INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI®

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/515

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

A SURVEY OF UNDERGRADUATE PIANO PEDAGOGY CORE COURSE CONTENT

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

VICTORIA LEIGH JOHNSON
Norman, Oklahoma
2002

UMI Number: 3067107

Copyright 2002 by
Johnson, Victoria Leigh

All rights reserved.



UMI Microform 3067107
Copyright 2003 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

© Copyright by VICTORIA LEIGH JOHNSON 2002
All Rights Reserved.

A SURVEY OF UNDERGRADUATE PIANO PEDAGOGY
CORE COURSE CONTENT

A Dissertation APPROVED FOR THE
SCHOOL OF MUSIC

BY

Jane Magrath, Major Professor

Nancy Barry, Major Professor

Barbara Fast

Michael Rogers

Carolyn Morgan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere gratitude and appreciation go to the co-chairs of my committee, Dr. Jane Magrath and Dr. Nancy Barry, for so enthusiastically sharing their knowledge and insight, attention to detail, and time during the writing of my dissertation and throughout my degree program.

Special thanks are also due to committee members Dr. Barbara Fast, Dr. Michael Rogers, and Dr. Carolyn Morgan for graciously giving their time and expertise; and to my family, friends, colleagues, and students for their support, encouragement, and interest in this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose	3
	Organization of the Study	3
2	RELATED LITERATURE	5
	A Brief History of Piano Pedagogy at American Colleges and Universities	5
	The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy (1979-1994)	7
	Curricular Guidelines for Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy	10
	Piano Pedagogy Textbooks	15
	Research in Piano Pedagogy Instruction and Course Content	15
	Recent Developments in Piano Pedagogy	17
	New Student Groups	18
	Technological Developments	20
	New Professional Resources and Organizations	22
	Summary	27
3	METHODS AND PROCEDURES	28
	Development of the Research Instrument	28
	Administration of the Research Instrument	30
4	RESULTS OF THE STUDY	31
	Introduction to the Data	31
	Institutional Information	33
	Personal Information	40
	The Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s): Format and Materials	47
	Pedagogy Core Course Content: Topics	65
	Pedagogy Core Course Content: Experiences	76
	Summary of the Data: Profile of the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course	92
5	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	94
	Summary	94
	The Institutions	95
	The Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Instructor	95
	The Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s): Format and Materials	96
	Pedagogy Core Course Content: Topics	97
	Pedagogy Core Course Content: Experiences	99

Conclusions 100
The Institutions..... 100
The Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Instructor..... 101
The Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s): Format and Materials..... 102
Pedagogy Core Course Content: Topics..... 103
Pedagogy Core Course Content: Experiences..... 108
Recommendations for Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Curricula.... 111
Recommendations for Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Curricula..... 111
Recommendations for Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Materials..... 113
Recommendations for Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Teacher Training..... 114
Recommendations for Further Research..... 115

REFERENCES..... 118

APPENDICES 123
A. Cronbach's Alpha Values for Questionnaire Item Clusters..... 123
B. List of Pilot Study Participants..... 124
C. Cover Letter to Pilot Study Participants..... 125
D. Survey Questionnaire..... 126
E. Cover Letter to Piano Pedagogy Instructor..... 138
F. Follow-Up Letter to Piano Pedagogy Instructor..... 139
G. Second Follow-Up Letter to Piano Pedagogy Instructor..... 140
H. Additional Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course Titles..... 141
I. Additional Print Materials Used in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course..... 148

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Type of Institution	34
2.	Total Enrollment of Institutions During the 2001-2002 Academic Year	34
3.	Number of Undergraduate Piano Performance Majors During the 2001-2002 Academic Year	35
4.	Number of Students Pursuing an Emphasis/Major in Piano Pedagogy During the 2001-2002 Academic Year	36
5.	Number of Full-Time Faculty Members Teaching Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Courses During the 2001-2002 Academic Year	37
6.	Number of Part-Time Faculty Members Teaching Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Courses During the 2001-2002 Academic Year	37
7.	Undergraduate Degrees Offered with an Emphasis in Piano Pedagogy	38
8.	Undergraduate Degrees Offered with a Major in Piano Pedagogy	39
9.	Institutions Offering an Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course	39
10.	Appointment of Piano Pedagogy Instructors	40
11.	Academic Rank of Piano Pedagogy Instructors	41
12.	Age of Piano Pedagogy Instructors	42
13.	Gender of Piano Pedagogy Instructors	42
14.	Highest Degree Earned by Piano Pedagogy Instructors	43
15.	Teaching Experience of Piano Pedagogy Instructors	44
16.	Percentage of Teaching Load in Piano Pedagogy	45
17.	Additional Courses Taught by Piano Pedagogy Instructors	46
18.	Priority Given to Piano Pedagogy by Instructors	47
19.	Number of Undergraduate Pedagogy Core Course Titles Listed	48
20.	Course Titles of Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Courses	49
21.	Credit Values Given for Undergraduate Pedagogy Core Courses	50
22.	Core Course Credit Types	50
23.	Frequency of Course Meetings Per Week	51
24.	Length of Class Sessions	52
25.	Frequency of Core Course Offerings	53
26.	Total Enrollment in Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Courses	54
27.	Enrollment Trends in Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Courses	54
28.	Students Required to Enroll in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course	55
29.	Required Print Materials in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course	56

30. Print Materials Required in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s): Course Number One..... 58
31. Print Materials Required in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s): Course Number Two..... 60
32. Print Materials Required in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s): Course Number Three..... 62
33. Print Materials Required in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s): Course Number Four..... 63
34. Areas of Professional Growth in which Students Participate..... 64
35. Teaching Strategies Addressed in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s)..... 66
36. Teaching Techniques Addressed in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s)..... 67
37. Teaching Literature Addressed in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s)..... 69
38. Content Areas Addressed in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s)..... 71
39. Teaching Aids Discussed in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s)..... 73
40. Required Projects/Assignments in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s)..... 75
41. Institutions Requiring Observation of Teaching in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s)..... 76
42. Amount of Observation Time Required Prior to Student Teaching..... 77
43. Amount of Observation Time Required During Student Teaching..... 78
44. Type of Teaching Observed..... 78
45. Teachers Observed by Pedagogy Students..... 79
46. Institutions Requiring a Specific Teaching Assignment as Part of the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s)..... 80
47. Institutions that Evaluate the Teaching of Pedagogy Students..... 81
48. Format Used by the Pedagogy Instructor for Evaluating the Pedagogy Student Teacher..... 81
49. Form of Evaluation Comments Given to the Pedagogy Student..... 82
50. Available Settings for Student Teaching and Observation of Teaching..... 83
51. Institutions Where Pedagogy Students Teach or Observe Individual Instruction of Beginning Students..... 84
52. Institutions Where Pedagogy Students Teach or Observe Group Instruction of Beginning Students..... 85
53. Institutions Where Pedagogy Students Teach or Observe Individual Instruction of Intermediate Students..... 86
54. Institutions Where Pedagogy Students Teach or Observe Group Instruction of Intermediate Students..... 87

55. Institutions Where Pedagogy Students Teach or Observe Individual Instruction of Advanced Students..... 88
56. Institutions Where Pedagogy Students Teach or Observe Group Instruction of Advanced Students.....89

ABSTRACT

A SURVEY OF UNDERGRADUATE PIANO PEDAGOGY CORE COURSE CONTENT

By: Victoria Leigh Johnson

Major Professors: Dr. Jane Magrath
Dr. Nancy Barry

The purpose of this study was to identify the content of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses at four-year, National Association of Schools of Music (NASM)-accredited colleges and universities. Data were collected through a questionnaire sent to 321 pedagogy instructors listed in the 2001-2002 College Music Society Directory. The questionnaire sought information on the institution, the pedagogy instructor, the format of the undergraduate piano pedagogy core course(s), the topics covered in the core course(s), and the teaching and observation experiences included in the core course(s).

Data analysis was based on 147 (45.79%) valid responses. The results showed that the typical core course is offered once every two years for 2.19 credits and enrolls 6.29 students. *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* (Uszler, Gordon, & Smith, 2000) is the required text. The instructor is a female between the ages of 46 and 55, appointed full-time at the rank of Professor, who holds a doctorate in piano performance. The course focuses on the teaching of pre-college elementary and intermediate students in a private setting. Observation and student teaching experiences are requirements of the course.

Recommendations for further research included: 1) the sequencing of topics in the core course; 2) recent graduates' perceptions of their preparation to teach; 3) independent piano teachers' perceptions of useful skills and understandings; 4) uses of

technology by independent teachers; and 5) the development of an internship program pairing independent teachers and pedagogy students.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The last half of the twentieth century witnessed tremendous growth in the field of piano pedagogy. As an academic discipline at colleges and universities, pedagogy grew from a single course, to a sequence of courses, and finally to an emphasis or major at some institutions (Uszler & Larimer, 1984). The mid-1980s were a time of particular significance for the field: Curricular guidelines for pedagogy study at the undergraduate and graduate level were published by the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy (NCPP) (Uszler & Larimer, 1984; Uszler & Larimer, 1985), and the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) recognized piano pedagogy as a degree program (National Association of Schools of Music, 1985). In the years since, the profession has continued to grow remarkably. Pedagogy degrees at the baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral level are offered at an increasing number of institutions. Pedagogy programs are being led by individuals specifically trained and hired to teach pedagogy. Piano pedagogy textbooks and other instructional materials have been published. New professional organizations and periodicals have been founded. Technological developments are being incorporated into piano pedagogy courses.

In the last twenty years, research has been conducted in several areas pertaining to piano pedagogy courses. Studies have addressed piano pedagogy curricula at the undergraduate and graduate levels (Uszler & Larimer, 1984; Uszler & Larimer, 1985), the piano pedagogy instructor (Kowalchyk, 1989; Shook, 1993), teaching internships in piano pedagogy (Lyman, 1991), and trends in piano pedagogy (Montandon, 1998). Piano pedagogy course content research has focused on graduate level courses (Milliman,

1992), as well as undergraduate level courses in Thailand (Charoenwongse, 1998) and Korea (Won, 1999). To date, there has not been a comprehensive study of undergraduate piano pedagogy course content at American colleges and universities.

The purpose of this study was to provide information on the current status of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses at American colleges and universities. The results of the study will be valuable to the following:

1. Institutions interested in establishing or revising undergraduate piano pedagogy courses and programs.
2. Instructors interested in developing, evaluating, or revising undergraduate piano pedagogy courses.
3. Individuals interested in writing textbooks and other materials for undergraduate piano pedagogy courses.

Furthermore, it is hoped that the comparison of data from this study with data from previous studies will provide the following information:

1. Whether undergraduate piano pedagogy courses concur with the curricular guidelines given by Uszler and Larimer (1984).
2. How undergraduate piano pedagogy core course content compares to graduate piano pedagogy core course content, as determined by Milliman (1992).
3. How the educational background, teaching experience, and teaching responsibilities of current piano pedagogy instructors compare to those of pedagogy instructors in 1988, as reported by Kowalchyk (1989).

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to provide information on the content of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses at American colleges and universities. Core courses, as defined by Milliman (1992), are those that serve as prerequisites for most other pedagogy courses and cover general principles of teaching rather than specialized topics. At the undergraduate level, some institutions may offer only a one-semester pedagogy core course; at other institutions, as many as four semesters of pedagogy core courses may exist. The specific research questions of this study were:

1. What are the educational background, teaching experience, and current teaching responsibilities of the undergraduate piano pedagogy instructor?
2. What is the format of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses?
3. What materials are used in undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses?
4. What topics are covered in undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses?
5. How much emphasis is given to each topic covered in undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses?
6. What observation and teaching experiences are required of students in undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses?

Organization of the Study

The following chapter is a review of the related literature. Sources related to the history of piano pedagogy, guidelines for piano pedagogy curricula, research in piano pedagogy, and recent developments in piano pedagogy are discussed. Chapter Three describes the procedures of the study, including the development of the survey

questionnaire, selection of the target population, administration of the questionnaire, and data analysis.

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

1. Institutional Information
2. Personal Information
3. The Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s): Format and Materials
4. Pedagogy Core Course Content: Topics
5. Pedagogy Core Course Content: Experiences

Chapter Five includes a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

RELATED LITERATURE

A Brief History of Piano Pedagogy in American Colleges and Universities

Piano pedagogy courses, emphases, and degree programs are relatively recent developments at American colleges and universities. Uszler and Larimer (1984) reported that it is difficult to discern the exact origins of pedagogy courses and programs, but pointed to the collaboration of music performance and education faculty members in the 1920's and 1930's in order to strengthen the pedagogy components of piano performance curricula at colleges and universities. Prior to this time teacher training and performance study were separate disciplines, addressed by different institutions: "The conservatory produced the performer; the normal school trained the teacher..." (Uszler & Larimer, 1984, p. 5). Most early pedagogy courses were designed to train specialists to teach class piano, which was prevalent in public schools in the first four decades of the 20th-century. A history of the class piano movement can be found in Monsour (1959) and Richards (1962). Significant figures in the development of early university piano pedagogy courses were Leon Iltis and Peter Dykema at the University of Wisconsin; Osbourne McConathy, Charles Haake, and Gail Martin Haake at Northwestern University; and Raymond Burrows, Peter Dykema, and James Mursell at Columbia University. By 1929, 43 institutions were offering piano class pedagogy; this number increased to more than 150 by 1931 (Richards, 1978).

Although early pedagogy courses focused on the group piano teacher, developments in the middle of the 20th-century focused on the education of the private teacher, due in part to the decline in popularity of class piano courses after the 1930's.

Holland (1996) reported that Frances Clark established piano pedagogy programs at Kalamazoo College in Michigan in the 1940's and at Westminster Choir College in New Jersey in the 1950's. Unlike previous pedagogy programs, which trained public school class piano teachers, Clark's programs were geared towards independent music teachers. Other important pedagogy programs developed by the 1940's included those at Illinois Wesleyan University in Bloomington-Normal (led by Zelah Newcombe) and the American Conservatory in Chicago (led by Louis Newcombe). In addition, Angela Diller and Elizabeth Quaile, authors of educational piano materials, operated a teacher-training program in conjunction with a large community school in New York City (Holland, 1996).

The independent music teacher was the subject of a panel at the 1953 annual meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music. Speakers called for the establishment of a curriculum to prepare performers for careers as teachers and argued for certification of private teachers by either state departments of education or state professional associations (Uszler, 1985). At the 1956 NASM annual meeting, a four-year Bachelor of Music curriculum with a teaching major in applied music was considered. The purpose of this curriculum, prepared by a Music Teachers National Association (MTNA) committee, was to support the certification of private music teachers, a group which numbered approximately 150,000 in 1956 (Uszler & Larimer, 1984). The course content of the 1956 curriculum included a survey of methods and materials for individual and group instruction, professional education courses, an introduction to the business aspects of running an independent studio, and practice teaching (Sturm, James, Jackson, & Burns, 2000/2001). Performance and teaching

expectations for pedagogy majors were not particularly high: Pedagogy majors were only expected to achieve the "advancement of an applied major at the end of the junior year," and no graduation recital was required (Uszler & Larimer, 1984, p. 10). Furthermore, it was expected that the pedagogy major would become the "average teacher with a class of students between the ages of 5 and 18," not a master teacher (Uszler & Larimer, 1984, p. 10). Official action taken on the 1956 curriculum is unclear. Another important mid-century development was the establishment of preparatory departments at universities, which provided observation and practice teaching opportunities for pedagogy students.

From the late 1950's through the 1970's piano pedagogy degree programs at both the undergraduate and graduate level were established at an increasing number of universities. As a result, the number of piano pedagogy graduates, graduate assistants, and faculty members grew dramatically. The titles, content, and requirements of pedagogy programs, however, varied considerably. Curricular titles included major in piano pedagogy, major in group piano pedagogy, major in performance with a pedagogy emphasis, major in music education with a piano pedagogy emphasis, and concentration in piano pedagogy and literature (Uszler & Larimer, 1984). Consequently, pedagogy faculty became interested in establishing specific curricular guidelines. The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy played an important role in this endeavor.

The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy (1979-1994)

In 1979, the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy (NCPP) was founded to address curriculum-building problems in piano pedagogy. Meetings of the NCPP occurred biannually from 1980 until 1994, when it disbanded due to the "absence of

adequate income" necessary to manage an organization of its size and complexity (Montandon, 1998, p. 5). The eight volumes of Proceedings published by the NCPP continue to be an important resource for piano pedagogy instructors. According to Montandon, the NCPP "was of paramount importance in fostering articulation among professionals in the area of piano pedagogy" (1998, p. 170). She summarized the contributions of the NCPP to the field of piano pedagogy as follows:

> It served as the communication organ of the piano pedagogy field; a platform to present current practices; a forum for the exchange of ideas on the piano teaching training area; a unifier and ground breaker in setting standards; a recorder of tendencies in the piano pedagogy and performance area; a reference from which colleges and universities could refine their piano pedagogy programs. The work of the Committees, offering recommendations and specific information on issues related to pedagogy programs and performance, made the Proceedings a first and most lasting reference guide for practical use by the pedagogy and performance community. Above all, the Proceedings of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy reflect the hard work, the achievements, and the progress made by the profession. (pp. 170-171)

The 1980 meeting of the NCPP was particularly important in the establishment of guidelines for piano teacher training. The focus of the conference, and a panel discussion led by Frances Clark, Richard Chronister, James Lyke, and Robert Pace was "building a piano pedagogy curriculum" (Baker, 1981, p. iii). Frances Clark shared her vision of a future in which piano performance majors would also be trained in the art of teaching, and would come to think of a teaching career as "an important artistic endeavor" (Baker,

1981, p. 2). She suggested that pedagogy students be supervised by outstanding teachers with years of experience, just as general education and music education students are. Richard Chronister proposed specific emphases for pedagogy study at the undergraduate, master's and doctoral level:

> The undergraduate degree is not adequate to develop a competent teacher for all levels—elementary, intermediate, and advanced. I think it is useful to consider the undergraduate degree as time to aim for competency at the elementary level; the graduate degree for competency at the intermediate level; the doctoral degree for competency at the advanced level. (Baker, 1981, p. 5)

Chronister recommended that directed teaching begin in the sophomore year, so that pedagogy students could see at least some of their students through three years of study. "Teaching only a few elementary students only a few months of lessons is not adequate teacher training" (Baker, 1981, p. 5). He also admitted that it would be wrong to exclude intermediate and advanced levels from the undergraduate piano pedagogy curriculum. Preparation to teach intermediate students could be accomplished by learning and performing the intermediate repertoire in performance classes separate from the piano major's applied lessons. Chronister pointed out that most piano majors missed a large amount of the intermediate literature in their pre-college studies. The piano major's study of the advanced literature in his/her own lessons would serve as preparation to teach advanced students. This way, the curriculum would not be overloaded with pedagogy courses.

Over the course of its 15-year existence the NCPP gradually broadened its focus from piano teacher training to issues concerning the education and careers of pianists in

general. In the last two meetings of the NCPP in particular (1992 and 1994), the focus shifted from pedagogy to performance (Montandon, 1998). The purpose of Montandon's study (1998) was to identify trends in piano pedagogy in the United States as reflected by the NCPP Proceedings. She found that the topics most frequently addressed at the Conference were Practice Teaching, Pedagogy Curriculum Program, Technology, Learning Theories, Literature, and Performance. Among the least often discussed topics were Piano Materials, History of Piano Pedagogy, Music Education/Piano Pedagogy Relationship, Research in Piano Pedagogy, and Students Participation. Trends indicated in the findings included: a shift in focus from pedagogy to performance in the last two meetings; an emphasis on practical topics and activities; a lack of research and scholarly papers; the closer connection between learning theories, practice teaching, and teaching materials at early years of the Conference; a teacher-centered approach in curriculum decisions; and a lack of self-analyzing discussion in piano pedagogy. Milliman (1992), Shook (1993), and Montandon (1998) summarized the topics and themes of each of the meetings of the NCPP.

Curricular Guidelines for Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy

In the 1980's, both the NCPP and the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) established curricular guidelines for piano pedagogy. *The Piano Pedagogy Major in the College Curriculum: A Handbook of Information and Guidelines. Part I: The Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Major* was published by NCPP in 1984. *Part II: The Graduate Piano Pedagogy Major* was published the following year. According to Uszler and Larimer (1984), the authors of these studies, there are several considerations that justify study in piano pedagogy at the undergraduate level. The most important

consideration is that for many students, the baccalaureate degree will be the highest degree received. It is likely that a large percentage of these students will become independent studio teachers working primarily with pre-college students. Therefore, it is crucial that undergraduate training include the preparation of students of this level.

The following recommendations were made regarding piano pedagogy course content at the undergraduate level:

1. Introduction to study of the learning process should provide a general overview of various psychologies of learning. The most important aspect of such study should be the practical association of the learning and teaching process with the nature of performance.
2. A survey of current teaching literature should provide a general orientation to methods and materials at the pre-college level. At the same time, a more intensive study of one method or approach must be included if the student teacher is to function effectively in the practice teaching situation. "Orientation to methods and materials" is to be distinguished from an evaluative study, which is more appropriate at the graduate level.
3. Observation of experienced teachers is essential, and should precede as well as accompany student teaching. Furthermore, it is essential that pedagogy students be provided with an opportunity to observe a learning sequence over an extended period of time.
4. Instructional techniques should emphasize approaches to both group and individual lesson settings. "Instructional techniques" is used here to mean

communication skills applied to varied learning environments, age and developmental levels, equipment, and materials.

