

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF GOALS AND
PROGRAMS FOR COLLEGE LEVEL GROUP PIANO
INSTRUCTION IN KANSAS

by

Gayle J. Umberger

B.M., University of Kansas, 1975

B.M.E., University of Kansas, 1975

Thesis
1981
U423
C.2
music

Submitted to the Department of Art and
Music Education and Music Therapy and
the Faculty of the Graduate School of
the University of Kansas in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Music Education.

Redacted Signature

Redacted Signature

Redacted Signature

Committee Members

Redacted Signature

For the Department

ABSTRACT

This study was a comparative analysis of group piano programs and goals between the secondary two-year schools and the four-year schools of Kansas .

A four-part survey was mailed to all group piano instructors of college piano classes; the results were returned by mail; and the answers were analyzed by computer .

Results indicated no significant differences occur between goals and programs of group piano classes in the two-year schools and the goals and programs of the four-year schools .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to take this opportunity to express her appreciation to Dr. George L. Duerksen for his patience and advice, to Mrs. Flora Silini for her enthusiasm and interest, and to the writer's family for their encouragement.

G.J.U.
1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTER I	1
Introduction	1
Class Piano Today	2
Purpose of Study.....	2
Schools in Kansas	3
General Hypothesis	4
CHAPTER II	5
Lesson Styles	5
Laboratory's Appearance	6
Manufacturers of Electronic Laboratories	6
Costs of Equipment	7
Classroom or Private Instruction - Individual Decision	8
Advantages of Private Instruction	8
Disadvantages of Private Instruction	8
Colleges Develop Piano Musicianship Classes	9
Advantages of Group Piano Instruction	9
Peer Influence	10
Grouping	10
Class Size	11
Economics	11

	Page
Disadvantages of Group Instruction	12
Acquainting the Teacher With the Printed Page	13
Materials	13
History	13
Materials Today.....	14
Supplemental Materials	15
Sources of New Materials	15
Skills	16
Performance	16
Technique	17
Theory	18
Improvisation.....	18
Ear Training	19
Sight-reading.....	20
Six Methods - How They Teach Skills	23
Presentation of the Methods	23
Technique	24
Ear Training	25
Improvisation.....	26
Transposition.....	27
Sight-reading	27
Repertoire	28
Special Features	28
Selection of Method	29
Teacher Qualifications	29
The Student's First Teacher.....	31
Purpose of Study	32
Definition of Terms	32
CHAPTER III	34
Introduction	34

	Page
The Survey Design	34
Selection of Questions	34
Part I - Description of Institutions.....	35
Part II - Teachers' Ratings of Functional Skills Importance.	35
Part III - Teachers' Ratings of Skills-Teaching	
Effectiveness.....	35
Part IV - Optional Questions	36
Survey Distribution.....	36
Selection of Subjects	36
Packet	36
Mailing.....	37
Returns	37
CHAPTER IV	39
Introduction.....	39
Survey Results	40
Part I - Description of Institutions	40
Part II - Teachers' Ratings of Functional Skills Importance.	68
Part III - Teachers' Ratings of Skills-Teaching	
Effectiveness.....	83
Part IV - Optional Questions.....	98
Solutions.....	102
CHAPTER V.....	104
Introduction.....	104
Summary.....	104
The Schools	104
Laboratories	105
Class Time and Credit	105
Students	106
Enrollment	106
Teachers	107
Instruction	107
Part II and Part III - Skills.....	108
Part IV - Optional Questions.....	111

	Page
Conclusions	112
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	113
APPENDIX A: Survey.....	119
APPENDIX B: Addresses	133

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Chronology of Survey Returns	37
2. List of Abbreviations Used in Describing Results.....	39
3. Level and Number of School Responses to Part II	68
4. Level and Number of School Responses to Part III	84
5. Response Distribution to Question One, Part IV.....	99
6. Teachers' Opinions of Group Piano's Purpose.....	99
7. Response Distribution to Question Two, Part IV.....	101
8. Common Teaching Problems Encountered	101
9. Teachers' Solutions to Problems	103
10. Enrollment in Class Piano Programs	106
11. A Comparison of Skills' Importance and Effectiveness.....	110

CHAPTER I

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF GOALS AND PROGRAMS FOR COLLEGE LEVEL GROUP PIANO INSTRUCTION IN KANSAS

Introduction

A 1978 report in The Piano Quarterly revealed evidence of class piano instruction as early as 1815 in Dublin, Ireland. Teachers from Philadelphia and New York City were said to have studied in classes taught by Johann Bernhard Logier in Dublin at that time. By 1864 class piano teaching had moved to Canada and by 1860, some "female schools" in Holly, Mississippi had employed teachers to give lessons to groups (Richards, 1978, p. 12). Class piano instruction in all grade levels of the public schools flourished from approximately 1913 until a few years after World War I (Birge, 1937, p. 201). Before World War II, girls who could play the piano were considered more desirable as future wives than girls who were not pianists. Vestiges of this thought are seen today in the talent portion of the Miss America contests (Payne, 1979, p. 32).

In the late 1920's, a Texan by the name of Irl Allison noted that college piano students were dropping out of school at Hardin-Simmons University due to the impending Depression. Mr. Allison, realizing that his own job and the music department at his school were at stake, attempted to stimulate more interest and enrollment in the piano department among city students by offering class work combined with

private instruction. The result was a classroom of ten Baldwin pianos and two grand pianos, and a twenty-piano concert at the end of the year. This was one of the first piano ensemble presentations in the United States, and the beginning of the National Guild of Piano Teachers auditions (Bastien, 1973, pp. 401, 402).

Class Piano Today

Today the class piano teaching concept has found its way into four-year colleges and universities, community colleges, all levels of public school instruction, and private studios. All age levels - from kindergarten through senior citizen - have found enjoyment and perhaps the fulfillment of lifelong dreams through the piano laboratories (Catron, 1977, p. 23).

Purpose of Study

This study is not intended to deal with the entire spectrum of class piano programs, but rather to focus on the purpose and intent of the two-year community colleges' and the four-year colleges' or universities' programs in Kansas. College piano laboratories are usually designed for music majors who need to develop keyboard proficiency although the piano is not their main instrument (Robinson, 1975, p. 26). ✓
Music teachers find themselves dependent upon piano competency on their first jobs. Teachers must use the piano for general music and elementary music; instrumentalists need the piano when acquainting themselves with band or orchestra scores. A 1962 study, also by

Buchanan, of 312 music educators currently teaching in the United States, reveals the skills most needed in all fields of music education are those keyboard skills of accompanying, score playing, sight-reading, improvising, playing by ear, and harmonizing. Unless the student in his or her undergraduate study has the training in these skills, he or she is not educated enough to be a music educator (Buchanan, 1964, pp. 134, 136, 138).

Schools in Kansas

The 1979-1980 edition of the Kansas Educational Directory lists 25 two-year colleges, and 23 four-year colleges and universities in Kansas (Kansas State Department of Education, 1979, pp. 121-127). Music educators should be curious to know how and if the teaching goals and programs of various class piano instructors compare with one another. This study is designed to compare Kansas class piano instructional goals and programs, as reported by the teachers, of the two-year colleges with the four-year colleges and universities to see if similarities and differences can be revealed and analyzed. This information could prove useful to a high school senior wishing to pursue a career in music, or perhaps to a two-year college music student wishing to transfer to a four-year school. Certainly this information would be helpful to the instructors from the various institutions, particularly as concerns their ability to articulate and coordinate programs to facilitate student transfer. At the present time, no information of this type seems to be

available.

General Hypothesis

No differences exist between the musical goals and programs the instructors at the four-year colleges and universities in the state of Kansas feel are important for their class piano students to attain, and the musical goals and programs which the instructors at the two-year colleges in Kansas feel are important for their class piano students.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

Music is an art and the piano is one means of expressing that art (Last, 1972, p. ix). Surely no educator would argue with that statement; controversy does appear when the question arises: "How does one best acquire the knowledge and skill of playing the piano and thereby producing music?". The majority of pianists traditionally achieve their piano proficiency through private study, but recently, due to the availability of electronic laboratories, group instruction in piano laboratories seemingly has been increasing in popularity.

Lesson Styles

The traditional private piano lesson usually consists of one teacher and one student meeting once a week for a designated period of time. The focus of the lesson is usually on learning repertoire of the masters and preparing for recital appearances. The piano laboratory may have several faces. The approach to and the focus of teaching is different. Class piano lessons may be taught several ways - all group, group and partner lessons, group and private lessons, master classes, musicianship classes, and more (Bianchi, 1978, p. 19). The focus of the lessons is to develop not only performance skills, but also to develop a comprehensive musical knowledge using the piano as the teaching medium. Group class meeting schedules vary from five days a week to only one day a week.

Laboratory's Appearance

Piano laboratories differ among themselves in appearance. The two main types of laboratories are: (1) the acoustical laboratory where conventional pianos are used, and (2) the electronic laboratory where electronic pianos are used. Laboratories are sometimes equipped with cardboard keyboards, dummy pianos, acoustical pianos, electronic pianos, overhead projectors, tapes, cassettes, radios, televisions, moving pictures, visualizers, and possibly more equipment (Well, 1978, p. 3). The "typical" electronic piano laboratory will consist of a teacher's console (piano) connected to the audio on the student pianos, and an arrangement of student pianos numbering anywhere from two to twenty-four or more pianos. The instructor speaks through a microphone on his or her headset which enables one, two, or all of the students to hear through their headsets. This two-way communication allows for several student activities to go on at one time. Through electronic controls at the teacher's piano, groups of two or three students may work on one activity at a time while another group across the room may be working together on an entirely different activity (Dolence, 1980, p. 23). The use of headsets also helps students with hearing difficulties to understand directions more clearly, thus making learning easier (Catron, 1977, p. 23).

Manufacturers of Electronic Laboratories

The four leading manufacturers of electronic laboratories are

Wurlitzer, Baldwin, Rhodes, and Electrokey. Musictronic has appeared recently. All of the four leaders have features in common: earphones, a teacher's controlling console, and various audio-visual aids. Systems vary in keyboard range, tuning, height, weight, and price (Dolence, 1980, p. 23).

Costs of Equipment

The 1978 prices show the approximate cost of one electronic student piano at \$1,000.00 while the price of a teacher's piano ranges from \$12,000.00 - \$15,000.00 (Dolence, 1980, p. 23). Many people object to group instruction because they believe the costly electronic equipment is necessary. This belief is untrue. A laboratory may consist of one or two acoustical pianos which two students use at a time. The remaining students can use plastic keyboards placed on small tables or desks (Payne, 1979, p. 32). The Memphis, Tennessee, City School System began with one acoustical piano and gave dummy keyboards to each student (Pardue, 1978, p. 27).

Electronic pianos, while being convenient and useful teaching devices, are not intended for performances even though successful concerts have been given using electronic pianos. James Bastien believes one conventional piano should be available in each classroom so that each student will have the opportunity to learn the sound and "feel" of a conventional piano (Bastien, 1973, p. 288).

