and are deriving a greater portion of their income from teaching (Brubaker, 1996; Sturm, James, Jackson & Burns, 2000/2001; Uszler, 2000). Brubaker (1996) writes:

> More independent studio teachers in the late twentieth century have depended on their business for a living wage, unlike many married women in earlier decades who supplemented a husband's income with their earnings from piano teaching. Practical issues of studio design, marketing, scheduling, lesson fee schedule, studio policies, bookkeeping and tax deductions have become more critical for those supporting themselves with their teaching profession. Although a large constituency of part-time teachers has remained, many more keyboard teachers have organized their full-time activity more akin to that of any small business. (p. 379)

Despite the reality of business responsibilities for teachers, studies by Wolfersberger (1986), MTNA (1990), and MTNAF (1990) indicate that piano teachers are not well equipped to deal with business aspects of running a studio. Wolfersberger studied aspects of the piano teaching profession, and found that only 12% of piano teachers earned wages over the poverty line. Yet, 72% of respondents had earned at least a bachelor's degree in music, and 32% held degrees beyond the bachelor's. Of the 28% of respondents who did not have a bachelor's degree or higher, 18% had some college music courses in their background. Only 10% of respondents had no college music

courses at all. However, just 2% of teachers earned over $20,000, and those people were considered the "high earners" in Wolfersberger's study. The high earners were more likely than lower earners to teach advanced students and other professionals, to teach in groups, and to teach outside their homes. They also taught more students per week, and placed a higher value than other teachers on teaching improvisation and providing piano ensemble experience.

MTNAF (1990) conducted a national survey of independent music teacher incomes and lesson fees. They reported that the average studio income for independent music teachers was $11,136, and median income was $8,000. The use of technology in the studio showed a positive correlation with studio income. The report states:

> Studio income was significantly higher for independent teachers who use technology in the studio (a mean value of $14,195) compared with teachers who do not use technology (a mean of $9,460). (p. 10)

Current MTNA membership statistics indicate that the average member's income is $40,000 (MTNA 2003a), but information is not available on how much of piano teachers' income is derived from independent teaching. Recent literature reveals a widely shared view among pedagogy experts that piano teachers should learn studio business procedures, but research is needed to assess what areas of studio business management piano teachers deem important. Uszler (2000) states:

> The status of the piano teacher is moving (though not as dramatically as some may think or wish) from that of cottage industry to professional entrepreneur. Teachers are now involved with zoning laws, marketing techniques, insurance

coverage, tax deductions, Internet chat groups, professional career development, and inservice training. (p. xiv)

Summary

Piano teaching and piano teacher preparation have undergone tremendous changes in the past century. The last 10-20 years have witnessed exciting change, especially regarding student populations, technology, lesson settings, repertoire and materials, goals of piano study, and professional benefits to teachers. Piano teachers now have more tools and opportunities than ever before to make piano teaching a stimulating and rewarding career.

The related literature supports the need for a study to examine the piano pedagogy course topics that piano teachers find most relevant to their careers and most important for the preparation of new teachers. The study by MTNA (1990), while making an important contribution to knowledge of music teachers' pedagogical backgrounds, was limited in scope and did not investigate teachers' attitudes toward many important new issues in piano teaching, such as technology, specific studio business procedures, and new repertoire. A more current and wide-reaching study on piano teachers' attitudes toward aspects of pedagogical training is needed to aid piano pedagogy programs in preparing teachers to deal with the challenges of teaching piano today, and to take advantage of the wide array of available resources.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

As the number of piano pedagogy programs in America has grown in recent decades, research has been conducted on piano pedagogy curricula (Uszler & Larimer, 1984; Uszler & Larimer, 1986), piano pedagogy course content in American universities (Johnson, 2002; Milliman, 1992), piano pedagogy course content in other countries (Charoenwongse, 1998; Won, 1999), the piano pedagogy instructor (Kowalchyk, 1989; Shook, 1993), teaching internships in piano pedagogy (Lyman, 1991), and role identification among university piano majors as teacher or performer (Gray, 1997). Current research on piano teachers' attitudes about piano pedagogy course topics is limited, and there is a need for such a study.

The purpose of this study was to examine piano teachers' attitudes toward pedagogical training by obtaining information on how relevant teachers feel piano pedagogy course topics are to their careers, and how important piano pedagogy topics are to the preparation of new teachers. Information was sought from piano teachers who instruct students in a variety of settings, including independent teachers, college and university teachers, and teachers in schools and preparatory programs. The primary research questions of this study were:

1. What are piano teachers' attitudes regarding the relevance of various piano pedagogy course topics to their careers?
2. What aspects of pedagogical training do teachers feel are important for the preparation of new teachers?

Population and Subjects

The Music Teachers National Association (MTNA) is the oldest professional music organization in America. Its mission is to "advance the value of music study and music making to society and to support the professionalism of independent and collegiate studio music teachers" (MTNA, 2003b). Of the 24,000 member teachers in fifty states and the District of Columbia, 18,000 are piano teachers. A subgroup of MTNA was selected for this study because of the large size of MTNA, and its willingness to sell its mailing list to researchers. According to MTNA statistics, 90% of MTNA members are female, and 86% of members have a home address, rather than a work address, on file with MTNA.

Development of the Research Instrument

The research was conducted by means of a survey instrument. Due to the nature of this study, an original questionnaire instrument needed to be developed. However, questionnaire instruments used by MTNA (1990), Milliman (1992), and Johnson (2002) were studied extensively due to commonalities in content and research goals, and elements of those instruments were incorporated. Other sources consulted in developing the research instrument included: a review of related literature, an examination of other dissertations and studies using survey techniques, and a review of texts on educational research and survey development, administration, and analysis. Texts studied include *Research in Music Education* by Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (2001), *Questionnaire Research* by Patten (2001), and *Survey Research* by Fowler (2002).

Prior to the administration of the final questionnaire instrument, a preliminary version of the questionnaire was submitted to a panel of piano teachers and doctoral

piano students to critique and provide feedback on face validity. Fifteen independent and collegiate piano teachers in northern New York State and 10 doctoral piano students at the University of Oklahoma completed the questionnaire, provided suggestions for revisions, and reported the time taken to complete the questionnaire. Cronbach's Alpha was used to further assess the inter-item reliability of the instrument. Cronbach's Alpha values ranged from .7217-.9626 for eight of the ten questionnaire cluster items, while two items had relatively low values of .6977 and .3784. The research instrument was then revised, using data obtained from the panel participants, and from further study of resources related to survey research.

Administration of the Research Instrument

Participants were systematically selected from a mailing list purchased from MTNA. From the national list of piano teachers at MTNA, names were listed by order of nearest annual membership renewal date. The first 1200 names on that list were selected for solicitation for participation in the study. The final version of the questionnaire (see Appendix B), along with a cover letter and self-addressed, stamped envelope for return of the questionnaire, was mailed May 14, 2004 to the selected piano teachers. The cover letter (see Appendix C) informed participants of the nature of the study, the approximate time it would take them to complete the questionnaire, and the date by which to return it. Participants were asked not to identify themselves on the questionnaire. As questionnaires were received, the return envelopes were discarded and the questionnaires were placed in a box to await analysis. One week after the initial mailing, all participants were sent a postcard follow-up reminder to return the questionnaire (see Appendix D).

Before the questionnaires were mailed, the researcher had established a target number of 500 returned questionnaires, to provide confidence in analyzing the data using statistical procedures. On June 1, 2004, the returned questionnaires were counted to determine if more questionnaires needed to be mailed to a new set of potential participants. However, over 500 responses had been received by that point, so a second mailing was not necessary.

Data Analysis

Data were recorded and analyzed using the computer software SPSS 11.0. Data obtained by Questions 1-16 of the survey, which sought information on participants' teaching careers, demographics, and college/university piano pedagogy coursework, were descriptive in nature. This information was described primarily by using frequencies and percentages. Some information from Question 4, which investigated the lesson settings used for teaching and the number of students taught by respondents, was represented by means and standard deviations. Data obtained by Questions 17-23, which sought information on teachers' attitudes toward piano pedagogy course topics, were described using the means and standard deviations of the Likert-type scale employed for those questions. The reliability of the research instrument was assessed by running Cronbach's Alpha on the same ten cluster items tested in the preliminary version of the questionnaire, plus two additional cluster items added to the revised questionnaire. Cronbach's Alpha values for the twelve questionnaire cluster items ranged from .7331-.8950, which suggests that the questionnaire was a reliable instrument (See Appendix A).

Several items from Questions 1-23 were tested for significant differences in responses by age group and highest degree earned. Because a relatively small number of

respondents were from the "25 or below," "26-35," and "36-45" age groups, those three groups were combined into an "under 46" age group when testing for significance. The age groups "46-55," "56-64," and "65 or above" remained intact. When testing for significant differences by highest degree earned, only respondents whose highest degree earned was an undergraduate degree (bachelor's), and those whose highest degree earned was a graduate degree (master's or doctoral) were included, due to the relatively small number of respondents who did not hold a bachelor's degree or higher. Chi-square tests were used to test for significant differences by age group and highest degree earned in Questions 1-3, Question 4 as it pertained to lesson settings used, and Questions 13-15. For Questions 17-23, paired samples *t*-tests were used to test for significant differences between means of how all respondents rated items for "relevance to your teaching career" versus "importance to the training of new teachers today." Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to test for significant differences among the means of items in Questions 4 and 17-23 by age group, highest degree earned, and the interaction of age group and highest degree earned. For all items in which significance testing was employed, a Bonferoni adjustment was not deemed necessary, as a hypotheses testing model was not being used. However, to decrease the risk of a Type 1 error, it was deemed appropriate to use a more stringent alpha level for significance testing than the traditional $p < .05$ level. Therefore, an alpha level of $p < .01$ was used to determine significance.

Open-ended responses to Questions 16 and 24 were transcribed and coded for response trends. To check possible researcher bias, a qualified researcher who was not involved in this study coded the open-ended data independently. Only a small number of

minor differences in interpretation of the qualitative data were found, all of which were discussed and resolved.

Summary

This study examined piano teachers' attitudes toward pedagogical training by administering a survey questionnaire to piano teachers who were members of MTNA. Participation was sought from teachers who carry out their instruction in a variety of settings, including independent studios, colleges and universities, and schools and preparatory programs. It obtained information on the relevance of various piano pedagogy course topics to teachers' careers, and on their perceptions of useful skills and understandings for the preparation of new teachers. The analysis of the data obtained by this study will be of value to piano pedagogy instructors and piano pedagogy program coordinators, institutions interested in establishing or revising piano pedagogy courses and programs, authors of materials for piano pedagogy instruction, and individuals interested in developing pedagogy workshops for piano teachers.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction to the Data

This study sought to examine piano teachers' attitudes toward piano pedagogy course topics, based on what topics are relevant to teachers' careers and what topics they feel are important for new teachers. The primary research questions for this study were:

1. What are piano teachers' attitudes regarding the relevance of various piano pedagogy course topics to their careers?
2. What aspects of pedagogical training do teachers feel are important for the preparation of new teachers?

Participation was sought from teachers in a variety of settings, including independent studios, colleges and universities, schools, preparatory programs, and other locations. Participants' names were obtained through the mailing list of the Music Teachers National Association (MTNA).

Data for the study were collected by means of a survey instrument that included 24 questions. The questions were divided into four main sections:

1. Teaching Information
2. Personal Information
3. Information on College/University Piano Pedagogy Coursework
4. Evaluation of Piano Pedagogy Course Content

The first section (Teaching Information) included five questions. Participants were asked to provide information on where they teach piano, their primary teaching location,

the levels of students they teach, the ages and groups of students they teach, the types of lessons they teach and number of students in each of those settings, and how long they have been teaching piano.

Section Two (Personal Information) consisted of four questions. The data obtained in this section provided information on teachers' state of residence, age, sex, and education.

The third section pertained to college/university piano pedagogy coursework. The seven questions of this section sought information on how teachers learned to teach, how many (if any) piano pedagogy courses they have taken at the college/university level, whether courses taken were completed at the undergraduate and/or graduate level, whether teaching and/or observation experience was part of respondents' college/university piano pedagogy coursework, and how helpful that teaching and/or observation experience was in preparing them for their teaching careers. Teachers who have had teaching and/or observation experience in their pedagogy coursework were invited to elaborate on the helpfulness of that experience in an open-ended format.

The last section of the survey (Evaluation of Piano Pedagogy Course Content) asked teachers to rate specific piano pedagogy topics according the relevance of each topic to their careers, and on how important they thought each topic was for the preparation of new teachers today. The topics were divided into seven categories: teaching techniques for different types of students, teaching strategies for lesson settings, strategies for teaching different kinds of repertoire, teaching techniques for student skill areas, teacher knowledge of particular content areas, uses of technology in teaching, and knowledge of business and professional issues. The final question on the survey invited

respondents to provide additional comments on their feelings about the relevance of piano pedagogy topics to their careers, and/or the importance of pedagogy topics to the preparation of new teachers.

Collection and Analysis of the Data

The questionnaire was mailed to 1200 members of MTNA who identified themselves as piano teachers. Names were systematically selected based on the renewal date of their membership to MTNA. This selection process provided a sample of potential participants in numbers from each state approximately proportionate to the MTNA membership in each state. Teachers solicited for participation in the study were mailed a stamped, addressed return envelope along with the questionnaire, and were also sent a follow-up postcard reminder one week after the initial mailing.

Of the 1200 teachers who were mailed questionnaires, 602 returned them, for a response rate of 50.16%. An additional six people phoned or sent email messages stating they could not return the questionnaire because of retirement, a busy schedule, or the intended participant was deceased. Of the 602 surveys received, five were returned unanswered for similar reasons, for a total of 598 valid returns (49.83%) used in reporting results of the study. The number of responses used to report results for individual survey questions will vary, as not all participants answered every question. Some questions allowed for multiple responses from participants, causing percentages to exceed 100% in some cases.

Data were analyzed using the computer software SPSS 11.0, with the exception of the open-ended responses to Questions 16 and 24. The open-ended responses were analyzed using qualitative methodology by coding responses for emerging themes.

Teaching Information

The first section of the questionnaire elicited information on the teaching careers of participants. Question 1 sought information on where the participants do their teaching (see Table 1). Of the 598 teachers who answered this question, 514 (86%) taught in a studio in their homes. Some teachers taught in more than one location, causing the total frequencies and percentages for teaching locations to exceed 100%.

Table 1

Teaching Location

Teaching Location	Frequency (*N*=598)	Percentage
Studio in Your Home	514	86.0
Four-Year College/University	63	10.5
Studio Outside Your Home	63	10.5
Travel to Students' Homes	55	9.2
Church	40	6.7
Elementary School	30	5.0
Two-Year College	24	4.0
College Preparatory Department	16	2.7
Secondary School	16	2.7
Music Store	14	2.3
Private Preparatory Department or Community Music School	11	1.8
Other	8	1.3

Respondents were also asked to identify their primary teaching location (see Table 2). Just over three quarters of teachers (76.6%) identified their home studio as their primary location.

Table 2

Primary Teaching Location

Primary Teaching Location	Frequency (*N*=598)	Percentage
Studio in Your Home	458	76.6
Four-Year College/University	44	7.4
Studio Outside Your Home	27	4.5
Travel to Students' Homes	14	2.3
Elementary School	9	1.5
Two-Year College	8	1.3
Private Preparatory Department or Community Music School	7	1.2
Church	6	1.0
College Preparatory Department	6	1.0
Music Store	6	1.0
Secondary School	3	.5
Other	2	.3
No Response	8	1.3

Questions 2 and 3 sought information on the students the participants teach. Question 2 (see Table 3) asked teachers to identify the levels of students they teach. Nearly all respondents taught elementary students (94.6%) and intermediate students (96.5%), and many also taught advanced students (71.2%). Question 3 (see Table 4)

sought information on the ages and groups of students taught. The majority of teachers taught 12- to 18-year olds (94.3%), 7- to 11-year olds (91.6%), adult hobby students (72.7%), and students under 7 years old (60.2%).