5. Lesson and curricular planning should be examined in relationship to observation and applied to student teaching. It is particularly important that the student teacher is guided in preparing for and teaching in actual situations. (Uszler & Larimer, 1984, p. 32)

In addition to the above course content recommendations, Uszler and Larimer made suggestions concerning directed teaching. They recommended that directed student teaching should take place for no less than one academic year, and should include both individual and group teaching experiences. Directed teaching may include assisting the supervising teacher, teaching small segments of a class or lesson, tutoring students, monitoring students' practice, and/or teaching complete classes or lessons. Initial teaching experiences should be "limited and highly controlled" (1984, p. 32), allowing the student to immediately apply the teaching principles and techniques being discussed in the pedagogy course. Later in the student's education, more concentrated teaching experiences may be arranged under a separate course number. It is essential that supervising teachers observe and evaluate the student teacher at least bi-weekly (1984, p. 33).

Uszler and Larimer (1984) also made recommendations concerning the resources necessary for a successful undergraduate piano pedagogy program. Since undergraduate student teaching should focus on the teaching of elementary through intermediate level students, a preparatory program connected with the pedagogy program is the best option for providing directed teaching opportunities. Student teaching experiences may

alternatively be arranged at independent studios in the community. In either case, it is important that the pedagogy program enroll only as many students as can be carefully monitored by the pedagogy faculty. At most institutions, a minimum of two faculty members will be necessary. Additional resources necessary are a pedagogy library of current teaching materials, audio-visual equipment for evaluation purposes, and teaching space free from distractions for student teaching assignments.

In 1985, the NASM handbook included guidelines for degrees in pedagogy for the first time. NASM stated that "the Bachelor of Music in Pedagogy may be justified only if an institution is adequately staffed and equipped to offer a significant number of specialized courses and internship opportunities in pedagogy" (National Association of Schools of Music, 1993, p. 68). The following standards for curricular structure were established by NASM:

> 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 of performance, supportive courses in music, and pedagogy should total at least 65% of the curriculum. (National Association of Schools of Music, 1993, p. 68)

Four recommendations for essential competencies, experiences, and opportunities were given:

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. Opportunities for teaching in an organized internship program. Such programs shall be under the general supervision of the pedagogy faculty and 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.

Piano Pedagogy Textbooks

Several piano pedagogy textbooks published from the 1970's through the early 1990's provide course content guidance for pedagogy instructors. Among these textbooks are *How To Teach Piano Successfully* by James Bastien (1973, revised in 1977, 1988, and 1995), *Creative Piano Teaching* by James Lyke and Yvonne Enoch (1977, revised in 1987 and 1996), *Teaching Piano* by Denes Agay (1981), and *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* by Marienne Uszler, Stewart Gordon, and Elyse Mach (1991, revised 2000). All four textbooks cover the following subjects: the elementary student, the intermediate student, the preschool student, the adult beginner, teaching methods and literature, and business aspects of the independent studio. Recent revisions of *How to Teach Piano Successfully* (Bastien, 1995), *Creative Piano Teaching* (Lyke, Enoch, & Haydon, 1996), and *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* (Uszler, Gordon, & Smith, 2000) discuss the use of technology in piano teaching. Detailed comparisons of pedagogy textbooks can be found in Milliman (1992) and Shook (1993).

Research in Piano Pedagogy Instruction and Course Content

Due to the increase in the number and size of graduate programs, particularly doctoral programs, in the 1980's and 1990's, the amount of research in piano pedagogy grew considerably. Several studies from these decades pertained to the instruction and course content of piano pedagogy courses. Studies by Kowalchyk (1989) and Shook (1993) focused on the piano pedagogy instructor. Kowalchyk (1989) provided a descriptive profile of the piano pedagogy instructor. She concluded that pedagogy instructors were trained as pianists/performers. They were not trained to teach piano pedagogy and were not hired to teach piano pedagogy, but had developed an interest in

teaching pedagogy through their own personal choice. They saw little need for future pedagogy instructors receiving training different from their own, perpetuating the ideas that "if one can play piano, one can teach piano" and "if one can teach piano, one can teach piano pedagogy" (Kowalchyk, 1989, p. 105). Kowalchyk also found that pedagogy instructors were not concerned with computer technology, electronic keyboards, or synthesizers. She called for studies concerning the actual course content of pedagogy courses.

Shook (1993) developed and evaluated competencies and experiences for the undergraduate piano pedagogy instructor. The 38 competencies and experiences covered the areas of administration, general knowledge, studio management, and studio teaching. A questionnaire designed by the researcher was sent to current undergraduate piano pedagogy instructors and experts in the field of piano pedagogy to determine the importance of the competencies and teaching experiences in the preparation of future undergraduate pedagogy instructors. Respondents indicated that graduate study was the best experience for achieving the majority of the objectives. Specifically, graduate studies in the areas of performance skill development, piano repertoire, teaching methods and materials, the learning process and practical application of the teaching process were considered most beneficial. Teaching experiences were considered the next most important preparation for teaching pedagogy, with college group piano teaching and pre-college independent studio teaching identified as most desirable.

Research by Milliman (1992), Charoenwongse (1998), and Won (1999) examined piano pedagogy course content. Milliman (1992) surveyed graduate piano pedagogy instructors to identify the content of graduate piano pedagogy core courses. Milliman

concluded that the typical graduate piano pedagogy core course covered teaching strategies for pre-college intermediate and advanced students in an individual instruction setting. *How to Teach Piano Successfully* by James Bastien was the most frequently used textbook. Teaching techniques were covered for articulation, dynamics, fingering, hand position, music reading, pedaling, phrasing, rhythm, sight-reading, technique, and tone production. The following topics were addressed in the core course: developing goals/objectives, learning theories, lesson planning, motivation, organizational skills, an overview of professional music organizations/journals, philosophy of teaching piano, qualities of a good teacher, and reference books on pedagogical topics. Students in the graduate pedagogy core course were required to observe and teach both group and private lessons for elementary, intermediate, and advanced students. Observation and student teaching occurred in college or university group piano classes and college or university laboratory programs. Milliman recommended that future research examine the content of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses. Charoenwongse (1998) and Won (1999) adapted Milliman's questionnaire for studies of undergraduate piano pedagogy offerings in Thai universities and Korean universities respectively. To date, no study of undergraduate piano pedagogy core course content at American colleges and universities has been undertaken.

Recent Developments in Piano Pedagogy

From the 1920's through the 1980's piano pedagogy within the university setting grew from a course to a series of courses to a degree. Curricular guidelines were established and a national organization devoted to piano teacher training (the NCPP) was founded. Textbooks and other materials for piano pedagogy courses were published and

research was conducted in areas pertaining to piano pedagogy. In the 21st century, however, undergraduate piano pedagogy courses will need to address the following trends in the piano-teaching profession:

1. New student groups
2. Technological developments
3. New professional resources and organizations

New Student Groups

Many students who study piano pedagogy at the undergraduate level will become independent studio teachers. Traditionally, independent teachers have focused on students between the ages of 5 and 18. This has meant that independent teachers have been restricted to teaching during after-school hours. In the 21st century, instructors who are willing and able to teach two growing groups of the piano-studying population (preschool-age children and adults) will have the opportunity to expand teaching hours and reap the rewards of working with students of a variety of ages and experiences.

A growing segment of the piano-playing population is preschool age children. Collins reported that as recently as twenty years ago, preschool piano lessons or classes were offered in very few studios. In the future, however, she believes that the "average-age beginner" will be four instead of seven (1996, p. 37). With much information being provided on the benefits of early childhood music study, parents are eager for their children to begin music lessons as early as possible.

In the past, pedagogy courses have not always addressed the teaching of preschool students. However, if future piano teachers are to gain the rewards that working with this age group can bring, they will need to be acquainted with the learning

capabilities of preschoolers, as well as the methods and materials available for preschool music study. Pedagogy textbooks and professional journals are giving more attention to matters concerning preschool music study. In addition to traditional programs that have provided preschool general music training (Dalcroze, Orff, Kodály, Suzuki, Yamaha, and Kindermusik), there are now several preschool methods that focus specifically on piano training. Examples are *Music for Little Mozarts* by Barden, Kowalchyk, and Lancaster (1999), and *Bastiens' Invitation to Music* by Jane, Lori, and Lisa Bastien (1993-1994).

Adults are also pursuing piano study in increasing numbers, due to several factors. Pike (2001) reported that that the percentage of the North American population over the age of 55 will increase dramatically over the next decade. This age group will benefit from "better health, a longer life expectancy, and more leisure time than retirees from previous generations" (p. 1). In addition, they will have more disposable income than their predecessors. According to Graessle, "There has been a growing shift from a linear life plan-one that reserves education for the young, work for the middle-aged, and leisure for the elderly-to a blended life plan-one that blends education, work, and leisure at all points throughout life (2000)."

Pedagogy students in the 21st century will need to be aware of the differences in the goals and abilities of adult students and pre-college students. The piano pedagogy field has already responded to this need in a number of ways. Research by Conda (1997) and Pike (2001) focused on the adult piano student. Current pedagogy textbooks and periodicals such as *Keyboard Companion, Clavier, The American Music Teacher,* and *Piano Pedagogy Forum* address issues related to teaching adults. Several new method books for the adult leisure student have been published recently, including *Adult Piano*

Adventures by Faber and Faber (2001-2002), *Play Piano Now!* by Palmer, Manus, and Lancaster (2000), *Piano 101* by Lancaster and Renfrow (1999), and *Piano for Adults* by Jane, Lori, and Lisa Bastien (1999).

Technological Developments

The technological developments in piano pedagogy at the end of the 20th century were staggering. Berr (2000) outlined the technological possibilities available to piano teachers and students that were practically nonexistent a decade ago:

1. Access to affordable, high quality home video equipment allows teachers to videotape their own teaching for self-study purposes and to share with others.
2. Students practice theory drills, rhythm exercises and even solfege regularly during the week with their home computer, receiving accurate, continual feedback as from a tutor.
3. Journals on music and teaching, through the use of the Internet, offer readers audio and video clips that vividly supplement the text of the printed articles.
4. Through e-mail and chat groups, music teachers from across the country and the world share thoughts, dreams and gripes with one another at the end of their teaching day.
5. Truly affordable electronic synthesizers have made keyboard ensembles a reality for many piano students.

6. CD-ROMS allow for intensive study of a musical work, including performances, excerpts, history and graphics, with everything cross-linked, inviting exploration-learning-for hours. (pp. 28-29)

By incorporating these technologies into the independent piano studio, teachers can maximize student learning and motivation and increase studio profits. The challenge for current and future piano teachers is to keep current with ever-changing technologies. Especially useful resources towards this end are "Tomorrow Today: Technology," a regular department in *Keyboard Companion* magazine, and the articles pertaining to technology in each issue of *Piano Pedagogy Forum*, an online publication. Upitis (2000) gave an annotated list of technological resources in four categories: books, periodicals, and catalogs; videos; computer software; and software publishing companies.

A discussion at the first meeting of the National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum in August 2000 centered on the question "What aspects of technology do you feel most compelled to include in our piano pedagogy program?" Participants suggested that the following categories of technology be incorporated into the piano pedagogy course:

1. Group piano labs
2. Digital instruments/sequencing equipment and other recording media
3. Computer software/technology courses
4. The internet

Morenus (2001) reported the conclusions of discussion participants:

> 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.

New Professional Resources and Organizations

The dissemination of information for piano teachers has increased at the turn of the 21st century, due to the founding of two new periodicals and four new professional organizations. Two important professional periodicals for piano teachers and pianists were established in the 1990's. *Keyboard Companion: A Practical Magazine on Early-Level Piano Study* was founded by Richard Chronister in the spring of 1990. This quarterly magazine features ten departments: Teacher/Student/Parent, Home Practice, Music Reading, Technique, Rhythm, Perspectives in Pedagogy, Adult Piano Study, Repertoire, Technology, and News and Views. In each issue, each department focuses on a question related to early-level piano study. Several writers (teachers, students, and/or parents) are invited to share their answers to the question.

Piano Pedagogy Forum is an online publication supported by the University of South Carolina School of Music. Three times a year college and university piano faculty members and others from the United States and abroad write articles concerning the following areas: Piano Performance, Piano Pedagogy, Group Piano, Keyboard Education, Keyboard Technology, and Collaborative Piano.

Since the disbandment of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy in 1994, four professional organizations for pianists and piano teachers have been founded: the World Piano Pedagogy Conference (1996), MTNA's Pedagogy Saturday (1997), the National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum (2000), and the National Conference

on Keyboard Pedagogy (2001). The founding of these organizations underscores the importance placed on piano teacher education at the turn of the 21st century.

The World Piano Pedagogy Conference (WPPC), founded in 1996 by executive director Benjamin Saver, convenes annually. This conference is international in scope, with 1200 presenters and participants from 33 countries attending the 2000 meeting in Las Vegas (Mach, 2000). According to the WPPC website, the organization's mission is to:

1. Offer a forum for promotion and dissemination of quality piano teaching and teacher training for independent teaching studios, pre-college institutions, conservatories, colleges, and universities.
2. Design programs and presentations to enhance teacher training specifically for music students and young professionals.
3. Present piano and keyboard educators, performers, composers, piano and keyboard manufacturers, music publishers and the rest of the music industry.
4. Enable interaction of piano teachers and pedagogues from the USA and abroad, information sharing, demonstrations, discussions, and analysis of piano teaching and pedagogy topics.
5. Document the conference on videotapes for current and future generations of piano teachers.
6. Create an environment, which will bring piano and music to everyone's home where music becomes a part of every day's life. (World Piano Pedagogy Conference [WPPC], 2001)

Meetings of the WPPC have taken place in Philadelphia (1997), Fort Worth (1998), St. Louis (1999), Las Vegas (2000), Orlando (2001), and Las Vegas (2002). An additional meeting was held in Portorož, Slovenia in July 2002. The following committees comprise the WPPC: Technique, Motion, and Wellness; Technology; Theories of Learning and Music; Historical Perspectives; and Performance. Conference agendas include teaching and coaching demonstrations, lectures, masterclasses, and recitals. Rather than publishing proceedings, the WPPC produces videotapes of conference sessions.

MTNA Pedagogy Saturday, started in 1997, is an intensive one-day conference held during the annual MTNA convention. Meetings have taken place in Dallas (1997), Nashville (1998), Los Angeles (1999), Minneapolis (2000), Washington, D.C. (2001), and Cincinnati (2002). The purpose of Pedagogy Saturday sessions is "to provide stimulation and a broader understanding of what is required in not only training future music teachers, but also nurturing the professional growth and career improvements of those already teaching" (Music Teachers National Association [MTNA], 2000). Pedagogy Saturday is unique in that it is designed not only for piano teachers, but for teachers of other instruments as well.

Sessions at Pedagogy Saturday I (1997) included "Learning the Language of Music," "The Teaching Process," "Observation and Intern Teaching," " The Ensemble Pianist," and "The Healthy Musician" (Music Teachers National Association, 1998, p. 3). Pedagogy Saturday II (1998) was subtitled "Look at Me: Music Lessons from the Student's Point of View." Sessions featured videotaped voice, piano, and string lessons

with the camera on the student. Panels of distinguished teachers discussed the students and their reactions to instruction (Lorince, 1998).

Pedagogy Saturday III (1999), "Three or More: Beyond the Traditional Private Lesson," explored advantages of group teaching, skills required for group teaching, and the use of group teaching techniques in the private lesson (MTNA, 1999). Pedagogy Saturday IV (2000) delved further into these issues. Videotapes were shown featuring experienced voice, woodwind, string, and keyboard teachers teaching the same basic lesson twice-once to a group, then to an individual student (MTNA, 2000). Pedagogy Saturday V (2001) explored various aspects of the student/teacher relationship. Pedagogy Saturday VI (2002) examined learning styles and approaches.

The first meeting of the National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum took place August 4-5, 2000 in Cincinnati, OH. This conference was specifically designed for college and university group piano and piano pedagogy instructors. The focal point of the first day of the forum was the teaching of group piano. Group piano curriculum building was the subject of a panel discussion; presentations centered on group piano teaching techniques for sight-reading, technology, and repertoire, as well as issues pertaining to the evaluation of group piano students. Summaries of conference sessions were published in *Piano Pedagogy Forum* ("National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum," 2001).

Cincinnati was again the location of the second meeting of the National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum, held August 2-3, 2002. A panel discussed group piano proficiency requirements, and presentations covered popular chording, software and online support for group piano, and web-based support for group piano. A video

presentation featured teaching excerpts by American pioneers of group piano. The second day, devoted to the teaching of piano pedagogy, included sessions on teaching beginning technique, pedagogy course assignments, and the Canadian Royal Conservatory examination process (B. Fast, personal communication, February 25, 2002).

The newest professional organization, the National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy (NCKP), reactivates the original National Conference on Piano Pedagogy. The conference is sponsored by the Frances Clark Center for Keyboard Pedagogy, founded in 1999 by Louise Goss and the late Richard Chronister. The first meeting of the NCKP, attended by approximately 650 pianists and teachers from the US and abroad, was held July 19-21 in Oak Brook, IL. A second convention will take place August 6-9, 2003 in the same location.

The Pre-Conference Seminar of the 2001 NKCP was entitled "Toward a Pedagogy for the New Millennium" (National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy [NCKP], 2001). Intended for college and university pedagogy students and teachers, sessions focused on curriculum and degree issues in Bachelor's, Master's, Doctoral, and non-degree programs, as well as the benefits of collaboration with colleagues in music education, music therapy, educational psychology, web-based education, performance, and administration. Activities at the remainder of the conference included keynote speakers, teaching demonstrations covering a variety of age levels and teaching formats, breakout sessions, workshops, and recitals.

Ten committees of the NCKP study specific topics related to piano pedagogy. Titles of committees are: Future Trends, Historical Perspectives, Independent Teachers,

Internships/Practica, Music in Early Childhood, Research, Teaching Adults, Technology, the Pedagogy Student, and Wellness for the Pianist. A committee on collaborative performance may be introduced in the future. In addition to the committees, the NCKP includes two task forces (Pedagogy Curricula, Composition Competition) and four liaisons: the NCKP/Industry Liaison, the NCKP/MTNA Liaison, the NCKP/Pedagogy and Administration Liaison, and the NCKP/Performance and Pedagogy Liaison (S. Holland, personal communication, April 1, 2002).

Summary

The piano pedagogy field made remarkable strides in the 20th century. Piano pedagogy offerings at colleges and universities grew from a single course to a series of courses to degree programs at the baccalaureate, master's and doctoral levels. Curricular guidelines were established and textbooks and other materials for pedagogy courses were published. Research was conducted in many areas pertaining to piano pedagogy.

At the beginning of the 21st century, the profession continues to grow. New student groups are being taught, technological developments are being utilized, and new professional periodicals and organizations are disseminating information on teaching piano. All of these developments highlight the importance placed on piano teacher training in the 21st century. As Robert Pace stated in the January 2001 issue of *Clavier*, "Piano pedagogy has a very bright future" (p. 26).

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Development of the Research Instrument

Based on readings of the related literature, the questionnaire from Milliman's dissertation, *A Survey of Graduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course Offerings* (1992), was adapted to elicit information on the content of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses. Milliman's questionnaire was previously adapted by Charoenwongse (1998) and Won (1999) for studies of undergraduate piano pedagogy offerings at Thai and Korean universities respectively. The use of the questionnaire in these studies suggests that it is a valid instrument for the study of piano pedagogy course content.

A pilot study was conducted in the fall of 2000. A preliminary version of the questionnaire was sent to 31 piano pedagogy instructors at four-year National Association of Schools of Music (NASM)-member institutions in Texas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas as listed in the *College Music Society 1997-1998 Directory of Music Faculties in Colleges and Universities in the United States and Canada.* A total of 13 questionnaires, 41.94% of the sample population, were returned. Cronbach's Alpha was used to measure inter-item reliability of the pilot questionnaire. Cronbach's Alpha values ranged from .8127-.8654 for questionnaire item clusters (see Appendix A). Although the pilot study population was small, the Cronbach's alpha values suggest that the research instrument was reliable.

The instrument was revised based on the responses of subjects of the pilot study and further review of the related literature. Additional guidelines for revision of the questionnaire came from Gayle Kowalchyk's dissertation, *A Descriptive Profile of Piano*

Pedagogy Instructors at American Colleges and Universities (1989), and Diana Skroch's dissertation, *A Descriptive and Interpretive Study of Class Piano Instruction in Four-year Colleges and Universities Accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music with a Profile of the Class Piano Instructor* (1991). *Research in Music Education* by Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1996) and *The Sample Survey: Theory and Practice* by Warwick and Lininger (1975) were also consulted for aid in refinement of the instrument. The questionnaire consists of five sections:

1. Institutional Information
2. Personal Information
3. The Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s): Format and Materials
4. Pedagogy Core Course Content: Topics
5. Pedagogy Core Course Content: Experiences

Question types include closed-ended, forced choice, listing, and a four-point Likert-type scale.

Prior to its mailing to the target population, the questionnaire was pilot-tested a second time by a panel of doctoral students in piano pedagogy (see Appendix B). Doctoral students were chosen as subjects of the second pilot study so that the final study population of college and university piano pedagogy faculty members remained intact. A cover letter (Appendix C) asked pilot subjects to complete the questionnaire, record the time necessary for completion, and make suggestions for revisions. The questionnaire was then revised, based on the suggestions gained from the second pilot test.