Classroom or Private Instruction - Individual Decision

Although this paper inclines to support the thriving group piano movement, the question of which instruction is superior - group or private - is a vital question each teacher must answer for him or herself. Private instruction can prove its validity through the musicians it has produced.

Advantages of Private Instruction

Louise Goss insists that no two people are built alike; therefore technical studies have to be individualized for optimum student progress. Interpretation and performance skills also vary with individuals and can be dealt with more efficiently through private instruction. A plus factor for private instruction is the student and the teacher have the unique opportunity to develop a young adult-adult relationship which can prove vital in a world where almost all of a student's education and involvement result from group participation (Goss, 1978, p. 32). In Russia, Alexander Toradze (silver medalist winner in the Fifth Van Cliburn Piano Competition) told Clavier's Lester Van Tress that "... In my country the teacher is very near to his student, teaching much more than music. There is a complete exchange of ideas. Very close..." (Van Tress, 1979, p. 38). Louise Goss and Frances Clark are convinced that group and private instruction should go together (Goss, 1978, p. 30).

Disadvantages of Private Instruction

The fact that the exceptionally talented student should have private

lessons will remain unchallenged, but while the old system of the private piano lesson in the home does produce many fine pianists, the disadvantages include students with little or no history and theory knowledge, and students who cannot sight-read (Payne, 1979, p. 32).

Colleges Develop Piano Musicianship Classes

Colleges and universities are attempting to increase their students' education by developing more comprehensive music programs on the undergraduate level. This "functional" piano is defined by William E. Trantham as the ability to sight-read, to improvise or play by ear, to accompany, and to create harmonizations to tunes. The goal of musicianship is to interrelate and synthesize all these skills through group or class piano study.

Advantages of Group Piano Instruction

A 1965 study conducted by Northwestern University indicates that group teaching of comprehensive functional skills is both educationally and economically efficient for the student and the teacher (Trantham, 1970, pp. 49, 56). Helene Robinson of Arizona State University believes class piano instruction is equal to or perhaps superior to private instruction because more material may be covered in a class situation than in a private study situation.

Advantages of group instruction include the fact that fundamentals of music encompassing keyboard harmony, technique, sight-reading, and etc. can be taught as easily to several students as they can be taught to

one. This not only provides for more efficient usage of teacher time (Robinson, 1975, p. 26), but also increases the students' comprehension of music (Erlings, 1978, p. 6).

Peer Influence. In a group, an individual can take pride in his strong areas and achievements. In his weaker areas, peer encouragement is helpful (Almlie, 1979, p. 42). Composers Hartline, Lyke, and Elliston realize students need peer interaction to develop their individual musical judgment (Lyke, Hartline, Elliston, 1974, p. i). Peer influence promotes motivation, but it also creates the atmosphere where responsibility, the developing of aesthetic sensitivity and independent learning, and the acquiring of self-confidence can occur (Erlings, 1978, pp. 10, 11).

Grouping. In working with class piano groups, the teacher is wise to take note of how to group his or her classes. Most often age groupings are important because common interests contribute more than similar abilities. The variety of abilities keeps the classes from becoming dull if the brighter students are given more difficult tasks while the slower students catch up (Bianchi, 1978, p. 19). The exceptionally slow students may be overwhelmed by class work, but the lazy learner will either be stimulated to work harder or else he will be "weeded out" which may prove to be more beneficial to that student. Unmotivated and uninterested students should not be forced to take piano lessons. The highly motivated, hard-working student will not be held back by

class piano. If a teacher is not challenging the student in a class, chances are slim that the teacher is challenging that student in a private lesson (Payne, 1979, p. 33).

Class Size. In considering class size, a recent report by Lancaster which polled college class piano teachers in the United States indicated the teachers' estimates of the ideal class size would average 8.6 students for the first year's instruction and average 8.1 students for the second year's instruction. He found the average piano laboratory size for public colleges and universities across the United States contained an average of 13-14 pianos. His report indicated also that private colleges were more likely to use private instruction than the piano laboratory, and the private colleges that did have laboratories tended to use acoustical pianos rather than the electronic laboratories (Bastien, 1973, p. 294).

Economics. One of the larger advantages to class piano instruction is economics - both from the administrative viewpoint of utilizing building space more effectively and efficiently to the teacher's viewpoint of saving his or her time through the absence of daily repetition that would be necessary in teaching several private lessons. The teacher is able to increase the range and scope of skills and concepts in a class compared to those covered in private lessons (Erlings, 1978, p. 10). In a private studio situation, teaching group piano is beneficial to the teacher when the teacher charges the group students less than a

private student. The group teacher will earn more money than the private teacher simply because more students can be taught in a given amount of time (Payne, 1979, p. 33).

Disadvantages of Group Instruction

Occasionally a student who has problems or is experiencing constant failures should be considered for private lessons. In this case, perhaps group piano is not for everyone (Bianchi, 1978, p. 19). One criticism of electronic laboratories is that too often the students use headsets to the extent that they are almost more alone in a group setting than they would be in a private lesson. Careful planning by the teacher can avoid the isolation situation. Also, compensation for the time spent alone is the advantage of interaction among the members of the class that would be impossible in a private lesson. Another criticism is the relinquishing of the one-to-one relationship between student and teacher. This may be overcome by combining individual and group instruction (Payne, 1979, pp. 32, 33).

Perhaps the more immediate problem of an electronic laboratory would be its initial cost. The European countries are slow to adopt group piano instruction because of limited space and the expense of establishing the laboratories (Well, 1978, p. 3). This, too, can be overcome through the careful management of a competent teacher. The laboratories can be used through adult education programs or for community use where a fee would be charged for the student to use the

piano, thus helping to defray the cost of purchasing.

Acquainting the Teacher With the Printed Music

With all the emphasis on teaching a comprehensive piano class at the college level, teachers will have to acquaint themselves with the availability and quality of printed music at hand.

Materials

History. Piano teachers entered the twentieth century using the 1892 version of W.S.B. Matthews' piano teaching method. Around 1925, John Williams introduced his piano method that was "to improve upon and to simplify" Matthews' method. These two courses taught note-reading by learning the lines and spaces of the grand staff and then applying that knowledge to the keyboard. Since most teachers began teaching this method by starting with middle C, these methods became known as the "middle C" methods. Many authors followed Williams, but no really new approach was developed until 1950 when Frances Clark popularized the idea of beginning with the keyboard and proceeding to the grand staff - just the opposite of Williams' method. In 1960, Robert Pace approached reading music by introducing various five-fingered patterns at the beginning and teaching the students to relate the notes to the staff and keys to the keyboard in major keys.

The copiers or followers of Clark's method developed the "black-key" approach where students first learned the keyboard by identifying black key groups of twos and threes. Although these followers were

referred to by others and by themselves as developing the "black-key" approach, some of their methods did not begin on the black keys!

Pace, too, had his followers whose methods became generally known as the "multiple key approach". Their methods rarely taught more than five-fingered patterns.

Neither Williams, Clark, nor Pace actually originated their approaches, but they are important historically because they were the first to put their ideas into written courses which were and still are widely used by piano teachers (Chronister, 1977, p. 3).

Materials Today. E.L. Lancaster (currently the coordinator of class piano at the University of Oklahoma) insists that a good pedagogy class finds materials that demonstrate activities of analysis, sight-reading, improvisation, harmonization, technique, transposition, playing by ear, accompanying, score reading, chord progressions, and critical listening (Lancaster, 1979, p. 16). In a 1962 thesis at the Conservatory of Music in Kansas City, Richards concluded from his survey of music educators and class piano teachers, that both groups believed skills as playing by ear, recognizing chord progressions, analyzing music, transposing music, and improvising were more important than learning to play figured bass or memorizing. The class piano teachers considered learning repertoire more important than did the music educators (Bastien, 1973, p. 286). A survey of California State University graduate students and faculty found an increased emphasis

on sight-reading and score reading (both vocal and instrumental scores), and a decreased emphasis on repertoire. Scales and memorization requirements were totally eliminated (Richards, 1977, p. 31).

Allowing for various individual differences, most college classes of group piano will require a basic text and supplementary repertoire books (Lancaster, 1977, p. 26). The method book and the method of instruction should be so that each step of learning reinforces previous learning and prepares for the next step (Tranthan, 1970, p. 50).

When choosing a method book, the teacher should remember the need for a comprehensive study and the need for the materials to be visually attractive. Books with titles like "for the young" should be discarded when preparing materials for college level instruction (Ozanian, 1979, p. 28).

Supplemental Materials. Method books or texts are usually weak in contemporary or twentieth-century music. For this reason the classroom should have multiple copies of supplemental collections. If chosen carefully, all areas of musicianship and functional skills may be covered in the supplementary repertoire. Although copyright laws prohibit duplication of popular music, most of the songs may be easily played by ear. The progressive teacher will realize the appeal of the pop-rock music for drills in ear training, improvisation, and harmonization (Lancaster, 1977, pp. 26, 27, 42).

Sources of New Materials. Searching for fresh materials is a constant

job for the conscientious teacher. Perhaps the quickest sources for new materials are found in reviews in professional journals, in attending workshops and in-service institutes, in attending conventions of the various professional music organizations, and in conversing with colleagues and peers (Lancaster, 1977, p. 38). If materials are being sought for a class of music education majors, the teacher may wish to use literature that would be taught in a public school. The student learning the functional skills would benefit in two ways: 1) he would become more proficient at the piano, and 2) he would be learning materials that he may in return wish to teach (Buchanan, 1964, p. 137).

Skills

Performance. A natural outgrowth of learning how to play the piano is the desire to perform at the piano. James Dick, a noted concert pianist and former Hutchinson, Kansas resident, believes that performance experience is crucial to learning musicality and technique (Bastien, 1973, p. 417). While solo recital performances are common, multiple piano concerts should not be disregarded. Alene Yoder, a group piano teacher at Cherry Hill High School East in New Jersey, recently presented a concert using 16 pianos, 24 pianists, harpsichordists, hand bell players, dancers, and small brass, woodwind, and vocal ensembles. Yoder thought that multiple piano concerts provide an area for pianists to become showmen for the untrained

audiences. She believes this concert was a means of creating more excitement, more attendance, and more interest among the general public concert-goers than would normally occur at a classical pianist's performance (Yoder, 1979, p. 27). In every performance, notes Dick, rhythmic pulsation is dominant. Rhythmic movement is noticed if it is captivating, and it is noticed if it is inferior (Bastien, 1973, p. 423). Technique. Working on technical studies will not be a surprise to college music students. Music majors who are taking group piano to fulfill piano proficiency requirements are already musicians. They know how to read music and rhythms, and have already well-developed musical and listening abilities. For these students, the frustrating aspect of learning the piano will occur in developing their motor and coordination skills. Since the music major students are accustomed to "warming-up" on their major instrument; they adapt readily to the idea of "warming-up" at the piano through technical exercises.

Karen Rogers, an assistant professor of music at Southern Illinois University, suggests that at least one-third of class time should be spent on technique. The technical exercises should cover skills to strengthen and to increase independence of individual fingers, to increase endurance, to develop relaxation of the fingers and the body, and to increase a familiarity with the keyboard geography and hand-eye coordination. These daily "warm-up" skills can be used to learn and practice transposition, harmonization, and other skills (Rogers, 1980,

p. 28).