Table 3

Levels of Students Taught

Levels of Students	Frequency (*N*=598)	Percentage
Elementary	566	94.6
Intermediate	577	96.5
Advanced	426	71.2

Table 4

Ages/Groups of Students Taught

Ages/Groups of Students	Frequency (*N*=598)	Percentage
Under 7 Years Old	360	60.2
7 to 11 Years Old	548	91.6
12 to 18 Years Old	564	94.3
College Music Majors	114	19.1
College Non-Music Majors	133	22.2
Adults-Hobby	435	72.7
Learning Disabled	116	19.4
Physically Impaired	54	9.0

Chi-square analysis revealed significant differences ($p < .01$) in responses of teachers of different age groups and with a different highest degree earned for some items in Questions 1-3. Tables 5 and 6 show frequencies and percentages by age group and

degree group for those items in which significant differences existed. Teachers under the age of 46 were more likely than teachers in older age groups to teach in a studio outside their home and were also more likely than the older groups to teach students under the age of seven years old. Not surprisingly, teachers with a graduate degree were more likely than those with an undergraduate degree as the highest degree earned to teach in a two-year or four-year college/university, and to teach college music majors, college non-music majors, and advanced students. Teachers with an undergraduate degree as the highest degree earned were more likely than those with a graduate degree to teach in a home studio, to teach elementary students, and to teach students in the 7-11 year-old age group.

Table 5

Studio Location and Types of Students Taught: Significant Differences Among Age Groups

	Age Group										
	< 46 (*n*=100)		46-55 (*n*=143)		56-64 (*n*=132)		> 64 (*n*=219)				
Location/Students	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	*df*	χ^2	*p*
Studio Location											
Studio Outside Your Home	18	18.0*	23	16.1	5	3.8	16	7.3	3	19.536	.000
Students Taught											
Under 7 Years Old	71	71.0*	91	63.6	85	64.4	111	50.7	3	14.825	.002

*Highest percentage among age groups.

Table 6

Studio Location and Types of Students Taught: Significant Differences Between Degree Groups

	Highest Degree Earned						
	Undergraduate (*n*=266)		Graduate (*n*=276)				
Topic	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	*df*	χ^2	*p*
Studio Location							
Studio in Your Home	247	92.9*	216	78.3	1	23.177	.000
Studio Outside Your Home	17	6.4	37	13.4*	1	7.430	.006
Two-Year College	4	1.5	19	6.9*	1	9.650	.002
Four-Year College/ University	9	3.4	53	19.2*	1	33.461	.000
Students Taught							
Elementary	260	97.7*	250	90.6	1	12.516	.000
Advanced	162	60.9	228	82.6*	1	31.627	.000
7-11 Years Old	260	97.7*	233	84.4	1	29.243	.000
College Music Majors	24	9.0	85	30.8*	1	39.974	.000
College Non-Music Majors	47	17.7	75	27.2*	1	7.016	.008

*Higher percentage between degree groups.

Chi-square procedures also revealed significant differences in responses pertaining to primary teaching location, both by age group and degree group. Tables 7 and 8 display the specific frequencies and percentages for some primary teaching locations, based on age group and highest degree earned. Only teaching locations that included sufficient frequencies to warrant chi-square analysis are included. These results should be considered preliminary, as response trends were similar among age and degree groups, and several teaching locations contained a small number of frequencies from any

group. However, it is apparent that older teachers and those with an undergraduate degree as the highest earned were more likely than younger teachers and those with a graduate degree as the highest earned to teach in a home studio as the primary location.

Table 7

Primary Teaching Location, Displayed by Age Group

	Age Group										
	< 46 (*n*=100)		46-55 (*n*=143)		56-64 (*n*=132)		> 64 (*n*=219)				
Primary Teaching Location	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	*df*	χ^2	*p*
Studio in Your Home	61	61.0	103	72.0	106	80.3	186	84.9*	3	26.127	.000**
Studio Outside Your Home	8	8.0	10	7.0	3	2.3	5	2.3	3	9.178	.027
Four-Year College/ University	12	12.0	11	7.7	13	9.8	8	3.7	3	8.667	.034

*Highest percentage among age groups.
**$p < .01$.

Table 8

Primary Teaching Location, Displayed by Degree Group

	Highest Degree Earned						
	Undergraduate (n=266)		Graduate (n=276)				
Primary Teaching Location	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	*df*	χ^2	*p*
Studio in Your Home	235	88.3*	176	63.8	2	48.469	.000**
Studio Outside Your Home	7	2.6	15	5.4	2	5.602	.061
Travel to Students' Homes	7	2.6	5	1.8	2	.876	.645

*Higher percentage between degree groups.
**$p < .01$.

Question 4 asked teachers to identify the types of lesson settings they employ to teach their students, and to provide the number of students they were currently teaching in each setting. Table 9 indicates that some teachers used more than one setting to teach different kinds of students, as percentages total more than 100. Many respondents (78.1%) taught students in private lessons only, and 28.3% had students who received

both private and partner or group lessons. Only 8.2% reported having students who received only partner or group lessons. Table 10 shows the number of students taught in each setting, including the minimum and maximum number reported by respondents, the mean, and the standard deviation. The numbers reported in Table 10 should be interpreted cautiously, as a considerable number of respondents did not report the number of students, and the standard deviation for each mean is large. Chi-square and MANOVA analysis did not indicate significant differences ($p < .01$) in responses to any item in Question 4 among teachers of different age groups or degree groups.

Table 9

Lesson Settings

Type of Lessons	Frequency (*N*=598)	Percentage
Private Only	467	78.1
Partner/Group Only	49	8.2
Private And Partner/Group	169	28.3
No Response	1	.2

Table 10

Number of Students

Lesson Setting	Frequency (*n*=467)	Min.	Max.	M	SD
Private Only	423	1	86	24.75	14.36
No Response:	44				
	(*n*=49)				
Partner/Group Only	45	2	140	28.71	26.98
No Response:	4				
	(*n*=169)				
Private and Partner/Group	150	1	250	27.64	25.87
No Response:	19				

Teachers were asked in Question 5 to provide information on how long they have been teaching piano. As revealed in Table 11, the respondents were largely an experienced group, with the majority (51.8%) reporting more than 30 years of teaching. A relatively small number of teachers were new teachers, with only 3.5% reporting 5 or fewer years of experience.

Table 11

Years of Teaching Experience

Years	Frequency (*N*=598)	Percentage
5 Years or Less	21	3.5
6-10 Years	38	6.4
11-20 Years	75	12.5
21-30 Years	154	25.8
More than 30	310	51.8

Personal Information

The participants' state of residence was identified in Question 6. The study included responses from teachers in 48 states and the District of Columbia. (No responses were received from the states of Hawaii or Idaho.) The distribution of responses from each state is represented in Table 12.

Table 12

State of Residence

State	Frequency (*N*=598)	Percentage
Alaska	1	.2
Alabama	9	1.5
Arkansas	7	1.2
Arizona	14	2.3
California	31	5.2
Colorado	13	2.2
Connecticut	11	1.8
District of Columbia	1	.2
Delaware	7	1.2
Florida	24	4.0
Georgia	17	4.0
Iowa	19	3.2
Illinois	34	5.7
Indiana	15	2.5
Kansas	9	1.5
Kentucky	8	1.3
Louisiana	6	1.0
Massachusetts	12	2.0
Maryland	11	1.8
Maine	2	.3
Michigan	19	3.2
Minnesota	26	4.3
Missouri	14	2.3
Mississippi	7	1.2
Montana	4	.7
North Carolina	11	1.8
North Dakota	8	1.3
Nebraska	7	1.2
New Hampshire	4	.7
New Jersey	10	1.7
New Mexico	5	.8
Nevada	9	1.5
New York	23	3.8
Ohio	23	3.8
Oklahoma	11	1.8
Oregon	18	3.0
Pennsylvania	22	3.7
Rhode Island	1	.2
South Carolina	8	1.3
Tennessee	8	1.3
Texas	34	5.7
Utah	10	1.7
Virginia	19	3.2
Vermont	4	.7
Washington	17	2.8
Wisconsin	20	3.3
West Virginia	2	.3
Wyoming	2	.3

Question 7 asked teachers to identify their age group, and Question 8 pertained to gender. As shown in Table 13, the largest group of teachers (36.6%) was in the "65 or Above" category. The next highest group was "46-55," followed closely by "56-64." Only 16.8% of respondents were under the age of 46. Table 14 reveals that 90.1% of respondents were female.

Table 13

Age

Age	Frequency (*N*=598)	Percentage
25 or Below	4	.7
26-35	35	5.9
36-45	61	10.2
46-55	143	23.9
56-64	132	22.1
65 or Above	219	36.6
No Response	4	.7

Table 14

Sex

Sex	Frequency (*N*=598)	Percentage
Female	539	90.1
Male	57	9.5
No Response	2	.3

Information on participants' education was solicited in Question 9. Teachers were asked to identify the level of their highest degree earned, their major, and their primary instrument if the major was music. The data obtained by this question indicate that the respondents were an educated group. As shown in Table 15, 90.6% of respondents held a bachelor's, master's, or doctoral degree. Table 16 provides information on the major of respondents' highest degree. Most teachers (85.6%) reported a music major. Fourteen of the 66 respondents who reported a non-music field as the major of their highest degree volunteered additional information indicating that they had taken music courses at a different degree level.

Table 15

Degree Level

Degree Level	Frequency (*N*=598)	Percentage
Some High School	0	0.0
High School	2	.3
Some College	34	5.7
Associate's Degree	14	2.3
Bachelor's Degree	266	44.5
Master's Degree	219	36.6
Doctoral Degree	57	9.5
Other	4	.7
No Response	2	.3

Table 16

Major

Major	Frequency (*N*=598)	Percentage
No Major/Not Applicable	13	2.2
Music Performance	180	30.1
Performance and Pedagogy	80	13.4
Piano Pedagogy	36	6.0
Music Education	137	22.9
Music Performance and Music Education	12	2.0
Piano Pedagogy and Music Education	11	1.8
Performance and Pedagogy and Music Education	9	1.5
Other Music	47	7.9
Non-Music Field	66*	11.0
No Response	7	1.2

*Fourteen of the 66 respondents who indicated "non-music field" as the major of their highest degree volunteered additional information indicating they had completed music courses at another degree level.

Table 17 contains data on the primary instrument of those whose highest degree was a music degree. (Participants who reported their major as "no major/not applicable" or "non-music field," and those who did not identify a major are not included in the reporting of this item.) Piano was the primary instrument reported by 426 (89.5%) respondents. Of those 426 pianists, 394 reported only piano as their primary instrument, while 32 of them reported a second primary instrument as well. Organ was the primary

instrument of 22 (4.3%) of respondents. The primary instruments indicated by the other 25 (5.1%) teachers who answered this part of the question included voice, various string and wind instruments, and percussion.

Table 17

Primary Instrument

Instrument	Frequency (*n*=512)	Percentage
Piano	394	83.3
Organ	22	4.3
Voice	12	2.5
Piano and Voice	12	2.3
Piano and Organ	11	2.1
Piano and another instrument (not Voice or Organ)	9	1.8
Flute	3	.6
Violin	3	.6
Harp	2	.4
Clarinet	2	.4
French Horn	1	.2
Percussion	1	.2
Saxophone	1	.2
No Response	39	7.6

Information on College/University Piano Pedagogy Coursework

Teachers were asked in Question 10 to identify the various ways they learned to teach piano. Table 18 shows how many respondents utilized each method of learning to teach, and Table 19 reports the various responses that were written in by respondents who selected the "other" category. While every item except "other" was identified by a majority of respondents, the greatest number, at 513 (85.8%), reported "Attended Workshops, Clinics, and Conferences on Teaching." Of the 71 (11.9%) teachers who circled the "other" category, 28 (39.4%) reported receiving piano pedagogy instruction outside a college/university setting.

Table 18

Ways of Learning to Teach Piano

Ways of Learning	Frequency (*N*=598)	Percentage
Attended Workshops, Clinics, and Conferences on Teaching	513	85.8
Studied Piano Method Books and Materials	481	80.4
Emulated Your Own Teacher	475	79.4
Experience/Trial and Error	471	78.8
Studied Available Materials On Teaching (such as texts, articles, videos)	459	76.6
Talked with Other Teachers	428	71.6
Took College/University Piano Pedagogy Courses	405	67.7
Observed Another Teacher	328	54.8
Other	71	11.9
No Response	3	.5

Table 19

Other Ways of Learning to Teach Piano

Other Ways of Learning	Frequency (*n*=71)	Percentage
Piano Pedagogy Instruction Outside College/University	28	39.4
Membership in Professional Organizations	10	14.1
College Courses other than Pedagogy and Music Education	5	7.0
Pedagogy Courses for Another Instrument	4	5.6
Master Classes	4	5.6
Music Education Course(es)	3	4.2
Assisted Another Teacher	2	2.8
Listened to Artists' Recordings	2	2.8
Taught College Pedagogy	2	2.8
Extensive Study of Piano Literature	2	2.8
Preparation of Own Performances	2	2.8
Non-music Courses	1	1.4
No Answer/Unclear Answer	6	8.5

Question 11 sought information on the number of piano pedagogy courses teachers have taken at a college or university, including both undergraduate and graduate levels (see Table 20). One hundred seventy-nine respondents (29.9%) indicated they have never taken a college/university piano pedagogy class, while 412 (68.9%) reported

having taken one or more courses. Of the 412 teachers who took college/university piano pedagogy courses, the largest number (144) took four or more courses.

Table 20

Number of Pedagogy Courses

Number of Courses	Frequency (*N*=598)	Percentage
None	179	29.9
One	109	18.2
Two	111	18.6
Three	48	8.0
Four or more	144	24.1
No Response	7	1.2

Respondents who reported in Question 11 that they had not taken college/university piano pedagogy classes were asked to skip to Question 17. Therefore, data obtained by Questions 12-16 pertain only to those who have taken college/university piano pedagogy courses. Question 12 (see Table 21) concerns the level at which piano pedagogy coursework was completed. Just under half the respondents (49.3%) took piano pedagogy courses at the undergraduate level only, while 19.9% took classes at the graduate level only, and 30.1% took classes at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Table 21

Level of Pedagogy Courses

Level of Courses	Frequency (*n*=412)	Percentage
Undergraduate Only	203	49.3
Graduate Only	82	19.9
Both Undergraduate and Graduate	124	30.1
No Response	3	.7

The next three questions (13, 14, and 15) asked respondents who completed college/university piano pedagogy coursework if they taught and/or observed various types of students and lesson settings as part of that coursework (see Table 22). For every category except "adult hobby students," more respondents had observation experience than teaching experience. Pertaining to the levels of students taught/observed, over 56% of respondents had experience teaching and observing elementary students. Only 34.2% observed advanced students, and 15.5% taught them. The only age/group of students that was taught and observed by a majority of respondents was 7-11 year-olds. Although Question 3 revealed that 72.7% of teachers provided instruction to adult hobby students as part of their teaching careers (see Table 4), only 12.6% of those with piano pedagogy coursework observed them, and 13.1% taught them. The majority of respondents both taught (54.4%) and observed (56.3%) private lessons, while 25.5% taught partner and/or group lessons and 38.3% observed them. For Questions 13-15 combined, 349 respondents circled at least one "YES" for teaching and/or observation, while 62 respondents indicated that their piano pedagogy coursework included no teaching or observation experience.