Administration of the Research Instrument

On April 8, 2002, the revised questionnaire (see Appendix D), accompanied by a self-addressed envelope for return of the questionnaire, was mailed to piano pedagogy instructors at American colleges and universities listed in the *College Music Society 2000-2001 Directory of Music Faculties in Colleges and Universities in the United States and Canada*. The study was limited to piano pedagogy faculty at four-year, National Association of Schools of Music (NASM)-accredited institutions. A cover letter (see Appendix E) stated the purpose of the study and the need for the study, gave instructions for completing the questionnaire, stated the approximate time needed for completion, and assured the subjects of the confidentiality of their responses. Subjects were asked not to include any identifying information on the questionnaire. The return envelopes contained identification numbers that enabled the researcher to cross respondents' names off the mailing list when questionnaires were returned. Envelopes were then discarded. Respondents' names were never placed on questionnaires. One week after the initial mailing of the questionnaire, all subjects were sent a postcard follow-up reminder (see Appendix F). Approximately three weeks after the initial mailing, non-respondents were sent another follow-up letter (see Appendix G) and a second copy of the questionnaire. A closing date of June 29, 2002 was determined for receipt of the questionnaires; responses received after that date were not included in the study. Data were recorded and analyzed using SPSS 10.0. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, and means) were used in analysis of data collected from the questionnaires. Reliability of the research instrument was tested using Cronbach's Alpha. Cronbach's alpha values for questionnaire item clusters ranged from .7855 to .8217 (see Appendix A).

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction to the Data

Data for the study were collected through a questionnaire (see Appendix D) designed to gather information on undergraduate piano pedagogy core course content. The 52-item questionnaire was divided into five sections:

1. Institutional Information
2. Personal Information
3. The Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s): Format and Materials
4. Pedagogy Core Course Content: Topics
5. Pedagogy Core Course Content: Experiences

Section I, consisting of nine questions, sought institutional information. Respondents were asked to provide information on the type of institution (public or private), the total enrollment of the institution, the number of piano performance majors, the number of students pursuing a major or emphasis in piano pedagogy, the number of faculty members teaching piano pedagogy, and the degrees offered with a major or emphasis in piano pedagogy. The final question in this section asked respondents whether their institution offered an undergraduate piano pedagogy core course; if the institution did not, the respondent was not required to answer any further questions.

The second section of the survey contained 10 questions designed to collect information about the pedagogy instructor. These questions concerned the pedagogy instructor's appointment (full-time or part-time), rank, age, gender, highest degree

earned, amount and type of teaching experience, current teaching responsibilities, and personal priority given to the teaching of pedagogy.

The 11 questions in Section III were formulated to elicit information on the format and materials used in undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses. Questions concerning format examined pedagogy core course titles, credit value, meeting length, frequency of offering, and number and type of students enrolled. The remaining questions in this section covered print materials required in the pedagogy course, as well as the areas of professional growth in which students participate.

Section IV, containing six items, focused on the content of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses. Respondents were asked whether they addressed specific teaching strategies, teaching techniques, teaching literature, content areas, and teaching aids. Respondents then ranked the specific topics according to the amount of emphasis given to each. The last question in the section dealt with course projects and assignments.

The final section of the questionnaire gathered data on the teaching and observation requirements of piano pedagogy core courses. Specifically, respondents were asked to supply information on the amount of observation and teaching required, the setting in which students observe and teach, whom the students observe and teach, and the format used to evaluate student teachers. Lastly, space was provided for respondents to make additional comments on the content of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses.

The questionnaire was mailed to 321 piano pedagogy instructors at American colleges and universities listed in the *College Music Society 2000-2001 Directory of*

Music Faculties in Colleges and Universities in the United States and Canada. The study was limited to piano pedagogy faculty at four-year, NASM-member institutions. If more than one pedagogy faculty member was listed in the CMS directory, the questionnaire was sent to the faculty member of highest rank and/or appointment.

A total of 163 (50.78%) responses was received. Of these, eight surveys were returned unanswered for reasons such as the retirement of the pedagogy instructor or the discontinuation or lack of an undergraduate piano pedagogy course. Another eight of the respondents sent email messages stating that an undergraduate piano pedagogy course was not offered at their institution. The remaining 147 valid returns (45.79%) were used in reporting the results of the study. The number of responses may differ throughout the data presentation, however, due to the varying number of answers for each question. In addition, respondents were allowed multiple responses for several questions. For this reason, percentages may exceed 100% for some questions.

Institutional Information

The first section of the questionnaire sought information about the institutions involved in the study. Question 1 concerned the type of institution (see Table 1). Of the 147 respondents, 91 (61.90%) teach at public institutions and 56 (38.10%) teach at private institutions. In Question 2, respondents reported the total enrollment of their institutions (see Table 2). Enrollments ranged from less than 500 students to more than 35,000 students, with the largest number of institutions (32.65%) reporting an enrollment of 1001-5000 students.

Table 1

Type of Institution

Type of Institution	Respondents (N=147)	Percentage
Public	91	61.90
Private	56	38.10

Table 2

Total Enrollment of Institutions During the 2001-2002 Academic Year

Enrollment	Respondents (N=147)	Percentage
0-500	6	4.08
501-1000	10	6.80
1001-5000	48	32.65
5001-10,000	22	14.97
10,001-20,000	33	22.45
20,001-35,000	21	14.29
Over 35,000	7	4.76

Questions 3 and 4 solicited information on the number of piano performance majors and the number of students pursuing an emphasis/major in piano pedagogy. The number of piano performance majors ranged from 0 to 141, with the greatest number of institutions (31.97%) enrolling 1 to 5 piano performance majors (see Table 3). The average number of piano majors was 11.68. The number of students pursuing piano pedagogy majors or emphases varied from 0 to 25; the average was 2.02 (see Table 4). The majority of institutions (51.02%) reported that no students were pursuing pedagogy

majors or emphases, and an additional 9 respondents (06.12%) stated that this question was not applicable for their institution.

Table 3

Number of Undergraduate Piano Performance Majors During the 2001-2002 Academic Year

Number of Students	Respondents (N=147)	Percentage
0	11	7.48
1-5	47	31.97
6-10	30	20.41
11-15	21	14.29
16-20	22	14.97
21-25	2	1.36
31-35	1	1.36
36-40	1	.68
41-45	2	1.36
46-50	2	1.36
55-60	1	.68
95-100	1	.68
141-145	1	.68
No Response=4		

Table 4

Number of Students Pursuing an Emphasis/Major in Piano Pedagogy During the 2001-2002 Academic Year

Number of Students	Respondents (N=147)	Percentage
0	75	51.02
1-5	41	27.89
6-10	13	8.84
11-15	1	.68
16-20	1	.68
21-25	2	1.36
Not Applicable	9	6.12
No Response=5		

Questions 5 and 6 asked respondents how many full-time and part-time faculty members were teaching undergraduate piano pedagogy courses during the 2001-2001 academic year. At the majority of institutions (74.15%), only one full-time faculty member taught piano pedagogy (see Table 5). As shown in Table 6, most schools (75.51%) had no part-time faculty members teaching piano pedagogy in the 2001-2002 academic year.

Table 5

Number of Full-Time Faculty Members Teaching Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Courses During the 2001-2002 Academic Year

Number of Faculty Members	Respondents (N=147)	Percentage
0	26	17.69
1	109	74.15
2	8	5.44
3	2	1.36
4	1	.68
6	1	.68

Table 6

Number of Part-Time Faculty Members Teaching Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Courses During the 2001-2002 Academic Year

Number of Faculty Members	Respondents (N=147)	Percentage
0	111	75.51
1	32	21.77
2	3	2.04
4	1	.68

Question 7 asked participants to specify the undergraduate degrees offered with an emphasis in piano pedagogy (see Table 7). Most institutions (70.07%) offered no undergraduate degree with an emphasis in piano pedagogy. Thirty-two schools (21.77%) offered a Bachelor of Music degree with an emphasis in piano pedagogy, and 14 schools

(9.52%) offered a Bachelor of Arts degree with an emphasis in piano pedagogy. Four respondents indicated that their schools offered degrees with emphases in piano pedagogy other than those listed in the questionnaire: the Bachelor of Music Education, the Bachelor of Fine Arts, the Bachelor of Arts and Sciences, and a Certificate in Piano Pedagogy.

Table 7

Undergraduate Degrees Offered with an Emphasis in Piano Pedagogy

Degree	Respondents (N=147)	Percentage
No degree offered	103	70.07
Bachelor of Music	14	9.52
Bachelor of Arts	32	21.77
Other	4	2.72
No Response=1		

In Question 8, respondents identified the undergraduate degrees offered with a major in piano pedagogy (see Table 8). The majority of respondents (84.33%) indicated that there is no degree offered with a major in piano pedagogy at their institution. A Bachelor of Music degree with a major in piano pedagogy was offered by 11.19% of institutions and a Bachelor of Arts degree with a major in piano pedagogy was offered by 2.24% of institutions.

Table 8

Undergraduate Degrees Offered with a Major in Piano Pedagogy

Degree	Respondents (N=147)	Percentage
No degree offered	124	84.35
Bachelor of Music	16	10.88
Bachelor of Arts	4	2.72
No Response=3		

The final question in the first section asked whether an undergraduate piano pedagogy core course was offered at the university (see Table 9). The majority of institutions (85.71%) did offer an undergraduate piano pedagogy course. Two of the respondents teaching at institutions that did not offer an undergraduate pedagogy course indicated that pedagogy was occasionally taught as an independent study.

Table 9

Institutions Offering an Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course

Response	Respondents (N=147)	Percentage
Institutions that do offer a core course	126	85.71
Institutions that do not offer a core course	21	14.29

Respondents at institutions not offering an undergraduate piano pedagogy core course were not required to answer any further questions. Therefore, data analysis for the next three sections of the survey is based on responses from the 126 (85.71%) institutions that did offer an undergraduate piano pedagogy core course.

Personal Information

Section II of the questionnaire gathered personal and professional information on the undergraduate piano pedagogy instructor. Question 10 concerned the appointment of the pedagogy faculty member (see Table 10). Most respondents (85.71%) held full-time appointments.

Table 10

Appointment of Piano Pedagogy Instructors

Appointment	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
Full-time	108	85.71
Part-time	18	14.29

The academic rank of the pedagogy instructor was the subject of Question 11 (see Table 11). The largest percentage of respondents (31.75%) held the rank of Professor, followed closely by Associate Professor (30.16%), and Assistant Professor (23.02%). Only 4.76% of respondents held the rank of Instructor. Thirteen respondents (10.32%) indicated that they held a rank other than those listed. These titles included Lecturer (three responses), Professor Emeritus, Adjunct Associate Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Program Director, Professional in Residence, Resident Artist, Senior Lecturer-Academic Staff, and Graduate Assistant. One respondent reported that his/her institution did not rank faculty members.

Table 11

Academic Rank of Piano Pedagogy Instructors

Rank	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
Professor	40	31.75
Associate Professor	38	30.16
Assistant Professor	29	23.02
Instructor	6	4.76
Other	13	10.32

Questions 12 and 13 asked for the age and gender of the pedagogy instructor. This information is presented in Tables 12 and 13. The largest number of pedagogy instructors was between 46 and 55 years of age (38.89%), followed by those between 36 and 45 (29.37%). Approximately two-thirds (67.46%) of respondents were female and approximately one-third (30.95%) of respondents were male.

Table 12

Age of Piano Pedagogy Instructors

Age	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
25 or below	0	.00
26-35	12	9.52
36-45	37	29.37
46-55	49	38.89
56-65	20	15.87
Over 65	7	5.56
No Response=1		

Table 13

Gender of Piano Pedagogy Instructors

Gender	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
Female	85	67.46
Male	39	30.95
No Response=2		

Question 14 gathered information on the educational background of pedagogy instructors (see Table 14). The majority of respondents (89 or 70.63%) had earned a doctoral degree, 56 (62.92%) of these in piano performance, 17 (19.10%) in piano pedagogy, 12 (13.48) in performance and pedagogy, three (3.37%) in music education, and one (1.12%) in music education and piano pedagogy. A master's degree was the highest degree earned by 27 (21.43%) of respondents, 22 (81.48%) of these in piano

performance, four (14.81%) in piano performance and pedagogy, and one (3.70%) in piano pedagogy. Eight respondents (6.35%) held degrees other than those listed. The other degrees cited were: Master of Music in Organ Performance, Performance Diploma, Diploma Mozarteum, Doctor of Philosophy in Comparative Arts, Diplôme Jacques-Dalcroze, Doctorate in Church Music, Master of Arts in Arts and Humanities, and Master of Music in Music Theory and Piano. Of all highest degrees earned by piano pedagogy faculty, 78 (61.90%) were solely performance degrees; only slightly more than one-fourth (35 or 27.28%) of highest degrees earned were in pedagogy or performance and pedagogy.

Table 14

Highest Degree Earned by Piano Pedagogy Instructors

Degree	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
Doctorate	89	70.63
Master's	27	21.43
Other	8	6.35
No Response=2		

Question 15 asked respondents to list their total years of teaching experience. Responses ranged from 7 to 50 years; the average was 26.64 years. Question 16 asked instructors to list the number of years teaching experience in specific areas. All but two respondents reported college teaching experience, which ranged from 2 to 46 years, with an average of 18.90 years. Over three-fourths (75.40%) of respondents possessed experience as an independent piano teacher of pre-college students, ranging from 1 to 46 years, with an average of 19.39 years. Fifty-five (43.65%) respondents had taught pre-

college students in preparatory departments; experience in this environment varied from 1 to 35 years, with an average of 13.73 years. Only 13.49% of pedagogy instructors had pre-college public school teaching experience, ranging from one-half year to fifteen years, with an average of 4.79 years. Three respondents listed other types of teaching experience: summer piano/music camps, private secondary (preparatory) school, graduate assistantships, and adjunct teaching. Information on the teaching experience of pedagogy instructors is presented in Table 15.

Table 15

Teaching Experience of Piano Pedagogy Instructors

Experience	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage	Average Years
College	124	98.41	18.90
Independent studio	95	75.40	19.39
Preparatory	55	43.65	13.73
Public school	17	13.49	4.79
Other	3	02.38	8.50
No Response=2			

In Question 17, respondents indicated what percentage of their teaching load was piano pedagogy. The majority of instructors (64.29%) reported that piano pedagogy comprised 24% or less of their load. This information is given in Table 16.

Table 16

Percentage of Teaching Load in Piano Pedagogy

Percentage of Load	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
100%	1	.79
75-99%	4	3.17
50-74%	13	10.32
25-49%	24	19.84
24% or less	81	64.29
No Response=2		

Question 18 asked respondents to indicate the courses taught in addition to piano pedagogy (see Table 17). The great majority of respondents taught applied piano (91.27%), followed by group piano (69.84%). Fifty respondents (39.68%) taught piano literature, 18 (14.29%) taught music theory, 10 (7.94%) taught music history, and 4 (3.17%) taught music education. Forty-eight (38.10%) respondents specified teaching responsibilities other than those listed. The most frequent responses in this category were Accompanying (16 responses), Chamber Music (five responses), Music Appreciation (five responses), Piano/Keyboard Ensemble (four responses), and Harpsichord (three responses).

Table 17

Additional Courses Taught by Piano Pedagogy Instructors

Course	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
Applied Piano	115	91.27
Group Piano	88	69.84
Piano Literature	50	39.68
Music Theory	18	14.29
Music History	10	7.94
Music Education	4	3.17
Other	48	38.10
No Response=2		

Question 19 asked respondents to indicate the priority they personally gave piano pedagogy within their teaching load. As shown in Table 18, teaching pedagogy was a high priority for approximately two-thirds (65.08%) of respondents and a moderate priority for one third of respondents (33.33%). One pedagogy instructor selected two responses: "moderate priority" and "would prefer not to teach it."

Table 18

Priority Given to Piano Pedagogy by Instructors

Priority	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
High	82	65.08
Moderate	42	33.33
Would prefer not to teach it	1	.79

The Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s): Format and Materials

Section III of the survey was designed to elicit information about the format of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses, the students enrolled in the courses, and the materials used in the courses. In Question 20, respondents reported the titles and credit values of all undergraduate level piano pedagogy core courses offered at their institutions. A total of 312 courses were listed. The number of course titles listed ranged from one to seven, with an average of 2.48 courses listed per institution. At the largest number of responding institutions (54 or 42.86%), just one undergraduate pedagogy core course was offered. These data are presented in Table 19.

Table 19

Number of Undergraduate Pedagogy Core Course Titles Listed

Number of Courses	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
1	54	42.86
2	25	19.84
3	13	10.32
4	15	11.90
5	6	4.76
6	12	9.52
7	1	.79

One hundred thirty-seven different course titles were listed. The most common course titles were Piano Pedagogy (listed by 42.85% of responding institutions), Piano Pedagogy I (27.78%), and Piano Pedagogy II (27.78%) (see Table 20). Additional course titles could be grouped into piano pedagogy course titles, practicum/internship course titles, and group pedagogy course titles. These titles can be found in Appendix H.

Table 20

Course Titles of Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Courses

Course Title	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
Piano Pedagogy	54	42.85
Piano Pedagogy I	35	27.78
Piano Pedagogy II	35	27.78
Piano Pedagogy III	12	9.52
Piano Pedagogy IV	7	5.56

For the 312 core courses listed, credit values ranged from one-half to six credits, with an average of 2.19 credits per course. Most courses (48.08%) were offered for two credits (see Table 21). Question 21 asked whether credits were based on semester hours, quarter hours, or course units. The vast majority of institutions (91.27%) awarded credits based on semester hours (see Table 22).

Table 21

Credit Values Given for Undergraduate Pedagogy Core Courses

Credits	Responses (n=312)	Percentage
0.5	5	1.60
1.0	47	15.06
1.5	4	1.28
2.0	150	48.08
3.0	93	29.81
4.0	3	.96
6.0	3	.96
Variable Credit	6	1.92

Table 22

Core Course Credit Types

Type	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
Semester hours	115	91.27
Quarter hours	7	5.56
Course units	4	3.17

In Questions 22 and 23, respondents reported the frequency and length of pedagogy core course meetings. Detailed data from these questions are presented in Tables 23 and 24. The average course met 1.86 times a week for 68.24 minutes. At 17 responding institutions (13.50%), the number of course meetings per week varied, as did the duration of course meetings at 11 (8.73%) responding institutions.

Table 23

Frequency of Course Meetings Per Week

Number of Meetings	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
Twice a week	68	53.97
Once a week	29	23.02
Three times a week	12	9.52
Variable	17	13.50

Table 24

Length of Class Sessions

Number of Minutes	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
50	65	51.58
55	1	.79
57	1	.79
58	1	.79
60	12	9.52
65	1	.79
75	5	3.97
80	2	1.59
90	7	5.56
100	5	3.97
110	3	2.38
115	1	.79
120	7	5.56
145	1	.79
165	1	.79
180	2	1.59
Variable	11	8.73

Data for Question 24 revealed that most pedagogy courses (65.08%) were offered once every two years (see Table 25). Only 19.05% of institutions offered pedagogy courses once a year, and 4.76% offered pedagogy courses every term. Of respondents indicating "other" under frequency of course offerings, most specified that the core course was offered as needed.

Table 25

Frequency of Core Course Offerings

Frequency	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
Once every two years	82	65.08
Once a year	24	19.05
Once a term	6	4.76
Other	14	11.11

The enrollment in piano pedagogy core courses was examined in Question 25. Total course enrollment ranged from 0 to 25 students, with an average of 6.29 students (see Table 26). Respondents were then asked to indicate the number of piano performance majors, piano pedagogy majors/emphases, and other majors enrolled in the pedagogy core course. The number of piano performance majors enrolled ranged from 0 to 19, with an average of 3.63; the number of piano pedagogy majors/emphases enrolled ranged from 0 to 12, with an average of 1.48; and the number of other majors enrolled ranged from 0 to 20, with an average of 2.24. Several respondents specified the other majors enrolled. These included music education majors (four responses), church music majors (one response), graduate students (one response), adult students (one response), and area teachers (one response).

Table 26

Total Enrollment in Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Courses

Number of Students	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
0	1	.79
1-5	61	48.41
6-10	50	39.68
11-15	9	7.14
16-20	2	1.59
21-25	1	.79
No Response=2		

Question 26 asked respondents whether they perceived enrollment in pedagogy core courses at their institution to be increasing, decreasing, or remaining stable. Most instructors (59.52%) indicated that enrollment was remaining stable (see Table 27).

Table 27

Enrollment Trends in Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Courses

Enrollment	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
Remaining stable	75	59.52
Increasing	29	23.02
Decreasing	18	14.29
No Response=4		

Question 27 asked respondents to indicate which students are required to take the undergraduate piano pedagogy core course (see Table 28). At almost three-quarters (74.60%) of responding institutions, all piano performance majors are required to take the pedagogy core course. Approximately one-third (32.54%) of respondents indicated that all undergraduate students pursuing an emphasis or major in piano pedagogy are required to take the course, and 11.90% of respondents stated that the pedagogy core course is not required of anyone. Thirteen respondents reported other students who are required to take the core course(s): music education students with piano/keyboard emphases (three responses), all piano majors or emphases (three responses), pedagogy certificate students (three responses), church music majors with keyboard emphases (two responses), graduate students (two responses), all performance majors (one response), all music education students (one response), and those needing the course as a prerequisite for graduate piano pedagogy courses (one response).

Table 28

Students Required to Enroll in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course

Student	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
All undergraduate piano performance majors	94	74.60
All undergraduate piano pedagogy majors/emphases	41	32.54
Not required of anyone	15	11.90
Other	16	12.70
No Response=1		

Respondents specified the print materials required in the pedagogy core course(s) in Question 28. A published pedagogy textbook was required at 83.33% of responding institutions, as was the instructor's syllabus. Professional journals, books from average-age beginning methods, and books of intermediate repertoire were each required in courses at approximately one-half of responding schools (see Table 29). Twenty respondents listed other materials that were required in the pedagogy core course(s). These included web sites (three responses), adult method books (two responses), books on education and psychology (two responses), books on marketing (one response), and method books for instruments other than the piano (one response).