Theory. College music majors are required to take harmony courses. Billie Erlings is one of the many people who believe that theory taught in a separate unit away from the keyboard creates difficulties in transferring the knowledge from the class to the keyboard and vice versa (Erlings, 1978, p. 6). A 1965 Northwestern University study indicates that keyboard harmony would gain more successful results if it were placed in a course of comprehensive piano study rather than in the often fragmented instruction given in theory classes. This also is a more economical use of teacher and student time. Students who learn harmonic skills should be able to play the skills also (Tranthan, 1970, pp. 49, 50). Harmonization, transposition, and improvisation skills can be improved through the use of books that contain only melodies, or books that contain melodies with limited chord symbols and/or chord usage (Lancaster, 1977, p. 38). Listening to their classmates perform is an invaluable aid in teaching the students to make valid evaluations (Erlings, 1978, p. 11).

Improvisation. Art cannot exist without creativity; each human contains a creative spark that needs to be nourished to grow. Therefore, one responsibility of teachers is to feed the creative spark through improvisation and composition (Bashaw, 1980, p. 34). Young people today are less interested in playing the piano as a "social grace" and more interested in spontaneous, informal music. Young people

like popular music and by teaching them only three chords, teachers can open a world of improvisation and ear playing that is undoubtedly more important to the student than learning a Clementi "Sonatina" (Payne, 1979, p. 32). Too often improvisation and playing by ear are avoided in private lessons because of a lack of ideas. Class piano groups inspire one another and help to reduce insecurities (Erlings, 1978, p. 11). Improvisational skills, according to Joseph Banowitz, are necessary for the student who wishes to teach class piano, to work in a public school, or even to teach in a private studio (Bastien, 1973, p. 354). Improvisation consists of two types - free and structured. In free improvisation, the student is given an idea (perhaps a picture or a story) to illustrate on the piano in whatever way he chooses. In structured improvisation, the student has to illustrate his idea based upon specific musical concepts such as improvising on black keys only, or improvising for eight measures in common time. Whichever method the teacher wishes to follow, he or she must remember that to assure success, improvisation needs to be taught consistently and for a few minutes at each lesson (Bashaw, 1980, pp. 34, 35).

Ear Training. Since an existing part of music is aural perception (Erlings, 1978, p. 4), teachers of comprehensive music programs cannot afford to slight studies of ear training. The purpose of ear training is to get the ear into the habit of placing the fingers on the

proper keys. Continued exercises in ear training will soon result in students' recognition of patterns, progressions, and skips. This knowledge has two advantages: 1) students are more confident during performances if they know they will be able to substitute a chord if they have a possible memory lapse, and 2) playing by ear is fun and is one step closer to improvisation. While playing by ear is drudgery for some, others find playing by ear quite an enjoyable experience. Indications are that people who play by ear easily were often surrounded by music and musicians early in their childhood. Their learning happened accidentally and painlessly.

Playing by ear should not be confused with learning to play by rote. Learning by rote includes imitating the sounds heard and imitating the fingers or keys used. In rote playing, aural and visual senses are concerned while in playing by ear, the aural sense is used. Rote training does not necessarily train the ear (Polk, 1980, pp. 42, 43). Group piano teachers have to be aware of the differences between rote playing and playing by ear because older students (like the college music majors) have a tendency to learn through their visual senses. Teachers must plan lessons to redevelop the students' aural senses (Erlings, 1978, p. 5).

Sight-reading. Much has been written about the importance of sight-reading. Rita Fuszek defines sight-reading as "reading of the score" and sight-playing as "execution of the score". The most commonly

accepted definition of sight-reading (and the definition that shall be followed in this paper) is "to play an unfamiliar composition accurately and musically, up to tempo" (Fuszek, 1977, p. 12).

William Richards, a teacher at California State University, says functional reading skills (including sight-reading) take time to mature and must be started in the first semester of piano instruction (Richards, 1977, p. 31). Adele Marcus believes one-half hour to forty-five minutes a day should be spent in sight-reading so that the student can become familiar with repertoire and particular styles (Bastien, 1973, p. 412). Rosina Lhevinne thinks sight-reading is important to the extent that her students spend a minimum of fifteen minutes a day practicing sight-reading. They read the melody and bass lines first, and inner parts are added when possible. She agrees that sight-reading adds to the students' knowledge of repertoire (Bastien, 1973, p. 399). Joan Last believes in the rule of reading something new every day. She says that sight-reading needs to be practiced (Last, 1972, p. 79). Perhaps the most convincing argument for sight-reading comes from Adele Marcus who believes that the young child should enjoy his music, and be made to read a lot of music from the earliest stage possible. Marcus believes scales and exercises too often become drudgery and result in unmusical playing and discouragement for the youngster (Bastien, 1973, p. 413).

The fact that sight-reading is important has been established, but

further investigation shows not all experts agree on how people sight-read or how they learn to sight-read. Sight-reading can begin by the recognition of intervals of seconds, thirds, and etc. (Last, 1972, p. 80). Trantham observed that if a student was able to employ sonorities of seconds and fourths in improvisation, he would be able to sight-read music that employed them, too (Trantham, 1970, p. 50). Ortmann concluded from studying chords that music majors tended to read chords better when arranged in thirds rather than inversions or chords that had a majority of other intervals. Jacobsen added that better readers read chords from the top down, and that poor readers saw and formed the chord one note at a time (Lowder, 1973, pp. 68, 69).

The most extensive study on sight-reading was performed by Fuszek. After a three year study of sight-reading techniques, she concludes that a good sight-reader has to be consciously aware of five things: tempo, rhythm, pitch, fingering, and keeping his or her eyes on the music. She further states that taking these stages in reverse order improves a poor sight-reader (Fuszek, 1977, p. 5).

In sight-reading as in playing by ear, one purpose of the study is to train the eye to tell the fingers which keys to play without looking at the keyboard (Polk, 1980, p. 42). Joan Last suggests students should practice scales and other familiar pieces with their eyes closed so they will learn to "feel" the various patterns (Last, 1972, p. 82).

All types of music containing various rhythmic figures, accompaniment styles, skips, intervals, and passage work should be studied in a balanced sight-reading program. The repertoire should be easier than the repertoire done in daily class work (Lancaster, 1977, p. 27).

Six Methods - How They Teach Skills

So that the reader may better understand what materials the comprehensive music teacher of class piano has available, the following discussion will attempt to explain and clarify six class piano methods. Of the six, only the Page method was written specifically for the electronic laboratory (Page, 1974, p. vi). The other methods, written for acoustical pianos, can be adapted to fit the electronic laboratory. The methods which are discussed are: Keyboard Musicianship by James Lyke, Elisabeth Hartline, and Ron Elliston; Class Piano by Margaret Starr McLain; Piano for Classroom Music by Robert Pace; The Laboratory Piano Course by Cleveland L. Page; The Collegiate Piano Course by Jack Swartz; and Basic Piano for the College Student by Alex Zimmerman, Russell Hayton, and Dorothy Priesing. These methods are referred to in this paper by the last name of the first author.

Presentation of the Methods. The way an author approaches or presents his or her book influences students' reactions to the piano and consequently, their successes or failures. An example of the traditional style of piano teaching is McLain's technique of using the right hand to

learn intervals and notes in relationship to middle C (McLain, 1974, p. 2). The popular progressive idea instructs the students to play five-fingered songs at the first lesson. Pace (1971, p. 6), Hartline (1974, p. 6), Page (1974, p. 1), and Swartz (1971, p. 1) begin this way. Zimmerman's approach is similar, but instead of progressing directly through the book, he organizes it into sections of music fundamentals, technique, and repertoire. Teaching occurs simultaneously in several sections (Zimmerman, 1974, p. 10). Page's organized sections differ from Zimmerman's in that his sections are arranged so each becomes increasingly difficult. The hand position leaves its five-fingered pattern and proceeds to extended, jumping patterns. One section deals solely with arpeggios, triads, and scales in two- and three-part textures (Swartz, 1971, p. 28).

Technique. Finger dexterity, finger independence, and finger strength are skills pianists constantly strive to improve. Providing the beginner with a comprehensive, graduated method book which allows him to discover and practice these skills without becoming bored saves time and discouragement. Zimmerman, Swartz, and McLain embellish the five-fingered pattern technique by using chordal exercises and by later attempting the regular two-octave scale fingerings (Zimmerman, 1974, p. 10; Swartz, 1971, p. 28; McLain, 1974, p. 10).

McLain assumes the other performance skills will be learned

through repertoire and through the rhythm and warm-up drills she provides in almost every chapter. Her repertory songs slight the left hand (by concentrating left hand studies on whole and half notes only) which, with few exceptions, is the predominantly weaker hand. The rhythm and warm-up drills are harmonized by the students who at this point lack the facility and the knowledge to construct complicated left hand patterns (McLain, 1974, p. vi). Following basic pentachord and technique drills and scales (p. 12), Pace branches out using repertoire songs to develop legato (p. 30) and staccato touch (p. 44). Hartline drills her students on technique by learning major and harmonic minor scales (p. 33), by playing Czerny-like exercises (p. 18), and by recognizing chord qualities (p. 140). Page includes what the previously mentioned authors have done and adds studies on arpeggios (p. 65) and examples of counterpoint and double counterpoint dominant-seventh chords (p. 95).

Ear Training. Having learned chord structures and patterns, the student applies this knowledge to harmonizing given melodies and ear songs. Page omits harmonization completely although his students analyze all their work (Page, 1974, p. 53). McLain explains harmonization in chapter 2, but gives seemingly tedious warm-up drills in chapter 1 as examples. Zimmerman believes his students can learn harmonization, transposition, chord progressions, and improvisation simultaneously (pp. 15-27). Swartz's students have worked on

harmonization since page seven, but he offers few examples to harmonize. Pace suggests harmonizing familiar songs, and Hartline devotes one section to harmonizing folk songs (p. 52) in the I-V⁷-I pattern using various accompaniment styles (p. 55). She offers a list of ear songs to harmonize which use the tonic and dominant-seventh chords (p. 69) and later gives another list requiring harmonization with the tonic, dominant-seventh, and subdominant chords.

Improvisation. Progressions, technical facility, and harmonization lead the students to improvisation. Improvisation, a new concept for the piano student, was introduced by educators when they realized the need for this skill by elementary classroom teachers, music therapists, music educators, and by those who have the desire in expressing themselves at the keyboard (Page, Clavier, 1973, p. 20). Because improvisation is a new idea, some teachers, who either do not have the knowledge of improvisation or any desire to acquaint themselves with it, fail to teach it. Page leaves improvisation entirely to the discretion of the teacher. The students' books make no mention of improvisation, but the teacher's manual suggests improvising on songs the students learn. Swartz mentions rhythmic improvisation (p. 117). McLain believes in improvisation but approaches it using both hands. Until this point, McLain's students have played only one song in which they used two hands together (p. 21). She and Hartline provide improvisatory exercises in almost every chapter.