Table 22

Levels of Students Taught/Observed
(*n*=412)

	Taught		Observed	
Level	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Elementary	232	56.3	242	58.7
Intermediate	165	40.0	200	48.5
Advanced	64	15.5	141	34.2

Table 23

Ages/Groups of Students Taught/Observed
(*n*=412)

	Taught		Observed	
Age/Group	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Under 7	117	28.4	133	32.3
7-11	208	50.5	215	52.2
12-18	137	33.3	172	41.7
College majors	50	12.1	115	27.9
College Non-Majors	69	16.7	87	21.1
Adults-Hobby	54	13.1	52	12.6
Learning Disabled	14	3.4	16	3.9
Physically Impaired	12	2.9	16	3.9

Table 24

Lesson Settings Taught/Observed
(*n*=411)

	Taught		Observed	
Lesson Setting	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Private Lessons	224	54.4	232	56.3
Partner/Group Lessons	105	25.5	158	38.3

For some items in Questions 13-15, chi-square analysis showed significant differences ($p < .01$) among teachers in different age groups and degree groups. Tables 25 (age group) and 26 (degree group) display those items in which significant differences existed. As shown in Table 25, the youngest age group held the highest percentage on all items in which significant differences were present, which includes observing elementary and intermediate students, children from under 7 though 11 years old, college non-music majors, and private and partner/group lessons. The youngest age group was also more likely to teach college non-music majors and partner/group lessons. There were not many significant differences found in the teaching and observing experience of people with an undergraduate degree versus a graduate degree as the highest earned, but those with a graduate degree were more likely to teach college music majors and college non-music majors, and to teach partner/group lessons.

Table 25

Student and Lessons Taught/Observed: Significant Differences Among Age Groups

	Age Group										
	< 46 (*n*=79)		46-55 (*n*=93)		56-64 (*n*=91)		> 64 (*n*=146)				
Students/Lessons	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	*df*	χ^2	*p*
Elementary (observe)	64	81.0*	56	60.2	50	54.9	71	48.6	3	22.976	.000
Intermediate (observe)	52	65.8*	48	51.6	44	48.4	55	37.7	3	16.700	.001
Under 7 Years Old (observe)	40	50.6*	29	31.2	24	26.4	40	27.4	3	15.199	.002
7-11 Years Old (observe)	57	72.2*	48	51.6	44	48.4	65	44.5	3	16.609	.001
College Non-Music Majors (teach)	20	25.3*	21	22.6	10	11.0	17	11.6	3	11.384	.010
College Non-Music Majors (observe)	27	34.2*	22	23.7	18	19.8	20	13.7	3	12.293	.004
Private Lessons (observe)	63	79.7*	54	58.1	45	49.5	69	47.3	3	24.372	.000
Partner/Group Lessons (teach)	34	34.0*	26	28.0	14	15.4	30	20.5	3	19.908	.000
Partner/Group Lessons (observe)	50	63.3*	37	39.8	31	34.1	39	26.7	3	29.925	.000

*Highest percentage among age groups.

Table 26

Students and Lessons Taught/Observed: Significant Differences Between Degree Groups

	Highest Degree Earned						
	Undergraduate (*n*=170)		Graduate (*n*=216)				
Students/Lessons	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	*df*	χ^2	*p*
College Music Majors (teach)	10	5.9	37	17.1*	1	11.253	.001
College Non-Music Majors (teach)	16	9.4	50	23.1*	1	12.633	.000
Partner/Group Lessons (teach)	30	17.6	69	31.9*	1	10.197	.001

*Higher percentage between degree groups.

In Question 16, the 349 respondents who had circled at least one "YES" in Questions 13-15 (indicating that some teaching and/or observation experience was included as part of their piano pedagogy coursework) were asked to rate the helpfulness of that experience in preparing them for the teaching they do in their careers. As shown in Table 27, nearly all respondents (95.7%) rated their teaching and/or observation experience as "very helpful" or "somewhat helpful."

Table 27

Helpfulness of Teaching and/or Observation Experience

Rating	Frequency (*n*=349)	Percentage
Very Helpful	192	55.0
Somewhat Helpful	142	40.7
Somewhat Unhelpful	4	1.1
Very Unhelpful	6	1.7
No Response	5	1.4

Respondents were invited to elaborate on their answer to Question 16 in an open-ended format by writing comments on the bottom or backside of that page of the questionnaire. Forty-nine people provided written comments. Of the 10 respondents who rated their teaching/observation experience as "somewhat unhelpful" or "very unhelpful" in Question 16, four provided supporting comments:

> I was too young at the time. I've learned to teach by teaching and attending many workshops and master classes, and finding out what works.
>
> It wasn't helpful or harmful, but that's because I wasn't observing a very good teacher.
>
> It was the "on site" experience of actually teaching (having had many problems myself), that enabled me to teach well.

I don't remember a specific course. I do remember being observed a few times.

The 45 open-ended responses provided by teachers who rated their teaching/observation experience as "very helpful" or "somewhat helpful" were coded for themes. Table 28 shows an outline of the main themes and sub-categories that emerged, followed by the number of respondents who wrote comments pertaining to each idea. The two main themes that emerged were: Observation Experience and Teaching Experience. Twenty-four teachers indicated that observation experience is important and helpful, and 19 wrote comments identifying teaching experience as important and helpful. (Teachers who identified *both* observation and teaching experience as beneficial are included in the frequency count for both items.) The following comments are typical of the teachers who indicated that teaching and/or observation experience is important and helpful:

> There is nothing, in my opinion, quite as valuable as observing the interaction between teacher and student. Both good and bad teaching helps one evaluate their own behaviors!
>
> I believe that a prospective teacher cannot have too much experiential training in both observation and actual teaching. These are the best learning activities in my opinion.
>
> Teaching and observing different levels of students are excellent ways to gain knowledge and experience before establishing a music career. It helps the future teacher to learn useful techniques and approaches.
>
> It is crucial, absolutely necessary to have "hands on" teaching experience under the supervision of university professors. It is irresponsible to start to teach only with "trial and error" method.

Seven teachers wrote that observation and/or teaching experience can be helpful under certain conditions. The following four quotations provide examples:

Observations are probably the most important part of any pedagogy class. However, I am speaking of observing at least two lessons per month during the year—not two lessons per year!

Because the observation was not a structured activity and was only a few times, it was not that beneficial. Observation done with a purpose and structure would be.

I wish I had been able to observe experienced teachers of ordinary students (not master classes of dedicated students who actually practice every day).

I learned what music/methods I would either avoid or augment. I also learned how I would not teach: reciting names of notes, limited amount of music to practice. My pedagogy professors were a kind, well-organized couple, but their teaching style was hopelessly stodgy and unimaginative, and did not allow for spontaneity. Observation would have been better with stronger teachers.

Table 28

Themes of Open-Ended Responses to Question 16

Themes/sub themes followed by frequency
I. Attitudes Toward Observation (33)
A. Observation is Important and Helpful (24)
B. Observation is Helpful Under Certain Conditions (7)
1. Better if "Ordinary" Students are Observed, Rather than "Gifted Students/Prodigies" (2)
2. Teachers Being Observed Should be Strong Teachers (2)
3. Observation Needs Structure and Regularity (2)
C. Observation is Not Important—Teachers Will Still Develop Their Own Style or Emulate Their Own Teacher(s) (2)
II. Attitudes Toward Teaching Experience (22)
A. Teaching Experience is Important and Helpful (19)
B. Teaching Experience is Helpful if Enough Feedback is Given (2)
C. Teaching Experience is Not Helpful for Teachers who Already Have Previous Experience (1)

Evaluation of Piano Pedagogy Course Content

Questions 17-23 asked all respondents to rate various topics of piano pedagogy based on two criteria: how relevant the topic was to the respondent's own career, and how important the topic was for the preparation of new teachers today. The Likert-type scale for both criteria ranged from 1 to 4, with 1 representing "little relevance" or "little importance," and 4 representing "much relevance" or "much importance." Because some

respondents rated some topics and skipped others, the frequency for each item varies. The results of the items included in each question are listed in order of mean raking for "importance to the training of new teachers today," in descending order from highest mean to lowest. Tables 29-35 report the mean and standard deviation for each item, as well as results of significance testing. The standard deviation for many items was quite high, indicating wide diversity of opinion among respondents. However, it is interesting to note that for every item in every question, the mean of teachers' ratings for "importance to the training of new teachers today" was higher than the mean for "relevance to your teaching career." The only three items in which those differences were not found to be significant ($p < .01$) by paired-samples *t*-tests were teaching in a private lesson setting, teaching rhythm, and teaching technique.

Table 29 shows the mean Likert-type ratings for items in Question 17, which pertain to teaching techniques for various types of students. Not surprisingly, teachers rated broader categories of students ("elementary," "intermediate," "advanced," "transfer") higher for both relevance to respondents' careers and importance to new teachers than for smaller, more specific groups of students. The standard deviation for "importance to the training of new teachers today" of teaching elementary, intermediate, advanced, and transfer students was relatively low, suggesting that teachers were more in agreement about the value of these items.

Table 29

Teaching Techniques for Types of Students

Student	Relevance to Respondents' Careers FREQ	M	SD	Importance for New Teachers FREQ	M	SD	*df*	*t*	*p*
Elementary	581	3.67	.75	576	3.88	.42	558	-7.198	.000**
Intermediate	582	3.76	.59	574	3.86	.43	568	-4.198	.000**
Advanced	574	3.37	1.01	571	3.67	.66	560	-7.513	.000**
Transfer	567	3.42	.91	565	3.59	.76	556	-5.779	.000**
Pre-school	573	2.42	1.28	572	3.38	.89	558	-19.372	.000**
Adult hobby	576	3.00	1.08	565	3.36	.88	560	-9.322	.000**
Learning disabled	559	2.27	1.18	560	3.23	.94	547	-20.074	.000**
Physically impaired	556	2.03	1.16	556	3.15	.97	543	-22.991	.000**
College music majors	567	2.20	1.29	562	3.08	1.04	549	-15.467	.000**
College non-music majors	564	2.23	1.23	560	3.02	1.01	547	-14.722	.000**

**$p < .01$.

In Question 18 (see Table 30), teachers rated private lessons highly both for relevance to their careers (3.85) and for importance to new teachers (3.89), and the standard deviation for that item in both columns was relatively low. Group lessons, partner lessons, and master classes were all rated below 3.0 for relevance to teachers' careers, but significantly higher (and above 3.0 each) for importance to new teachers.

Table 30

Teaching Strategies for Types of Lesson Settings

Lesson Setting	Relevance to Respondents' Careers FREQ	M	SD	Importance to New Teachers FREQ	M	SD	*df*	*t*	*p*
Private lessons	585	3.85	.54	575	3.89	.42	571	-1.141	.254
Group lessons	561	2.57	1.28	558	3.42	.87	545	-20.480	.000**
Master classes	563	2.80	1.25	561	3.29	1.04	547	-16.912	.000**
Partner lessons	559	2.31	1.22	559	3.29	.93	548	-9.155	.000**

**$p < .01$.

Respondents rated repertoire for elementary and intermediate students as most relevant to their own careers and as most important to new teachers (see Table 31). Literature for advanced students was not far behind in either column, followed by "duet/ensemble" repertoire, "jazz/blues," and "popular."

Table 31

Strategies for Teaching Kinds of Repertoire

Repertoire	Relevance to Respondents' Careers FREQ	M	SD	Importance to New Teachers FREQ	M	SD	*df*	*t*	*p*
Elementary	571	3.69	.75	560	3.88	.44	554	-6.597	.000**
Intermediate: 17th-19th centuries	573	3.77	.56	561	3.85	.44	555	-5.166	.000**
Intermediate: 20th-21st centuries	573	3.67	.68	561	3.83	.47	555	-6.915	.000**
Advanced: 17th-19th centuries	567	3.46	.93	559	3.74	.59	549	-8.506	.000**
Advanced: 20th-21st centuries	564	3.34	1.00	556	3.70	.65	544	-9.568	.000**
Duet/Ensemble	570	3.39	.87	559	3.65	.67	554	-8.562	.000**
Jazz/Blues	563	2.95	1.06	553	3.42	.81	542	-12.119	.000**
Popular	558	2.69	1.13	550	3.05	1.03	538	-9.504	.000**

**$p < .01$.

In Question 19 (See Table 32), teachers gave high ratings for both relevance to teachers' careers and importance for new teachers to basic skills, including "music reading," "rhythm," and "technique." These three areas received a mean rating of 3.90 or higher both for relevance to respondents' careers and importance to new teachers, with relatively low standard deviation. Receiving a mean Likert-type rating of 3.70 or higher in both relevance and importance was "style/interpretation," "tone production," and "sight reading." The only item to receive a mean rating lower than 3.0 in both columns was "playing by ear."

Table 32

Teaching Techniques for Student Skill Areas

Skill Area	Relevance to Respondents' Careers FREQ	M	SD	Importance to New Teachers FREQ	M	SD	*df*	*t*	*p*
Music reading	583	3.90	.42	574	3.95	.27	571	-3.278	.001**
Rhythm	581	3.92	.38	576	3.95	.28	571	-2.064	.039
Technique	583	3.90	.38	574	3.93	.33	571	-1.718	.086
Style/Interpretation	582	3.82	.47	574	3.89	.37	571	-4.091	.000**
Tone production	581	3.78	.53	574	3.86	.42	571	-4.059	.000**
Sight reading	583	3.70	.62	574	3.82	.48	571	-5.840	.000**
Memorization	582	3.54	.75	574	3.68	.64	571	-5.840	.000**
Accompanying	580	3.10	.97	571	3.49	.73	566	-11.400	.000**
Harmonization	574	3.05	.99	571	3.40	.80	564	-10.225	.000**
Transposition	574	3.04	.97	570	3.35	.85	563	-9.487	.000**
Improvisation	571	2.78	1.05	570	3.29	.86	558	-14.000	.000**
Score reading	571	2.70	1.13	568	3.14	.98	559	-11.512	.000**
Composition	566	2.61	1.08	566	3.12	.93	555	-13.374	.000**
Playing by ear	567	2.46	1.15	566	2.95	1.06	556	-13.045	.000**

**$p < .01$.

Teachers rated "selecting piano teaching literature" as both the most relevant teacher knowledge area to their careers, and as the most important for new teachers today (see Table 33). Also given relatively high ratings in both columns were "motivating piano students," "selecting piano methods," and "preparing students for recitals." Areas

given a mean rating of below 3.0 in both columns were “games for students,” “history of piano technique,” and “history of piano pedagogy.”

Table 33

Teacher Knowledge of Content Areas

Content Area	Relevance to Respondents' Careers FREQ	M	SD	Importance to New Teachers FREQ	M	SD	*df*	*t*	*p*
Selecting piano teaching literature	582	3.85	.50	571	3.92	.35	567	-3.475	.001**
Motivating piano students	580	3.77	.61	571	3.86	.45	567	-4.958	.000**
Selecting piano methods	583	3.64	.77	571	3.84	.48	567	-6.907	.000**
Preparing students for recitals	580	3.62	.66	571	3.70	.57	567	-4.180	.000**
Lesson planning	576	3.37	.86	570	3.64	.65	566	-9.528	.000**
Establishing a curriculum	577	3.36	.86	570	3.62	.65	566	-9.721	.000**
Learning theories	579	3.33	.88	569	3.57	.72	565	-9.803	.000**
Performance anxiety	581	3.36	.84	572	3.54	.73	569	-7.417	.000**
Philosophy of piano teaching	576	3.16	.96	569	3.41	.85	562	-8.854	.000**
Preparing students for college	572	3.04	1.06	561	3.33	.87	556	-7.584	.000**
Adjudication	576	3.08	1.05	567	3.29	.87	562	-5.678	.000**
Purchase, care, and maintenance of keyboard instruments	577	3.00	1.01	562	3.28	.89	559	-9.645	.000**
Reference books on pedagogy	574	2.93	1.04	562	3.28	.87	560	-10.827	.000**
Medical problems of pianists	568	2.69	1.08	565	3.14	.91	556	-12.851	.000**
Games for students	572	2.63	1.09	561	2.98	1.01	557	-10.147	.000**
History of keyboard technique	571	2.63	1.08	560	2.97	.99	557	-10.247	.000**
History of piano pedagogy	571	2.36	1.09	559	2.83	1.03	556	-12.766	.000**

**$p < .01$.

Teachers held widely divergent opinions on the role of technology in teaching, as indicated by the high standard deviation for most items in Question 21 (see Table 34). The highest mean rating of any technology topic for relevance to respondents' careers was only 2.43, for "Internet resources," and two items received mean ratings even below 2.0—"electronic keyboard labs" (1.88) and "synthesizers" (1.78).