Table 29

Required Print Materials in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Courses

Materials	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
Published pedagogy textbook	105	83.33
Instructor's syllabus	105	83.33
Books from an average-age beginning method	68	53.97
Professional journals	66	52.38
Books of intermediate level standard repertoire	58	46.03
Other	22	17.46
No Response=6		

Question 29 asked respondents to list the titles and authors of print materials that students are required to purchase for each of the pedagogy core courses. Tables 30-33 give detailed information on print materials reported by two or more respondents. Print materials reported only once per course are listed in Appendix I. Four respondents stated that no materials were required for purchase in the pedagogy core course(s); all necessary materials were either in the library, provided by the instructor, or available through textbook rental.

The required materials listed for course one could be grouped into the categories of pedagogy textbooks, professional journals, average-age beginning methods, and guides to the piano teaching repertoire. The print material reported most frequently was *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* (Uszler, Gordon, & Smith, 2000), used by 59 (46.83%) responding institutions. In second place was *How to Teach Piano Successfully* (Bastien, 1995), mentioned by 34 (26.98%) instructors. *Creative Piano Teaching* (Lyke, Enoch, & Haydon, 1996) was required at 12 (9.52%) institutions. Thirteen additional materials mentioned by at least two respondents are listed in Table 30.

Table 30

Print Materials Required in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s):

Course Number One

Title	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
Uszler, M., Gordon, S., & Smith, S. M. (2000). *The well-tempered keyboard teacher* (2nd ed.). New York: Schirmer Books.	59	46.83
Bastien, J. (1995). *How to teach piano successfully* (4th ed.). San Diego, CA: Kjos.	34	26.98
Lyke, J., Enoch, Y., & Haydon, G. (1996). *Creative piano teaching* (3rd ed.). Champaign, IL: Stipes.	12	9.52
Keyboard companion. P. O. Box 651, Kingston, NJ 08528.	7	5.56
Agay, D. (1981). *Teaching piano* (Vols. 1-2). New York: Yorktown.	6	4.76
American Music Teacher. 441 Vine St., Ste. 505, Cincinnati, OH 45202	6	4.76
Clark, F. (1992). *Questions and answers: Practical advice for piano teachers.* Northfield, IL: The Instrumentalist.	5	3.97
Clark, F., Goss, L., & Holland, S. (2000). *Time to begin.* Miami: Summy-Birchard.	5	3.97
Clavier. 200 Northfield Rd., Northfield, IL 60093.	4	3.17
Kern, R. F., & Miller, M. (1988). *Projects for piano pedagogy* (Vols. 1-2). San Diego, CA: Kjos.	4	3.17

(table continues)

Magrath, J. (1995). *The pianist's guide to the standard teaching and performance literature.* Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.	4	3.17
Albergo, C., & Alexander, R. (2000). *Intermediate piano repertoire: A guide for teaching* (4th ed.). Missisauga, ON, Canada: Frederick Harris.	3	2.38
Camp, M. (1992). *Teaching Piano: The synthesis of mind, ear, and body.* Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.	2	1.59
Clark, F., Goss, L., & Holland, S. (2000). *The music tree, part 1.* Miami: Summy-Birchard.	2	1.59
Faber, R., & Faber, N. (1993). *Piano adventures, primer level.* North Miami Beach, FL: FJH Music.	2	1.59
Gordon, S. (1995). *Etudes for piano teachers: Reflections on the teacher's art.* New York: Oxford University Press.	2	1.59

Seventy-two (57.14%) responding institutions offered a second undergraduate piano pedagogy course. *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* (Uszler et al.) and *How to Teach Piano Successfully* (Bastien), piano pedagogy textbooks, were again the most frequently required print materials. In third and fourth place were guides to the piano teaching repertoire: *The Pianist's Guide to the Standard Teaching and Performance Repertoire* (Magrath, 1995) and *Intermediate Piano Repertoire: A Guide for Teaching* (Albergo & Alexander, 2000). Further data on print materials used in course two are presented in Table 31 and Appendix I.

Table 31

Print Materials Required in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s):

Course Number Two

Title	Respondents (n=72)	Percentage
Uszler, M., Gordon, S., & Smith, S. M. (2000). *The well-tempered keyboard teacher* (2nd ed.). New York: Schirmer Books.	27	37.50
Bastien, J. (1995). *How to teach piano successfully* (4th ed.). San Diego, CA: Kjos	14	19.44
Magrath, J. (1995). *The pianist's guide to the standard teaching and performance literature.* Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.	9	12.50
Albergo, C., & Alexander, R. (2000). *Intermediate piano repertoire: A guide for teaching* (4th ed.). Missisauga, ON, Canada: Frederick Harris.	6	8.33
Lyke, J., Enoch, Y., & Haydon, G. (1996). *Creative piano teaching* (3rd ed.). Champaign, IL: Stipes.	6	8.33
Clark, F., Goss, L., & Holland, S. (2000). *The music tree, part 1.* Miami: Summy-Birchard.	5	6.94
Clavier. 200 Northfield Rd., Northfield, IL 60093.	5	6.94
American Music Teacher. 617 Vine St., Ste. 1432, Cincinnati, OH 45202	3	4.17
Agay, D. (1981). *Teaching piano* (Vol. 1). New York: Yorktown.	2	2.78

(table continues)

Kern, R. F., & Miller, M. (1988). *Projects for piano pedagogy* (Vols. 1-2). San Diego, CA: Kjos.	2	2.78
Keyboard companion. P. O. Box 651, Kingston, NJ 08528.	2	2.78
Ristad, E. (1982). *A soprano on her head: right-side up reflections on life and other performances.* Moab, UT: Real People Press.	2	2.78

A third undergraduate piano pedagogy core course was offered at 47 (37.30%) institutions. *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* (Uszler et al.) was again the required print material mentioned most often; *How to Teach Piano Successfully* (Bastien) and *Creative Piano Teaching* (Lyke et al.) tied for second place. Five other materials received two mentions each (see Table 32).

Table 32

Print Materials Required in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s):

Course Number Three

Title	Respondents (n=47)	Percentage
Uszler, M., Gordon, S., & Smith, S. M. (2000). *The well-tempered keyboard teacher* (2nd ed.). New York: Schirmer Books.	9	19.15
Bastien, J. (1995). *How to teach piano successfully* (4th ed.). San Diego, CA: Kjos.	4	8.51
Lyke, J., Enoch, Y., & Haydon, G. (1996). *Creative piano teaching* (3rd ed.). Champaign, IL: Stipes.	4	8.51
Agay, D. (1981). *Teaching piano* (Vol. 2). New York: Yorktown.	2	4.26
Albergo, C., Alexander, R., & Blickenstaff, M. (1996). *Celebration series handbook for teachers* (2nd ed.). Missisauga, ON, Canada: Frederick Harris.	2	4.26
Gillespie, J. (1990). *Five Centuries of keyboard music: An historical survey of music for harpsichord and piano.* New York: Dover.	2	4.26
Magrath, J. (1995). *The pianist's guide to the standard teaching and performance literature.* Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.	2	4.26
Ristad, E. (1982). *A soprano on her head: right-side up reflections on life and other performances.* Moab, UT: Real People Press.	2	4.26

A fourth core course was reported at 34 (26.98%) schools. A limited number of required print materials were listed. *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* (Uszler et al.) was cited by four respondents. *How to Teach Piano Successfully* (Bastien) and *Guide to the Pianist's Repertoire* (Hinson, 2000) were each cited twice. Materials mentioned once are listed in Appendix I.

Table 33

Print Materials Required in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s): Course Number Four

Title	Respondents (n=34)	Percentage
Uszler, M., Gordon, S., & Smith, S. M. (2000). *The well-tempered keyboard teacher* (2nd ed.). New York: Schirmer Books.	4	11.76
Bastien, J. (1995). *How to teach piano successfully* (4th ed.). San Diego, CA: Kjos	2	5.88
Hinson, M. (2000). *Guide to the pianist's repertoire* (3rd ed.). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.	2	5.88

Fifth and sixth core courses were offered at 13 (10.32%) and 7 (5.56%) institutions respectively. No materials for courses five and six were listed by more than one respondent; therefore, information on these materials is presented in Appendix I.

In Question 30, respondents indicated the areas of professional growth in which pedagogy students participate. At over half of responding institutions (50.79%), students attended area piano teaching workshops. Subscription to *Clavier* was required at 43.65% of institutions, and subscription to *Keyboard Companion* was required at 25.40% of institutions. Several instructors (29 or 23.02%) reported other areas of professional

growth. The following activities were mentioned most frequently: attending and/or monitoring local festivals and competitions, attending master classes, participating in online discussion boards, joining the student chapter of MTNA, and observing and or assisting local independent teachers. Detailed data on the professional activities required of pedagogy students are given in Table 34.

Table 34

Areas of Professional Growth in which Students Participate

Professional Activity	Respondents (n=126)	Percentage
Attend area piano teaching workshops	64	50.79
Subscribe to *Clavier*	55	43.65
Subscribe to *Keyboard Companion*	32	25.40
Join state and national music teachers association	31	24.60
Join local professional music teachers organization	28	22.22
Attend professional music teachers meetings	27	21.43
Other	29	23.02
No Response=20		

Pedagogy Core Course Content: Topics

The six questions in Section IV of the survey questionnaire pertained to the content of the undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses. Respondents were asked to indicate whether specific teaching strategies, teaching techniques, teaching literature, content areas, and teaching aids were addressed in the pedagogy core course(s). In addition, respondents were asked to designate the amount of emphasis given to each item. Items were rated using a four-point Likert-type scale (1=little emphasis; 4=much emphasis). Tables 35-39 present these data. The percentage of respondents who included the item in the core course is listed, followed by the mean Likert rating given by those respondents including the item in the core course. The final question of the section asked respondents to identify the assignments and projects required in the pedagogy core course(s). Three respondents did not answer the questions in Sections IV and V of the survey. Two of these respondents did not answer because they would be teaching the course for the first time in the 2002-2003 academic year; one respondent was hired as a one-year appointment in the 2001-2002 academic year, during which undergraduate piano pedagogy was not offered. Therefore, data analysis was based on 123 responses.

In Question 31, respondents indicated the teaching strategies for specific levels and classifications of students addressed in the pedagogy core course(s) (see Table 35). Virtually all respondents (99.19%) included teaching strategies for pre-college elementary students and pre-college intermediate students in an individual setting. However, the teaching of elementary students was given a slightly higher Likert rating than the teaching of intermediate students. Other teaching strategies covered by more than 80% of respondents were "pre-college elementary student-group instruction"

(86.18%), "pre-school student" (86.18%), and "adult/hobby student" (82.11%). The teaching of college group piano and the teaching of advanced pre-college students in a group setting were included least often. Included in "other" responses were disabled students (two responses), ADD students (one response), Yamaha and Suzuki approaches (one response), and academic 6-12 piano classes (one response).

Table 35

Teaching Strategies Addressed in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s)

Teaching Strategies	"Included" Percentage (n=123)	Mean Likert Rating for "Included"
Pre-college elementary private	99.19	3.67
Pre-college intermediate private	99.19	3.52
Pre-college elementary group	86.18	2.85
Pre-school	86.18	2.41
Adult/hobby	82.11	2.33
Pre-college advanced private	74.80	2.80
Pre-college intermediate group	71.54	2.60
Group piano for college non-keyboard music majors	61.79	2.37
Group piano for college non-music majors	55.28	2.33
Pre-college advanced group	47.97	2.08

Question 32 focused on the teaching techniques addressed in the pedagogy core course(s). All but one respondent (99.19%) addressed teaching techniques for rhythm and technique; all but two respondents (98.37%) addressed hand position, practicing, dynamics, fingering, and pedaling; and all but three respondents (97.56%) addressed music reading, phrasing, articulation, and tone. Sight-reading, memorization, and style

were the other areas included by at least 90% of respondents. Table 36 presents further information on the teaching techniques addressed, as well as the amount of emphasis given to each.

Table 36

Teaching Techniques Addressed in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s)

Teaching Techniques	"Included" Percentage (n=123)	Mean Likert Rating for "Included"
Rhythm	99.19	3.69
Technique	99.19	3.57
Hand position	98.37	3.62
Practicing	98.37	3.59
Dynamics	98.37	3.40
Fingering	98.37	3.40
Pedaling	98.37	3.17
Music reading	97.56	3.70
Phrasing	97.56	3.46
Articulation	97.56	3.35
Tone	97.56	3.28
Sight reading	96.75	3.36
Memorization	95.93	3.28
Style	95.12	3.39
Ornamentation	88.62	2.87
Improvisation	82.93	2.73
Harmonization	80.49	2.82
Transposition	79.67	2.70
Ear training	77.24	2.82

(table continues)

Playing by ear	76.42	2.47
Computer technology	71.54	2.51
Electronic keyboard technology	69.92	2.49
Jazz/blues/pop music	69.11	2.01
Score reading	40.65	2.26

Respondents indicated the categories of teaching literature addressed in the pedagogy core course(s) in Question 33 (see Table 37). Average-age beginning methods were covered by the largest number of respondents (98.37%) and received the most emphasis ($M = 3.68$). Also included at over 90% of responding institutions were intermediate solo standard literature (96.75%), supplementary solo literature for the elementary student (93.50%), and intermediate solo educational literature (92.68%). Solo and ensemble literature for advanced pre-college students and adult group piano received the least coverage and stress. Three respondents commented that advanced level literature is covered in piano literature courses. Other types of teaching literature mentioned by respondents included contemporary music, music for prepared piano, and music for one hand (one response each).

Table 37

Teaching Literature Addressed in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s)

Teaching Literature	"Included" Percentage (n=123)	Mean Likert Rating for "Included"
Average-age beginning methods	98.37	3.68
Intermediate solo standard literature	96.75	3.47
Supplementary solo literature for the elementary student	93.50	3.33
Intermediate solo educational literature	92.68	3.22
Pre-school methods	86.99	2.77
Adult/hobby beginning methods	82.93	2.82
Supplementary ensemble literature for the elementary student	82.11	2.74
Intermediate ensemble standard literature	75.61	2.54
Intermediate ensemble educational literature	69.92	2.50
Group piano texts for college non-keyboard music majors	68.29	2.47
Advanced solo literature	65.04	2.78
Group piano texts for college non-music majors	60.98	2.41
Advanced ensemble literature	48.78	2.13
Supplementary ensemble literature for adult group piano	47.15	2.04
Supplementary solo literature for adult group piano	47.15	1.98

Question 34 solicited data on the content areas addressed in the undergraduate piano pedagogy core course(s) (see Table 38). Areas included by over 90% of responding institutions were "motivating the piano student" (99.19%), "selecting teaching literature" (98.37%), "qualities of a good teacher" (98.37%), "lesson planning" (97.56%), "developing goals and objectives for the piano lesson" (96.75%), "policies and procedures for the independent piano studio" (95.93%), "overview of many average-age beginner methods" (95.12%), "organizational skills for teaching" (93.50%), "philosophy of piano teaching" (94.31%), "preparing students for recitals" (91.06%), and "diagnostic skills to evaluate the piano student" (90.24%).

The content areas receiving the greatest emphasis were "selecting teaching literature" ($M = 3.60$), "qualities of a good teacher" ($M = 3.58$), "developing goals and objectives for the piano lesson" ($M = 3.56$), "lesson planning" ($M = 3.55$), "organizational skills for teaching" ($M = 3.47$), and "overview of many average-age beginner methods" ($M = 3.46$). Content areas other than those listed that were mentioned by respondents were Dalcroze Eurythmics (two responses); and professional ethics, preventing teacher burnout, finances and taxes for the independent teacher, recital planning, and Kindermusik (one response each). Three respondents commented that certain content areas were covered in courses other than piano pedagogy: "preferred editions of advanced-level standard keyboard music" and "history of piano technique" were covered in piano literature classes; "performance anxiety" was addressed in performance classes.

Table 38

Content Areas Addressed in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s)

Content Areas	"Included" Percentage (n=123)	Mean Likert Rating for "Included"
Motivation	99.19	3.35
Selecting teaching literature	98.37	3.60
Qualities of a good teacher	98.37	3.58
Lesson planning	97.56	3.55
Developing goals/objectives	96.75	3.56
Policies and procedures for the independent piano studio	95.93	3.33
Overview of many average-age beginner methods	95.12	3.46
Organizational skills	93.50	3.47
Philosophy of piano teaching	94.31	3.20
Preparing students for recitals	91.06	2.92
Diagnostic skills to evaluate the piano student	90.24	3.03
Learning theories	89.43	3.02
Advantages/disadvantages of private lessons	89.43	3.02
Preferred editions of intermediate standard keyboard music	89.43	3.00
Reference books on pedagogical topics	89.43	2.77
Advantages/disadvantages of group lessons	87.80	2.94
Advantages/disadvantages of group lessons in conjunction with private lessons	85.37	2.92
Overview of professional music organizations/journals	85.37	2.80

(table continues)

Music technology/current trends	82.93	2.67
Performance anxiety	81.30	2.67
Careers for pianists	79.67	2.56
In-depth study of one average-age beginner method	78.86	3.38
Overview of many pre-school methods	78.86	2.73
Preferred editions of advanced standard keyboard music	73.17	2.87
Study of group dynamics	71.54	2.86
History of piano pedagogy	69.11	2.54
Medical problems of pianists	69.11	2.38
Overview of many adult/hobby methods	67.48	2.53
History of keyboard technique	62.60	2.57
Adjudication	61.79	2.53
Copyright laws	60.98	2.49
Overview of college group piano texts	58.54	2.52
Purchase, care, and maintenance of keyboard instruments	58.54	2.27
Composition of elementary teaching pieces	57.72	2.71
Preparing students for college	56.91	2.48
In-depth study of one pre-school method	56.10	2.76
In-depth study of one college group piano text	44.72	2.30
In-depth study of one adult/hobby method	43.90	2.39

In Question 35, respondents reported the teaching aids discussed in the pedagogy core course(s) (see Table 39). In general, teaching aids were included less frequently and

given less emphasis than teaching strategies, teaching literature, and content areas. The metronome (90.24%) was the only teaching aid included by over 90% of responding institutions; this was followed by visual aids (82.93%) and games (78.86%). Two other teaching aids were listed by one respondent each: Disklavier and hardware for piano preparation.

Table 39

Teaching Aids Discussed in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s)

Teaching Aid	"Included" Percentage (n=123)	Mean Likert Rating for "Included"
Metronome	90.24	2.69
Visual aids	82.93	2.62
Games	78.86	2.47
Computer software for music instruction	77.24	2.57
Electronic keyboards	76.42	2.52
Electronic keyboard laboratories	75.61	2.74
Audio tape recorders	74.80	2.44
Computers	73.17	2.65
Video tape recorders	73.17	2.64
Sequencers	48.78	2.22
Computer software for word processing, spreadsheets, databases	45.53	2.06
Overhead projector	43.90	1.84
Visualizer	39.02	2.23
No Response=1		

Information on required pedagogy core course assignments and projects was requested in Question 36 (see Table 40). Required projects/assignments reported most often were "reading assignments" (93.93%), "survey of beginning methods" (91.06%), "written assignments" (89.43%), "survey of teaching literature" (75.61%), and "lecture/demonstration of teaching literature" (73.98%). Thirty-two (26.02%) respondents specified course assignments/projects other than those listed. Most often mentioned (14 responses) were teaching and/or observation assignments, which are the subject of the next section of the questionnaire. Also cited were independent projects/presentations on topics of interest (four responses); performances of teaching literature, teaching journals, and creating games (three responses each); exams, book reports, method reviews, adjudication assignments, pedagogical compositions, composition/teaching of rote pieces, and internet searches (two responses each); and articulation of a teaching philosophy, teaching demonstrations, lesson plans, sequencing assignments, recital planning and performance, community evaluation (census and sociological factors), and a survey of professional periodicals (one response each).

Table 40

Required Projects/Assignments in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s)

Assignment/Project	Respondents (n=123)	Percentage
Reading assignments	118	93.93
Survey of beginning methods	112	91.06
Written assignments	110	89.43
Survey of teaching literature	93	75.61
Lecture/demonstration of teaching literature	91	73.98
Notebook of class notes and materials	90	73.17
Independent studio management project	65	52.85
Correlating activities with a piano method	62	50.41
Research paper	54	43.90
Card file/database of teaching literature	54	43.90
Card file/database of reference books	34	27.64
Other	32	26.02
No Response=1		

Pedagogy Core Course Content: Experiences

The final section of the survey questionnaire investigated the teaching and observation experiences included in undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses. Question 37 asked whether observations of teaching were required as part of the core course (see Table 41). At 112 (91.06%) responding institutions, observations of teaching were a requirement of the core course; at 11 institutions, observations were not required.

Table 41

Institutions Requiring Observation of Teaching in the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s)

Response	Respondents (n=123)	Percentage
Those requiring observation	112	91.06
Those not requiring observation	11	8.94

Institutions not including observations as part of the core course were not required to answer Questions 38-41. Therefore, data analysis for these questions was based on responses of the 112 institutions requiring observations. Questions 38 and 39 examined the amount of observation time required of the pedagogy student prior to and during student teaching. Required observation time prior to student teaching ranged from 0 to 32 hours per course; the average was 5.21 hours per course (see Table 42). Required observation time during student teaching ranged from 0 to 30 hours per course, with an average of 5.77 hours per course (see Table 43).

Table 42

Amount of Observation Time Required Prior to Student Teaching

Number of Hours	Respondents (n=112)	Percentage
0	18	16.07
1-5	41	36.61
6-10	28	25.00
11-15	12	10.71
30-35	1	.89
Variable	1	.89
Not Applicable	3	2.44
No Response=8		

Table 43

Amount of Observation Time Required During Student Teaching

Number of Hours	Respondents (n=112)	Percentage
0	15	13.39
1-5	42	37.50
6-10	21	18.75
11-15	8	7.14
16-20	4	3.57
26-30	1	.89
Variable	1	.89
Not Applicable	4	3.57
No Response=16		

In Question 40, respondents reported whether pedagogy students observed private lessons only, group lessons only, or both. As can be seen in Table 44, pedagogy students observed both group and private instruction at the majority (83.93%) of institutions.