Hartline and Pace began improvisation on the early five-fingered patterns, but Hartline emphasizes rhythmic improvisation (p. 9) and Pace stresses improvisation in question and answer forms (p. 25). He discusses variations on familiar tunes (p. 32) and different musical forms (p. 37).

Transposition. Transposition itself is not a new concept, but treating it as an essential part of the beginner's lesson is a new concept. Again, many teachers avoid it altogether. McLain, Swartz, and Zimmerman mention it briefly and provide few examples. Pace (p. 5), Hartline (p. 12), and Page (p. 11) require students to transpose on the five-fingered pattern at the beginning of piano playing. Page advances his students to transposing songs up and down the interval of a fifth (p. 31).

Sight-reading. To music education or music therapy majors who use the keyboard as a means of accomplishing musical purposes of accompanying, score-reading, teaching aid, and etc., the importance of sight-reading is equal to knowing note values (Silini, 1975). Swartz and Pace make no mention of sight-reading. Page suggests using supplementary material because he does not provide any examples in his book (p. 2). McLain believes use of a cardboard "gimmick" called a pacer (a strip of cardboard five inches long by one and one-half inches wide) will aid the student. The pupil looks at a note, covers it with the pacer and then plays the note. Simultaneous actions of

playing and covering the second note occur while the student looks at the third note. This is intended to train the eye to look ahead and the brain to think. Zimmerman and Hartline insist on more thorough studies of sight-reading and include a variety of examples which the students analyze and transpose in each chapter. Zimmerman adds score-reading practice (p. 106).

Repertoire. Variety in repertoire songs is a basic problem in any beginning book whether it be the private piano student or the beginner in trumpet. McLain's first chapter includes two songs which contrast with the last part of her book which includes several examples too difficult for the first year student. On the basis of trite melodies, Swartz's book becomes extremely unchallenging. Zimmerman and Pace include a few boogie pieces and the rest are folk tunes. Page and Hartline contain a variety of types of music. Their selection ranges from folk tunes of many countries, spirituals, Christmas carols, patriotic songs, blues and jazz pieces and whole-tone scale examples to choices by classical composers.

Special Features. A selected group of the methods contains features which are unique to their particular authors. Hartline offers self-quizzes throughout the text to aid the student in knowing what to review. (The first quiz appears on page fifty-four). Zimmerman's special features are a section dealing entirely with modes and whole-tone scales (pp. 53-59), and a section on patriotic music where each

song is presented in several styles. Page thrives on patterns, phrases, and forms as shown throughout his book. Page, emphasizing the playing of ensemble music, writes songs for four, five, or six pianos. Each part could stand as a separate composition, but put together, they form a sophisticated work at a level which is unattainable by the private piano student (Page, 1974, p. vii). Page suggests using other instruments to demonstrate phrasing (Page, Instructor's Manual, 1974, p. 6).

Selection of Method. The group piano teacher must be aware of his personal goals, and the strong and deficient points of his students before selecting a method book. On that basis, he can choose the book with a particular strong area to counter the corresponding weak area in his or her students. Group teaching is flexible enough that lesson plans should be adapted to the class - not the class to the lesson plans (Bianchi, 1978, p. 20).

The obvious goal in group piano teaching is to teach music (or aesthetic sensitivity as some prefer to call it) using the piano as an exploratory medium. The teacher too often forgets to train the student to be capable of independent learning which encourages the student to enjoy and to continue learning after he or she leaves the classroom (Erlings, 1978, pp. 4, 6).

Teacher Qualifications

As with the public school classroom teacher, the group piano

teacher must be capable of handling groups of people at one time and keeping them busy and happy (Lancaster, 1978, p. 16). At times teachers are called upon to become amateur psychologists in attempts to balance the needs of the students with the standards of the profession (Hersh, 1979, p. 32).

For the above reasons and for the fact that schools are now demanding accountability, quality teaching is a must. No longer can the applied piano teacher be thrown into a classroom of non-piano majors and be expected to produce high results. The need for specialization is here (Lancaster, 1979, p. 16).

One of the more serious problems of college class piano instruction is finding a qualified and willing instructor (Bastien, 1973, p. 16). Often the more successful group piano teachers are those who have a combination background of applied piano and public school classroom experience which automatically disqualifies most applied piano majors. Teachers need a thorough knowledge of materials and methods, they need to know how to integrate the functional skills, they need to be organized to the extent that definite objectives are designed for each meeting, they need to have the knowledge of operating special equipment, they need to perform, and they need to continually further their own education (Lancaster, 1979, p. 16). From the employment aspect, the class piano teachers must be prepared to teach classes of music history, theory, music literature, introduction to music

courses, and other related classes in the event that enrollment or financial difficulties dictate that employees (teachers) be full-time (Hersh, 1979, p. 32). Applied piano majors often do not possess these skills.

The Student's First Teacher. All teachers influence their students - that is why beginning students must have good teachers. Rosina Lhevine, in an interview with Bastien, commented upon teachers of beginners, saying that the first teacher that a student has is very important since that teacher must instill love, understanding, and interest in music. Irl Allison believes that teachers to be successful have to be enthusiastic. They must generate the feeling that everything that is practiced must be worthwhile. Dick says students need at first to imitate a teacher who has professional and recognized experience. The wise teacher explains that imitation eventually ends and that individual styles and qualities must develop (Bastien, 1973, p. 32).

Teachers, in Marcus' opinion, need to be conversant in all types of music even if the style does not appeal to them personally. Periodicals are good sources of information, but personal contact in the manner of workshops, master classes, and participation in local, state, and national organizations are better. Bianchi cautions teachers that the college piano laboratory facility is the training center for future teachers and those future teachers will learn their methods and attitudes from the classroom teacher (Bastien, 1973, pp. 340, 414).

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is: 1) to report the equipment, materials, and facilities that are presently being used in college level group piano classes of Kansas; 2) to analyze the importance of and the teaching effectiveness of fifteen functional skills goals as rated by the instructors; and 3) to compare the data to discover whether similarities and differences occur between the two- and four-year schools.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are used in this research:

technique development: to include but not limited to developing the five-fingered pattern and learning chords.

chord progression knowledge: to include but not limited to learning the basic I-IV-V⁷-I progression.

harmonization: to include but not limited to using left hand chords of I, IV, and V⁷ placed with right hand melodies of any difficulty.

transposition: to include but not limited to transposing songs either by reading intervals or by reading lines at a given interval distance.

sight-reading: to play at sight an unfamiliar tune.

repertoire: to include but not limited to songs of any difficulty, any length, and any type.

individual performance capabilities: to include but not limited to the student's ability to perform at the piano at least one song (any difficulty) to the teacher's satisfaction.

dictation: to include but not limited to the student's ability to either write down what he or she hears, or to play back what he or she hears.

composition: to include but not limited to the student's ability to write an original song, or to play an original song while at the piano.

playing by ear: to include but not limited to playing recognizable melodies without the aid of printed music or previous memorization.

history: to include but not limited to a basic music history knowledge of time periods and styles representing those time periods.

score-reading: to include but not limited to playing a simple choral score - all parts.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Introduction

In order to make a valid and comparative summary concerning techniques, materials, and methods of class piano teaching between the 48 two-year community colleges and the four-year colleges and universities of Kansas, a four-part survey was mailed on November 10, 1980. The survey consisted of one part multiple-choice or yes/no answers; two parts where skills and their effects were rated; and one optional part containing two questions. The class piano teachers (or the piano department chairman where class piano teachers were unavailable) marked their answers on computer answer sheets and mailed the responses to the author. Of the 48 surveys mailed, 40 were ultimately returned.

The Survey Design

Selection of Questions. The questions were selected on the basis of pedagogy class discussions, from conversations with colleagues and peers, from various workshops, from the author's own curiosity, and from class piano music major students whose main focus of study was an instrument other than piano. Questions were chosen to collect information pertinent to the purpose of the study. The survey is shown in Appendix A.

Part I - Description of Institutions. Part I of the survey asked multiple-choice, or yes/no answers to general fact-finding questions as: the type of school; the size, brand, type, and use of the laboratory; the length of time the laboratory had been in use; the type of students who used the laboratory; the additional equipment that was used; the educational backgrounds of the teachers; the number of students who enrolled and used one piano at a time; the number of credit hours given for what specific time spent in class per week; the teachers' approaches to beginning piano; the type of literature used; and the method books most commonly used.

Answers to these questions were indicated by darkening the appropriate blanks on the computer answer sheet. The computer answer sheet was to be returned and the participants retained the questionnaire.

Part II - Teachers' Ratings of Functional Skills Importance. Part II listed fifteen functional skills. Following each skill were the numbers "one" through "ten". The individual teacher was to rate each skill in the order of importance in his/her own teaching goals. The number "one" indicated "least important" and the number "ten" indicated "most important". Directions were to return this portion of the survey.

Part III - Teachers' Ratings of Skills-Teaching Effectiveness. Part III listed the same functional skills as Part II; the teachers were asked to rate how effectively they thought they were accomplishing the skills. The number "one" represented "not effective" and the number "ten"

represented "highly effective". The teachers were to return this portion of the actual survey.

Part IV - Optional Questions. Part IV was a two-questioned optional part which allowed the teachers to express individual viewpoints.

Question one asked what the purpose of group piano instruction should be. Question two asked what were the more common problems and possible solutions faced daily by group piano teachers. If the teachers participated in Part IV, they were asked to return it in the envelope provided.

Survey Distribution

Selection of Subjects. The survey was mailed to group piano teachers of all two- and four-year colleges and universities in Kansas. The author collected the names of the various group piano teachers from the chairman of the group piano division of the state chapter of the Music Teachers' Association. In instances where the names of the group piano teachers were unknown, the author telephoned the individual schools and asked for the names. If the school did not have a piano laboratory or a teacher of group piano instruction, the author mailed the survey to the person designated as the chairman of the school's piano department. Addresses are found in Appendix B.

Packet. The packet included the following materials: the survey in four parts, a computer answer sheet, an introductory letter, one page of directions, one no. 2 lead pencil, and a large self-addressed,

stamped manila envelope.

Mailing. The surveys were mailed to all two- and four-year colleges and universities in Kansas on November 10, 1980. All the survey materials were enclosed in a large manila envelope.

Returns. Forty of the 48 surveys mailed were returned. On December 17, 1980, 18 postcards were mailed reminding individuals to return the survey, and on January 19, 1981, ten follow-up telephone calls were made to those teachers suspected of not returning the survey. Based upon telephone conversations with two of the community colleges in November, the author filled out two computer answer sheets with the information that the schools were two-year schools and they did not possess laboratories or teach classroom piano in any form.

Table 1 indicates the rate at which the surveys were returned.

TABLE 1
CHRONOLOGY OF SURVEY RETURNS

Date	Number of Surveys Returned
Nov. 25	21
Dec. 8	5
Dec. 17	6
Jan. 3	3
Jan. 8	1
Feb. 4	1
Feb. 11	1

With the addition of the two computer sheets completed by the author on the basis of telephone data, a total of 40 surveys were returned.