Table 34

Uses of Technology in Teaching

	Relevance to Respondents' Careers			Importance to New Teachers					
Technology	FREQ	M	SD	FREQ	M	SD	*df*	*t*	*p*
Computer software	572	2.34	1.26	563	3.43	.84	554	-21.831	.000**
Internet resources	569	2.43	1.21	560	3.41	.86	550	-20.214	.000**
Electronic keyboards	575	2.34	1.26	561	3.30	.92	555	-20.277	.000**
MIDI applications	569	2.01	1.20	557	3.26	.93	548	-24.607	.000**
Electronic keyboard labs	568	1.88	1.16	559	3.18	.98	550	-26.073	.000**
Synthesizers	569	1.78	1.06	558	2.99	1.04	548	-24.885	.000**

**$p < .01$.

Question 23 asked respondents for their views on knowledge of business and professional issues (see Table 35). While there was a wide range of ratings as to how relevant the various topics were to respondents' careers, there was more agreement on the importance of these topics to new teachers today. "Studio policies" received the highest mean rating in both columns, followed by "setting lesson fees." The lowest item in both columns was "computer software for businesses." All topics in this category received a rating of 3.24 or higher for importance to new teachers.

Table 35

Knowledge of Business and Professional Issues

Issues	Relevance to Respondents' Careers FREQ	M	SD	Importance to New Teachers FREQ	M	SD	*df*	*t*	*p*
Studio policies	578	3.44	.90	565	3.73	.57	557	-9.125	.000**
Setting lesson fees	581	3.44	.91	568	3.68	.64	564	-7.429	.000**
Bookkeeping/Taxes	573	3.31	1.00	564	3.65	.66	559	-10.085	.000**
Scheduling	576	3.42	.94	567	3.60	.72	562	-6.585	.000**
Copyright laws	572	3.12	1.06	562	3.54	.79	558	-11.857	.000**
Insurance/Liability laws	568	2.95	1.10	561	3.52	.75	555	-14.469	.000**
Overview of professional music organizations and journals	575	3.23	.94	564	3.51	.80	557	-9.820	.000**
Marketing/Recruiting students	570	2.64	1.17	562	3.49	.78	557	-18.837	.000**
Career choices	570	2.75	1.16	562	3.46	.80	555	-16.359	.000**
Zoning laws	567	2.60	1.21	559	3.29	.92	552	-15.775	.000**
Computer software for businesses	567	2.29	1.18	558	3.24	.95	552	-19.572	.000**

**$p < .01$.

Of all the items included in Questions 17-23 (Tables 29-35), MANOVA procedures showed significant differences ($p < .01$) in some mean ratings for teachers in different age groups, and for teachers with a different highest degree held. Table 36 shows the items in which significant differences were present based on age group. The youngest age group gave higher mean ratings than the other groups to the career

relevance of "transfer students," "electronic keyboard labs," and the business and professional issues of "marketing/recruiting students," "studio policies," and "computer software for businesses." For the importance to new teachers, the youngest group gave the highest mean ratings for teaching transposition and improvisation, and teacher knowledge of games for students. The 46-54 age group had the highest mean rating on every technology item in Question 22, except the relevance electronic keyboard labs to respondents' careers. They also had the highest mean rating for the career relevance of teaching popular repertoire and the importance to new teachers of playing by ear. Neither of the oldest two age groups had the highest mean rating for any item in which significant differences existed. Each item in Table 36 is followed by the abbreviation "rel" for "relevance to your career" or "impt" for "importance to the training of new teachers today."

Table 36

Significant Differences Among Age Groups for Items in Questions 17-23

	Age Group														
	< 46			46-55			56-64			> 64					
Topic	FREQ	M	SD	FREQ	M	SD	FREQ	M	SD	FREQ	M	SD	*df*	*F*	*p*
Types of Students															
Transfer (rel)	99	3.60*	.71	139	3.46	.93	126	3.53	.80	200	3.25	1.01	3	4.933	.002
Types of Repertoire															
Popular (rel)	99	2.84	1.09	140	2.86*	1.07	125	2.71	1.10	191	2.46	1.17	3	5.603	.001
Student Skills															
Transposition (impt)	98	3.47*	.78	139	3.41	.79	127	3.46	.77	203	3.18	.94	3	4.788	.003
Improvisation (impt)	98	3.49*	.75	139	3.40	.78	126	3.29	.82	204	3.11	.96	3	5.173	.002
Playing by ear (impt)	98	3.11	1.06	140	3.15*	.94	126	2.92	1.06	199	2.74	1.12	3	4.255	.006
Teacher Knowledge															
Games for students (impt)	96	3.27*	.83	137	3.19	.97	127	3.01	1.00	198	2.68	1.06	3	9.015	.000
Uses of Technology															
Electronic keyboards (rel)	98	2.53	1.23	141	2.67*	1.25	127	2.26	1.24	206	2.05	1.22	3	8.293	.000
Electronic keyboards (impt)	94	3.30	.89	136	3.49*	.80	125	3.29	.91	203	3.16	.99	3	4.191	.000
Electronic keyboard labs (rel)	98	2.09*	1.21	140	2.05	1.19	127	1.81	1.17	200	1.67	1.04	3	4.497	.004
MIDI applications (rel)	98	2.11	1.22	140	2.29*	1.23	128	2.02	1.20	200	1.77	1.12	3	4.834	.003
MIDI applications (impt)	95	3.23	.93	136	3.47*	.76	125	3.33	.90	198	3.10	1.03	3	4.713	.003
Synthesizers (rel)	98	1.80	1.01	140	2.04*	1.16	128	1.72	1.03	200	1.60	.97	3	4.434	.004
Synthesizers (impt)	95	2.92	1.03	136	3.25*	.90	125	2.99	1.05	199	2.85	1.10	3	4.077	.007
Computer software (rel)	98	2.54	1.18	141	2.92*	1.23	128	2.41	1.28	202	1.99	1.22	3	8.029	.000
Computer software (impt)	95	3.46	.73	138	3.64*	.65	125	3.50	.78	202	3.22	.99	3	5.703	.001
Internet resources (rel)	98	2.70	1.16	140	2.77*	1.08	129	2.46	1.26	199	2.02	1.18	3	14.701	.000
Internet resources (impt)	94	3.45	.82	137	3.61*	.64	126	3.42	.83	200	3.24	.99	3	4.417	.004
Business and Professional Issues															
Marketing/Recruiting (rel)	100	2.96*	1.13	141	2.78	1.15	125	2.63	1.67	201	2.36	1.14	3	3.486	.001
Studio policies (rel)	100	3.64*	.75	142	3.47	.84	126	3.60	.84	207	3.25	1.03	3	6.246	.000
Computer software for businesses (rel)	100	2.64*	1.11	140	2.49	1.14	124	2.37	1.21	200	1.91	1.13	3	10.765	.000

*Highest mean rating among age groups.

Table 37 lists items from Questions 17-23 in which MANOVA procedures indicated that mean ratings were significantly different based on highest degree earned. Respondents with an undergraduate degree gave significantly higher ratings than those with a graduate degree on the following items for relevance to their career: elementary students, learning disabled students, jazz/blues repertoire, popular repertoire, teacher

knowledge of games for students, setting lesson fees, and bookkeeping/taxes. Those with an undergraduate degree also rated the following items significantly higher, as they pertained to the importance to the training of new teachers: teaching score reading, "games for students" and "Internet resources." Respondents with a graduate degree as the highest degree earned rated the career relevance of teaching college music majors and college non-music majors significantly higher, as well as the career relevance of strategies for teaching advanced repertoire from the 20th and 21st centuries. Each item in Table 37 is followed by the abbreviation "rel" for "relevance to your career" or "impt" for "importance to the training of new teachers today."

Table 37
Significant Differences Between Degree Groups for Items in Questions 17-23

	Highest Degree Earned								
	Undergraduate			Graduate					
Topic	FREQ	M	SD	FREQ	M	SD	*df*	*F*	*p*
Types of Students									
Elementary (rel)	258	3.78*	.61	267	3.55	.88	1	8.800	.003
College music majors (rel)	253	1.82	1.13	262	2.56*	1.33	1	32.839	.000
College non-music majors (rel)	253	1.96	1.17	259	2.51*	1.26	1	18.251	.000
Learning disabled (rel)	251	2.38*	1.20	255	2.16	1.15	1	11.287	.004
Types of Repertoire									
Advanced, 20th-21st centuries (rel)	251	3.28	1.01	262	3.45*	.94	1	6.668	.010
Jazz/Blues (rel)	253	3.17*	.94	256	2.75	1.12	1	16.333	.000
Popular (rel)	250	2.88*	1.06	255	2.48	1.17	1	16.386	.000
Student Skills									
Score reading (impt)	253	3.22*	.94	260	3.03	1.03	1	7.295	.007
Teacher Knowledge									
Games for students (rel)	254	2.80*	1.10	265	2.45	1.09	1	12.258	.001
Games for students (impt)	248	3.08*	.98	259	2.86	1.06	1	6.829	.009
Uses of Technology									
Internet resources (impt)	247	3.51*	.80	260	3.33	.90	1	8.418	.004
Business and Professional Issues									
Setting lesson fees (rel)	258	3.55*	.84	269	3.32	.98	1	9.452	.002
Bookkeeping/Taxes (rel)	256	3.45*	.88	264	3.15	1.09	1	10.204	.001

*Higher mean rating between degree groups.

MANOVA analysis revealed a significant difference ($p < .01$) in the mean ratings of one item from Questions 17-23 by the interaction between age group and highest degree earned, $F(3, 513) = 4.878$, $p = .002$. Teachers in the under 46 age group, with an undergraduate degree as the highest degree earned, rated "Internet resources" higher for the relevance of that item to their careers than other age and degree group combinations (see Table 38).

Table 38

Internet Resources (relevance to career): Significant Differences by Interaction Between Age Group and Highest Degree Earned

	Highest Degree Earned					
	Undergraduate (*n*=252)			Graduate (*n*=261)		
Age Group	FREQ	M	SD	FREQ	M	SD
< 46	43	3.00*	1.05	46	2.33	1.21
46-54	64	2.92	1.03	67	2.60	1.09
55-64	53	2.30	1.32	60	2.57	1.21
> 64	92	1.88	1.05	88	2.13	1.29

*Highest mean rating among age group/degree group combinations.

Open-Ended Responses

Question 24 invited respondents to add additional comments regarding their feelings about the relevance of various piano pedagogy course topics to their careers, and/or the importance of various piano pedagogy topics for the preparation of new teachers today. Written comments were provide by 184 teachers, which were coded for themes. An outline of emerging themes and the number of respondents who commented on each theme and its subcategories is displayed in Table 39 (p. 93). The total numbers in sub-categories do not always equal the number in larger categories because some teachers commented on more than one sub-category, and some teachers commented on a broad theme but did not offer specific details. The three main themes that emerged were: Attitudes Toward the Value of Piano Pedagogy Courses, Attitudes Toward the Importance of Specific Topics in Piano Pedagogy Curricula, and Attitudes Regarding the Education, Experiences, Skills, and Traits Needed to be a Good Teacher.

Attitudes Toward the Value of Piano Pedagogy Courses

Of the 86 respondents who chose to comment on their attitudes about piano pedagogy courses, 57 expressed positive feelings about the value of piano pedagogy courses in general. The following quotations illustrate those responses:

> I strongly feel that at least two semesters of pedagogy are necessary for all pianists with any teaching possibilities, addressing all of the topics you mention and with a heavy emphasis on practical experience.
>
> Since I do so many adjudications, I am becoming painfully aware that pedagogy really needs to come into the forefront of music majors' college curriculum.
>
> Prospective teachers need as much information as possible and I feel that all piano majors should be required to take a year of pedagogy. My Piano Perf. majors take 2 years of that class.
>
> I think piano pedagogy is helpful to the undergraduate in college and throughout a teacher's life. You never get done learning new ideas and useful tools for teaching students in different levels of study.
>
> Pedagogical training is so important for our teaching careers, and our students. Without the careful pedagogical training that I received as a student teacher in college, it would have been difficult to maintain a studio for the past 23 years. Teaching piano continues to be very rewarding, and has put me in contact with many special people who care about music.
>
> I only took 2 pedagogy courses (all that was offered at the time) in college. Both courses taught me a great deal, but I wish I had an opportunity for more training. The subject of pedagogy is highly important and necessary for this career, especially centering on ages and abilities (because you never know who's going to come knocking you your door).
>
> It is good someone is dealing with this. Most piano teachers, whether graduates of music school or not, are ill-equipped to teach. They only teach their own technique and have little to no knowledge of solid piano technique. Most college course work has little relevance to teaching and no education in business. Music majors are trained as if they will be performers when they will actually be self-employed teachers.

Along with the 57 respondents who expressed positive feelings about piano pedagogy courses in general, another 13 endorsed teacher training in a specific method,

approach, or philosophy. All of the teachers who mentioned a specific teacher training program wrote about it with enthusiasm, such as these two respondents:

> My piano pedagogy study with Robert Pace at Columbia Teachers College has given me the best preparation for teaching and for running a professional studio.

> I acquired training in Kindermusik and Musikgarten classes, which should be a must in every pedagogy curriculum—they know how to train!

Five teachers expressed a negative or indifferent attitude toward the value of piano pedagogy courses, and 11 indicated that their own pedagogy courses were not helpful for them, but that they could be helpful for others, such as this respondent:

> The piano pedagogy courses I took did not adequately prepare me for teaching. I learned more by doing, observing, and talking to other teachers. I think there should be more practicum-type courses where mentoring is involved—more "hands-on" types of learning for pedagogy students.

Attitudes Toward the Importance of Specific Topics in Piano Pedagogy Curricula

The most frequently recommended area for piano pedagogy curricula was teaching students specific skills. The specific skills mentioned varied greatly, but the one most frequently cited was "technique" (18), followed by "music theory" (13).

Technology was mentioned by 35 teachers, but the attitudes expressed were quite varied. The most frequent areas mentioned were attitudes toward the place of technology in general in piano teaching, "electronic keyboards"/"keyboard labs," and "computers"/"computer labs." The following quotations are representative of those with positive attitudes towards technology:

> Emphasis on allowing the student to be creative and thinking past the printed page, or even using the student's fundamental knowledge of reading music to create print music of their own through computers would also be invaluable.

> New teachers should certainly be aware of all the great software programs available!

> I have two grand pianos and a Clavinova. In a separate room there is a computer and an electronic keyboard. The two are linked by MIDI.
>
> I use music theory software with my MIDI keyboard to make music theory more fun.

The next three comments are representative of respondents with a negative attitude toward one or more areas of technology:

> I disagree strongly with some teachers who put the child on a computer for theory for a half hour and charge double the fee. The student misses the interaction with the teacher. There is no time for questions and explanations with the computer and if the student does not immediately use the theory concepts that he has learned, he has wasted his time.
>
> I am not of the generation that is computer-savy [sic], nor do I have any interest in such approaches. The finest teachers I have known teach human being to human being. I would not want an electronic gadget to stand between my student and me.
>
> I think "technology" is over-emphasized at conventions and conferences. Technology is present in almost every other aspect of children's lives today, and I do not feel "behind the times" teaching only on acoustic instruments. Being "au courant" doesn't mean that one is necessarily teaching well, or imparting the more subtle aesthetics which enhance music appreciation and study. My studio is packed, with nary a complaint regarding a lack of electronic instruments. Rather, everyone loves to play the harpsichord and my 7' Steinway. Electronic keyboards can be a fun diversion, and sometimes necessary in college group classes. I find the sound of these keyboards offensive, the music written for them sub-par, and I feel the use of them on a regular basis a sell-out. There. I said it! I'm really not ancient, either!

While both positive and negative attitudes were expressed toward technology, some teachers felt that technology was not relevant and/or appealing to them, but is important for new teachers:

> I am 72 years old and am not as comfortable with technology as younger people are. Using technology to teach is very important today and offers much of value to piano teachers, so they should be well-trained in it.
>
> I think it is important for the young teachers to investigate electronic equipment. Personally, I prefer two acoustic pianos in my studio, rather than keyboards,

> MIDI, etc. I like to teach "piano" and let others teach keyboards and computer techniques.