Table 44

Type of Teaching Observed

Type	Respondents (n=112)	Percentage
Both group and private instruction	94	83.93
Private instruction only	15	13.39
Group instruction only	3	2.68

Question 41 asked respondents to specify the type of teacher observed by pedagogy students when fulfilling observation requirements (see Table 45). Most often observed were "applied piano faculty" (75.89%), followed by "independent piano teachers" (66.96%), and "undergraduate pedagogy instructor(s)" (50.89). Thirteen respondents reported other types of teachers observed by pedagogy students. Receiving multiple mentions were group piano faculty (six responses), other pedagogy students (three responses), and college faculty in other disciplines (two responses). Reported by one respondent each were group piano programs in the schools (K-5 non-credit and 6-12 credit); preschool music classes; Dalcroze Eurythmics classes for children; and Yamaha, Suzuki, and Musikgarten programs.

Table 45

Teachers Observed by Pedagogy Students

Type of Teacher	Respondents (n=112)	Percentage
Applied piano faculty	85	75.89
Independent piano teachers	75	66.96
Undergraduate pedagogy instructor(s)	57	50.89
Preparatory division faculty	48	42.86
Graduate teaching assistants	23	20.54
Other	13	11.61

The remaining questions of the survey dealt with teaching experiences required in the undergraduate piano pedagogy core course(s). Data for Question 42 revealed that pedagogy students were required to complete a specific teaching assignment at 78.86% of responding institutions (see Table 46).

Table 46

Institutions Requiring a Specific Teaching Assignment as Part of the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s)

Response	Respondents (n=123)	Percentage
Those with a teaching requirement	97	78.86
Those without a teaching requirement	26	21.14

Institutions not requiring student teaching as part of the core course(s) did not need to answer any further questions. For that reason, data analysis for the remaining questions was based on 97 responses.

Questions 43-45 focused on the evaluation of pedagogy student teachers. At all but one (98.97%) of the institutions requiring student teaching, this teaching was evaluated (see Table 47). Personal observations (86.60%) and video observations (51.55%) were the most common forms of evaluation (see Table 50). Nine respondents listed other formats for evaluation, including self-evaluation by the student teacher (three responses), in-class teaching demonstrations (two responses), peer evaluation (two responses), weekly logs (one response), an end of semester recital (one response), and a personal conference between student and teacher while watching the teaching video tape (one response).

Table 47

Institutions that Evaluate the Teaching of Pedagogy Students

Response	Respondents (n=97)	Percentage
Teaching is evaluated	96	98.97
Teaching is not evaluated	1	1.03

Table 48

Format Used by the Pedagogy Instructor for Evaluating the Pedagogy Student Teacher

Evaluation Format	Respondents (n=97)	Percentage
Personal observation	84	86.60
Video cassette observation	50	51.55
Audio cassette observation	11	11.34
Other	9	9.28
No Response=5		

The pedagogy teacher's comments were usually given to the student teacher by means of a personal conference (82.47%) or written communication (67.01%) (see Table 49). Other means of giving evaluation comments were in-class discussion (nine responses), email messages (two responses), a message recorded on audio tape (one response), and a grade given for the student teaching (one response).

Table 49

Form of Evaluation Comments Given to the Pedagogy Student

Comment Format	Respondents (n=97)	Percentage
Personal conference	80	82.47
Written evaluation	65	67.01
Other	12	12.37

Question 46 sought information on the settings available for observation and student teaching. Respondents specified whether each setting was "unavailable," "available but not required," or "required" for both teaching and observation. Table 50 presents these data in detail. Two respondents offered general statements about student teaching and observation experiences. One stated that pedagogy students simply bring their students to class for teaching and observation. The other commented: "All the students are assigned one to two students each, one peer and one whomever. Since this is a one-credit course, we can't require them to do too much." Neither of the respondents answered any further questions. Therefore, data analysis for the remaining questions was based on 95 responses.

For required student teaching experiences, "college or university preparatory/laboratory division" was cited most often (45.26%). "College or university group piano classes" (27.37%), "local independent piano teachers" (17.89%), and "college or university applied lessons" (13.68%) were required much less frequently. As a required observation setting, "local independent piano teachers" (49.47%) was reported most often, followed closely by "college or university group piano classes" (48.42%) and "college or university preparatory/laboratory program" (44.21%).

Other resources for observation and/or teaching included the following: community music school (two responses); students from the community (two responses); another college's preparatory division (one response); the pedagogy professor's private studio (one response); pre-college teaching of university faculty, not through a preparatory program (one response); and lessons at a local music store (one response).

Table 50

Available Settings for Student Teaching and Observation of Teaching

Setting	*Teaching:* Unavailable %	Available %	Required % (n=95)	*Observing:* Unavailable %	Available %	Required %
College/university laboratory program	23.16	10.53	45.26	22.11	10.53	44.21
Local independent piano teachers	18.95	31.58	17.89	6.32	25.26	49.47
College/university group piano	18.95	31.58	27.37	1.05	32.63	48.42
College/university applied piano	28.42	27.37	13.68	4.21	38.95	34.74

In Question 47, respondents reported the types of beginning students taught and observed in an individual setting as part of the pedagogy core course (see Table 51). The pedagogy student most often taught individual lessons for average-age beginners (84.21%), followed by older beginners (51.58%), and pre-school beginners (38.95%). These types of students were also most frequently observed. Observation of individual lessons for average-age beginners was reported by 83.16% of responding institutions, while observation of individual lessons for older beginners and pre-school students was indicated by 66.32% and 56.84% of respondents respectively.

Table 51

Institutions Where Pedagogy Students Teach or Observe Individual Instruction of Beginning Students

Type of Student	Teach % (n=95)	Observe % (n=95)
Pre-school beginner	38.95	56.84
Average-age beginner	84.21	83.16
Older beginner	51.58	66.32
College non-music major	29.47	36.84
College non-keyboard music major	30.53	41.05
Adult/Hobby	28.42	33.68

In Question 48, respondents provided information on the teaching and observation of group instruction for beginning students. As shown in Table 52, average-age students were again taught most often (44.21%); all other types of students were taught at approximately one-fourth or fewer institutions. Pedagogy students observed group lessons for college non-keyboard music majors at almost one-half (49.47%) of responding schools; this was followed closely by group lessons for pre-school beginners (44.21%) and group lessons for college non-music majors (43.16%).

Table 52

Institutions Where Pedagogy Students Teach or Observe Group Instruction of Beginning Students

Type of Student	Teach % (n=95)	Observe % (n=95)
Pre-school beginner	14.74	44.21
Average-age beginner	44.21	52.63
Older beginner	13.68	28.42
College non-music major	26.32	43.16
College non-keyboard music major	22.11	49.47
Adult/Hobby	8.42	18.95

In Question 49, respondents supplied information on the types of intermediate students taught or observed in an individual environment. Individual lessons for pre-college intermediate students were taught at 46.32% of institutions and observed at 70.53% of institutions; individual lessons for college non-music majors were taught at 25.26% of institutions and observed at 33.68% of institutions; and individual lessons for college non-keyboard music majors were taught at 23.16% of institutions and observed at 30.53% of institutions. Table 53 gives further data on the teaching and observation of intermediate students in an individual setting.

Table 53

Institutions Where Pedagogy Students Teach or Observe Individual Instruction of Intermediate Students

Type of Student	Teach % (n=95)	Observe % (n=95)
Pre-college	46.32	70.53
College non-music major	25.26	33.68
College non-keyboard music major	23.16	30.53
College keyboard major	8.42	27.37
Adult/Hobby	22.11	29.47

Question 50 sought data on the teaching and observation of group instruction for intermediate students (see Table 54). Pedagogy students taught pre-college intermediate students in groups at 20% of responding schools and intermediate-level college non-music majors in groups at 11.58% of responding schools. The group teaching of all other types of intermediate students occurred at less than 10% of responding schools. Group lessons for pre-college intermediate students were observed at 28.42% of responding institutions. Approximately one-quarter (25.26%) of respondents reported that pedagogy students observe group lessons for intermediate-level college non-music majors and group lessons for intermediate-level college non-keyboard music majors.

Table 54

Institutions Where Pedagogy Students Teach or Observe Group Instruction of Intermediate Students

Type of Student	Teach % (n=95)	Observe % (n=95)
Pre-college	20.00	28.42
College non-music major	11.58	25.26
College non-keyboard music major	9.47	25.26
College keyboard major	4.21	9.47
Adult/Hobby	6.32	7.37

In Question 51, respondents indicated whether pedagogy students taught or observed advanced students in an individual setting (see Table 55). Individual lessons for advanced pre-college students were taught at 14.74% of responding institutions; individual lessons for all other types of advanced students were taught at less than 10% of institutions. Observation of individual instruction of advanced-level pre-college students, college keyboard majors, and non-college keyboard majors occurred at 35.79%, 30.53%, and 21.05% of responding schools respectively.

Table 55

Institutions Where Pedagogy Students Teach or Observe Individual Instruction of Advanced Students

Type of Student	Teach % (n=95)	Observe % (n=95)
Pre-college	14.74	35.79
College non-music major	8.42	13.68
College non-keyboard music major	6.32	21.05
College keyboard major	4.21	30.53
Adult/Hobby	5.26	15.79

In Question 52, respondents supplied information on the observation and teaching of group lessons for advanced students. As shown in Table 56, pedagogy students taught group lessons for advanced students of any type at less than 8% of responding institutions; observing group lessons for advanced college keyboard majors was reported by 13.68% of respondents.

Table 56

Institutions Where Pedagogy Students Teach or Observe Group Instruction of Advanced Students

Type of Student	Teach % (n=95)	Observe % (n=95)
Pre-college	7.37	7.37
College non-music major	3.16	6.32
College non-keyboard music major	3.16	9.47
College keyboard major	4.21	13.68
Adult/Hobby	2.11	2.11

At the end of the survey questionnaire, respondents were given the opportunity to make additional comments on the content of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses. Several respondents made statements concerning student teaching and/or observation experiences at their schools:

> Age and level of students observed and taught varies from one semester to the next according to which independent music teacher the student is working under. Most students are recruiting and teaching adult beginners as part of their teaching experience. Many also teach school-aged students. Master class and group lesson settings are used to fill in gaps with experience teaching all age groups and levels of ability.

> Students are required to teach one student, preferably at beginning levels, for 10 weeks and give two in-class lessons which all observe, and then evaluate as a class.

> Pedagogy II is a new requirement established when we converted from quarters to semesters. I have not yet taught Pedagogy II-and hope to establish some sort of student teaching component within this course. In Pedagogy I they currently only teach a couple of lessons to one of my private, pre-college students.

While student teaching is not an integral part of our one pedagogy course per se, after completion of the course, students can apply to become student teachers in our piano preparatory program where they teach in both group and private settings.

Our student teachers begin teaching in their sophomore year, after completing one semester of piano pedagogy. Student teaching (supervised) lasts two semesters. Students are not required to do student teaching but greater than 90% do it.

One instructor described the teaching opportunities and pedagogy resource center at his/her institution:

Upon completing the core course Piano Pedagogy for two credits, students are able to teach through the Preparatory Department. They are paid at the student teacher rate.

Students are encouraged to continue with two additional semesters of pedagogy in the Internship course. Students teach beginning piano in the electronic lab to a class of 4-6. One private student is also assigned. If college students wish, they may teach additional children for pay through the Preparatory Department. College students plan a recital of their students at the end of the year. College students perform a short piece as well. Refreshments are served-invitations are sent-and many photos are taken!

In all four semesters of pedagogy students must assist at one rehearsal/recital of Preparatory Department students.

We also have a Piano Pedagogy Resource Center with materials that our college students may check out. Complimentary music from publishers is included, as well as materials purchased from an annual $300 budget. Holdings are updated yearly on computer.

Two instructors gave general descriptions of the pedagogy offerings at their institutions:

Our music degree is a B.S. degree with emphasis in either music education, church music, performance, general studies and theory/composition. The B.A. degree in music is a forty hour program as opposed to the 60 B.S. The B.A. degree is combined with a double major. The piano performance students are required to take two semesters of piano pedagogy. Other piano majors can take the courses as electives. We do not have a pedagogy degree and there are no plans to add the degree as a major. This is a liberal arts college and the required numbers of hours beyond the major do not allow adding additional pedagogy hours. I try to cover as much as possible in the two semesters. We have a preparatory school and the students are allowed to teach beginning students after the first semester of pedagogy. This is an option and not a requirement. The fee

is set by the preparatory school, two dollars of which is kept for the preparatory school. The program has proven to be very successful.

Our pedagogy course is part of the program for applied piano. We do not have a pedagogy major but do offer a two-year course for piano majors to learn to teach musicianship skills in the piano lab setting. I and the other piano faculty each spend less than 25% of our time on pedagogy skills and we have one adjunct faculty teaching two classes of first year class piano to music majors. Because our department is small and completely undergraduate, some of the questions were difficult to answer.

One respondent described a cooperative arrangement between local colleges:

Our pedagogy sequence is part of a co-op. Three local colleges combine our students so our classes can be a little larger. Each of us teach a different course in that sequence.

One respondent commented on course content and offered suggestions for further research:

I think that specific questions about what periodicals, books and other supplemental material would be of interest to your research. Also, specific questions about computer software and hardware would be interesting to know. I use the world wide web a lot to review studio policies, look at music organizations, etc. This would be of interest to know.

Another respondent described her research projects concerning independent teachers, as well as additional resources used in pedagogy courses:

I surveyed five of the leading pre-college piano teachers in my state, asking them to provide a "Top Five Tips on Organizing a Studio Recital," and asking them to share copies of their studio recital programs from the past five years. The results were very instructive for my pedagogy students, and provided practical organizational guidelines for them to use themselves. (Most of my students are adults, not "traditional age" college students. They are 25 years or older, and had already done some teaching. I teach at an urban commuter campus.)

I surveyed 143 pre-college piano teachers statewide on business practices. The results were instructive for my pedagogy students. Billing procedures, range and average of lesson fees, technology fees, music fees. Accounting, software, etc.

I use an extensive reserve book list in the library, to supplement the course text. Also require reading on The Piano Education Page.

Summary of the Data:

Profile of the Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course

The typical undergraduate piano pedagogy core course is offered once every two years for 2.19 semester credits. The course, titled "Piano Pedagogy," meets 1.86 times a week for 68.24 minutes, and enrolls 6.29 students. The course is required for all piano performance majors, and the majority of the students are piano performance majors. *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* by Uszler, Gordon, and Smith (2000) is the required textbook; students are also required to obtain the instructor's syllabus.

The pedagogy core course instructor is a female between the ages of 46 and 55 who holds a full-time appointment at the rank of Professor. She holds a doctoral degree in piano performance. Her teaching experience includes 18.90 years at the college level and 19.39 years as an independent studio teacher. Piano pedagogy constitutes less than 25% of her teaching load; other responsibilities include applied piano and group piano. She personally gives the teaching of piano pedagogy high priority within her teaching load.

The pedagogy core course primarily addresses teaching strategies for pre-college elementary students and intermediate students in a private instruction setting. Teaching techniques for rhythm, technique, hand position, practicing, dynamics, fingering, pedaling, music reading, phrasing, articulation, ton, sight-reading, memorization, and style are covered. Teaching literature categories most often studied are average-age beginning methods, intermediate solo standard literature, supplementary solo literature for the elementary student, and intermediate solo educational literature.

Content areas included in the core course are motivation, selecting teaching literature, qualities of a good teacher, lesson planning, developing goals and objectives for the piano lesson, policies and procedures for the independent piano studio, overview of many average-age beginner methods, organizational skills for teaching, philosophy of piano teaching, preparing students for recitals, and diagnostic skills to evaluate the piano student. Other than the metronome, visual aids are not emphasized in the core course. Reading assignments and a survey of beginning methods are the major course assignments.

Pedagogy students observe both group and private instruction as a core course requirement, 5.21 hours prior to student teaching and 5.77 hours during student teaching. Applied piano faculty and independent teachers are most often observed. Pedagogy students usually observe private lessons for average-age beginning students and private lessons for pre-college intermediate students.

Student teaching is also a requirement of the undergraduate piano pedagogy core course. Student teaching takes place in the college or university laboratory or preparatory department, and most often includes private lessons for average-age beginners and private lessons for older beginners. The pedagogy instructor evaluates this student teaching by means of a personal observation and gives comments to the pedagogy student in a personal conference.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to provide information on the content of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses at American colleges and universities. Specifically, the study sought to identify the educational background, teaching experience, and current teaching responsibilities of the pedagogy instructor; the format of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses; the materials used in undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses; the topics covered in core courses and the amount of emphasis given to each; and the observation and teaching experiences included in undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses.

Data for the study were collected through a 52-item questionnaire sent to 321 piano pedagogy instructors listed in the *College Music Society 2000-2001 Directory of Music Faculties in Colleges and Universities in the United States and Canada.* The study population was limited to instructors at four-year, NASM-accredited institutions in the United States. If more than one pedagogy instructor was listed at an institution, the survey was sent to the faculty member of highest rank and/or appointment. The first mailing took place on April 8, 2002. A reminder letter was sent to all subjects one week later; an additional reminder letter and a second copy of the survey were sent to non-respondents three weeks later. A total of 163 (50.78%) responses were received. Eight of these were returned unanswered, due to reasons such as the retirement or relocation of the pedagogy instructor, or the discontinuation or lack of an undergraduate piano pedagogy core course. Another eight respondents replied by email, stating that an

undergraduate piano pedagogy core course was not offered at their institution. Therefore, analysis of the data was based on the remaining 147 valid returns (45.79%). Because this number represents less than half of the target population, the results of this study may not be an accurate reflection of undergraduate piano pedagogy core course content at all four-year, NASM-accredited institutions.

The Institutions

The data revealed that the majority of responding institutions (61.90%) were public institutions. Total institutional enrollments during the 2001-2002 academic year ranged from under 500 students to over 35,000 students, with the largest percentage of responding schools (32.65%) enrolling 1001-5000 students. Responding institutions enrolled an average of 11.68 piano performance majors and 2.02 piano pedagogy majors/emphases. However, slightly over half (51.02%) of responding schools reported that no pedagogy majors/emphases were enrolled.

Only one full-time faculty member taught undergraduate piano pedagogy at approximately three-quarters of the responding institutions. At about the same number of schools, no part-time faculty members taught undergraduate piano pedagogy. Most institutions (70.07%) offered no undergraduate degree with an *emphasis* in piano pedagogy; likewise, the majority of schools (84.35%) did not offer an undergraduate degree with a *major* in piano pedagogy. The vast majority of responding institutions (85.71%) did offer an undergraduate piano pedagogy core course.

The Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Instructor

The majority of pedagogy instructors (85.71%) held full-time appointments. The rank of Professor was most common (31.75%), followed closely by Associate Professor

(30.16%). Approximately two-thirds of pedagogy instructors were female and the greatest percentage of instructors (38.89%) was between the ages of 46 and 55.

A doctoral degree was held by the majority (70.63%) of pedagogy instructors, most of these (62.92%) in piano performance. Of all highest degrees earned, 61.90% were solely performance degrees; only about one-fourth of instructors held degrees in pedagogy or performance and pedagogy. The typical pedagogy instructor had taught a total of 26.64 years. College teaching was reported by 98.41% of respondents, with an average of 18.90 years; three-fourths of respondents had independent studio teaching experience, with an average of 19.39 years; and 43.65% of respondents had taught in preparatory departments, with an average of 13.73 years.

The largest number of pedagogy instructors (64.29%) indicated that piano pedagogy constituted 24% or less of their current teaching load. Over 90% of respondents also taught applied piano, and 69.84% of respondents taught group piano. Almost two-thirds of respondents reported that they personally gave the teaching of piano pedagogy high priority within their teaching responsibilities.

The Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s): Format and Materials

The number of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses offered at responding institutions ranged from one to seven, with an average of 2.48. The most common course titles were Piano Pedagogy, Piano Pedagogy I, and Piano Pedagogy II. Almost half of pedagogy core courses were offered for two credits. The average core course met 1.86 times a week for 68.24 minutes, was offered every two years, and enrolled 6.29 students. Piano performance majors outnumbered piano pedagogy emphases/majors and other majors. Most pedagogy instructors (59.52%) perceived enrollment in pedagogy courses at

their institutions to be remaining stable. At almost three-fourths of responding schools, all undergraduate piano performance majors were required to take the undergraduate piano pedagogy core course(s).

A published piano pedagogy textbook and the instructor's syllabus were required print materials at 83.33% of institutions. Books from an average-age beginning method and professional journals were required at just over half of responding schools. *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* (Uszler, Gordon, & Smith, 2000) was the print material reported most frequently for core courses one through four; in second place was *How to Teach Piano Successfully* (Bastien, 1995).

Participation in professional activities was required in about 50% or fewer piano pedagogy courses. Areas of professional growth most often included were attendance at area piano teaching workshops (50.79%) and subscription to *Clavier* (43.65%). The following professional activities were required at 25% or less of responding institutions: subscription to *Keyboard Companion*, membership in state and national music teachers associations, membership in local music teachers associations, and attendance at local professional music teachers meetings.

Pedagogy Core Course Content: Topics

Virtually all pedagogy core courses (99.19%) addressed *teaching strategies* for pre-college elementary students and pre-college intermediate students in an individual setting. These were followed by teaching strategies for pre-college elementary students in a group setting (86.18%), preschool students (86.18%), and adult hobby students (82.11%). Only teaching strategies for pre-college elementary students in a private setting and pre-college intermediate students in a private setting received mean Likert

ratings of 3.00 or higher. Teaching strategies for pre-college advanced students and college group piano were discussed least frequently.