Approximately 53% of the surveys were returned within the first fifteen days of the mailing.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

Totaled, 40 schools responded to the questionnaire. In the case of the school which awards doctoral degrees, two answer sheets were filled out because two different tracks of class piano are taught. The answer sheets were analyzed in the Academic Computer Center at the University of Kansas. In processing, the answers were divided into the four levels of institutions which they represented. The divisions and the abbreviations which will be used for further reference in this paper are the following:

TABLE 2

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED IN DESCRIBING RESULTS

Abbreviation	Institution
2 yr.	a two-year institution awarding associate degrees.
4 yr.	a four-year institution awarding bachelor's degrees in music therapy/music education.
5 yr.	a graduate level institution awarding bachelor's and master's degrees in music therapy/music education.
7 yr.	a graduate level institution awarding bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees in music therapy/music education.

Survey Results

Part I - Description of Institutions.

1. Is your institution:	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
a) a two-year institution awarding associate degrees?	18			
b) a four-year institution awarding bachelor's degrees in music/music education?		16		
c) a graduate level institution awarding bachelor's and master's degrees in music/music education?			5	
d) a graduate level institution awarding bachelor's, master's and doctoral degrees in music/ music education?				2

Forty institutions responded. Six of these (three each of four-year and two-year schools) indicated they did not have piano laboratories; these schools were not included in the analysis. The doctoral level school filled out two questionnaires. This means a total of 35 answer sheets representing schools were analyzed. By accident, the data from one two-year school were mixed with the data from the four-year schools (bachelor's degree level).

In the statistics which follow, each question shows the number of schools that responded and the percentage of each division's total that number represents. Although technically only one seven-year school exists in Kansas which teaches class piano, two answer sheets were returned and recorded because the one school teaches two distinct

tracks of class piano. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number for convenience and are based upon the 35 answer sheets which were processed.

2. Does your school offer group piano classes?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	12 (86%)	14 (100%)	5 (100%)	2 (100%)
b) no	2 (14%)	0	0	0

Answers indicate group piano classes are taught in all four-year institutions and in 86% of the two-year schools.

3. How many years has your school had a piano lab?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) five years or less	5 (36%)	6 (43%)	0	0
b) six to ten years	4 (29%)	5 (36%)	1 (20%)	0
c) eleven to fifteen years	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)
d) sixteen to twenty years	1 (7%)	0	3 (60%)	1 (50%)
e) no answer	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	0	0

The majority of schools have had labs for ten years or less. The four-year schools have had labs longer than most of the two-year schools. The results indicate that piano labs have been in existence in Kansas for sixteen to twenty years.

4. Are your group piano classes for:

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) music education/ music therapy students only?	0	0	0	0
b) composition, theory, and applied music students only?	0	0	0	0
c) a and b combined?	1 (7%)	0	0	1 (50%)
d) for any student who wishes to take piano lessons regardless of major?	3 (21%)	6 (43%)	1 (20%)	0
e) all of the above?	8 (57%)	8 (57%)	4 (80%)	1 (50%)
f) no answer	2 (14%)	0	0	0

Results indicate that all of the schools permit all types of students to enroll in class piano.

5. Is your lab used in the teaching of any handicapped students?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	7 (50%)	0	3 (60%)	1 (50%)
b) no	5 (36%)	11 (79%)	2 (40%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	0	0

Eleven schools teach handicapped students while 19 schools do not. The two-year schools will more likely teach the handicapped than the four-year schools.

6. Is your piano lab used in any type of adult or community education program?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	8 (57%)	3 (21%)	2 (40%)	0
b) no	4 (29%)	10 (71%)	3 (60%)	2 (100%)
c) no answer	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	0	0

The two-year colleges are involved with educating the surrounding community more than the four-year schools.

7. How many pianos are used in your teaching lab?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) one piano only	0	0	0	0
b) two or three pianos	0	2 (14%)	0	0
c) four to six pianos	5 (36%)	7 (50%)	1 (20%)	0
d) seven to ten pianos	5 (36%)	3 (21%)	1 (20%)	2 (100%)
e) eleven to fourteen pianos	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	3 (60%)	0
f) no answer	2 (14%)	0	0	0

Thirteen schools use four to six pianos while 11 schools use seven to ten pianos. The 5 yr. and 7 yr. schools will use more pianos than will the 2 yr. and 4 yr. schools.

8. Does your piano lab consist of:

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) entirely acoustical pianos?	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	1 (20%)	0
b) entirely electronic pianos?	6 (43%)	9 (64%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)
c) a mixture of acoustical and electronic pianos?	5 (36%)	3 (21%)	3 (60%)	0
d) other?	0	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)
e) no answer	2 (14%)	0	0	0

A majority of the four-year schools use an electronic lab as do a small majority of the two-year schools. Many schools of both sizes use a mixture of the acoustical and electronic labs.

9. What type (brand name) of electronic lab equipment do you use?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) Wurlitzer lab	1 (7%)	8 (57%)	4 (80%)	0
b) Baldwin lab	6 (43%)	3 (21%)	0	2 (100%)
c) Musictronic lab	3 (36%)	2 (14%)	0	0
d) other	0	0	0	0
e) none	0	1 (7%)	1 (20%)	0
f) no answer	2 (14%)	0	0	0

In the community colleges, the Baldwin lab is the more popular but the Musictronic lab follows closely behind. In the four-year schools, the Wurlitzer lab is most popular.

10. Do you use a tape recorder in your class piano instruction?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	2 (14%)	6 (43%)	2 (40%)	0
b) no	10 (71%)	8 (57%)	3 (60%)	2 (100%)
c) no answer	2 (14%)	0	0	0

The majority of schools do not use a tape recorder although a larger percentage of the four-year schools use the tape recorder than do the two-year schools.

11. Do the students record their performances and listen to them?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	2 (14%)	6 (43%)	2 (40%)	0
b) no	10 (71%)	8 (57%)	3 (60%)	2 (100%)
c) no answer	2 (14%)	0	0	0

The majority of schools do not tape and listen to their own performances.

12. Do you use self-instructional tapes (for example, Music Minus One) in your teaching?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	2 (40%)	0
b) no	11 (79%)	12 (86%)	3 (60%)	2 (100%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	0	0	0

The majority of schools do not use self-instructional tapes in their teaching of class piano.

13. Do you use an overhead projector in your instruction?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	3 (21%)	4 (29%)	2 (40%)	2 (100%)
b) no	10 (71%)	10 (71%)	3 (60%)	0
c) no answer	1 (7%)	0	0	0

The majority of schools do not use the overhead projector.

14. Do you use a slide projector in your instruction?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	4 (29%)	2 (14%)	1 (20%)	0
b) no	9 (64%)	11 (79%)	4 (80%)	2 (100%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	0

Most teachers do not use the slide projector in their instruction.

15. Do you use a visualizer in your instruction?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	9 (64%)	3 (21%)	2 (40%)	0
b) no	3 (21%)	11 (79%)	3 (60%)	2 (100%)
c) no answer	2 (14%)	0	0	0

Nine community colleges use visualizers in comparison with five four-year colleges.

16. Is the group piano staff composed of:

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) graduate assistants only?	0	0	0	0
b) regular faculty only?	11 (79%)	14 (100%)	1 (20%)	0
c) a combination of a and b?	0	0	4 (80%)	2 (100%)
d) other?	0	0	0	0
e) no answer	3 (21%)	0	0	0

The two-year schools and the schools that award bachelor's degrees as their highest degrees use regular faculty only. In the schools where graduate assistants are available, the majority of the schools use a combination of graduate assistants and regular faculty.

17. What types of educational backgrounds do your piano lab staff have?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) applied piano majors	3 (21%)	4 (29%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)
b) music education/ music therapy majors	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	0	0
c) theory and/or composition majors	0	2 (14%)	0	1 (50%)
d) any combination of the above	5 (36%)	5 (36%)	4 (80%)	0
e) other	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	0
f) no answer	3 (21%)	0	0	0

The majority of teachers in community colleges and in the four-year

schools have backgrounds in various music fields. Applied piano majors are ranked second in the statistics.

18. Has your group piano faculty had specific group or class piano training?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	9 (64%)	9 (64%)	4 (80%)	2 (100%)
b) no	2 (14%)	5 (36%)	1 (20%)	0
c) no answer	3 (21%)	0	0	0

The majority of teachers have group piano training. Eight instructors do not have specific group training.

19. Which of the following have been most helpful to you and your staff in your continuing education as group piano teachers?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) magazines	0	0	0	0
b) state, regional and national conventions	5 (36%)	4 (29%)	0	0
c) studying texts and books by piano specialists	3 (21%)	7 (50%)	2 (40%)	0
d) professional organizations	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	2 (40%)	0
e) other	2 (14%)	0	0	2 (100%)
f) no answer	3 (21%)	2 (14%)	1 (20%)	0

The majority of teachers felt gaining knowledge from studying texts and books by piano specialists were their best aids to furthering their

education. The two-year schools' instructors felt they were aided most by attending state, regional, and national conventions.

20. How many persons teach group piano in your schools?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) one person	7 (50%)	6 (43%)	0	0
b) two or three people	3 (21%)	7 (50%)	4 (80%)	0
c) six or seven people	0	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)
d) over eight people	0	0	1 (20%)	1 (50%)

As might be expected, the schools with the advanced degree programs employ more people to teach group piano than do the two-year schools.

Most of the schools hire three teachers or less.

21. In your group piano lab, how many students use one piano at a time?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) one student at a time only	10 (71%)	11 (79%)	4 (80%)	2 (100%)
b) two students	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	1 (20%)	0
c) three students	0	0	0	0
d) four students	0	0	0	0
e) over four students	0	0	0	0
f) no answer	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	0	0

Only four schools permit two students at one piano at a time. The majority of schools (26) allow one piano per student.

22. How many years of group piano does your school offer?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) one year only	1 (7%)	4 (29%)	0	0
b) two years	11 (79%)	7 (50%)	4 (80%)	0
c) three years	0	1 (7%)	1 (20%)	2 (100%)
d) four years	0	0	0	0
e) over four years	0	1 (7%)	0	0
f) no answer	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	0	0

The community colleges report they teach two years of group piano.

The four-year schools that award bachelor's degrees had the widest range in years of piano classes taught - 50% offer two years of instruction, and 7% offer over four years of instruction. The majority of schools, regardless of degree level they award, prefer to teach two years of piano.

23. What is the average length of the group piano instruction for your music majors?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) one or two semesters or terms	3 (21%)	5 (36%)	0	0
b) three or four semesters or terms	8 (57%)	7 (50%)	5 (100%)	2 (100%)
c) five or six semesters or terms	0	1 (7%)	0	0
d) seven or eight semesters or terms	0	0	0	0
e) other	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	0
f) no answer	2 (14%)	0	0	0

Twenty-one of the 34 schools surveyed teach three or four semesters of class piano. Eight of the 34 schools teach one or two semesters of piano.

24. How many times per week do your group piano classes meet?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) one time or period only	2 (14%)	2 (29%)	0	0
b) two times or periods	10 (71%)	8 (57%)	4 (80%)	0
c) three times or periods	0	0	0	2 (100%)
d) four times or periods	0	0	1 (20%)	0
e) over four times or periods	0	1 (7%)	0	0
f) no answer	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	0	0

Six schools meet one time or period a week, and 22 schools meet two times or periods a week. In both the two- and four-year schools, the majority agree on meeting two times per week. The school which awards doctoral degrees was the only school which reported meeting three times per week.