Of the 31 teachers who wrote about the importance of addressing specific knowledge and skill areas for teachers in piano pedagogy curricula, the most frequently mentioned areas were "knowledge of psychology, education, and learning theories" (10), and "knowledge of piano repertoire" (8).

Twenty-seven teachers discussed the importance of learning business practices, and several of them wrote about this quite emphatically, such as the teachers quoted below:

> Courses on the piano pedagogue as a small business owner and all the technicalities involved are sorely needed.

> I think one of the best classes a college could teach a music major is a class in business; how to set up a business—taxes, recruiting, location, incorporation, fee assessment, etc.

> Obviously, how to teach and appropriate literature is of primary importance, but in today's world, business practices and legal issues must also be presented.

> More emphasis should be placed on how to run your own business and be able to make enough profit to earn a decent living. It was only after many years of trial and error that I have a business that earns me a decent living.

Some teachers mentioned the importance of learning to teach specific kinds of students in pedagogy classes. Learning disabled (7) and pre-school students (5) were mentioned with the most frequency. The quotations below are representative of those sentiments:

> …teaching techniques for learning/physically disabled students must also be touched upon.

> I believe the biggest error in pedagogy is in starting children too late! I start children at 4-6 years old in the Suzuki method—incorporating pre-reading, flash cards, and (within the first year) reading with my Suzuki program. The children

> are brilliant, eager, fast to learn, wanting to please both parent and teacher, and so, so quick and facile with their little hands.

The importance of teaching and observation experience as part of piano pedagogy curricula was commented upon by 13 teachers. Their comments were similar in nature to those provided for Question 16 (see pp. 68-70).

Dealing with parents was an issue raised by 11 respondents. One teacher posed a series of questions regarding parents:

> Should parents be at lessons—all, none, or some of the time? What destructive behaviors can we change in parents? How can we reward the supportive, disciplined parent?

Others offered the following comments:

> Working with parents is as important as working with the student!

> A very important topic for teachers of young children especially is how to work with parents—their education, their involvement w/ their child in the practice and lesson situation, and the development of a studio and home environment conducive to the child's developing motivation.

> It is also relevant relating to difficult parents or parents who believe their child is a virtuoso. It is helpful in relating to "blended families" and extended families.

Ten teachers commented on the importance of partner and/or group lessons, while one teacher expressed a negative attitude toward the group setting. Two teachers included very specific information on why they use group lesson settings:

> I advocate group lessons because the amount of learning that goes on with a spirit of friendly competition and group dynamics is so much faster than what can be accomplished and taught in a single private lesson. Also, by performing in front of other students and observing the progress of peers on a regular basis, the fear of performing in a recital is greatly diminished. Plus, for me as a teacher, I am challenged by the planning of the group lessons which add variety to my teaching.

> Groups require lack of competition but a sharing of mutual joy in successful making of good music. Playing in unison helps develop good rhythm and gives a hesitant student more confidence as well as having occasional individual performances by each one in turn.

The one teacher who expressed a negative attitude toward group lessons wrote:

> I think one has to be careful for the motive often behind group lessons—it is a way for a piano teacher to earn a much increased income. However, my experience with each student one-on-one and his/her obvious desire to have that individual private time with me cannot be compromised for the $. Though I realize how tempting.

Nine teachers indicated a reluctance to identify what topics might be important to include in piano pedagogy curricula, as career plans and goals are different for each developing teacher.

Attitudes Regarding the Education, Experiences, Skills, and Traits Needed to be a Good Teacher

Comments were offered by 104 teachers on the qualities of good teachers, including the areas of education, experience, skills, and traits. Professional development and education was an area addressed by 58 respondents, and there was frequent mention of the importance of continuing education while in a teaching career, and the importance of attending workshops and conferences. Many teachers also wrote enthusiastically about membership in professional organizations. The following responses were typical:

> Belonging to OMTA (Oregon Music Teachers Association), MTNA, and Salem Federated Music Club has been invaluable. The conferences, workshops, recitals and networking are very important to being a successful teacher.

> I can't stress enough professional organizations as a resource...to keep up to date on new trends and for the feedback from other teachers.

> It's important for teachers to attend workshops and belong to local teachers' organizations—you get feedback from other teachers on various issues, and it's a good support vehicle.

> Encourage new teachers to attend workshops, conventions, and music teacher associations. I have taught 53 years and am still learning new techniques.

> I have attended numerous workshops, master classes, etc., all of which were extremely helpful—good things to emulate, and not so good things to avoid.

> After college, I have also learned so much going to music workshops, music conventions, and belonging to music organizations. Music teachers are always striving to learn and improve new approaches and methods when teaching students. Therefore, music teachers are always interested about different topics dealing with the different levels of students. Piano pedagogy is a great source of study!
>
> We have an enormously supportive group of teachers in our community, and the lack of rivalry and/or professional jealousy has helped the young teachers starting out more than anything, I feel, plus networking among ourselves to solve teaching and/or studio problems.
>
> In our community music school, I have founded and directed a continuing education piano pedagogy program for independent piano teachers in the area. It has been tremendously helpful to them in filling in the gaps they missed in college. Schools such as yours and community music schools such as ours should replicate this.

Other topics mentioned regarding the qualities of good teachers included: Tailoring Instruction to Meet the Individual Needs and Goals of Students (16), the Value of Gaining Teaching Experience (16), the Ability to Motivate Students (14), Possessing a Genuine Love of Music and Students, and Effective Communication Skills. The following comments are representative:

> I am a firm believer in <u>not</u> using the "ultimate" or "proven" method of teaching as each student presents his/her own problems, and a pedagogue should change and adjust for each student.
>
> Being able to tailor your teaching materials and methods to <u>individual</u> student's needs is of prime importance. Don't become stuck with one method. What works for Jane may <u>not</u> work for Susie.
>
> Always be aware of the students' practice for the coming week—is there enough explanation, inspiration? Enough time to make progress? Be specific about expectations. The student needs to catch your commitment to good technique and love of music. Learn to teach how to adopt standards of excellence—when has the music received enough practice.
>
> I've learned the most about teaching piano through doing—experience over many years.

My teaching philosophy centers on motivating my students and hoping they will always be music lovers (and concert attenders), whether or not they continue to perform.

As important as the technical instruction is, to maintain motivation is primary.

I feel the art of being a good teacher, besides your background and education, is to make each student enjoy and feel good about themselves and what they have accomplished. Also depending on age, incentives are a very important tool.

The most successful piano teachers I know taught because:

a) They loved music and its effect upon the human spirit, and

b) They loved people, especially young people, and appreciated the opportunity to make a difference in their lives. If you are wanting to use your teaching as a means of making a lot of money or for personal fame or aggrandizement, teaching is not for that person.

Of course, you have to love what you're doing and the people you're teaching. All of the pedagogy courses offered cannot teach you that aspect. I'm 72 years old and loving it more every year. I see teachers 1/2 my age burning out and happy to retire. Sorry to go on about that, but it is important—at least, in my mind.

A single concept is what sticks in one's mind while other aspects of the observed lesson are quickly forgotten. One idea Dr. Jim Lyke at University of Illinois offered is that by continually asking students to answer key aspects in music and waiting for them to give a response ensures that the student is at least thinking. We then know if that student is on the right track.

Table 39

Themes of Open-Ended Reponses to Question 24

Themes/sub themes followed by frequency

I. Attitudes Toward the Value of Piano Pedagogy Courses (86)
   - A. Positive Attitude Toward Piano Pedagogy Courses in General (57)
   - B. Positive Attitude Toward Teacher Training in a Specific Method, Approach, or Philosophy (13)
     1. Robert Pace (7)
     2. Orff (3)
     3. Dalcroze (2)
     4. Kodály (2)
     5. Suzuki (2)
     6. Yamaha (2)
     7. Frances Clark (1)
     8. Mary Gae George (1)
     9. Kindermusik (1)
     10. Musikgarten (1)
     11. Dorothy Taubman (1)
   - C. Negative or Indifferent Attitude Toward Piano Pedagogy Courses (5)
   - D. Mixed Attitude—Courses Were Not Valuable in Respondent's Own Experience, but Could be Helpful For Others (11)
     1. Course Topics were not Relevant to Respondent's Career (3)
     2. Not Enough Practical Experience was Included (1)
     3. Course was Taken When the Field of Piano Pedagogy was New (1)
     4. Did not Have a Strong Pedagogy Teacher (1)

II. Attitudes Toward the Importance of Specific Topics in Piano Pedagogy Curricula (133)
   - A. Teaching Students Specific Skills (42)
     1. Technique (18)
     2. Music Theory (13)
     3. Composition (9)
        a. Positive Attitude (8)
        b. Negative Attitude (1)
     4. Music Reading (8)
     5. Improvisation (8)
     6. Rhythm (7)
     7. Ear Training (4)
     8. Harmonization (4)
     9. Tone Production (4)
     10. Ensembles/Accompanying (3)
     11. Jazz/Popular Repertoire (3)
     12. Listening Skills (3)
     13. Memorization (3)
     14. Style/Interpretation (3)
     15. Classical Repertoire (2)
     16. Musical Form (2)
     17. Practicing (2)
     18. Performing (2)
     19. Transposition (2)
     20. Score Reading (1)

B. Technology (35)
    1. Technology in General (16)
        a. Positive Attitude (5)
        b. Negative or Indifferent Attitude (2)
        c. Mixed Attitude--Topic is not Relevant and/or Appealing for Respondent, but is Important for New Teachers (9)
    2. Electronic Keyboards/Keyboard Labs (13)
        a. Positive Attitude (7)
        b. Negative or Indifferent Attitude (5)
        c. Mixed Attitude--Topic is not Relevant and/or Appealing for Self, but is Important for New Teachers (1)
    3. Computers/Computer Labs (10)
        a. Positive Attitude (9)
        b. Negative or Indifferent Attitude (1)

C. Developing Specific Teacher Knowledge and Skills (31)
    1. Psychology, Education, and Learning Theories (10)
    2. Knowledge of Piano Repertoire (8)
    3. Teaching Busy Students in Today's World (5)
    4. Familiarity with Method Books (4)
    5. Understanding Pros and Cons of Competitions (4)
    6. Curriculum Building (2)
    7. Adjudication (1)
    8. Collaborating with School Music Teachers (1)
    9. Developing a Teaching Philosophy (1)
    10. Teaching in Public School Keyboard Labs (1)

D. Business Issues and Career Strategies (27)
    1. Setting Fees (5)
    2. Increasing Income (4)
    3. Recruiting/Dropping Students (4)
    4. Taxes (3)
    5. Zoning Regulations (3)
    6. Copyright Laws (1)
    7. Insurance/Liability (1)
    8. Studio Policies (1)

E. Teaching Specific Types of Students (16)
    1. Learning Disabled (7)
    2. Pre-school (5)
    3. Beginners (3)
    4. Physically Impaired (3)
    5. Adult (2)
    6. Home School vs. Public School vs. Private School Students (1)
    7. Non-English Speaking (1)
    8. Siblings (1)

F. Teaching and Observation Experience (13)

G. Dealing with Parents (11)

H. Partner/Group Lessons (11)
    1. Positive Attitude (10)
    2. Negative Attitude (1)

I. The Importance of Various Topics to the Training of New Teachers Today will Depend upon the Teachers' Individual Goals (9)

III. Attitudes Regarding the Education, Experiences, Skills, and Traits Needed to be a Good Teacher (104)

A. Professional Development and Education (58)
    1. Continuing Education (43)

Table 39, Continued

a. Workshops/Conferences (29)
b. Master Classes (7)
c. Reading/Independent Study (9)
d. Taking Piano Lessons (3)

2. Membership in Professional Organizations (23)
3. Education and Degrees in Music/Teacher Certification (6)
4. Helpfulness of Degrees and Experience in Non-Music Fields (4)

B. Tailoring Instruction to Meet the Individual Needs and Goals of Students (16)
C. Teaching Experience (16)
D. Ability to Motivate Students (14)
E. Being a Well-Rounded Musician (13)
F. Possessing a Genuine Love of Music and Students (10)
G. Effective Communication Skills (6)

Summary of the Data

Personal and Teaching Information

The typical piano teacher participating in this study was a woman above the age of 45 with a bachelor's degree in performance or music education, with piano as her primary instrument. She was an experienced teacher, with 20-30 years of teaching behind her. She taught primarily private lessons in a home studio. The greatest amount of her teaching was focused on elementary and intermediate students between the ages of 7 and 18, although advanced students, adult hobby students, and pre-school students were prevalent in the studio as well.

College/University Piano Pedagogy Coursework

The typical piano teacher in this study had taken piano pedagogy coursework at the undergraduate level in a college or university setting, but had also engaged in other means of learning to teach. The majority of respondents who took piano pedagogy courses taught and observed elementary students between the ages of 7 and 11 years old as part of that coursework, and found their teaching and/or observation experience to be helpful for the teaching they do in their careers.

Evaluation of Piano Pedagogy Course Content

Piano teachers in this study indicated a belief that piano pedagogy courses are valuable, and that nearly all pedagogy topics listed in the questionnaire are important for the training of new teachers today, even if all are not relevant to their own careers. The most relevant topics to their own careers regarding teaching strategies for different types of students (as indicated by a mean Likert-type rating of 3.0 or higher) were teaching "elementary," "intermediate," "advanced," "transfer," and "adult-hobby" students. The private lesson setting was far more relevant to them than partner lessons, group lessons, or master classes. Elementary repertoire, and intermediate and advanced repertoire from different eras were relevant to them, as well as duet/ensemble repertoire, while jazz/blues and popular music was somewhat less relevant. The most relevant skill areas to teach to students were basic skills such as "rhythm," "music reading," "technique," "style/interpretation," "tone production," "sight reading," and "memorization." Although the teaching of music theory was not included on the survey, many teachers indicated that this was an important area as well. Functional skills and creative activities, such as accompanying, harmonization, improvisation, composition, score reading, and playing by ear were somewhat less relevant to their teaching. The most relevant content areas to teachers' careers were "selecting piano literature," "motivating piano students," "selecting piano methods," and "preparing students for recitals." No area of technology was identified as being particularly relevant to their teaching. The most relevant business and professional issues to them were "studio policies," "setting lesson fees," "scheduling," "bookkeeping/taxes," and "professional music organizations and journals." Many teachers took time to write about the importance of continuing education through

workshops/conferences and membership in professional organizations, as well as a desire to know more about business issues for independent studios.

Nearly every item on Questions 17-23 received a mean Likert-type rating of 3.0 or higher for "importance to the training of new teachers today," and was rated significantly higher (as indicated by paired samples *t*-tests) for importance to new teachers than for relevance to respondents' careers. The only items that had a mean rating of just below 3.0 for "importance to the training of new teachers today" were teaching students "playing by ear" (2.94), teacher knowledge of "games for students" (2.98), "history of technique" (2.97), "history of piano pedagogy" (2.83), and "synthesizers" (2.99). It appears that piano teachers felt that new teachers should receive a comprehensive education in piano pedagogy that includes nearly every topic included on the survey, and should include ample observation and teaching experience.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate piano teachers' attitudes regarding the relevance of piano pedagogy course topics to their careers and the importance of those topics to the preparation of new teachers. Participation was sought from teachers from a variety of teaching settings, and information was obtained on participants' teaching careers, personal demographics, college/university piano pedagogy background, and attitudes toward piano pedagogy course topics.

Data for this study were obtained through a questionnaire that contained 24 items. Questionnaires were sent to 1200 members of Music Teachers' National Association (MTNA) who identified themselves as piano teachers. A total of 598 valid responses were used for analysis in this study, for a response rate of 49.83%.