The following *teaching techniques* were included in pedagogy core courses at more than 90% of responding institutions and received a mean Likert rating of 3.00 or more: rhythm, technique, hand position, practicing, dynamics, fingering, pedaling, music reading, phrasing, articulation, tone, sight reading, memorization, and style. Pedagogy instructors were least likely to cover teaching techniques for computer technology, electronic keyboard technology, jazz/blues/pop music, and score reading.

Categories of *teaching literature* addressed at over 90% of institutions and receiving mean Likert ratings of over 3.00 were average-age beginning methods, intermediate solo standard literature, supplementary solo literature for the elementary student, and intermediate solo educational literature. Solo and ensemble literature for advanced pre-college students and adult group piano received the least coverage and emphasis.

The following *content areas* were covered at over 90% of responding schools and were given at least a 3.00 mean Likert rating: motivating the piano student, selecting teaching literature, qualities of a good teacher, lesson planning, developing goals and objectives for the piano lesson, policies and procedures for the independent piano studio, overview of many average-age beginner methods, organizational skills for teaching, philosophy of piano teaching, and diagnostic skills to evaluate the piano student. Included in less than half of pedagogy core courses were in-depth study of one college group piano text and in-depth study of one adult/hobby method.

The metronome was the only teaching aid discussed at over 90% of responding institutions. No teaching aid was given a mean Likert rating of 3.00 or higher. Visual aids, games, computer software for music instruction, electronic keyboards, and electronic keyboard laboratories were studied in more than three-quarters of pedagogy core courses. The projects/assignments most often required in pedagogy core courses were reading assignments and a survey of beginning methods.

Pedagogy Core Course Content: Experiences

Observation of teaching was required at the vast majority (91.06%) of responding institutions. At these institutions, pedagogy students were required to observe from zero to thirty-two hours prior to student teaching, with an average of 5.21 hours. Teaching requirements during student teaching ranged from zero to thirty hours, with an average of 5.77 hours. At most (83.93%) institutions, pedagogy students observed both group and private instruction. The teachers most commonly observed were applied piano faculty (75.89%) and independent piano teachers (66.96%).

Over three-fourths of responding institutions required student teaching as part of the undergraduate piano pedagogy core course. At almost all schools (98.97%), this teaching was evaluated. The pedagogy instructor usually observed the student teacher in person (86.60%) and gave comments in a personal conference setting (82.47%). Videocassette observation (51.55%) and written evaluations (67.01%) were utilized less often.

The college or university laboratory/preparatory program (45.26%) was the setting most often required for student teaching. Pedagogy students rarely were required to teach in the college or university group piano program, in the studios of independent

teachers, or in college or university applied lessons. The most common settings for student teaching were as follows: studios of local independent teachers (49.47%); the college or university group piano program (48.42%); and the college or university laboratory/preparatory program (44.21%).

Private instruction of average-age beginners (84.21%) was by far the most common student teaching experience required in the core course. 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%) were taught much less often. Pedagogy students rarely taught college students or adult/hobby students.

Observation experiences of the pedagogy core course again emphasized private lessons for average-age beginners (83.16%). Private lessons for pre-college intermediate students (70.53%); private lessons for older beginners (66.32%); private lessons for pre-school beginners (56.84%); and group lessons for average-age beginners (52.63%) were also observed at over half of responding institutions. Lessons for adult/hobby students were observed least often.

Conclusions

Data collected from the survey questionnaire led to the following conclusions:

The Institutions

1. Most institutions (85.71%) offer an undergraduate piano pedagogy core course.
2. At most schools (74.15%), one full-time faculty member is responsible for the teaching of undergraduate piano pedagogy.

3. Most institutions (70.07%) do not offer an undergraduate degree in piano pedagogy. Similarly, most institutions (84.35%) do not offer an undergraduate emphasis in piano pedagogy.
4. Most schools enroll far more piano performance majors (11.68) than piano pedagogy majors/emphases (2.02).

The Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Instructor

5. The typical piano pedagogy instructor is female, between the ages of 46 and 55, and holds a full-time appointment at the rank of Professor.
6. Most pedagogy instructors (70.63%) hold a doctoral degree, the majority of these (62.92%) in performance.
7. The typical pedagogy instructor possesses considerable teaching experience at both the college and pre-college levels. Almost all pedagogy instructors (98.41%) have taught at the college level, with an average of 18.90 years, and three-fourths of pedagogy instructors have taught independently, with an average of 19.39 years.
8. Piano pedagogy comprises a small portion (24% or less) of the teaching load of most instructors (64.29%). However, the majority of instructors (65.08%) personally give the teaching of pedagogy high priority within their teaching responsibilities.
9. In addition to piano pedagogy courses, pedagogy instructors usually teach applied piano (91.27%) and group piano (69.84%).
10. Compared to the typical piano pedagogy instructor of 1988 (as described by Kowalchyk), the typical piano pedagogy instructor at the beginning of

the 21st century is more educated (she holds a doctorate rather than a master's degree) and holds a higher rank (Professor rather than Associate Professor). However, she is similar in age, teaching experience, and current teaching responsibilities to the pedagogy instructor of 1988. Most notably, the typical piano pedagogy instructor still holds a degree in piano performance, not piano pedagogy.

The Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s): Format and Materials

11. There is a great diversity in the number of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses offered (between one and seven) at responding institutions. Moreover, there are differing ideas as to what constitutes a "core course," as evidenced by the wide variety of pedagogy core course titles listed.
12. The greatest percentage of institutions (42.86%) offer only one undergraduate piano pedagogy core course.
13. The typical undergraduate piano pedagogy core course is titled "Piano Pedagogy," meets 1.86 times a week for 68.24 minutes, and is offered once every two years for two semester credits.
14. Since the typical core course is quite small (6.29 students), pedagogy students most likely receive much individual attention.
15. The typical pedagogy core course enrolls more piano performance majors (3.63) and other majors (2.24) than piano pedagogy majors/emphases (1.48).
16. Most pedagogy instructors (59.52%) describe pedagogy core course enrollment as remaining stable.

17. At almost three-fourths of institutions, all piano performance majors are required to take the undergraduate piano pedagogy core course(s).

18. A published piano pedagogy textbook and the instructor's syllabus are required at the great majority (83.33%) of institutions.

19. *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* (Uszler, Gordon, & Smith, 2000) is by far the text used most often in core courses one through four, followed by *How to Teach Piano Successfully* (Bastien, 1995). The same texts were used most frequently in graduate level pedagogy core courses (Milliman, 1992), which points to a need for materials written specifically for undergraduate and graduate level courses.

20. Participation in areas of professional growth is required at only about 50% or less of responding institutions. Most often included are attendance at area piano teaching workshops (50.79%) and subscription to *Clavier* (43.65%). Subscription to *Keyboard Companion*, membership in music teachers' organizations, and attendance at professional music teachers meetings are required at about 25% or fewer institutions.

Pedagogy Core Course Content: Topics

21. In general, the findings of the current study show that undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses concur with NCPP and NASM guidelines (National Association of Schools of Music, 1993; Uszler & Larimer, 1984). However, the following areas emphasized in both sets of guidelines are not given highest priority by pedagogy instructors: learning theories and their specific applications to piano teaching; and teaching

strategies, teaching literature, content areas, and observation and student teaching experiences related to group instruction.

22. Almost all undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses (99.19%) include teaching strategies for pre-college elementary students and pre-college intermediate students in an individual instruction setting. These are followed by teaching strategies for pre-college elementary students in a group setting (86.18%), preschool students (86.18%), and adult/hobby students (82.11%). This implies that pedagogy students are primarily being trained to teach the student groups traditionally found in an independent studio (pre-college elementary and intermediate students), but are also receiving training to teach the new student groups of the 21st century (preschool and adult/hobby students).

23. Teaching strategies for advanced students in private and group settings, intermediate students in a group setting, and college group piano for music majors and non-music majors receive much more coverage and emphasis in graduate piano pedagogy core courses (Milliman, 1992) than in undergraduate piano pedagogy courses. Teaching strategies for elementary students in private and group instruction, preschool students, adult/hobby students receive similar coverage and emphasis in graduate and undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses.

24. Over 90% of pedagogy instructors address teaching techniques for rhythm, technique, hand position, practicing, dynamics, fingering, pedaling, music reading, phrasing, articulation, tone, sight-reading, memorization, and

style. Most instructors address teaching techniques for ornamentation, improvisation, harmonization, transposition, ear training, playing by ear, computer technology, electronic keyboard technology, and jazz/blues/pop music. Score reading is included by less than half of instructors. This indicates that pedagogy instructors consider teaching techniques related to technical development, reading, performance, and musicality most important for pedagogy students, while teaching techniques associated with functional skills, improvisation/creative skills, non-classical literature, and technology are viewed as less crucial.

25. Categories of teaching literature related to teaching elementary and intermediate students in an individual setting (average-age beginning methods, intermediate solo standard literature, supplementary solo literature for the elementary student, and intermediate solo educational literature) receive the most coverage and emphasis in undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses. Pre-school methods, adult/hobby methods, and ensemble literature for elementary and intermediate level students are included less frequently and receive less stress. Literature categories related to teaching advanced students and college group piano receive the least coverage and emphasis. Again, this shows that undergraduate pedagogy courses focus primarily on the teaching of elementary and intermediate students in private settings; address the teaching of preschool students, adult/hobby students, and elementary and intermediate students

in a group setting to a lesser extent; and give the least attention to the teaching of advanced students and college group piano.

26. In general, literature categories for elementary students and preschool students receive more coverage and emphasis in undergraduate pedagogy core courses than in graduate pedagogy core courses. Literature categories for intermediate students and adult/hobby students receive slightly less coverage and emphasis at the undergraduate level than at the graduate level. Literature for teaching advanced students and college group piano are given considerably less coverage and emphasis in undergraduate core courses than in graduate core courses (Milliman, 1992).

27. Content areas addressed in over 90% of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses are motivation; selecting teaching literature; qualities of a good teacher; lesson planning; developing goals and objectives for the piano lesson; policies and procedures for the independent piano studio; overview of many average-age beginner methods; organizational skills for piano teaching; philosophy of piano teaching; preparing students for recitals; and diagnostic skills to evaluate the piano student. Content areas addressed at most institutions are learning theories; advantages/disadvantages of private lessons; preferred editions of intermediate standard keyboard music; reference books on pedagogical topics; advantages/disadvantages of group lessons; advantages/disadvantages of group lessons in conjunction with private

lessons; overview of professional music organizations/journals; music technology/current trends; performance anxiety; careers for pianists; in-depth study of one average-age beginner method; overview of many preschool methods; preferred editions of advanced standard keyboard music; study of group dynamics; history of piano pedagogy; medical problems of pianists; overview of many adult/hobby methods; history of keyboard technique; adjudication; copyright laws; overview of many college group piano texts; purchase, care, and maintenance of keyboard instruments; composition of elementary level teaching pieces; preparing students for college entrance; and in-depth study of one pre-school method. Covered at fewer than half of responding institutions are in-depth study of one college group piano text and in-depth study of one adult/hobby text.

28. Teaching aids are discussed far less often and are given much less emphasis than other content areas addressed in the pedagogy core course. The metronome is the only teaching aid addressed in over 90% of core courses. Discussed in most core courses are visual aids, games, computer software for music instruction, electronic keyboards, electronic keyboard laboratories, audio tape recorders, computers, and video tape recorders. Less than half of pedagogy core courses address the following teaching aids: sequencers; computer software for word processing, spreadsheets, and databases; overhead projectors; and visualizers.

29. Technology-related topics are not given high priority by pedagogy instructors. "Computer technology" and "electronic keyboard technology" were ranked 21st and 22nd respectively out of 24 teaching techniques; music technology/current trends was ranked 19th out of 38 content areas; and all technology-related teaching aids were covered in 75% or fewer pedagogy courses and received mean Likert ratings of 2.75 or less.
30. Reading assignments and a survey of beginning methods are required projects/assignments in more than 90% of pedagogy core courses. The following projects/assignments are included in most core courses: written assignments; survey of teaching literature; lecture/demonstration of teaching literature; notebook of class notes and materials; independent studio management project; and correlating activities with a piano method. Required at less than half of responding institutions are a research paper; a cardfile/database of teaching literature; and a cardfile/database of reference books.

Pedagogy Core Course Content: Experiences

31. Observation and teaching requirements of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses underscore the primary emphasis placed on the teaching of elementary and intermediate students in an individual instruction setting.
32. Observation of teaching (91.06%) is required at the vast majority of institutions.

33. Observation requirements for the pedagogy core course vary widely, with zero to thirty-two hours required before student teaching, and zero to thirty hours required during student teaching.

34. Undergraduate pedagogy students observe an average of 5.21 hours before student teaching.

35. Undergraduate pedagogy students observe an average of 5.77 hours during student teaching.

36. At the majority of institutions (83.93%), pedagogy students observe both group and private instruction.

37. The types of teachers most often observed by pedagogy students are applied piano faculty, independent piano teachers, and the undergraduate pedagogy instructor(s). Preparatory division faculty and graduate assistants are observed at less than half of institutions.

38. The settings most often required for observation are independent studios, the college or university group piano program, and the college or university laboratory/preparatory program.

39. The types of students and instructional settings usually observed by pedagogy core course students are private lessons for average-age beginners (83.16%) and private lessons for pre-college intermediate students (70.53%). Private lessons for older beginners, private lessons for pre-school beginners, and group lessons for average-age beginners are observed at over half of institutions. In general, instruction of advanced

students, college group piano, and adult/hobby students is observed least often.

40. Student teaching is required at over three-quarters of institutions (78.86%). This suggests that pedagogy instructors are interested in providing practical, hands-on experiences for students in the undergraduate pedagogy core course.

41. The teaching of pedagogy students is evaluated at virtually all institutions (98.97%).

42. Student teaching is usually evaluated by means of a personal observation (86.60%). At over half of institutions, a videocassette observation is also utilized.

43. Evaluation comments are usually given to the pedagogy student via personal conference (82.47%) and written evaluation (67.01%).

44. Although utilized at less than half of responding institutions, the college or university laboratory/preparatory program is by far the setting most often required for student teaching.

45. In the independent studio setting, pedagogy students teach (17.89%) much less often than they observe (49.47%).

46. Private instruction of average-age beginners (83.16%) is by far the most common teaching experience required of pedagogy students. 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%) are

taught much less often. Pedagogy students rarely teach advanced students, college group piano students, and adult/hobby students.

Recommendations for Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Curricula

Based on the data collected and conclusions drawn, the following recommendations are made for improvement in undergraduate piano pedagogy curricula, materials, and teacher training:

Recommendations for Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Curricula

1. A study of learning theories and their specific applications to piano teaching should form the basis of the undergraduate piano pedagogy core course. These theories can be revisited and explored in greater depth as the teaching of different ages and levels of students is addressed in the core course.
2. Undergraduate piano pedagogy students should be prepared for group teaching, and be made aware of its pedagogical and financial advantages. This is especially important since most pedagogy students were not exposed to group instruction in their own early piano study.
3. Undergraduate pedagogy courses should not neglect issues related to teaching pre-college advanced students. This training is of particular necessity for pedagogy students who do not pursue graduate degrees, as many of these students become independent teachers. Teaching strategies for advanced students and selection and sequencing of advanced repertoire are best covered in the pedagogy core course; however, close communication with applied piano faculty can determine the extent to

which topics such as preferred editions of advanced literature, style, ornamentation, memorization, performance anxiety, and musician wellness are covered in applied lessons, studio classes, and piano literature courses.

4. Undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses should include an orientation to teaching preschool students and adult students, as these groups are pursuing piano study in increasing numbers.
5. Technology-related topics should be given greater priority in the undergraduate piano pedagogy course. Even though most of today's undergraduate students are technology-savvy, they are probably not familiar with specific applications of technology for piano teaching.
6. Teaching techniques for improvisation, functional skills (harmonization, transposition, ear training, and playing by ear), and jazz/pop/blues music should be given greater priority in the pedagogy core course. This will prepare pedagogy students to develop students who are well-rounded musicians, able to play a wide variety of musical styles.
7. Pedagogy instructors should form strong relationships with successful local independent teachers. These professionals are a valuable resource for observation experiences, student teaching requirements, and information on topics concerning independent studio management.
8. Participation in professional activities should be incorporated into the undergraduate piano pedagogy core course. The knowledge gained from membership in music teachers' organizations, attendance at local piano

teaching workshops, and subscription to professional journals can help increase pedagogy students' awareness of issues crucial to their future success as piano teachers.

9. When the undergraduate piano pedagogy core course is limited to one semester, the curriculum should not be restricted to the teaching of beginning students, but should center on topics relevant to the teaching of students of all ages and levels. Appropriate topics include learning theories, developing a teaching philosophy, motivation, literature selection and sequencing, and lesson planning.

10. Since the majority of pedagogy core course students are performance majors, pedagogy instructors should strive to make course topics relevant to the students' performance studies when possible. For example, learning theories can be related to the students' own learning, practice, and performance of the advanced repertoire.

Recommendations for Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Materials

11. Textbooks and other materials should be written specifically for undergraduate level piano pedagogy courses.

12. Pedagogy instructors should require students to purchase textbooks and other course materials. This will ensure that pedagogy students have print resources to refer to in their future teaching careers; in addition, this may increase the likelihood that these items remain in print and are revised as needed.

Recommendations for Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Teacher Training

13. Since piano pedagogy usually constitutes a small portion of a college or university teaching load, doctoral students in piano pedagogy should be prepared to teach other music courses including applied piano, group piano, piano literature, music theory, and accompanying. Doctoral piano pedagogy majors must also maintain or develop strong performance skills, so that they are competitive with performance majors when applying for jobs that include the teaching of piano pedagogy. Similarly, doctoral performance majors should be prepared to teach piano pedagogy. At the minimum, this can be accomplished through piano pedagogy coursework and experience teaching pre-college elementary, intermediate, and advanced level students.

14. Graduate level piano pedagogy courses, particularly those enrolling doctoral students, should include a survey of undergraduate piano pedagogy curricula and materials. Observation of and student teaching in undergraduate piano pedagogy courses should also be incorporated, when appropriate and possible.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the findings of the current study, it is recommended that future research investigate the following:

1. The sequencing of topics and experiences in undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses.
2. Recent piano pedagogy graduates' perceptions of their preparation to teach piano.
3. Independent piano teachers' perceptions of useful skills and understandings.
4. Specific uses of music and computer technology by independent piano teachers.
5. The development, implementation, and evaluation of an internship program pairing pedagogy students with independent piano teachers.

In future survey research involving piano pedagogy instructors, there are several precautions that might be taken to eliminate some of the weaknesses of the present study. The relatively low response rate of the current study might be attributed to the time of year at which the questionnaire was distributed and the use of mailed questionnaires instead of an online survey. The questionnaire in the current study was mailed in April, a busy time for many college and university faculty members. In future studies, distributing the questionnaire early in a semester may increase the response rate. In addition, offering an online version of the questionnaire may garner more responses, as many individuals find this format more efficient.

An additional problem facing researchers in the field of piano pedagogy is the lack of a reliable directory of pedagogy instructors. Although they were listed as teaching piano pedagogy in the College Music Society Directory, several subjects replied by email or sent unanswered questionnaires stating that a pedagogy course was not offered at their institution. It is possible that this was also the case with some of the non-respondents. In the past, researchers were able to use the directory of pedagogy programs published by The National Conference on Pedagogy as a means of contacting pedagogy instructors. Hopefully, with the reactivation of this organization as the National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy, a similar directory will again be published.

A second weakness of the present study was the relatively low Cronbach's Alpha values for some questionnaire item clusters (see Appendix A). All item clusters compared a teaching literature category and a content area. For example, "Teaching literature: Average-age beginning methods" and "Content Area: Overview of many average-age methods" were compared. Low reliability rates may be due to the fact that some instructors may cover literature categories by means of an overview of many methods, while other instructors may consider in-depth study of one method sufficient study of a literature category. In future studies, researchers should carefully build equivalent items into the survey, so that reliability may be accurately tested.

Research in the field of piano pedagogy has grown considerably in recent decades. The present study, along with previous studies concerning pedagogy curricula and the pedagogy instructor, provides data on the current status of piano pedagogy instruction at American colleges and universities. Continued scientific research, particularly regarding recent pedagogy graduates and independent teachers, is necessary

to determine if pedagogy course content is adequately preparing the piano pedagogy student, upon graduation, to make the transition to successful piano teacher.

REFERENCES

Agay, D. (1981). *Teaching piano* (Vols. 1-2). New York: Yorktown Music Press.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (1996). *Introduction to research in music education* (5th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Baker, M. J. (Ed.). (1981). *Proceedings and Reference of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy, 1980.* Princeton, NJ: The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy.

Barden, C., Kowalchyk, G., & Lancaster, E. L. (1999). *Music for little Mozarts* (Bks. 1-2). Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Barden, C., Kowalchyk, G., & Lancaster, E. L. (2000). *Music for little Mozarts* (Bks. 3-4). Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Bastien, J. (1995). *How to teach piano successfully* (4th ed.). San Diego, CA: Kjos.

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

Bastien, J. S., Bastien, L., & Bastien, L. (1999). *Piano for adults* (Bks. 1-2). San Diego: Kjos.

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

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

Chronister, R. (1988, January). The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy: Whither and wherefore. *American Music Teacher,* 18-21.

Clark, F. (1992). *Questions and answers: Practical advice for piano teachers.* Northfield, IL: The Instrumentalist.

The College Music Society (2001). *Directory of faculties in colleges and universities, U.S. and Canada, 2001-2002.* Missoula, MT: The College Music Society.

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

Faber, N., & Faber, R. (2001). *Adult piano adventures* (Bk. 1). Mississauga, Ontario, Canada: Frederick Harris.

Faber, N., & Faber, R. (2002). *Adult piano adventures* (Bk. 2). Mississauga, Ontario, Canada: Frederick Harris.