25. Approximately how many hours per week is the student in group piano class?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) one hour	2 (14%)	4 (29%)	0	0
b) two hours	10 (71%)	8 (57%)	4 (80%)	0
c) three hours	0	0	0	2 (100%)
d) four hours	0	0	1 (20%)	0
e) over four hours	0	1 (7%)	0	0
f) no answer	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	0	0

Twenty-two schools have classes which meet two hours per week. The school which awards doctoral degrees meets three hours a week, and one four-year school which awards bachelor's degrees meets over four hours a week.

26. How many hours credit does a student earn for each term (semester) of group piano?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) one-half hour credit	0	2 (14%)	1 (20%)	0
b) one hour credit	12 (86%)	9 (64%)	4 (80%)	0
c) two hours credit	0	1 (7%)	0	2 (100%)
d) three hours credit	0	0	0	0
e) four hours credit	0	1 (7%)	0	0
f) no answer	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	0	0

Twenty-five schools award one hour credit which corresponds to

the answers in question #25 where the majority of schools spent two hours per week in class.

27. In one semester or term, what is the average total number of students enrolled in class piano (all sections combined)?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) 1 to 10 students	2 (14%)	4 (29%)	0	0
b) 11 to 15 students	4 (29%)	3 (21%)	1 (20%)	0
c) 16 to 24 students	3 (21%)	5 (36%)	0	0
d) 25 to 34 students	2 (14%)	0	1 (20%)	0
e) over 34 students	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	3 (60%)	2 (100%)
f) no answer	2 (14%)	0	0	0

The schools which award the master's and doctoral degrees have more students enrolled in group piano classes than the community colleges or the four-year schools which award bachelor's degrees. Eight schools have 16 to 24 students enrolled in their classes, and eight more schools have 11 to 15 students enrolled. Seven schools have over 34 students, and 6 schools have 1 to 10 students enrolled.

28. Has enrollment changed in your class piano program over the past three years?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) little or no change	6 (43%)	6 (43%)	3 (60%)	0
b) a definite increase in enrollment	5 (36%)	6 (43%)	2 (40%)	0
c) a definite decrease in enrollment	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	0	2 (100%)
d) no answer	2 (14%)	0	0	0

Fifteen schools noted little or no difference in enrollment in their programs. Thirteen schools reported a definite increase in enrollment, and four schools reported a definite decrease in enrollment. The school which awards doctoral degrees noted a decrease in enrollment.

29. Are pianos available for your students to practice other than in class?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	13 (92%)	14 (100%)	5 (100%)	2 (100%)
b) no	0	0	0	0
c) no answer	1 (7%)	0	0	0

All the schools provide pianos outside of class for student practice.

30. In your teaching, which do you emphasize more?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) functional skills (transposition, sight-reading, improvisation)	10 (71%)	13 (93%)	5 (100%)	2 (100%)
b) traditional literature	2 (14%)	0	0	0
c) no answer	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	0	0

All of the schools, with the exception of two two-year schools, stress the teaching of functional skills rather than traditional literature.

31. Do you follow an intense program where one skill is taught at one level only (for example, harmonization is taught only at level one, transposition is taught only on level two)?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	1 (7%)	0	0	0
b) no	11 (79%)	14 (100%)	5 (100%)	2 (100%)
c) no answer	2 (14%)	0	0	0

The schools teach several skills at several levels.

32. Do you follow a "spiral curriculum" in which specific topics (for example, transposition) are repeated at each level of increasing difficulty throughout the group piano program?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	9 (64%)	12 (86%)	5 (100%)	2 (100%)
b) no	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	0	0
c) no answer	2 (14%)	0	0	0

Almost all of the schools teach a "spiral curriculum" with the exception of two community colleges and two four-year schools which award bachelor's degrees.

33. Does your personal philosophy concerning the teaching of piano reveal a preference for:

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) multiple key approach	8 (57%)	9 (64%)	3 (60%)	2 (100%)
b) the middle C approach	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	0	0
c) the black key (learning groups of twos and threes) approach	0	2 (14%)	0	0
d) other	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	2 (40%)	0
e) no answer	2 (14%)	0	0	0

Twenty-one schools surveyed reveal a preference for teaching piano by the multiple key approach. Three teachers continue to use the middle C approach, and 6 teachers use an unspecified method. Fourteen percent (14%) of the community colleges use the middle C approach.

34. In your teaching, which do you stress more?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) ensemble playing	4 (29%)	5 (36%)	3 (60%)	2 (100%)
b) solo playing	9 (64%)	8 (57%)	2 (40%)	0
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	0

Nineteen schools stress solo playing and 13 schools stress ensemble playing. The figures indicate that the community colleges and the four-year colleges which award bachelor's degrees only stress solo playing as opposed to the other schools which stress ensemble playing.

Questions numbering 35 through 43 all pertain to the following statement: Are your classes designed to help students develop skills in playing...

35. country and western music?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	2 (40%)	0
b) no	10 (71%)	12 (86%)	3 (60%)	2 (100%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	0

Six schools attempt to teach country and western music. Of these six schools, 50% are community colleges.

36. jazz and improvisation?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	8 (57%)	8 (57%)	4 (80%)	2 (100%)
b) no	5 (36%)	6 (43%)	2 (20%)	0
c) no answer	1 (7%)	0	0	0

Instructors at 21 schools teach improvisation. A majority in all educational levels do teach jazz and improvisation.

37. traditional classical music? (includes Baroque, Romantic, etc.)

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	12 (86%)	13 (93%)	5 (100%)	2 (100%)
b) no	1 (7%)	0	0	0
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	0

With the exception of one community college, all of the schools teach classical music.

- 38. pop/rock music?

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	8 (57%)	7 (50%)	3 (60%)	1 (50%)
b) no	5 (36%)	6 (43%)	2 (40%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	0

The school levels which award advanced degrees teach pop/rock music. The two-year community colleges, and the four-year colleges which award bachelor's degrees indicate they favor the teaching of

pop/rock music.

39. religious music?

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
a) yes	8 (57%)	9 (64%)	3 (60%)	2 (100%)
b) no	5 (36%)	5 (36%)	2 (40%)	0
c) no answer	1 (7%)	0	0	0

Twenty-one of the schools teach religious music.

40. easy listening music?

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
a) yes	8 (57%)	7 (50%)	3 (60%)	2 (100%)
b) no	5 (36%)	7 (50%)	2 (40%)	0
c) no answer	1 (7%)	0	0	0

Nineteen of the schools favor the teaching of easy listening music while fourteen schools oppose that type of music. The majority in all levels approve of easy listening music.

41. folk music?

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
a) yes	13 (93%)	12 (86%)	5 (100%)	1 (50%)
b) no	0	2 (14%)	0	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	0	0	0

Thirty-one schools teach folk music.

42. patriotic music?

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
a) yes	7 (50%)	11 (79%)	5 (100%)	2 (100%)
b) no	6 (43%)	3 (21%)	0	0
c) no answer	1 (7%)	0	0	0

One hundred percent (100%) of the schools which award master's and doctoral degrees teach patriotic music. Seventy-nine percent (79%) of the schools which award bachelor's degrees teach patriotic music, and 50% of the community colleges teach patriotic music.

43. contemporary music?

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
a) yes	6 (43%)	10 (71%)	4 (80%)	2 (100%)
b) no	7 (50%)	4 (29%)	1 (20%)	0
c) no answer	1 (7%)	0	0	0

Of the four-year schools, 71% to 100% teach contemporary music while 43% of the two-year schools teach contemporary music.

Questions numbering 44 through 65 all pertain to the following statement of teaching materials: Do you use the following series of materials in your teaching of group piano?

44. Frances Clark

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
a) yes	3 (21%)	5 (36%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)
b) no	10 (71%)	9 (64%)	4 (80%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	0	0	0

Ten teachers use the Frances Clark series.

45. Jane or James Bastien

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
a) yes	11 (79%)	6 (43%)	3 (60%)	1 (50%)
b) no	2 (14%)	7 (50%)	2 (40%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	0

The majority of teachers use the Bastien series.

46. John Thompson

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
a) yes	2 (14%)	0	0	0
b) no	11 (79%)	13 (93%)	5 (100%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)

Only two community college teachers use the John Thompson series.

47. Glover

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	1 (20%)	0
b) no	9 (64%)	12 (86%)	4 (80%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)

The community colleges have more of a tendency to teach from Glover than the other schools, but the majority of teachers do not teach from Glover.

48. Schaum

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	3 (21%)	0	0	0
b) no	10 (71%)	13 (93%)	5 (100%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)

Three community college teachers use the Schaum series.

49. Pace

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	3 (21%)	0	0	1 (50%)
b) no	10 (71%)	13 (93%)	5 (100%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	0

Three community colleges use the Pace method.

50. Diller-Quaile

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
a) yes	5 (36%)	7 (50%)	3 (60%)	1 (50%)
b) no	8 (57%)	6 (43%)	2 (40%)	0
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)

Sixteen teachers use the Diller-Quaile method.

51. Wurlitzer (Lawrence Rast)

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
a) yes	3 (21%)	3 (21%)	1 (20%)	0
b) no	10 (71%)	10 (71%)	4 (80%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)

Seven instructors use the Wurlitzer method.

52. Burnam

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
a) yes	1 (7%)	0	1 (20%)	0
b) no	12 (86%)	13 (93%)	4 (80%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)

Only two teachers use the Burnam series.

53. Hartline, Lyke, Elliston

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	3 (21%)	3 (21%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)
b) no	10 (71%)	10 (71%)	4 (80%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	0

Eight teachers use the Hartline, Lyke, Elliston series.

54. CMP Library

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	3 (21%)	2 (14%)	1 (20%)	0
b) no	10 (71%)	11 (79%)	4 (80%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)

The majority of schools do not use the CMP Library.

55. Noona

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)
b) no	9 (64%)	12 (86%)	5 (100%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	0

The majority of schools do not use Noona.

56. Olson

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	6 (43%)	2 (14%)	0	1 (50%)
b) no	7 (50%)	11 (79%)	5 (100%)	0
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)

Nine schools use the Olson method.

57. Richter

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	0	0
b) no	10 (71%)	12 (86%)	5 (100%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)

Most teachers do not use the Richter method.

58. Eckstein

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	0	1 (7%)	0	0
b) no	13 (93%)	12 (86%)	5 (100%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)

Only one person teaches from the Eckstein method.

59. McClain

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
a) yes	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	0	0
b) no	11 (79%)	12 (86%)	5 (100%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)

Three teachers use the McClain method.

60. Swartz

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
a) yes	0	1 (7%)	0	0
b) no	13 (93%)	12 (86%)	5 (100%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)

Only one person teaches from the Swartz method.

61. Zimmerman

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
a) yes	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	0	0
b) no	11 (79%)	11 (79%)	5 (100%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)

Four teachers use the Zimmerman method.