Teaching Information

The results of this study indicate that the majority of respondents taught in a home studio (86%), and 76.6% reported the home studio as their primary teaching location. Younger teachers were more likely than older teachers to teach in a studio outside the home. Teachers with an undergraduate degree as the highest degree earned were more likely than those with a graduate degree to teach in a home studio, while those with a graduate degree were more likely than those with an undergraduate degree to teach in a studio outside the home, in a two-year college, and in a four-year college or university.

Most respondents taught elementary students (94.6%) and intermediate students (96.5%), and many also taught advanced students (71.2%). Teachers with an

undergraduate degree as the highest degree earned were more likely than those with a graduate degree to teach elementary students, while those with a graduate degree were more likely than those with only an undergraduate degree to teach advanced students.

The most common ages/groups of students taught by participants in this study were 12- to 18-year olds (94.3%) and 7- to 11-year olds (91.6%). The majority of teachers also taught adult hobby students (72.7%) and children younger than seven years of age (60.2%). Younger teachers were more likely than older teachers to teach children under seven years old. Teachers with an undergraduate degree were more likely than teachers with a graduate degree to teach 7- to 11-year olds, while those with a graduate degree were more likely than teachers with an undergraduate degree to teach college music majors and college non-music majors.

A large number of respondents had students who received only private lessons (78.1%) for their instruction, with an average of 25 students per teacher receiving solely private lessons. Just over a quarter (28.3%) of teachers offered a combination of private and partner/group lessons to at least some of their students, and 8.2% taught students who received only partner and/or group lessons.

The participants in this study were mostly an experienced group, with the majority of teachers having over 30 years of teaching experience (51.8%), and another 25.8% having 21-30 years of experience.

Personal Information

The largest age group participating in this study was people over age 65 (36.6%). Relatively few respondents were below the age of 46 (16.8%), so the results of this study

are based in large part on the responses of a mature sample. Most of the respondents were female (90.1%).

Most of the teachers held a bachelor's degree or higher (90.6%), and 85.6% majored in music for their highest degree. The specific music major was likely to be music performance (30.1%), music education (22.9%), or performance and pedagogy (13.4%). Another 6% were piano pedagogy majors, and 5.3% had some combination of music education with performance and/or pedagogy.

It can be summarized that the typical piano teacher participating in this study was a woman over age 45 with over 20 years of teaching experience, who held a bachelor's degree in music with piano as the primary instrument, and taught primarily in a studio in her home.

College/University Piano Pedagogy Coursework

Teachers participating in this study reported a variety of means of learning to teach piano, but the most frequently reported way to learn to teach piano was to attend workshops, clinics, and conferences on teaching (85.8%).

Over two-thirds of respondents (68.9%) indicated that they had taken one or more piano pedagogy courses at the college/university level. Of those with college/university piano pedagogy coursework, the largest number of them took four or more courses (24.1%). Almost half (49.3%) of respondents with college piano pedagogy coursework took their classes only at the undergraduate level, while 30.1% experienced both undergraduate and graduate pedagogy courses, and 19.9% took their coursework only at the graduate level.

Three hundred forty-nine (82.2%) of the respondents who took college/university piano pedagogy coursework reported having had some sort of teaching and/or observation experience as part of that coursework. The majority of the respondents with piano pedagogy coursework taught elementary students (56.3%), observed elementary students (58.7%), taught 7- to 11-year old students (50.5%), observed 7- to 11-year old students (52.2%), taught private lessons (54.4%), and observed private lessons (56.3%). Younger respondents were more likely than older respondents to have had teaching and observation experience in a number of areas, and respondents with a graduate degree were more likely than those with an undergraduate degree as the highest earned to teach college music majors, college non-music majors, and partner/group lessons. Of the 349 teachers with some teaching and/or observation experience as part of their piano pedagogy coursework, nearly all of them (95.7%) rated their experience as "very helpful" (55.0%) or "somewhat helpful" (40.7%) in preparing them for the teaching they do in their careers.

Evaluation of Piano Pedagogy Course Content

Respondents rated nearly all piano pedagogy content items significantly higher (as indicated by paired samples *t*-tests) on a four-point Likert-type scale for their importance to the preparation of new teachers than for their relevance their own careers. All teaching strategies for different types of students listed on the questionnaire received a mean Likert-type rating of 3.0 or higher for their importance for new teachers. The strategies to receive a 3.0 or higher for relevance to respondents' careers were those for the following types of students: "elementary," "intermediate," "advanced," "transfer," and "adult-hobby." Younger teachers rated transfer students higher than older teachers

did for relevance to their careers. Teachers with an undergraduate degree as the highest earned rated elementary and learning disabled students higher for career relevance than those with a graduate degree, while those with a graduate degree gave higher ratings for career relevance to college music majors and college non-music majors.

Of the teaching strategies for different types of lesson settings, private lessons were rated highly for both relevance to respondents' careers (3.85) and importance to new teachers (3.89). Group lessons, partner lessons, and master classes were all rated with a mean below 3.0 for relevance to respondents' careers, but above 3.0 for importance to new teachers.

Every item except "jazz/blues" and "popular" that was listed in strategies for teaching different kinds of repertoire received a mean rating of above 3.0 for relevance to respondents' careers. All items in this category were rated above 3.0 for importance to new teachers, but the highest rated categories were "elementary" (3.88), "intermediate: 17th-19th centuries" (3.85), and "intermediate: 20th-21st centuries" (3.83). The lowest rated categories for importance to new teachers were "jazz/blues" (3.42) and "popular" (3.05). Teachers over the age of 64 gave lower ratings than other age groups to the career relevance of popular literature. Teachers with a graduate degree rated the career relevance of advanced literature from the 20th-21st centuries higher than did teachers with an undergraduate degree. Those with an undergraduate degree gave higher ratings than teachers with a graduate degree to jazz/blues and popular literature.

The following categories of teaching techniques for student skill areas received a mean Likert-type rating of above 3.0 both for both relevance to respondents' careers and importance to new teachers: "music reading," "rhythm," "technique,"

"style/interpretation," "tone production," sight reading," memorization," accompanying," "harmonization," and "transposition." "Playing by ear" was rated below 3.0 in both relevance to respondents' careers (2.46) and importance to new teachers (2.95). Three additional items were rated below 3.0 for relevance to respondents' careers, including "improvisation" (2.78), "score reading" (2.70), and "composition" (2.46). Overall, basic skills (music reading, rhythm, technique, style/interpretation, tone production) were rated more highly in both columns than functional and creative skills (accompanying, harmonization, transposition, improvisation, score reading, composition, playing by ear). Younger teachers were more likely than the oldest group of teachers to consider "transposition", "improvisation," and "playing by ear," important to the training of new teachers. Respondents with an undergraduate degree as the highest earned gave higher ratings than those with a graduate degree to the importance to new teachers of teaching score reading.

Respondents rated "selecting piano teaching literature" as both the most relevant teacher knowledge area to their careers (3.85), and as the most important for new teachers today (3.92). "Motivating piano students," selecting piano methods," and "preparing students for recitals" were given relatively high ratings in both columns, while "games for students," "history of keyboard technique," and "history of piano pedagogy" were rated below 3.0 in both columns. However, younger teachers and teachers with an undergraduate degree as the highest earned gave higher mean ratings for the importance to new teachers of "games for students" than older teachers and those with a graduate degree. Those with an undergraduate degree also considered "games for students" more relevant to their careers than those with a graduate degree.

Every item listed under the heading *Uses of Technology in Teaching* was rated below 3.0 for relevance to respondents' careers, while all except "synthesizers" were rated above 3.0 for importance to new teachers today. The relatively large standard deviation for every item indicates that respondents held diverse opinions on these items. The highest rated items for both relevance to respondents' careers and importance to new teachers were "computer software" and "Internet resources," and the two lowest rated items in both columns were "electronic keyboard labs" and "synthesizers." "Electronic keyboard labs" received a very low rating of 1.88 for relevance to respondents' careers, and "synthesizers" was rated even lower at 1.78. Nearly every item in this category was rated higher by the two youngest age groups of teachers than the oldest age group for both career relevance and importance to new teachers, but the highest mean ratings were often given by the "46-55" age group, rather than the "under 46" age group. Teachers with an undergraduate degree gave higher ratings than those with a graduate degree to "Internet resources," as it pertained to importance to new teachers.

Respondents indicated that business practices are important for new teachers, as every item was rated 3.24 or higher for "importance to the training of new teachers today." The highest rated items for importance to new teachers were "studio policies" (3.73), "setting lesson fees" (3.68), and "bookkeeping/taxes" (3.65). The items with a mean rating above 3.0 for relevance to respondents' careers were "studio policies" (3.44), "setting lesson fees" (3.44), "scheduling" (3.42), "bookkeeping/taxes" (3.31), and "overview of professional music organizations and journals" (3.23). Younger teachers rated several items higher than older teachers, including the career relevance of "marketing/recruiting students," "studio policies," and "computer software for

businesses." Teachers with an undergraduate degree gave higher ratings than those with a graduate degree to the career relevance of "setting lesson fees" and "bookkeeping/taxes."

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to examine piano teachers' attitudes toward piano pedagogy course topics. Based on the data obtained by the questionnaire, the following conclusions may be drawn:

Piano Teachers' Teaching Careers

1. Most piano teachers provide instruction in a home studio (86.0%), and for many teachers, the home studio is also their primary teaching location (76.6%).
2. Most piano teachers teach students at the elementary (94.6%) and intermediate (96.5%) levels, and many teach advanced students (71.2%).
3. The majority of piano teachers teach students younger than 7 years old (60.2%), 7 to 11 years old (91.6%), 12 to 18 years old (94.3%), and adult-hobby students (72.7%).
4. Although some teachers are embracing the advantages of partner/group lesson settings, private lessons are still much more frequently used to teach students than partner/group lessons or a combination of private and partner/group.
5. A teacher who gives only private lessons has an average of about 25 students.

6. Most piano teachers hold a bachelor's degree or higher in music, with piano as the primary instrument. The education level of piano teachers in 2004 is very similar to what it was in 1989, as reported by MTNA (1990).
7. Most teachers have engaged in several methods of learning to teach piano other than taking college/university piano pedagogy coursework, including attending workshops, clinics and conferences on teaching (85.8%), studying piano method books and materials (80.4%), emulating their own teacher(s) (79.4%), experience/trial and error (78.8%), studying available materials on teaching (such as texts, articles, videos) (76.6%), talking with other teachers (71.6%), and observing another teacher (54.8%).
8. Just over two-thirds (68.9%) of piano teachers in this study have taken at least one piano pedagogy course at the college/university level.
9. Just under half (49.3%) of teachers who took college/university piano pedagogy coursework did so at the undergraduate level only.
10. Most teachers (82.2%) who took college/university piano pedagogy coursework obtained some teaching and/or observation experience as part of that coursework. The most frequently taught and observed students were elementary (taught 56.3%, observed 58.7%) and 7- to 11-year olds (taught 50.5%, observed 52.2%), and private lessons were more frequently taught (54.4%) and observed (56.3%) than partner/group lessons (taught 25.5%, observed 38.3%). However, according to Johnson (2002), current undergraduate piano pedagogy students are likely to receive a somewhat

wider range of teaching and observation experiences. Johnson reported that observation of teaching is required at 91.06% of institutions. Both private and group instruction is observed at 83.93% of institutions, and at least half of the undergraduate pedagogy programs require observation of private lessons for average-age beginners, pre-college intermediate students, older beginners, and pre-school beginners, and group lessons for average-age beginners. According to Johnson, 78.86% of undergraduate piano pedagogy programs require student teaching. That teaching is likely to include private instruction of average-age beginners (83.16%), private lessons for older beginners (51.58%), private lessons for pre-college intermediate students (46.32%), group lessons for average-age beginners (44.21%), and private lessons for pre-school beginners (38.95%). However, undergraduate pedagogy students today are unlikely to teach advanced students, college group piano students, or adult/hobby students. According to Milliman (1992), opportunities for graduate piano pedagogy students to teach advanced students and adult/hobby students are limited as well.

11. Nearly all teachers (95.7%) who have had teaching and/or observation experience as part of their college/university piano pedagogy coursework have found that experience to be helpful for the teaching they do in their careers.

Piano Teachers' Evaluation of Piano Pedagogy Course Content

12. Piano teachers consider most piano pedagogy topics to be more important for the preparation of new teachers today than relevant for their own careers.

13. Piano teachers consider teaching strategies for broad categories of students ("elementary," "intermediate," "advanced," "transfer") more relevant to their careers and important for new teachers today than smaller, more specific groups of students.
14. Teachers are largely in agreement that teaching strategies for private lessons are highly relevant to their careers and important for the training of new teachers. Partner lessons, group lessons, and master classes are considerably less relevant to current teachers' careers, but important for the preparation of new teachers.
15. Most categories of teaching literature are relevant to teachers' careers. Elementary and intermediate repertoires are most relevant to their careers, while jazz/blues and popular are least relevant. (These findings are similar to those of Wolfersbeger in 1986.) All categories of teaching literature are important to the preparation of new teachers, with elementary and intermediate repertoire being most important, and jazz/blues and popular styles somewhat less important.
16. Teaching students basic skills, including music reading, rhythm, technique, style/interpretation, tone production, and sight reading are most relevant to teachers' careers and important for new teachers. Functional and creative skills, including accompanying, harmonization, transposition, improvisation, score reading, composition, and playing by ear are less relevant to current teachers' careers, but important for new teachers. Teaching music theory is also an important component of piano lessons to many teachers.

17. Selecting piano literature is an important area of knowledge for both experienced and new teachers. Also highly important to current and new teachers are practical skills, such as motivating piano students, selecting piano methods, and preparing students for recitals. Communicating effectively with students and dealing with their parents are critical as well. Many teachers do not consider knowledge of games for students particularly relevant to their careers or important to new teachers, nor more academic topics such as the history of keyboard technique and history of piano pedagogy.
18. Teachers displayed varied attitudes toward the role of technology in piano teaching. Overall, however, teachers indicated that technology is not particularly relevant to their teaching careers. Utilizing available computer software and Internet resources are considered the most important technology topics for new teachers today, while using synthesizers is the least important.
19. Most business and professional issues are considered quite important for current and new teachers. Areas considered most relevant to current teachers' careers include writing studio policies, setting lesson fees, bookkeeping/taxes, and scheduling. Teachers consider continuing education in piano pedagogy through membership in professional organizations and attending workshops/conferences to be very valuable.
20. The attitudes of piano teachers vary on some piano pedagogy course topics, depending on age and highest degree earned.
21. Piano teachers consider piano pedagogy courses to be very important to teacher preparation.

22. Many teachers consider possessing a genuine love of music and students, and tailoring instruction to meet students' needs to be key components of a successful teaching career.
23. The topics that teachers cited as most important to pedagogical study in the study by MTNA in 1990 (supervised teaching and observation of good teaching, sequencing and knowledge of materials, knowledge of method books, presentation of materials, student motivation, and how to teach technique) are still deemed very important by teachers today.

Recommendations for Piano Pedagogy Curricula and Professional Music Teacher Organizations

1. Although most piano pedagogy core courses already include teaching techniques for elementary and intermediate students (Johnson, 2002; Milliman, 1992), pedagogy programs should also include a strong emphasis on teaching advanced students, as many teachers (71.2%) instruct advanced students as part of their teaching careers. This is particularly important for graduate pedagogy courses because teachers with graduate degrees are significantly more likely than those with undergraduate degrees to teach advanced students, but the majority (60.9%) of those with only an undergraduate degree teach advanced students as well.
2. Piano pedagogy programs should emphasize teaching strategies for pre-school and adult hobby students. Topics related to teaching these two groups of students are included in many pedagogy programs, but they are not given nearly as much emphasis as strategies for average-age beginners.

Opportunities for teaching and observation experience of pre-school and adult hobby students are not especially wide spread (Johnson, 2002; Milliman, 1992). Yet, the majority of piano teachers do instruct pre-school students (60.2%), and nearly three-quarters of teachers (72.7%) instruct adult hobby students. Younger teachers are significantly more likely than older ones to teach pre-school students, and it appears likely that new teachers will encounter numerous requests for early-age instruction during the course of their careers.