Graessle, R. K. (2000, January 1). Teaching adults: The rewards and the challenges. *Piano Pedagogy Forum, 3* (1). Retrieved February 25, 2002, from http://www.music.sc.edu/ea/keyboard/PPF/3.1/3.1.PPFpp.html

Holland, S. S. (1996). Louise Wadley Bianchi's contributions to piano pedagogy (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 57,* 0917.

Jacobsen, 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.

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,* (1989), 0643.

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

Lancaster, E. L., & Renfrow, K. (1999). *Piano 101* (Bks. 1-2). Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Lorince, M. (1998, October/November). Pedagogy Saturday II: Introduction. *American Music Teacher,* 18.

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, 53,* 0749.

Mach, E. (2001). 2000 World Pedagogy Conference. *Clavier, 40* (1), 66.

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. A. (1959). The establishment and early development of beginning piano classes in the public schools, 1915 to 1930 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1959). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 20,* 4680.

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, 53,* 0749.

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 February 25, 2002, from http://www.music.sc.edu/ea/keyboard/PPF/4.1/4.1.PPFtech.html

Music Teachers National Association (1998). *Proceedings from Pedagogy Saturday I.* Cincinnati, OH: Music Teachers National Association.

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

Music Teachers National Association (2000). *Proceedings from Pedagogy Saturday IV.* Cincinnati, OH: Music Teachers National Association.

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

National Association of Schools of Music (1993). *National Association of Schools of Music 1993-1994 Handbook.* Reston, VA: National Association of Schools of Music.

The National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy is Back! (n.d.). Retrieved February 28, 2002, from http://www.francesclarkcenter.org/Conference/Conf2001.html

National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum (2001, January 1). *Piano Pedagogy Forum, 4* (1). Retrieved February 25, 2002, from http://www.music.sc.edu/ea/keyboard/PPF/4.1/4.1.PPFintro.html

Pace, R. (2001). Many changes in piano pedagogy. *Clavier, 40* (1), 25-26.

Palmer, W., Manus, M., & Lancaster, E. L. (2000). *Play piano now!* (Bks. 1-2). Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Pearce, E. T. (1985, January). Issues in piano pedagogy II. *American Music Teacher,* 14-16.

Pike, P. D. (2001). Leisure piano lessons: A case study in lifelong learning (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62,* 2064.

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

Richards, W. H. (1978). A Brief Chronology. *Piano Quarterly, 101,* 12, 14.

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, 54,* 1279.

Skroch, D. (1991). A descriptive and interpretive study of class piano instruction in four-year colleges and universities accredited by the national association of schools of music with a profile of the class piano instructor (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 52,* 3854.

Sturm, C. A., James, M., Jackson, A., & Burns, D. B. (2000, October/November). Celebrating 100 years of progress in American piano teaching. *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. *American Music Teacher,* 24-28.

Upitis, R. (2000). Teaching with technology. In M. Uszler, S. Gordon, and S. M. Smith, *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher* (pp. 197-222). New York: Schirmer Books.

Uszler, M. (1985, January). Issues in piano pedagogy I. *American Music Teacher,* 10-13.

Uszler, M. (1996, October/November). The independent music teacher: Practice and preparation. *American Music Teacher,* 20-29, 62-63.

Uszler, M., Gordon, S., & Mach, E. (1991). *The well-tempered keyboard teacher.* New York: Schirmer Books.

Uszler, M., Gordon, S., & Smith, S. M. (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.

Warwick, D. P., & Lininger, C. A. (1975). *The sample survey: Theory and practice.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

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.

The World Piano Pedagogy Conference. (2001). *Mission statement.* Retrieved February 27, 2002, from http://www.pianopedagogy.com/2001/p21c.htm

Young, J. B. (1999). World Pedagogy Conference. *Clavier, 38* (1), 42.

APPENDIX A

CRONBACH'S ALPHA VALUES FOR QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM CLUSTERS

Item Clusters	Cronbach's Alpha: Present Study	Cronbach's Alpha: Pilot Study
Teaching Literature: Average-age beginning methods Content Area: Overview of many average-age beginner methods	.8173	.8159
Teaching Literature: Preschool methods Content Area: Overview of many preschool methods	.8217	.8654
Teaching Literature: Adult methods Content Area: Overview of many adult methods	.7855	.8127

APPENDIX B

LIST OF PILOT STUDY PARTICIPANTS

1. Alice Ballard
   Doctoral Student in Music Education/Piano Pedagogy
   University of Oklahoma
   Norman, Oklahoma

2. Karen Beres
   Doctoral Student in Piano Performance and Pedagogy
   University of Oklahoma
   Norman, Oklahoma

3. Christopher Fisher
   Doctoral Student in Piano Performance and Pedagogy
   University of Oklahoma
   Norman, Oklahoma

4. Christopher Hahn
   Doctoral Student in Piano Performance and Pedagogy
   University of Oklahoma
   Norman, Oklahoma

5. Erica Keithley
   Doctoral Student in Music Education/Piano Pedagogy
   University of Oklahoma
   Norman, Oklahoma

6. May Lim
   Doctoral Student in Piano Performance and Pedagogy
   University of Oklahoma
   Norman, Oklahoma

7. Charmaine Siagian
   Doctoral Student in Piano Performance and Pedagogy
   University of Oklahoma
   Norman, Oklahoma

8. Thomas Swenson
   Doctoral Student in Music Education/Piano Pedagogy
   University of Oklahoma
   Norman, Oklahoma

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER TO PILOT STUDY PARTICIPANTS

March 29, 2002

Dear Doctoral Student in Piano Pedagogy,

Thank you for agreeing to assist in the development of my survey questionnaire. Enclosed is a copy of the cover letter and survey questionnaire that will be mailed in April to piano pedagogy instructors at four-year, National Association of Schools of Music-member colleges and universities. Please attempt to answer all questions, noting the time required for completion. If you have not taught undergraduate piano pedagogy, please answer the questions based on your experience as an undergraduate pedagogy student, or based on the type of pedagogy program in which you would like to teach in the future.

Please make any suggestions for revision in the margins of the questionnaire or on a separate piece of paper. In particular, please let me know if there are any unclear items, any items that you think have been omitted, or any items that you think are unnecessary. Please return the questionnaire to my mailbox by noon on Tuesday, April 2nd.

Your time and assistance are greatly appreciated!

Sincerely,

Victoria Johnson

APPENDIX D

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

A SURVEY OF UNDERGRADUATE PIANO PEDAGOGY CORE COURSE CONTENT

This study examines undergraduate piano pedagogy core course content. For the purposes of this study, core courses are defined as those courses that are prerequisite for most (usually all) other pedagogy courses in the curriculum and cover general principles of teaching rather than specialized topics. Some institutions may offer a single core course while others may offer a sequence of core courses. Please answer questions related to the entire sequence of core courses.

Section I: Institutional Information

1. Type of institution: (circle number)

   1) PRIVATE
   2) PUBLIC

2. Total enrollment of institution during the 2001-2002 academic year: (circle number)

   1) 0-500
   2) 501-1000
   3) 1001-5000
   4) 5001-10,000
   5) 10,001-20,000
   6) 20,001-35,000
   7) Over 35,000

3. Total number of undergraduate piano performance majors during the 2001-2002 academic year: _____

4. Total number of undergraduate students pursuing an emphasis or a major in piano pedagogy during the 2001-2002 academic year: _____

5. Total number of full-time faculty members teaching undergraduate pedagogy courses during the 2001-2002 academic year (or the last time the course was offered): _____

6. Total number of part-time faculty members teaching undergraduate pedagogy courses during the 2001-2002 academic year (or the last time the course was offered): _____

7. Undergraduate degrees offered with an *emphasis* in piano pedagogy: (circle all that apply)

   1) NONE
   2) BACHELOR OF ARTS
   3) BACHELOR OF MUSIC

8. Undergraduate degrees offered with a *major* in piano pedagogy: (circle all that apply)

   1) NONE
   2) BACHELOR OF ARTS
   3) BACHELOR OF MUSIC

9. Does your institution offer an undergraduate piano pedagogy core course(s)? (Circle number)

   1) YES (If YES, please proceed to the next question)
   2) NO (If NO, please return the survey in the enclosed envelope. Since the purpose of this study is to examine the content of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses, you do not need to answer any further questions.)

Section II: Personal Information

10. Appointment: (circle number)

    1) FULL-TIME
    2) PART-TIME

11. Academic Rank: (circle number)

    1) PROFESSOR
    2) ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
    3) ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
    4) INSTRUCTOR
    5) OTHER (Please specify) _____

12. Age: (circle number)

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

13. Sex: (circle number)

1) FEMALE
2) MALE

14. Highest Degree Earned: (circle number)

1) DOCTORATE (PIANO PEDAGOGY)
2) DOCTORATE (PIANO PERFORMANCE)
3) DOCTORATE (MUSIC EDUCATION)
4) MASTERS (PIANO PEDAGOGY)
5) MASTERS (PIANO PERFORMANCE)
6) MASTERS (MUSIC EDUCATION)
7) OTHER (Please specify) _____

15. Number of years piano teaching experience: _____

16. List years of teaching experience in each category:

_____ PRE-COLLEGE (PUBLIC SCHOOL)
_____ PRE-COLLEGE (PREPARATORY)
_____ PRE-COLLEGE (INDEPENDENT PIANO TEACHER)
_____ COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY
_____ OTHER (Please specify)

17. What percentage of your teaching load is piano pedagogy? (Circle number)

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

18. What other courses do you teach? (Circle all that apply)

1) APPLIED PIANO
2) GROUP PIANO
3) PIANO LITERATURE
4) MUSIC THEORY
5) MUSIC HISTORY
6) MUSIC EDUCATION
7) OTHER (Please specify) _____

19. What priority do you personally give piano pedagogy within your course load? (Circle number)

    1) HIGH PRIORITY
    2) MODERATE PRIORITY
    3) I WOULD PREFER NOT TO TEACH IT

Section III: The Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course(s): Format and Materials

20. Please list the titles and credit value of all undergraduate level piano pedagogy core courses taught at your institution.

	Course Title	*Credits*
#1	_____	
#2	_____	
#3	_____	
#4	_____	
#5	_____	
#6	_____	

21. Are these credits semester hours, quarter hours, or course units? (Please specify) _____

22. How often does each of the courses meet per week? (Please specify)
    _____

23. What is the length (in minutes) of each of the class sessions? (Please specify)
    _____

24. How often are each of these courses offered? (Circle number)

    1) EVERY TERM
    2) ONCE A YEAR
    3) ONCE EVERY TWO YEARS
    4) OTHER (Please specify) _____

25. How many students were enrolled in the undergraduate piano pedagogy core course(s) during the 2001-2002 academic year (or the last time the course was offered)?

Total number of students enrolled _____
Number of piano performance majors enrolled _____
Number of piano pedagogy majors/emphases enrolled _____
Number of other majors enrolled _____

26. The total number of students enrolled in undergraduate pedagogy courses at your institution seems to be: (circle number)

1) INCREASING
2) DECREASING
3) REMAINING STABLE

27. Of whom is (are) the undergraduate piano pedagogy core course(s) required? (Circle all that apply)

1) NOT REQUIRED FOR ANYONE
2) ALL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS PURSUING AN EMPHASIS/MAJOR IN PIANO PEDAGOGY
3) ALL UNDERGRADUATE PIANO PERFORMANCE MAJORS
4) OTHER (Please specify) _____

28. What print materials are required in the pedagogy core course? (Circle all that apply)

1) PUBLISHED PEDAGOGY TEXTBOOK
2) INSTRUCTOR'S SYLLABUS
3) PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS
4) BOOKS FROM AN AVERAGE-AGE BEGINNING PIANO METHOD
5) BOOKS OF INTERMEDIATE LEVEL STANDARD REPERTOIRE
6) OTHER (Please specify) _____

29. Please list titles and authors of print materials that pedagogy students are required to purchase for each of the pedagogy core courses.

Course #1 _____
_____
_____
Course #2 _____
_____
_____

Course #3 _____

_____

_____

Course #4 _____

_____

_____

Course #5 _____

_____

_____

Course #6 _____

_____

_____

30. Please indicate those areas of professional growth in which students are required to participate. (Circle all that apply)

1) JOIN LOCAL PROFESSIONAL MUSIC TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
2) JOIN STATE AND NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL MUSIC TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
3) SUSCRIBE TO *CLAVIER*
4) SUSCRIBE TO *KEYBOARD COMPANION*
5) ATTEND AREA PIANO TEACHING WORKSHOPS
6) ATTEND PROFESSIONAL MUSIC TEACHERS MEETINGS
7) OTHER (Please specify) _____

Section IV: Pedagogy Core Course Content: Topics

The following section seeks to determine the specific topics included in the undergraduate piano pedagogy core course(s), as well as the **importance** placed on each topic.

On the left-hand side of the page, please indicate whether the topic is included in your current core course(s). *(I=Included, NI=Not Included)*

On the right hand side of the page, please circle the number that describes the amount of time and attention given to each topic in a core course. *(1=Little Emphasis, 4=Much Emphasis)*

31. The pedagogy core course addresses **teaching strategies** related to the following levels and classifications of students:

I	NI	Pre-school student 1 2 3 4
I	NI	Pre-college elementary student-private instruction 1 2 3 4
I	NI	Pre-college elementary student-group instruction 1 2 3 4
I	NI	Pre-college intermediate student-private instruction 1 2 3 4
I	NI	Pre-college intermediate student-group instruction 1 2 3 4
I	NI	Pre-college advanced student-private instruction 1 2 3 4
I	NI	Pre-college advanced student-group instruction 1 2 3 4

I=Included
NI=Not Included

1=Little Emphasis
4=Much Emphasis

I NI Group piano for college non-keyboard music majors..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Group piano for college non-music majors..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Adult/hobby student..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Other (Please specify)_____ 1 2 3 4
I NI Other (Please specify)_____ 1 2 3 4

32. The pedagogy core course addresses **teaching techniques** related to the following topics:

I NI Music reading..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Rhythm..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Technique..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Tone Production..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Articulation..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Phrasing..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Hand position..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Fingering..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Pedaling..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Dynamics..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Style..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Ornamentation..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Sight reading..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Harmonization..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Transposition..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Improvisation/creative..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Playing by ear..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Ear training..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Score reading..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Computer technology..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Electronic keyboard technology..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Jazz/blues/pop music..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Practicing..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Memorization..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Other (Please specify)_____ 1 2 3 4
I NI Other (Please specify)_____ 1 2 3 4

33. The pedagogy core course addresses the following categories of **teaching literature:**

I NI Pre-school methods..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Average-age beginning methods..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Supplementary solo literature for the elementary student..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Supplementary ensemble literature for the elementary student..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Adult/hobby beginning methods..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Group piano texts for college non-keyboard music majors..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Group piano texts for college non-music majors..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Supplementary solo literature for adult group piano..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Supplementary ensemble literature for adult group piano..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Intermediate student solo educational literature..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Intermediate student solo standard literature..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Intermediate student ensemble educational literature..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Intermediate student ensemble standard literature..... 1 2 3 4

I=Included
NI=Not Included

1=Little Emphasis
4=Much Emphasis

I NI Advanced student solo literature..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Advanced student ensemble literature..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Other (Please specify)_____ 1 2 3 4
I NI Other (Please specify)_____ 1 2 3 4

34. The pedagogy core course addresses the following **content areas**:

I NI Developing goals and objectives for the piano lesson..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Lesson planning..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Selecting piano teaching literature..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Organizational skills for teaching..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Study of group dynamics..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Qualities of a good teacher..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Learning theories..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Philosophy of piano teaching..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Motivating the piano student..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Diagnostic skills to evaluate the piano student..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Overview of many pre-school music methods..... 1 2 3 4
I NI In-depth study of one pre-school music method..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Overview of many average-age beginner methods..... 1 2 3 4
I NI In-depth study of one average-age beginner method..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Overview of many college group piano texts..... 1 2 3 4
I NI In-depth study of one college group piano text..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Overview of many adult/hobby methods..... 1 2 3 4
I NI In-depth study of one adult/hobby method..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Preferred editions of intermediate-level standard keyboard music..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Preferred editions of advanced-level standard keyboard music..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Composition of elementary-level keyboard teaching pieces..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Policies and procedures for the independent piano studio..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Advantages and disadvantages of private lessons..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Advantages and disadvantages of group lessons..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Advantages and disadvantages of group lessons in conjunction with private lessons..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Careers for pianists..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Medical problems of pianists..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Copyright laws..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Performance anxiety..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Preparing students for recitals..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Adjudication..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Preparing students for college entrance..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Reference books on pedagogical topics..... 1 2 3 4
I NI History of piano pedagogy..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Overview of professional music organizations and music journals..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Purchase, care, and maintenance of keyboard instruments..... 1 2 3 4
I NI History of keyboard technique..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Music technology and current trends in piano pedagogy..... 1 2 3 4
I NI Other (Please specify)_____ 1 2 3 4
I NI Other (Please specify)_____ 1 2 3 4

35. The piano pedagogy core course discusses the use of the following **teaching aids:**

I=Included *1=Little Emphasis*
NI=Not Included *4=Much Emphasis*

I	NI	Games	1 2 3 4
I	NI	Visual aids	1 2 3 4
I	NI	Metronome	1 2 3 4
I	NI	Video tape recorders	1 2 3 4
I	NI	Audio tape recorders	1 2 3 4
I	NI	Overhead projector	1 2 3 4
I	NI	Visualizer	1 2 3 4
I	NI	Computers	1 2 3 4
I	NI	Computer software for music instruction	1 2 3 4
I	NI	Computer software for word processing, spreadsheets, databases	1 2 3 4
I	NI	Electronic keyboards	1 2 3 4
I	NI	Electronic keyboard laboratories	1 2 3 4
I	NI	Sequencers	1 2 3 4
I	NI	Other (Please specify)_____	1 2 3 4
I	NI	Other (Please specify)_____	1 2 3 4

36. What specific course projects/assignments are required of the students in the pedagogy core course? (Circle all that apply)

1) Card file/database of reference books
2) Card file/database of teaching literature
3) Reading assignments
4) Written assignments
5) Notebook of class notes and materials
6) Research paper
7) Survey of beginning methods
8) Survey of teaching literature
9) Lecture/demonstration of teaching literature
10) Correlating activities with a piano method
11) Independent studio management project
12) Other (Please specify) _____
13) Other (Please specify) _____

Section V: Pedagogy Core Course Content: Experiences

37. Are observations of teaching required as part of the core course requirements? (Circle number)

1) YES (If YES, proceed to question 38)
2) NO (If NO, proceed to question 42)

38. What amount of observation is required of the pedagogy student *prior to* student teaching?

Hours per course _____

39. What amount of observation is required of the pedagogy student *during* student teaching?

Hours per course _____

40. What type of teaching do pedagogy students observe? (Circle number)

1) GROUP INSTRUCTION ONLY
2) PRIVATE INSTRUCTION ONLY
3) BOTH GROUP AND PRIVATE INSTRUCTION

41. What teachers do pedagogy students observe when fulfilling observation requirements? (Circle all numbers that apply)

1) UNDERGRADUATE PEDAGOGY INSTRUCTOR(S)
2) APPLIED PIANO FACULTY
3) PREPARATORY DIVISION FACULTY
4) GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANTS
5) INDEPENDENT PIANO TEACHERS
6) OTHER (Please specify) _____
7) OTHER (Please specify) _____

42. Is the pedagogy student required to complete a specific teaching assignment as part of the core course requirement? (Circle number)

1) YES (If YES, proceed to question 43)
2) NO (If NO, skip to the bottom of the last page)

43. Is the teaching of pedagogy students evaluated? (Circle number)

1) YES (If YES, proceed to question 44)
2) NO (If NO, proceed to question 46)

44. What format is used by the pedagogy instructor for evaluating the pedagogy student teacher? (Circle all numbers that apply)

1) PERSONAL OBSERVATION
2) VIDEO CASSETTE OBSERVATION
3) AUDIO CASSETTE OBERVATION
4) OTHER (Please specify) _____

45. In what form are evaluation comments given to the pedagogy student? (Circle all that apply)

1) PERSONAL CONFERENCE
2) WRITTEN EVALUATION
3) OTHER (Please specify) _____

46. Indicate what settings are available for both observation of teaching and student teaching. If available, also indicate whether the resource is required in student teaching and observation for the pedagogy core course. (Circle all numbers that apply under both headings)

1=unavailable
2=available, but not required
3=required

Teach		Observe
1 2 3	College or university preparatory/laboratory program.....	1 2 3
1 2 3	Local independent piano teachers.....	1 2 3
1 2 3	College or university group piano classes.....	1 2 3
1 2 3	College or university applied lessons.....	1 2 3
1 2 3	Other (Please specify)_____	1 2 3
1 2 3	Other (Please specify)_____	1 2 3

47. Do pedagogy students teach or observe *individual instruction* of *beginning students* as part of the pedagogy course? (Circle YES or NO under both headings)

Teach		Observe
YES NO	Pre-school beginner (1-6 years)	YES NO
YES NO	Average-age beginner (7-10 years)	YES NO
YES NO	Older beginner (11-17 years)	YES NO
YES NO	College non-music major	YES NO
YES NO	College non-keyboard music major	YES NO
YES NO	Adult/hobby	YES NO

48. Do pedagogy students teach or observe *group instruction* of *beginning students* as part of the pedagogy course? (Circle YES or NO under both headings)

Teach		Observe
YES NO	Pre-school beginner (1-6 years)	YES NO
YES NO	Average-age beginner (7-10 years)	YES NO
YES NO	Older beginner (11-17 years)	YES NO
YES NO	College non-music major	YES NO
YES NO	College non-keyboard music major	YES NO
YES NO	Adult/hobby	YES NO

49. Do pedagogy students teach or observe *individual instruction* of *intermediate students* as part of the pedagogy course? (Circle YES or NO under both headings)

Teach		Observe
YES NO	Pre-college	YES NO
YES NO	College non-music major	YES NO
YES NO	College non-keyboard music major	YES NO
YES NO	College keyboard major	YES NO
YES NO	Adult/hobby	YES NO

50. Do pedagogy students teach or observe *group instruction* of *intermediate students* as part of the pedagogy course? (Circle YES or NO under both headings)

Teach		Observe
YES NO	Pre-college	YES NO
YES NO	College non-music major	YES NO
YES NO	College non-keyboard music major	YES NO
YES NO	College keyboard major	YES NO
YES NO	Adult/hobby	YES NO

51. Do pedagogy students teach or observe *individual instruction* of *advanced students* as part of the pedagogy course? (Circle YES or NO under both headings)

Teach		Observe
YES NO	Pre-college	YES NO
YES NO	College non-music major	YES NO
YES NO	College non-keyboard music major	YES NO
YES NO	College keyboard major	YES NO
YES NO	Adult/hobby	YES NO

52. Do pedagogy students teach or observe *group instruction* of *advanced students* as part of the pedagogy course? (Circle YES or NO under both headings)

Teach		Observe
YES NO	Pre-college	YES NO
YES NO	College non-music major	YES NO
YES NO	College non-keyboard music major	YES NO
YES NO	College keyboard major	YES NO
YES NO	Adult/hobby	YES NO

Please use the back of this page to make any additional comments regarding the content of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses. Use additional pages, if necessary.