62. Page

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	3 (21%)	4 (29%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)
b) no	10 (71%)	9 (64%)	4 (80%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	0

Nine instructors use the Page method.

63. Bradley

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	2 (14%)	0	0	0
b) no	11 (79%)	13 (93%)	5 (100%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)

Only two community college teachers use the Bradley method.

64. Gilbert

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	0	0	0	0
b) no	13 (93%)	13 (93%)	5 (100%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)

No one teaches from the Gilbert method.

65. Palmer

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
a) yes	4 (29%)	3 (21%)	0	0
b) no	9 (64%)	10 (71%)	5 (100%)	1 (50%)
c) no answer	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)

Seven teachers use the Palmer method.

Part II - Teachers' Ratings of Functional Skills Importance. On a scale of one through ten with one being listed as "least important" and ten being listed as "most important", the teachers were asked to rate the importance of each of the fifteen functional piano skills in their particular programs. To make the explanation of the statistics clearer, during evaluation the numbers "1" through "3" will be referred to as "the lower third" (of the spectrum), the numbers "4" through "7" as "the middle third", and the numbers "8" through "10" as "the upper third".

TABLE 3

LEVEL AND NUMBER OF SCHOOL RESPONSES TO PART II

Size of School	Number Which Responded
2 yr.	14
4 yr.	13
5 yr.	5
7 yr.	2

Upon receiving Part II from the colleges' and universities' instructors, the author transferred their answers to computer answer sheets for easier

evaluation. Thirty-four sheets were processed. Six answer sheets were dropped because the schools did not possess laboratories. One instructor returned Part I of the survey, but did not return Part II.

1. technique development

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (least important)	1 (7%)	0	0	0
2.	0	1 (7%)	0	0
3.	0	0	1 (20%)	0
4.	0	0	0	0
5.	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)
6.	4 (29%)	0	1 (20%)	0
7.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	0
8.	3 (21%)	2 (15%)	0	0
9.	2 (14%)	8 (62%)	0	0
10. (most important)	3 (21%)	0	1 (20%)	0

The majority of schools rated technique development towards the middle to upper third of the spectrum. .:

2. chord progression knowledge

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (least important)	0	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0
3.	1 (7%)	0	0	0
4.	0	3 (23%)	0	1 (50%)
5.	1 (7%)	0	0	0
6.	3 (21%)	0	0	1 (50%)
7.	3 (21%)	2 (15%)	0	0
8.	2 (14%)	0	4 (80%)	0
9.	2 (14%)	2 (15%)	0	0
10. (most important)	2 (14%)	6 (46%)	1 (20%)	0

The majority of schools feel chord progression knowledge is important.

3. harmonization at the keyboard

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (least important)	1 (7%)	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0
3.	2 (14%)	0	0	0
4.	1 (7%)	0	0	0
5.	0	1 (7%)	0	0
6.	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)
7.	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	1 (20%)	0
8.	4 (29%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	0
9.	2 (14%)	3 (23%)	1 (20%)	0
10. (most important)	0	5 (39%)	2 (40%)	1 (50%)

The majority of schools (21) listed harmonization at the keyboard in the upper third of the spectrum as being a most important skill.

4. transposition

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (least important)	0	1 (7%)	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0
3.	3 (21%)	2 (15%)	0	0
4.	1 (7%)	0	0	0
5.	2 (14%)	0	0	0
6.	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	1 (20%)	0
7.	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	2 (40%)	0
8.	1 (7%)	4 (31%)	0	1 (50%)
9.	2 (14%)	0	0	0
10. (most important)	1 (7%)	4 (31%)	2 (40%)	1 (50%)

Most of the schools list transposition in the upper third of the spectrum as being a most important skill.

5. sight-reading

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (least important)	0	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0
3.	0	0	0	0
4.	0	0	0	0
5.	2 (14%)	0	0	0
6.	0	0	0	0
7.	2 (14%)	2 (15%)	0	0
8.	2 (14%)	3 (23%)	0	0
9.	2 (14%)	0	0	0
10. (most important)	6 (43%)	8 (62%)	5 (100%)	2 (100%)

No teacher listed sight-reading in the lower third of the spectrum.

Twenty-one teachers listed sight-reading as the number "10" on the scale.

6. repertoire

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
1. (least important)	0	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0
3.	0	0	0	0
4.	1 (7%)	0	1 (20%)	0
5.	2 (14%)	0	1 (20%)	0
6.	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	1 (20%)	0
7.	3 (21%)	4 (31%)	0	1 (50%)
8.	2 (14%)	3 (23%)	0	0
9.	2 (14%)	4 (31%)	0	1 (50%)
10. (most important)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	0	0

Seventeen teachers list repertoire in the middle third of the spectrum while fifteen teachers list it in the upper third.

7. individual performance capabilities

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (least important)	0	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0
3.	0	0	0	0
4.	2 (14%)	0	0	0
5.	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	2 (40%)	0
6.	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	1 (20%)	0
7.	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	1 (20%)	0
8.	1 (7%)	6 (46%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)
9.	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)
10. (most important)	3 (21%)	3 (23%)	0	0

No teacher listed individual performance capabilities as least important. Thirteen teachers listed it in the middle third of the spectrum, and twenty teachers listed it in the upper third.

8. dictation

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (least important)	4 (29%)	4 (31%)	2 (40%)	0
2.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	0	0
3.	3 (21%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0
4.	4 (29%)	0	0	0
5.	0	1 (8%)	0	0
6.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	0	0
7.	1 (7%)	0	1 (20%)	0
8.	0	3 (23%)	0	1 (50%)
9.	0	0	0	0
10. (most important)	0	0	0	1 (50%)

The majority (18) of the teachers rate dictation as a least important skill. Nine teachers rate it in the middle third of the spectrum while 5 teachers rate it as an important skill.

9. composition

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (least important)	5 (36%)	4 (31%)	2 (40%)	1 (50%)
2.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0
3.	3 (21%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	0
4.	1 (7%)	0	1 (20%)	0
5.	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	0	0
6.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	0	1 (50%)
7.	0	2 (15%)	0	0
8.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	0	0
9.	0	0	0	0
10. (most important)	0	0	0	0

Twenty-one teachers rate composition in the lower spectrum (least important). Nine teachers list it in the middle third, and 3 teachers list it in the upper third.

10. playing by ear

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (least important)	3 (21%)	1 (8%)	0	0
2.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	0	0
3.	1 (7%)	3 (23%)	1 (20%)	0
4.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	0	0
5.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	0	0
6.	2 (14%)	2 (15%)	3 (60%)	0
7.	2 (14%)	0	0	0
8.	3 (21%)	0	0	1 (50%)
9.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	0	0
10. (most important)	0	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)

Thirteen teachers rate playing by ear in the middle third of the spectrum. Twelve teachers place it in the lower third (least important) and ten teachers place it in the upper third.

11. history

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (least important)	4 (29%)	3 (23%)	1 (20%)	0
2.	1 (7%)	3 (23%)	1 (20%)	0
3.	0	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0
4.	3 (21%)	0	0	0
5.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	0	0
6.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)
7.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)
8.	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	0	0
9.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	0	0
10. (most important)	1 (7%)	0	0	0

Fifteen place history in the least important third of the spectrum.

Fourteen teachers place it in the middle third, and six teachers place it in the upper third of most important.

12. score reading

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
1. (least important)	3 (21%)	1 (8%)	0	1 (50%)
2.	2 (14%)	2 (15%)	0	0
3.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	0	0
4.	4 (29%)	0	0	0
5.	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	0	0
6.	0	0	2 (40%)	0
7.	0	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0
8.	2 (14%)	5 (39%)	1 (20%)	0
9.	1 (7%)	0	1 (20%)	0
10. (most important)	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	0	1 (50%)

Twelve teachers listed score reading in the lower third of the spectrum while 13 others listed it in the upper third of the spectrum. Eleven teachers listed it in the middle third.

13. improvisation

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (least important)	3 (21%)	0	1 (20%)	0
2.	0	1 (8%)	0	0
3.	2 (14%)	2 (15%)	0	0
4.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	0	0
5.	0	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	0
6.	0	0	1 (20%)	0
7.	2 (14%)	2 (15%)	0	0
8.	7 (50%)	0	2 (40%)	0
9.	0	4 (31%)	0	0
10. (most important)	0	1 (8%)	0	2 (100%)

The majority of teachers (16) feel improvisation is a most important skill. Ten teachers ranked it in the middle third, and nine teachers ranked it in the lower third (least important).

14. accompanying skills

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (least important)	1 (7%)	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0
3.	0	1 (8%)	0	0
4.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	0	0
5.	1 (7%)	3 (23%)	1 (20%)	0
6.	2 (14%)	0	0	0
7.	3 (21%)	2 (15%)	0	0
8.	4 (29%)	2 (15%)	3 (60%)	0
9.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	0	0
10. (most important)	2 (14%)	3 (23%)	1 (20%)	2 (100%)

Nineteen teachers rate accompanying skills in the upper third (most important) of the spectrum. Fourteen teachers list it in the middle third, and 2 teachers list it in the lower third.

15. evaluation of performance

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (least important)	0	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0
3.	1 (7%)	0	0	0
4.	1 (7%)	0	0	0
5.	0	2 (15%)	0	0
6.	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	0	0
7.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	0
8.	3 (21%)	2 (15%)	3 (60%)	1 (50%)
9.	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	0	1 (50%)
10. (most important)	4 (29%)	5 (39%)	1 (20%)	0

Twenty-three teachers rate evaluation of performance in the upper third (most important) of the spectrum. Ten teachers list it in the middle third, and one teacher lists it in the lower third.

Part III - Teachers' Ratings of Skills-Teaching Effectiveness. On a scale of one through ten with one being listed as "not effective", and ten being listed as "highly effective", the teachers were asked to rate the list of functional skills (as found in Part II) on how effectively they as teachers thought they were in helping the students attain the functional skill goals. Upon receiving Part III of the questionnaire from the teachers, the author transferred their answers to computer answer

sheets so the sheets could be processed by the computer. Six schools did not possess laboratories; they were not included in the Part II analysis. One teacher returned Part I of the survey, but did not return Parts II and III. Thirty-four answer sheets were processed for Part III.

TABLE 4

LEVEL AND NUMBER OF SCHOOL RESPONSES TO PART III

Size of School	Number Which Responded
2 yr.	14
4 yr.	13
5 yr.	5
7 yr.	2

1. technique development

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (not effective)	0	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0
3.	0	0	0	0
4.	1 (7%)	0	1 (20%)	0
5.	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0
6.	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0
7.	5 (36%)	2 (15%)	0	0
8.	4 (29%)	6 (46%)	2 (40%)	1 (50%)
9.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	0	0
10. (highly effective)	0	1 (8%)	0	1 (50%)

Most teachers feel they are highly effective in teaching technique development. Twenty-four ranked technique in the upper third, ten teachers ranked it in the middle third, and no teachers ranked it in the lower third.