3. Piano pedagogy programs should at least touch upon teaching strategies for learning disabled and physically impaired students. Nearly one in five teachers instruct learning disabled students (19.4%), and 9% teach physically impaired students. Related literature suggests that learning disabled and physically impaired students are a growing segment of the piano student population. Data are not available on how many undergraduate piano pedagogy programs include strategies for these students, but according to Milliman (1992), only about one-third of graduate programs include topics related to the instruction of learning disabled and physically impaired students, and those that do tend to give them little emphasis.
4. Piano teacher organizations should present workshops for established teachers on teaching student groups with which they may not have experience or pedagogical training, including advanced, pre-school, learning disabled, and physically impaired students.

5. Piano pedagogy programs should include a strong emphasis on not only teaching students basic skills, but also functional and creative skills, such as accompanying, harmonization, transposition, improvisation, score reading, composition, and playing by ear. It is especially important for teachers who did not have instruction in these areas in their own studies to become comfortable teaching their students these skills, so that their students may become well-rounded musicians.
6. Piano pedagogy students should be well educated in the business practices of running an independent studio in one's home. This is especially important at the undergraduate level, as nearly all (92.9%) teachers with a bachelor's degree as the highest earned do at least some of their teaching in a home studio. It is important to the future of the piano pedagogy and piano performance fields that good teachers are able to make a living at what they do, rather than having to change professions out of financial necessity. According to Johnson (2002), 95.93% of undergraduate pedagogy programs do address "policies and procedures for the independent studio," and Milliman (1992) reported that at the time of her study, 98% of graduate pedagogy programs did so, but it is not clear exactly what aspects of this topic are addressed. Just over half (52.85%) of undergraduate programs require students to complete a project related to independent studio management (Johnson). It is important that professional piano teacher organizations and publications provide their members with resources on studio management.

7. Piano pedagogy courses should help students become aware of teaching applications of technology, especially computer software and Internet resources. According to Johnson (2002), technology-related topics are not given high priority by pedagogy instructors. Likewise, piano teacher organizations should introduce established teachers to various forms of technology, and explain the educational and financial benefits that may result from utilizing such technology in their teaching.
8. Piano pedagogy courses and professional organizations should provide students and teachers with a thorough grounding in partner/group instruction and a familiarity with its educational and financial benefits. Although most undergraduate and graduate programs do address group teaching, it is not clear how much those programs are helping students find practical ways to transfer knowledge of group and partner teaching to the setting of a home studio, where many teachers are likely to carry out their instruction.
9. Piano pedagogy programs should place a strong emphasis on the importance of professional resources for piano teachers, and consider requiring student participation in piano teachers' organizations and subscriptions to publications for piano teachers. This can help students form a network of professional support before they make the transition from students to professionals, and can familiarize them with the valuable resources that such organizations and publications offer to teachers. It also helps to keep the organizations and publications themselves strong and viable. Yet, Johnson (2002) found that only about 50% of undergraduate programs require participation in at least

one area of professional growth. Milliman (1992) reported that even fewer graduate programs do so (36.7%), although though many instructors recommend participation.

10. Piano pedagogy programs should continue to give high priority to selecting and sequencing repertoire for students. Students in piano pedagogy programs should become familiar with a wide variety of repertoire in different styles, from elementary to advanced levels. Duet/ensemble repertoire should hold an important place in the study of repertoire, and jazz/blues and popular repertoire should also be visited.
11. Piano pedagogy programs should provide students with knowledge and skills on communicating with parents of child and adolescent students and on understanding different family structures and cultures.
12. Piano pedagogy programs should help piano students who wish to become teachers understand the critical importance of caring for their students and genuinely wanting to teach.
13. Although recently published piano pedagogy textbooks address many traditional and emerging topics relevant to piano teachers, no one textbook currently contains sufficient information on all topics deemed important to most piano teachers. Therefore, pedagogy instructors should assign students readings and experiences from a variety of sources, such as textbooks, videos, professional publications and journals, Internet sites for teachers, workshops, and conferences.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the findings of this study, further investigation is recommended in the following areas:

1. Recent college/university piano pedagogy graduates' perceptions of the quality of their preparation to teach piano.
2. Established teachers' attitudes on what topics of piano pedagogy they would like to learn more about.
3. Workshop and conference session offerings by professional music teacher organizations.
4. Specific uses of technology by independent piano teachers.
5. Strategies for group teaching that piano teachers use in home studios.
6. Development of a comprehensive course and/or textbook on business practices for independent piano teachers.
7. Origins and development of piano pedagogy programs in the U.S.A.

Limitations of the Study

Some weaknesses of this study limit the extent to which the results can be generalized. The time of year in which the survey questionnaire was mailed to teachers may have resulted in a lower response rate than if it had been mailed at a different time. May is a busy time of year for piano teachers, as piano recitals and festivals often take place then. Future researchers in this area might consider including an option for returning the questionnaire online, as this may be more convenient for some participants.

A second weakness is the relatively low response rate from new teachers and young teachers. A majority of respondents (51.8%) had over 30 years of teaching

experience, and only 16.8% were under the age of 46. Therefore, the results cannot readily be generalized to new and young teachers.

For some questions, a considerable number of teachers did not respond to one or more components of it. This was especially problematic as it pertained to the number of students taught for Question 4, and the primary instrument for Question 9. This might be avoided in future studies by breaking down multi-part questions into separate questions.

A problem facing researchers of topics related to piano teaching is the lack of a comprehensive directory of piano teachers in the U.S.A. Although the Music Teachers National Association (MTNA) is a large organization of music teachers, it represents only those piano teachers who choose to join that particular organization. Other organizations also exist which have mailing lists of piano teachers, but some teachers are not members of any music-related organizations, and there is no comprehensive list or registry of piano teachers in the country.

Closing

This study provides information on piano teachers' attitudes toward piano pedagogy course topics, and builds on previous studies concerning piano pedagogy curricula and the piano teaching profession. Additional research in the piano pedagogy field will help colleges, universities, and professional piano teacher organizations and publications continue to provide relevant instruction and resources to help teachers be successful and effective in their careers.

REFERENCES

American Music Teacher. The Carew Tower, 441 Vine St., Ste. 505, Cincinnati, OH 45202-2811.

Ascari, D. (2003). *The art of effective piano teaching*. Bloomington, IN: 1st Books Library.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2001). *Introduction to research in music education* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Baker-Jordan, M. (2003). *Practical piano pedagogy*. Miami, FL: Warner Bros. Publications.

Barden, C., Kowalchyk, G., & Lancaster, E.L. (1999-2000). *Music for little Mozarts* (Bks. 1-4). Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Bastien, J. (1995). *How to teach piano successfully* (3rd ed.). San Diego, CA: Kjos.

Bastien, J.S., Bastien, L., & Bastien, L. (1993-1994). *Bastien's invitation to music* (Bks. A-D). San Diego, CA: Kjos.

Bauer, E. (2003). What is an appropriate approach to piano instruction for students with Down syndrome? (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *64* (05). (UMI No. 3090728)

Beres, K. (2003). The contributions of Marienne Uszler to piano pedagogy (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*, 709.

Berr, B. (2000, June/July). MTNA and music technology. *American Music Teacher*, 28-29.

Brubaker, D. (1996). A history and critical analysis of piano methods published in the United States from 1796 to 1995 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 57 (8A)*, 3436.

Charoenwongse, C. (1998). Undergraduate piano pedagogy course offerings in Thai universities (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53,* 0749.

Chronister, R., & McBeth, T. (Eds.). (1989). *Proceedings and Reference, 1988-1989: The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy*. Princeton, NJ: The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy.

Chronister, R., & Meader, P. (Eds.). (1993). *Proceedings and Reference, 1992-1993: The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy*. Los Angeles, CA: The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy.

Chronister, R., & Meader, P. (Eds.). (1995). *Proceedings and Reference, 1994-1995: The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy*. Los Angeles, CA: The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy.

Clavier. 200 Northfield Rd., Northfield, IL 60093.

Collins, A. (1996). Some whys, hows, and whats of preschool piano. In J. Lyke, Y. Enoch, & G. Haydon, *Creative Piano Teaching* (3rd ed.) (pp. 37-50). Champaign, IL: Stipes.

Collins, A. (2000). *Jazz works: Beginning jazz techniques for intermediate- to advanced-level pianists*. Van Nuys, CA: Alfred Publishing, Co, Inc.

Collins, A., & Clary, L. (1981, 1987). *Sing and Play* (Bks. 1-3). Champaign, IL: Stipes.

Conda, J. M. (1997). The late-bloomers piano club: A case study of a group in progress (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 58*, 0409.

Crum, Jeffrey T. (1998). Attitudes and opinions toward beginning through intermediate piano instruction among Florida state music teachers association piano teachers (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59*, 4090.

Edwards, D. (1996). The adult beginner in the studio and college. In J. Lyke, Y. Enoch, & G. Haydon, *Creative Piano Teaching* (pp. 37-50). Champaign, IL: Stipes.

Fowler, F. (2002). *Survey research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Graessle, R. K. (1998). Adult music programming in member schools of the national guild of community schools for the arts (music instruction). (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59*, 3387

Graessle, R. K. (2000, January 1). Teaching adults: The rewards and challenges. *Piano Pedagogy Forum, 3* (1). Retrieved November 1, 2003, from http://www.music.sc.edu/ea/keyboard/PPF/3.1/3.1.PPFpp.html

Gray, M. E. (1997). University of Oklahoma piano majors' attitudes about performing and teaching skills (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59*, 1104

Jacobson, J. (1995). Do piano pedagogy courses really make better piano teachers? *Proceedings of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy* (pp. 186-187). Los Angeles: The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy.

Johnson, V. (2002). A survey of undergraduate piano pedagogy core course content (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63,* 3503.

Jutras, P. (2001-2002). Highlights of discussions by breakout groups: Doctoral degree. In B. Maris (Ed.), *Proceedings of the National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy (*pp. 19-20). Retrieved October 30, 2003, from http://www.francesclarkcenter.org/Conference/Proceedings/proceedings.html

Kasap, B. (1999). Status of undergraduate secondary piano instruction in selected departments of music education in Turkey with recommendations for teaching functional piano skills in groups (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 50*, no. 05A, 1385.

Keithley, E. (Ed.) (2003, January 1). Group discussion: Share your favorite technology and non-technology pedagogy projects. *Piano Pedagogy Forum, 6* (1). Retrieved November 9, 2003, from http://www.music.sc.edu/ea/keyboard/PPF/6.1/6.1.PPFkeithley.html

Keyboard Companion. P.O. Box 651, Kingston, NJ 08528.

Konowitz. B. (1992). *Alfred's basic adult jazz/rock course*. Van Nuys, CA: Alfred Publishing Co., Inc.

Kowalchyk, G. (1989). A descriptive profile of piano pedagogy instructors at American colleges and universities. (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1988). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 50,* 0643.

Kowalchyk, G. & Lancaster, E. L. (n.d.). Expanding your horizons: Teaching in groups [Electronic version]. *Piano Rendezvous*. Retrieved November 3, 2003, from http://www.alfred.com/frameset.cfm?sub=piano

Kwon, Y. (2002). The art of training teachers: An interview with Frances Larimer. *Clavier, 41* (2), 15-19.

Lyke, J. (1996). The preparation of the piano teacher. In J. Lyke, Y. Enoch, & G. Haydon, *Creative piano teaching* (3rd ed.) (pp. 37-50). Champaign, IL: Stipes.

Lyke, J., Enoch, Y., & Haydon, G. (1996). *Creative piano teaching* (3rd ed.). Champaign, IL: Stipes.

Lyman, J.P. (1991). Administrative aspects of intern teaching in piano pedagogy courses (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 52,* 1248.

Maris, B. E. (Ed.). (2001). Highlights of discussions by breakout groups. *Proceedings of the National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy*. Retrieved October 30, 2003, from: http://www.francesclarkcenter.org/Conference/Proceedings/proceedings.html

Milliman, A. L. (1992). A survey of graduate piano pedagogy core course offerings (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53*, 0749.

Monsour, S. (1963, October). Piano classes are not new! *Clavier, 2,* 33.

Montandon, M. I. (1998). Trends in piano pedagogy as reflected by the proceedings of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy (1981-1995) (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59,* 3387.

Morenus, C. (Ed.). (2001, January 1). What aspects of technology do you feel most compelled to include in your piano pedagogy program? *Piano Pedagogy Forum, 4* (1). Retrieved November 9, 2003, from http://www.music.sc.edu/ea/keyboard/PPF/4.1/4.1.PPFtech.html

Music Teachers National Association. (1990). *Pedagogic training of music teachers: A survey report*. Cincinnati, OH: Author.

Music Teachers National Association (1999). *Proceedings from Pedagogy Saturday III*. Cincinnati, OH: Author.

Music Teachers National Association (2001). Relating to the special learner. *Proceedings from Pedagogy Saturday V* (pp. 35-37). Cincinnati, OH: Author.

Music Teachers National Association (2003a). *Mailing list rental*. Retrieved November 16, 2003: http://www.mtna.org/listrentals.htm

Music Teachers National Association (2003b). *Music Teachers National Association homepage*. Retrieved December 2, 2003: http://www.mtna.org/home.htm

Music Teachers National Association Foundation. (1990). *The MTNA foundation national survey of independent music teacher income and lesson fees*. Cincinnati, OH: Author.

National Association of Schools of Music (1985). *National Association of Schools of Music 1985-1986 Handbook*. Reston, VA: Author.

National Association of Schools of Music (2003). *National Association of Schools of Music 2003-2004 Handbook*. Reston, VA: Author.

National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy (2004a). D.M.A. in performance and pedagogy. In F. Larimer (Ed.), *Proceedings of the National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy*. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from http://www.francesclarkcenter.org/NationalConferencePages/resources/curriculum/DMApiped.pdf

National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy (2004b). Master of music in piano performance and pedagogy. In F. Larimer (Ed.), *Proceedings of the National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy*. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from http://www.francesclarkcenter.org/NationalConferencePages/resources/curriculum/MMpiped.pdf

National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy (2004c). Pedagogy for B.M. degree in piano performance. In F. Larimer (Ed.), *Proceedings of the National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy*. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from http://www.francesclarkcenter.org/NationalConferencePages/resources/curriculum/UG1yr.pdf

National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy (2004d). Undergraduate major, emphasis, or concentration in piano pedagogy. In F. Larimer (Ed.), *Proceedings of the National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy*. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from http://www.francesclarkcenter.org/NationalConferencePages/resources/curriculum/BMpiped.pdf

Noona, W., & Noona, C. (1997). *Music magic*. Dayton, OH: Heritage Music Press.

Pace, R. (1999). Why do you advocate "three or more" teaching? In Music Teachers National Association, *Proceedings from Pedagogy Saturday III* (pp. 14-15). Cincinnati, OH: Music Teachers National Association, Inc.

Pace, R. & Pace, H. (1971). *Music for moppets*. Milwaukee: Lee Roberts (Hal Leonard, dist.).

Patten, M. (2001). *Questionnaire research: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.

Piano Pedagogy Forum. Retrieved December 10, 2003: http://www.music.sc.edu/ea/keyboard/PPF/index.i.html

Pike, P. D. (2001). Leisure piano lessons: A case study in lifelong learning (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 28*, 0712.

Price, S. (Ed.). (2002). Teaching students with disabilities: Personal accounts from teachers. *Piano Pedagogy Forum, 5* (1). Retrieved November 8, 2003, from http://www.music.sc.edu/ea/keyboard/PPF/5.1/5.1/PPFe.html

Richards, W. H. (1962). Trends of piano class instruction, 1815-1962 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri at Kansas City, 1962). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 28*, 0712.

Shook, T. R. (1993). The development and evaluation of competencies and experiences for teaching undergraduate piano pedagogy courses (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 52*, 3854.