APPENDIX E

COVER LETTER TO PIANO PEDAGOGY INSTRUCTOR

1100 Oak Tree Ave., Apt. O15
Norman, OK 73072

April 8, 2002

Dear Piano Pedagogy Instructor:

I am presently involved in a study investigating the content of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses at four-year, National Association of Schools of Music-member colleges and universities. The results of this study will be the basis of a doctoral dissertation at the University of Oklahoma.

As an expert in the field of piano pedagogy, your assistance in this project would be invaluable. The enclosed questionnaire has been adapted from Ann L. Milliman's dissertation, *A Survey of Graduate Piano Pedagogy Core Course Offerings* (University of Oklahoma, 1992). For the purposes of this study, core courses are defined as those that serve as a prerequisite for most other pedagogy courses in the curriculum, and cover general principles of teaching rather than specialized topics. At some institutions there may be only one undergraduate piano pedagogy core course offered; at other institutions, there may be a series of piano pedagogy core courses in the curriculum.

The enclosed questionnaire will take about 30 minutes to complete. By completing the questionnaire, you are consenting to participate in this study. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. Please do not include any identifying information on the questionnaire. The return envelope contains an identification number that will enable me to cross your name off the mailing list when the questionnaire is returned. The envelope will then be discarded. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire. If you believe another person at your institution may answer the questions more easily, please forward the questionnaire to him or her. A stamped, self-addressed envelope has been included for return of the questionnaire. Please return to me no later than April 29, 2002.

Since there has not been a comprehensive national study of undergraduate piano pedagogy core course content, the results of this study should be helpful to administrators and piano pedagogy instructors, as well as to individuals interested in writing textbooks and other materials for undergraduate pedagogy courses. If you are interested in receiving a report on the results of the study, please email me at vjohnson@ou.edu. Your consideration is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Victoria Johnson

APPENDIX F

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PIANO PEDAGOGY INSTRUCTOR

April 15, 2002

Dear Piano Pedagogy Instructor:

Last week a questionnaire requesting information on the content of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses 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 important to the study, even if your institution does not offer an undergraduate piano pedagogy core course. The results will be the basis for a doctoral dissertation at the University of Oklahoma.

If you believe another person at your institution may answer the survey questions more easily, please forward the questionnaire to him or her. If you did not receive a copy of the questionnaire, please email me at <vjohnson@ou.edu> or call me collect at (405) 329-5236, and I will mail you another copy immediately. Your time and response are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Victoria Johnson
1100 Oak Tree Ave., Apt. O15
Norman, OK 73072

APPENDIX G

SECOND FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PIANO PEDAGOGY INSTRUCTOR

April 29, 2002

Dear Piano Pedagogy Instructor:

Approximately three weeks ago I wrote to you requesting information on the content of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses. As of today I have not yet received your completed questionnaire.

This study is designed to identify the course content of undergraduate piano pedagogy core courses. The data will provide information to institutions interested in establishing or revising undergraduate piano pedagogy courses and programs. Your response is important to the accuracy of my findings, even if your institution does not offer an undergraduate piano pedagogy core course. The results of this study will be the basis for a doctoral dissertation at the University of Oklahoma.

The questionnaire should require approximately thirty minutes to complete. If your institution does not offer an undergraduate piano pedagogy core course, only a few minutes will be necessary to complete the survey. If you believe that another person at your institution could answer the questions more easily, please forward the questionnaire to him or her.

In case your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed. If you have already returned the questionnaire, please do not respond a second time. Your consideration is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Victoria Johnson
1100 Oak Tree Ave., Apt. O15
Norman, OK 73072

APPENDIX H

ADDITIONAL UNDERGRADUATE PIANO PEDAGOGY CORE COURSE TITLES

Piano Pedagogy Course Titles

Advanced Pedagogy

Advanced Piano Pedagogy 1

Advanced Piano Pedagogy 2

Advanced Piano Pedagogy I

Advanced Piano Pedagogy II

Advanced Piano Pedagogy I/II

Advanced Piano Pedagogy and Practicum

Advanced Students/History of Pedagogy

Approaches to Studio Teaching

Beginning Piano Pedagogy

Beginning Teacher

Comparative Piano Methods and Media

Creative Activities for the Piano Teacher

Early Advanced Piano Pedagogy

Elementary Materials and Methods

Elementary Methods

Elementary Piano Pedagogy

Fundamentals of Piano Pedagogy I

Fundamentals of Piano Pedagogy II

How to Teach Beginners

Intermediate and Advanced Piano Pedagogy

Intermediate Materials and Methods

Intermediate Pedagogy

Intermediate Piano Pedagogy

Intermediate Piano Pedagogy and Literature

Intermediate Students

Introduction to Piano Pedagogy

Introduction to Piano Pedagogy I

Introduction to Piano Pedagogy II

Introduction to Piano Pedagogy III

Jazz Pedagogy

Keyboard Pedagogy I

Keyboard Pedagogy II

Keyboard Pedagogy III

Literature for Pre-College Teaching

Management of the Private Studio

Music Methods and Materials

Organization and Competitions for Piano Teachers

Pedagogical Literature

Pedagogical Literature and Methods

Pedagogy in Applied Field

Pedagogy for Children

Pedagogy of Music (Piano)

Pedagogy of Musical Performance

Pedagogy of Piano Technique

Pedagogy Seminar

Piano Pedagogy I/II

Piano Pedagogy A

Piano Pedagogy B

Piano Pedagogy-Introduction

Piano Pedagogy: Introduction and Practicum

Piano Pedagogy-Kinder Keyboard

Piano Pedagogy-Level 1

Piano Pedagogy-Level 2

Piano Pedagogy-Level 3

Piano Pedagogy-Level 4

Piano Pedagogy and Materials (Beginning)

Piano Pedagogy and Materials (Intermediate)

Piano Pedagogy and Practicum 1

Piano Pedagogy and Practicum 2

Piano Pedagogy and Practicum 3

Piano Pedagogy: Resources and Materials

Piano Pedagogy Survey

Piano Repertoire for Teachers

Piano Teaching Preparation

Piano Teaching Procedures I

Piano Teaching Procedures II

Piano Teaching Materials

Piano Teaching Techniques and Materials

Principles of Pedagogy

Seminar in Piano Pedagogy

Seminar in Piano Pedagogy I/II

Studio Teaching I

Studio Teaching II

Survey of Piano Pedagogy 1

Survey of Piano Pedagogy 2

Survey of the Piano Teaching Literature

Survey of Teaching Methods

Suzuki Piano

Teaching Beginning Adults

Teaching Beginning Piano

Topics in Advanced Pedagogy

Topics in Piano Pedagogy

Transfer Students

Undergraduate Piano Pedagogy

Group Pedagogy Course Titles

Class Piano Pedagogy

Group Piano

Group Piano I

Group Piano II

Group Piano Pedagogy

Group Teaching/Research

Pedagogy of Group Piano

Teaching Group Piano

Practicum/Internship Course Titles

Directed Teaching

Field Experience

Guided Observation

Internship

Internship in Independent Studio Teaching

Internship in Piano Pedagogy

Internship in Piano Teaching

Internship in Piano Teaching I

Internship in Piano Teaching II

Internship in Piano Teaching I, II

Junior Internship in Piano Pedagogy

Observation 1

Observation 2

Pedagogy Laboratory I/II

Piano Pedagogy Field Experience

Piano Pedagogy Practicum

Piano Practicum

Piano Practicum I

Piano Practicum II

Piano Practicum I & II

Piano Teaching Practicum

Practicum

Practicum in Piano Pedagogy

Practicum in Piano Pedagogy I

Practicum in Piano Pedagogy II

Practicum (Teaching Group Piano) I, II

Practicum (Teaching Private Piano) I, II

Senior Internship in Piano Pedagogy

Special Topics: Piano Pedagogy (Supervised Teaching)

Studio Teaching in Piano

Supervised Piano Teaching

Supervised Teaching

Teaching Practicum

Miscellaneous Course Titles

Advanced Keyboard Musicianship

Functional Piano I

Functional Piano II

Guided Project

Independent Study

Keyboard Literature I

Keyboard Literature II

Piano Literature

Piano Pedagogy Lecture (Terminal Project and Recital)

Research Semester

Senior Research Paper

APPENDIX I

ADDITIONAL PRINT MATERIALS USED IN THE UNDERGRADUATE PIANO PEDAGOGY CORE COURSE

Course One

Agay, D. (1999). *Easy classics to moderns.* Omnibus Press.

An adult method book

Alfred, Clark, Glover, Faber & Faber

Anna Magdalena Bach Notebook

Average age method-varies year to year

A beginning method book

Bernstein, S. (1981). *With your own two hands.* New York: Schirmer Books.

Clark, F. (1973). *Teaching the music tree.* Secaucus, NJ: Summy-Birchard (Warner Brothers, dist.).

Clark, F., Goss, L., & Holland, S. (2000). *The music tree* (Parts 2A-2B). Secaucus, NJ: Summy-Birchard (Warner Brothers, dist.).

An elementary series such as *Music Tree,* Faber

Esping, A. (2000). *Sympathetic vibrations: A guide for private music teachers.* Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Faber & Faber

Faber, R., & Faber, N. (with McArthur, V.) (1993-1998). *Piano adventures* (Level 1). North Miami Beach, FL: FJH Music.

Faber, R., & Faber, N. (with McArthur, V.) (1993-1998). *Piano adventures.* North Miami Beach, FL: FJH Music.

Illinois State Music Teachers Association Performance Syllabus

Hinson, M. (2000). *Guide to the pianist's repertoire* (3rd ed.). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Holland, S. (1993). *Teaching toward tomorrow: A music teacher's primer for using electronic keyboards, computers, and MIDI in the studio.* Loveland, OH: Debut Music Systems.

Instructor's packet

Johnson, M. T. (1990). *Keys to successful piano lessons.* Somma Distributing.

Kreader, B., Kern, F., Keveren, P., & Rejino, M. (1996-2000). *Piano Lessons, Piano Solos, Piano Technique* (Level 1). Milwaukee: Hal Leonard.

Maris, B. E. (2000). *Making music at the piano: Learning strategies for adult students.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Nikolaev, A., & Kissell, E. (Eds.) (Trans. N. Harutyunyan) (1978). *Russian school of piano playing.* London: Boosey and Hawkes.

Ortmann, O. (1962). *The physiological mechanics of piano technique: An experimental study of the nature of the muscular action as used in piano playing, and the effects thereof upon the piano key and piano tone.* New York: Dutton and Co.

Pace, R. (1994-1996). *Music for piano* (Levels 1A-3B). Milwaukee: Lee Roberts (Hal Leonard, dist.).

Palmer, P. (1997). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ristad, E. (1982). *A soprano on her head: Right-side up reflections on life and other performances.* Moab, UT: Real People Press.

Selection of journal and magazine articles I prepare

Suzuki, S. (1999). *Ability development from age zero.* Birch Tree Group.

Sonatina album

Stephan, G. (1998). *How to make money writing, performing, and teaching music: For* all musicians. Grand Rapids, MI: Stephan Publications.

Williams, L. V. (1986). *Teaching for the two-sided mind: A guide to right brain/left brain education.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Course Two

Agay, D. (1982). *Teaching piano* (Vol. 2). New York: Yorktown.

Albergo, C., Alexander, R., & Blickenstaff, M. (1996). *Celebration series handbook for teachers* (2nd ed.). Missisauga, ON, Canada: Frederick Harris.

Assorted intermediate classical music-many sources

Average age method-varies year to year

Bastien, J. S. (1966-1968). *Piano literature* (Vols. 1-3). San Diego: Kjos.

Bernstein, S. (1981). *With your own two hands.* New York: Schirmer Books.

Camp, M. (1992). *Teaching piano: The synthesis of mind, ear, and body.* Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Clark methods

Diller, A., & Quaile, E. (Eds.) (1986). *Solo book: 1.* Milwaukee: Hal Leonard.

Eigeldinger, J. J. (1989). *Chopin: Pianist and teacher: As seen by his pupils* (K. Osostowicz, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Esping, A. (2000). *Sympathetic vibrations: A guide for private music teachers.* Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Faber & Faber method books

Faber, R., & Faber, N. (with McArthur, V.) (1993-1998). *Piano adventures.* North Miami Beach, FL: FJH Music.

Gerig, R. R. (1974). *Famous pianists and their technique.* New York: Robert B. Luce.

Green, B. (with Gallwey, T.). (1986). *The inner game of music.* New York: Anchor Press.

Herrigel, E. (1999). *Zen in the art of archery.* New York: Random House.

Holland, S. (1993). *Teaching toward tomorrow: A music teacher's primer for using electronic keyboards, computers, and MIDI in the studio.* Loveland, OH: Debut Music Systems.

Instructor's packet

Intermediate level collection

Intermediate selections (Baroque to modern) edited by Lynn Freeman Olson

Isacoff, S. (Ed.). (1998). *Great lessons from great pianists.* Bedford Hills, NY: Ekay Music.

Last, J. (2000). *Freedom technique, exercises, and studies.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Machover, W., & Uszler, M. (1996). *Sound choices: Guiding your child's musical experiences.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Madsen, C., & Madsen, C. (1972). *Parents and children, love and discipline: A positive approach to behavior modification.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Pace

Pace, R. (1994-1996). *Music for piano* (Levels 1A-3B). Milwaukee: Lee Roberts (Hal Leonard, dist.).

Palmer, W. (Ed.). (1973). *J. S. Bach: An introduction to his keyboard works.* Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Piano method (Duckworth)

Olson, L. O. (1987-1988). *Essential keyboard repertoire* (Vols. 1-2). Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Olson, L. O. (1988). *First steps in keyboard literature.* Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Outside reading

Royal Conservatory of Music (2001). *Celebration series* (Bks. 2 and 5). Mississauga, ON, Canada: Frederick Harris.

Sandor, G. (1981). *On playing piano: Motion, sound, and expression.* New York: Schirmer Books.

Schmitt op. 16

Sheftel, P. (1992). *Classics, Romantics, Moderns.* New York: Carl Fischer.

Smith, V. (1981). *You and your piano technician.* San Diego, CA: Kjos.

Wiedemayer exercises

Course Three

Agay, D. (1982). *Teaching piano* (Vol. 1). New York: Yorktown.

Albergo, C., & Alexander, R. (2000). *Intermediate piano repertoire: A guide for teaching* (4th ed.). Missisauga, ON, Canada: Frederick Harris.

Bach, J. S. *18 little preludes.*

Bastien, J. S. (1966-1968). *Piano literature* (Vols. 1-4). San Diego: Kjos.

Bernstein, S. (1991). *Twenty lessons in keyboard choreography.* Milwaukee: Seymour Bernstein Music (dist. Hal Leonard).

Bernstein, S. (1981). *With your own two hands.* New York: Schirmer Books.

Camp, M. (1992). *Teaching piano: The synthesis of mind, ear, and body.* Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Case-Stott, A. *Keyboard harmony.*

Clarfield, I. J., & Guy, S. W. (1996). *From mystery to mastery* (Bks. 1-2). Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Clark, F. (1992). *Questions and answers: Practical advice for piano teachers.* Northfield, IL: The Instrumentalist.

Clark, F., Goss, L., & Holland, S. (2000). *The music tree.* Secaucus, NJ: Summy-Birchard (Warner Brothers, dist.).

Clark, F., Goss, L., Holland, S., & Betts, S. (2000). *The music tree activities.* Secaucus, NJ: Summy-Birchard (Warner Brothers, dist.).

Clark, M. E. (1972). *Contempo 1 and 2: An introduction to twentieth century idioms for the beginning pianist.* Boulder, CO: Myklas.

Clavier. 200 Northfield Rd., Northfield, IL 60093

Frackenpohl, A. R. (1991). *Harmonization at the piano* (6th ed.). Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.

Holland, S. (1993). *Teaching toward tomorrow: A music teacher's primer for using electronic keyboards, computers, and MIDI in the studio.* Loveland, OH: Debut Music Systems.

Intermediate level collection

Kern, R. F., & Miller, M. (1988). *Projects for piano pedagogy* (Vols. 1-2). San Diego, CA: Kjos.

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

King, V. *Piano technique.*

MTNA policies, etc.

MTNA legal guide

Olson, L. F., & Hilley, M. (Eds.) (1988). *Essential keyboard sonatinas.* Van Nuys: Alfred.

Pace, R. (1994-1996). *Music for piano* (Levels 1A-3B). Milwaukee: Lee Roberts (Hal Leonard, dist.).

Sandor, G. (1981). *On playing piano: Motion, sound, and expression.* New York: Schirmer Books.

Various method books

Course Four

Bastien, J. S. (1966-1968). *Piano literature* (Vols. 1-4). San Diego: Kjos.

Burgmüller studies

Clark, F. (1992). *Questions and answers: Practical advice for piano teachers.* Northfield, IL: The Instrumentalist.

Clark, F., Goss, L., & Holland, S. (2000). *The music tree.* Secaucus, NJ: Summy-Birchard (Warner Brothers, dist.).

Clark, F., Goss, L., Holland, S., & Betts, S. (2000). *The music tree activities.* Secaucus, NJ: Summy-Birchard (Warner Brothers, dist.).

Fink, S. (1992). *Mastering piano technique: A guide for students, teachers, and performers.* Portland, OR: Amadeus Press.

Guy, S. & McArthur, V. (2000-2001). *Great piano literature: Focus on melody* (Bks. 1-2). North Miami Beach, FL: FJH.

Hilley, M., & Olson, L. F. (2001). *Piano for the developing musician* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Holland, S. (1993). *Teaching toward tomorrow: A music teacher's primer for using electronic keyboards, computers, and MIDI in the studio.* Loveland, OH: Debut Music Systems.

Instructor's syllabus

Intermediate level collection

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

Lancaster, E. L., & Renfrow, K. (1995-1996). *Alfred's group piano for adults* (Bks. 1-2). Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Lhevinne, J. (1972). *Basic principles in pianoforte playing.* New York: Dover.

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

Lyke, J., Caramia, T., Haydon, G., Alexander, R., & Elliston, R. (1998). *Keyboard musicianship* (Vol. 1) (7th ed.). Champaign, IL: Stipes.

Lyke, J., Caramia, T., Haydon, G., Alexander, R., & Elliston, R. (1994). *Keyboard musicianship* (Vol. 2) (6th ed.). Champaign, IL: Stipes.

Magrath, J. (1995). *The pianist's guide to the standard teaching and performance literature.* Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Neuhaus, H. (1973). *The art of piano playing* (Trans. K. A. Leibovitch). London: Barrie and Jenkins.

Pace, R. (1994-1996). *Music for piano* (Levels 1A-3B). Milwaukee: Lee Roberts (Hal Leonard, dist.).

Paperno, D. (1998). *Notes of a Moscow pianist.* Portland, OR: Amadeus Press.

Royal Conservatory of Music (2001). *Celebration Series* (Books 4-6). Missisauga, ON, Canada: Frederick Harris.

Timbrell, C. (1999). *French pianism: A historical perspective.* Portland, OR: Amadeus Press.

Wilson, F. (1986). *Tone deaf and all thumbs: An invitation for late bloomers and non-prodigies.* New York: Viking-Penguin.

Course Five

Agay, D. (1982). *Teaching piano* (Vols. 1-2). New York: Yorktown.

Camp, M. (1992). *Teaching piano: The synthesis of mind, ear, and body.* Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Camp, M. (1990). *Developing piano performance: A teaching philosophy.* Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Collins, A. (1985). *How to use a fake book: Fakin' accompaniments from melodies and chord symbols.* Milwaukee: Hal Leonard.

Holland, S. (1993). *Teaching toward tomorrow: A music teacher's primer for using electronic keyboards, computers, and MIDI in the studio.* Loveland, OH: Debut Music Systems.

Miscellaneous books on technique

Various Russian texts translated in class by Russian professor

Course Six

Evans, L. (1982). *Jazz keyboard harmony.* New York: Edward B. Marks.

Lancaster, E. L., & Renfrow, K. (1995-1996). *Alfred's group piano for adults* (Bks. 1-2). Van Nuys, CA: Alfred.

Lead sheets

Over $100 of intermediate music-I've used 4-5 volumes of Lynn Freeman Olson

Suzuki materials

Varies according to topics