Short, R. (2001-2002). Highlights of discussions by breakout groups: Master's degree. In B. Maris (Ed.), *Proceedings of the National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy* (pp 16-19). Retrieved October 30, 2003: http://www.francesclarkcenter.org/Conference/Proceedings/proceedings.html

Snyder, R. (2001-2002). Highlights of discussions by breakout groups: Bachelor's degree. In B. Maris (Ed.), *Proceedings of the National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy* (p. 16). Retrieved October 30, 2003: http://www.francesclarkcenter.org/Conference/Proceedings/proceedings.html

Sturm, C. A., James, M., Jackson A., & Burns, D. B. (2000, October/November). Celebrating 100 years of progress in American piano teaching: Part I: 1900-1950. *American Music Teacher*, 29-32.

Sturm, C. A., James, M., Jackson A., & Burns, D. B. (2000/2001, December/January). Celebrating 100 years of progress in American piano teaching, Part II: 1950-2000. *American Music Teacher*, 24-28.

Uszler, M. (1992). Research on the teaching of keyboard music. In R. Colwell, (Ed.). *Handbook of research on music teaching and learning: A project of the Music Educators National Conference* (pp. 584-593). New York: Macmillan.

Uszler, M. (2000). Introduction: Into the twenty-first century. In Uszler, M., Gordon, S., & McBride Smith, S., *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* (2nd ed.) (pp. xiii-xvi). New York: Schirmer Books.

Uszler, M., Gordon, S., & McBride Smith, S. (2000). *The well-tempered keyboard teacher*. (2nd ed.). New York: Schirmer Books.

Uszler, M., & Larimer, F. (1984). *The piano pedagogy major in the college curriculum: A handbook of information and guidelines. Part I: The undergraduate piano pedagogy major*. Princeton, NJ: The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy.

Uszler, M., & Larimer, F. (1986). *The piano pedagogy major in the college curriculum: A handbook of information and guidelines. Part II: The graduate piano pedagogy major*. Princeton, NJ: The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy.

Wolfersberger, M. M. (1986). A study of selected aspects of the piano teaching profession. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 48*, 07A. (UMI No. 8721198)

Won, K. K. (1999). Undergraduate piano pedagogy course offerings in selected colleges and universities in the Republic of Korea (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60*, 1495.

Zdzinski, S. F. (2002). Adapting piano teaching for special learners. *Piano Pedagogy Forum, 5* (1). Retrieved November 1, 2003, from http://www.music.sc.edu/ea/keyboard/PPF/5.1/5.1.PPFke.html

APPENDIX A

CRONBACH'S ALPHA VALUES FOR QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM CLUSTERS

Item Clusters	Cronbach's Alpha: Present Study	Cronbach's Alpha: Preliminary Study
Importance for the training of new teachers today:		
Student type: College music majors Student type: College non-music majors	.8847	.8927
Student type: Learning disabled students Student type: Physically impaired students	.8950	.8514
Student type: Elementary Repertoire type: Elementary	.7331	.3784
Student type: Intermediate Repertoire type: Intermediate	.8081	.8972
Student type: Advanced Repertoire type: Advanced	.8143	.7217
Student skill: Improvisation Student skill: Composition	.8378	.7462
Teacher knowledge of content area: Establishing a curriculum Teacher knowledge of content area: Lesson planning	.8523	N/A
Relevance to respondents' careers:		
Student type: Elementary Repertoire type: Elementary	.8082	.8496
Student type: Intermediate Repertoire type: Intermediate (17th-19th centuries and 20th-21st centuries)	.7688	.6977
Student type: Advanced Repertoire type: Advanced (17th-19th centuries and 20th-21st centuries)	.7743	.9626
Student skill: Improvisation Student skill: Composition	.8240	.8425
Teacher knowledge of content area: Establishing a curriculum Teacher knowledge of content area: Lesson planning	.8301	N/A

APPENDIX B

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

PIANO TEACHERS' ATTITUDES
ABOUT PIANO PEDAGOGY COURSE TOPICS

This study examines piano teachers' attitudes concerning the relevance of selected piano pedagogy course topics to their careers, and the importance of those topics for the preparation of new teachers. **Please complete this survey regardless of whether you have taken college/university piano pedagogy courses.** Because you are an experienced piano teacher, your participation is very important.

SECTION 1: Teaching Information

1. Where do you teach piano? (Circle all that apply)

    1) STUDIO IN YOUR HOME
    2) STUDIO OUTSIDE YOUR HOME
    3) TRAVEL TO STUDENTS' HOMES
    4) CHURCH
    5) MUSIC STORE
    6) ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
    7) SECONDARY SCHOOL
    8) COLLEGE PREPARATORY DEPARTMENT
    9) PRIVATE PREPARATORY SCHOOL
    10) TWO YEAR COLLEGE
    11) FOUR YEAR COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY
    12) OTHER (Please specify) _____

If you indicated more than one of the locations listed above, which one do you consider your primary teaching location?
(Write the number listed next to that location in the blank) _____

2. Indicate which of the following levels of students you teach: (Circle all that apply)

    1) ELEMENTARY
    2) INTERMEDIATE
    3) ADVANCED

3. Indicate which of the following age/groups of students you teach: (Circle all that apply)

   1) UNDER 7 YEARS OLD
   2) 7-11 YEARS OLD
   3) 12-18 YEARS OLD
   4) COLLEGE MUSIC MAJORS
   5) COLLEGE NON-MUSIC MAJORS
   6) ADULTS-HOBBY
   7) LEARNING DISABLED STUDENTS
   8) PHYSICALLY IMPAIRED STUDENTS

4. Indicate which types of lessons you teach (circle all that apply), and write the number of students you are currently teaching for each setting in the blank.

   1) PRIVATE LESSONS ONLY _____
   2) PARTNER/GROUP LESSONS ONLY _____
   3) PRIVATE AND PARTNER/GROUP LESSONS _____

5. How long have you been teaching piano? (Circle number)

   1) 5 YEARS OR LESS
   2) 6-10 YEARS
   3) 11-20 YEARS
   4) 21-30 YEARS
   5) MORE THAN 30 YEARS

SECTION II: Personal Information

6. In what state do you live? (Write name of U.S. state) _____

7. Age: (Circle number)

   1) 25 or below
   2) 26-35
   3) 36-45
   4) 46-55
   5) 56-64
   6) 65 or above

8. Sex: (Circle number)

   1) FEMALE
   2) MALE

9. Indicate your highest completed degree: (Place an "X" in the box that best corresponds to the degree and major of your highest earned degree)

Degree/Major	No major/ not applicable	Music Performance	Performance and Pedagogy	Piano Pedagogy	Music Education	Other Music	Non-Music Field
Some high school							
High school							
Some College							
Associate's degree							
Bachelor's degree							
Master's degree							
Doctoral degree							
Other--Please specify:							

If your highest degree is a music degree, name your primary instrument: _____

SECTION III: Information on College/University Piano Pedagogy Coursework

10. How did you learn to teach piano? (Circle all that apply)

1) EMULATED YOUR OWN TEACHER(S)
2) OBSERVED ANOTHER TEACHER
3) TALKED WITH OTHER TEACHERS
4) EXPERIENCE/TRIAL AND ERROR
5) STUDIED AVAILABLE MATERIALS ON TEACHING (Such as texts, articles, videos)
6) STUDIED PIANO METHOD BOOKS AND MATERIALS
7) ATTENDED WORKSHOPS, CLINICS, AND CONFERENCES ON TEACHING
8) TOOK COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY PIANO PEDAGOGY COURSE(S)
9) OTHER (Please Specify) _____

11. Please indicate the total <u>number</u> of piano pedagogy courses you have taken at a college or university, including both undergraduate and graduate levels: (Circle number)

1) NONE (If you have not taken a piano pedagogy course at a college or university, please proceed to Question #17)
2) ONE
3) TWO
4) THREE
5) FOUR OR MORE

12. At what level(s) did you take college/university piano pedagogy coursework? (Circle number)

1) UNDERGRADUATE ONLY
2) GRADUATE ONLY
3) BOTH UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE

13. Did you teach or observe the following levels of students as part of your college/university pedagogy coursework? (Circle YES or NO under headings)

Teach		**Observe**
YES NO	Elementary	YES NO
YES NO	Intermediate	YES NO
YES NO	Advanced	YES NO

14. Did you teach or observe the following ages/groups of students as part of your college/university pedagogy coursework? (Circle YES or NO under headings)

Teach		**Observe**
YES NO	Under 7 years old	YES NO
YES NO	7-11 years old	YES NO
YES NO	12-18 years old	YES NO
YES NO	College music majors	YES NO
YES NO	College non-music majors	YES NO
YES NO	Adults-hobby	YES NO
YES NO	Learning disabled	YES NO
YES NO	Physically impaired	YES NO

15. Did you teach or observe the following kinds of lessons as part of your college/university pedagogy coursework? (Circle YES or NO under headings)

Teach		**Observe**
YES NO	Private lessons	YES NO
YES NO	Partner/group lessons	YES NO

16. If you answered YES to any items in questions #13-15, how helpful do you feel your teaching and/or observation experiences were overall, in preparing you for the teaching you do in your career?

1) VERY HELPFUL
2) SOMEWHAT HELPFUL
3) SOMEWHAT UNHELPFUL
4) VERY UNHELPFUL

If you would like to elaborate on your answer to question #16, please feel free to write comments on the bottom of this page or on the backside of this page.

SECTION IV: Evaluation of Piano Pedagogy Course Content

The following section seeks to determine the importance of specific piano pedagogy course topics to piano teachers. **Please complete this section regardless of whether you have taken piano pedagogy courses at a college or university.** Your participation is important!

The left-hand column of each table lists specific piano pedagogy topics in various areas.

Middle column: Please circle the number that best describes how relevant you feel each topic is to the teaching that you do in your career. (*1=Little relevance, 4=Much relevance)*

Right-hand column: Please circle the number that best describes how important you feel each topic is for inclusion in the training of new teachers today. *(1=Little importance, 4=Much importance.)*

17. Teaching techniques for the following types of students:

Types of students	**Relevance to your teaching career:** 1=Little relevance 4=Much relevance	**Importance to the training of new teachers today:** 1=Little importance 4=Much importance
Pre-school students	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Elementary students	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Intermediate students	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Advanced students	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Transfer students	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Adult hobby students	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
College music majors	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
College non-music majors	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Learning disabled students	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Physically impaired students	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

18. Teaching strategies for the following types of lesson settings:

Types of lesson settings	**Relevance to your teaching career:** 1=Little relevance 4=Much relevance	**Importance to the training of new teachers today:** 1=Little importance 4=Much importance
Private lessons	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Partner lessons (2 students)	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Group lessons (3 or more students)	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Master classes	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

19. Strategies for teaching the following kinds of repertoire to students:

Types of repertoire	**Relevance to your teaching career:** 1=Little relevance 4=Much relevance	**Importance to the training of new teachers today:** 1=Little importance 4=Much importance
Elementary	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Intermediate: 17th-19th centuries	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Intermediate: 20th-21st centuries	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Advanced: 17th-19th centuries	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Advanced: 20th-21st centuries	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Jazz/Blues	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Popular	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Duet/Ensemble	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

20. Teaching techniques for the following skill areas:

Skill areas	**Relevance to your teaching career:** 1=Little relevance 4=Much relevance	**Importance to the training of new teachers today:** 1=Little importance 4=Much importance
Music reading	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Rhythm	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Technique	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Tone production	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Style/Interpretation	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Memorization	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Sight reading	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Score reading	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Accompanying	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Harmonization	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Transposition	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Improvisation	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Composition	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Playing by ear	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

21. Teacher knowledge of the following content areas:

Content areas	**Relevance to your teaching career:** 1=Little relevance 4=Much relevance	**Importance to the training of new teachers today:** 1=Little importance 4=Much importance
Selecting piano teaching literature	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Selecting piano methods	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Learning theories	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Philosophy of piano teaching	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Establishing a curriculum	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Lesson planning	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Motivating piano students	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Games for students	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Medical problems of pianists	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Performance anxiety	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Preparing students for recitals	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Adjudication	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Preparing students for college	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Reference books on pedagogy	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
History of piano pedagogy	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
History of keyboard technique	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Purchase, care, and maintenance of keyboard instruments	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

22. Uses of technology in teaching:

Technologies	**Relevance to your teaching career:** 1=Little relevance 4=Much relevance	**Importance to the training of new teachers today:** 1=Little importance 4=Much importance
Electronic keyboards	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Electronic keyboard labs	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
MIDI applications	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Synthesizers	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Computer software	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Internet resources	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

23. Knowledge of business and professional issues:

Business and professional issues	**Relevance to your teaching career:** 1=Little relevance 4=Much relevance	**Importance to the training of new teachers today:** 1=Little importance 4=Much importance
Setting lesson fees	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Marketing/Recruiting students	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Studio policies	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Scheduling	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Bookkeeping/Taxes	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Insurance/Liability laws	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Copyright laws	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Zoning laws	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Career choices	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Computer software for businesses	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
Overview of professional music organizations and journals	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

24. Please use the bottom or back side of this page to make any additional comments regarding your feelings about the relevance of various piano pedagogy topics to your career, and/or the importance of various piano pedagogy topics for the preparation of new teachers today. Use additional pages, if necessary.

When you are finished, please place this survey in the return envelope provided, and place it in the mail.

Thank you for your time!

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER TO PIANO TEACHERS

PIANO TEACHERS' ATTITUDES ABOUT PIANO PEDAGOGY COURSE TOPICS

669A County Rt. 59
Potsdam, NY 13676

May 13, 2004

Dear Piano Teacher,

I am presently involved in a research study conducted under the auspices of the University of Oklahoma, investigating the importance of various piano pedagogy course topics to the teaching careers of piano teachers. As an active piano teacher in the U.S.A., your assistance in this project would be invaluable, and I invite you to participate in this study. The results of this study will be the basis of my doctoral dissertation at the University of Oklahoma, under the direction of Dr. Nancy Barry and Dr. Jane Magrath in the School of Music.

Your participation will involve completing the enclosed survey and returning it in the envelope provided, and should only take about 30 minutes of your time. Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate. This questionnaire is anonymous. To maintain your anonymity, please do not put any identifying information on the questionnaire or the return envelope. The results of the study may be published, but your name will not be linked to responses in publications that are released from the project.

The findings from this project will provide information on the value of various piano pedagogy course topics to the preparation of future piano teachers with no cost to you other than the time it takes to complete the survey. No risks to participants beyond those experienced in everyday life are anticipated.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to call me at (315) 265-5051 or email me at schonssm@ou.edu. You may also contact Dr. Nancy Barry at (405) 325-4146 or e-mail at barrynh@ou.edu. Questions about your rights as a research participant or concerns about the project should be directed to the Institutional Review Board at The University of Oklahoma-Norman Campus at (405) 325-8110 or irb@ou.edu.

By returning this questionnaire in the envelope provided, you will be agreeing to participate in the above described project. **Please mail your completed by survey by Thursday, May 27.**

Thank you for your consideration!

Sincerely,

Suzanne Schons
Ph.D. Candidate, University of Oklahoma

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PIANO TEACHERS

PIANO TEACHERS' ATTITUDES ABOUT PIANO PEDAGOGY COURSE TOPICS

669A County Rt. 59
Potsdam, NY 13676

May 20, 2004

Dear Piano Teacher,

Last week a questionnaire requesting information on your views of the importance of piano pedagogy course topics to piano teachers' careers was mailed to you. If you have already completed and returned the survey, please accept my thanks. If you have not yet had an opportunity to answer and return this form, please take the time to do so now. Your response is very important to the study. The results will be the basis for a doctoral dissertation at the University of Oklahoma.

If you did not receive the survey, please email me at schonssm@ou.edu or call me collect at (315) 256-5051, and I will mail you another copy immediately. Your time and response are greatly appreciated!

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to contact me, or contact Dr. Nancy Barry at (405) 325-4146 or e-mail at barrynh@ou.edu. Questions about your rights as a research participant or concerns about the project should be directed to the Institutional Review Board at The University of Oklahoma-Norman Campus at (405) 325-8110 or irb@ou.edu.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Schons
Ph.D. Candidate, University of Oklahoma