2. chord progression development

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (not effective)	0	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0
3.	0	1 (8%)	0	0
4.	0	0	0	0
5.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	0	0
6.	2 (14%)	0	0	0
7.	3 (21%)	2 (15%)	2 (40%)	2 (100%)
8.	6 (43%)	1 (8%)	2 (40%)	0
9.	0	6 (46%)	0	0
10. (highly effective)	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0

Nineteen teachers feel they are highly effective in teaching chord progression development. Fourteen teachers rank in the middle third, and one teacher ranks in the lower third.

3. harmonization at the keyboard

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (not effective)	0	0	0	0
2.	1 (7%)	0	0	0
3.	0	0	0	0
4.	0	0	0	0
5.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	0
6.	1 (7%)	0	0	0
7.	5 (36%)	4 (31%)	0	0
8.	5 (36%)	3 (23%)	4 (80%)	1 (50%)
9.	0	3 (23%)	0	1 (50%)
10. (highly effective)	0	1 (8%)	0	0

Nineteen teachers placed their effectiveness in teaching harmonization at the keyboard in the middle range of the spectrum. Seventeen teachers placed themselves in the upper third, and 1 teacher placed him/herself in the lower third.

4. transposition

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
1. (not effective)	0	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0
3.	1 (7%)	3 (23%)	0	0
4.	0	0	0	0
5.	4 (28%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	0
6.	2 (14%)	0	0	0
7.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	0	0
8.	3 (21%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)
9.	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	2 (40%)	1 (50%)
10. (highly effective)	0	3 (23%)	1 (20%)	0

Seventeen teachers believe they are highly effective in teaching transposition. Twelve teachers rank themselves in the middle third of the spectrum, and three teachers believe they are not effective.

5. sight-reading

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (not effective)	0	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0
3.	0	0	0	0
4.	0	0	0	0
5.	5 (36%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0
6.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	0
7.	3 (21%)	2 (15%)	0	0
8.	3 (21%)	4 (31%)	1 (20%)	0
9.	2 (14%)	2 (15%)	2 (40%)	1 (50%)
10. (highly effective)	0	2 (15%)	0	1 (50%)

Eighteen teachers rate themselves as highly effective in teaching sight-reading while 16 rank themselves in the middle third of the spectrum.

6. repertoire

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (not effective)	0	0	0	0
2.	0	0	1 (20%)	0
3.	0	0	0	0
4.	1 (7%)	0	0	0
5.	3 (21%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	0
6.	2 (14%)	0	0	0
7.	2 (14%)	3 (23%)	0	1 (50%)
8.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	0
9.	3 (21%)	4 (31%)	2 (40%)	0
10. (highly effective)	2 (14%)	2 (15%)	0	1 (50%)

Most teachers feel they are highly effective in teaching repertoire.

7. individual performance abilities

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
1. (not effective)	0	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0
3.	1 (7%)	0	0	0
4.	0	0	0	0
5.	2 (14%)	2 (15%)	2 (40%)	0
6.	1 (7%)	0	0	1 (50%)
7.	3 (21%)	5 (39%)	0	0
8.	1 (7%)	3 (23%)	1 (20%)	0
9.	4 (29%)	0	1 (20%)	0
10. (highly effective)	2 (14%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)

Sixteen teachers rate themselves in the middle third of effectiveness.

Sixteen teachers rate themselves as highly effective in teaching individual performance abilities.

8. dictation

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (not effective)	6 (43%)	4 (31%)	2 (40%)	1 (50%)
2.	1 (7%)	0	1 (20%)	0
3.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0
4.	3 (21%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	0
5.	0	2 (15%)	0	0
6.	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	0	0
7.	0	1 (8%)	0	0
8.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	0	0
9.	0	0	0	0
10. (highly effective)	0	1 (8%)	0	1 (50%)

The majority of teachers (18) feel they are not effective in teaching dictation. A possible explanation would be that perhaps they do not teach dictation in their piano classes.

9. composition

	<u>2 yr.</u>	<u>4 yr.</u>	<u>5 yr.</u>	<u>7 yr.</u>
1. (not effective)	7 (50%)	5 (39%)	3 (60%)	1 (50%)
2.	1 (7%)	0	1 (20%)	0
3.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	0	0
4.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	0
5.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	0	0
6.	1 (7%)	0	0	1 (50%)
7.	1 (7%)	0	0	0
8.	0	1 (8%)	0	0
9.	0	0	0	0
10. (highly effective)	0	1 (8%)	0	0

Twenty-one teachers believe they are not effective in teaching composition. This suggests that composition may not be taught in the group piano classes.

10. playing by ear

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (not effective)	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	0	0
2.	0	2 (15%)	0	0
3.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	2 (40%)	0
4.	1 (7%)	3 (23%)	0	0
5.	2 (14%)	2 (15%)	0	1 (50%)
6.	2 (14%)	0	0	0
7.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	3 (60%)	0
8.	3 (21%)	0	0	0
9.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	0	0
10. (highly effective)	0	1 (8%)	0	1 (50%)

The majority (16) of teachers consider themselves in the middle third of the spectrum of teaching effectiveness.

11. history

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (not effective)	4 (29%)	3 (23%)	2 (40%)	1 (50%)
2.	1 (7%)	3 (23%)	0	0
3.	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	0	0
4.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0
5.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	0
6.	2 (14%)	0	1 (20%)	1 (50%)
7.	1 (7%)	0	0	0
8.	0	1 (8%)	0	0
9.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	0	0
10. (highly effective)	0	1 (8%)	0	0

The majority of teachers list themselves as not effective in teaching history.

12. score reading

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (not effective)	4 (20%)	1 (8%)	0	0
2.	2 (14%)	3 (23%)	1 (20%)	0
3.	0	0	1 (20%)	0
4.	2 (14%)	3 (23%)	1 (20%)	0
5.	0	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0
6.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	0	0
7.	2 (14%)	2 (15%)	2 (40%)	0
8.	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)
9.	0	0	0	0
10. (highly effective)	0	0	0	1 (50%)

The majority of teachers rank themselves as not effective in teaching score reading.

13. improvisation

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (not effective)	2 (14%)	0	0	0
2.	0	1 (8%)	0	0
3.	0	1 (8%)	0	0
4.	1 (7%)	4 (31%)	1 (20%)	0
5.	3 (21%)	1 (8%)	2 (40%)	0
6.	3 (21%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0
7.	3 (21%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	0
8.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0
9.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	0	1 (50%)
10. (highly effective)	0	1 (8%)	0	1 (50%)

The majority of teachers rank themselves in the middle third of teaching effectiveness of improvisation.

14. accompanying skills

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (not effective)	1 (7%)	0	0	0
2.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	0	0
3.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0
4.	0	1 (8%)	0	0
5.	2 (14%)	3 (23%)	1 (20%)	0
6.	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0
7.	4 (29%)	3 (23%)	0	1 (50%)
8.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)
9.	1 (7%)	0	0	0
10. (highly effective)	0	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	0

Nineteen teachers rank themselves in the middle third of effectiveness in teaching accompaniment skills.

15. evaluation of performance

	2 yr.	4 yr.	5 yr.	7 yr.
1. (not effective)	0	0	0	0
2.	2 (14%)	0	0	0
3.	2 (14%)	0	0	0
4.	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0
5.	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	0	0
6.	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	0
7.	2 (14%)	2 (15%)	0	0
8.	1 (7%)	4 (31%)	1 (20%)	0
9.	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)
10. (highly effective)	2 (14%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)	1 (50%)

The majority of teachers rank themselves as highly effective in teaching the evaluation of performance.

Part IV - Optional Questions - Question One. Of the 41 participating teachers, 17 responded to question number one which asked participants' opinions of what is or should be the focus of group piano teaching in higher education today. Their responses are broken down in the following table.

TABLE 5
RESPONSE DISTRIBUTION TO QUESTION ONE, PART IV

Number of Teachers	Number of Responses
6	1 response only
6	2 responses
3	3 responses
1	4 responses
1	6 responses

Seventeen teachers expressed 33 ideas of what the purpose of group piano teaching should be. Their ideas are the following:

TABLE 6
TEACHERS' OPINIONS OF GROUP PIANO'S PURPOSE

Number of Teachers	Ideas
8	- to teach comprehensive musicianship
4	- to learn and to prepare basic skills
4	- to increase musical pleasure
3	- to explore all types of music
3	- to teach theory and keyboard harmony
3	- to teach musicality
2	- to save teacher time
2	- to teach self-confidence
2	- to organize practice time
2	- to teach a large number of students
1	- to instill competitiveness
1	- to teach adults
1	- to teach independence
1	- to teach anyone who wishes to learn

The responses may be loosely grouped to support three major goals - musical goals, efficiency and economical goals, and students' self-improvement goals.

The more obvious musical goal of acquiring the skills necessary to play the piano, developing an appreciation of and a further understanding of music, and using the piano as a medium of self-expression is supported by 23 responses.

The second goal is using the piano laboratory as the means of educating a great number of people in the shortest amount of time while using the least number of teachers. Group lesson times can be very structured and organized practice sessions. They allow the space for people from various backgrounds and from various age groups the opportunity to learn to play the piano. This goal received 6 responses.

The third goal, which gathered 4 responses, focused on developing the non-musical, yet personal characteristics of instilling independence, competitiveness, and self-confidence to the participants.

Although these three goals vary widely in type and scope, Kansas class piano instructors designate the goals as contributors towards the successful class piano instruction.

Question Two. Question two asks teachers to list their daily problems they encounter and when feasible, offer possible solutions. This question elicited 34 responses from 18 people. The breakdown is as follows:

TABLE 7
 RESPONSE DISTRIBUTION TO QUESTION TWO, PART IV

Number of Teachers	Number of Responses
8	1
5	2
4	3
1	4

Their problems as they listed them are:

TABLE 8
 COMMON TEACHING PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

Number of Teachers	Problems
6	- grouping classes by abilities
5	- insufficient class time
4	- coordinate practicers with non-practicers
4	- coordinate lesson plans
4	- no motivation or incentive
3	- lack of proper facilities and materials
2	- insufficient credit hours given
2	- no self-confidence
1	- hand-eye coordination
1	- absenteeism
1	- faculty and community ignorance
1	- teaching applied theory

The problems may be loosely grouped into three areas - teacher problems, school or facility problems, and student problems.

The foremost problem (receiving 12 responses) is the teacher's task of coordinating the daily lesson plan so that each student is exposed to optimum opportunity for learning. The task is made difficult when the extreme variability of students' talents, abilities, and outside practice habits occurs within one class. The difficulty is more acute in smaller schools where the smaller enrollment prohibits addition of classes where students could be grouped better by abilities. Added to grouping and planning problems is the lack of acceptance of the class piano concept by the faculty and community.

The second problem (11 responses) deals directly with students' attitudes. Teachers report that many students lack motivation, incentive and self-confidence. The students do not practice and absenteeism from class is frequent.

The third problem (11 responses) deals with school administrative problems. Teachers report that they have insufficient class time to teach, students receive inadequate credit hours for the time they spend on class piano, and teachers are required to teach applied theory rather than learning the piano. Insufficient equipment and materials are also on this list.

Solutions. Seven people offered one solution each.

TABLE 9

TEACHERS' SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS

Number of Teachers	Solutions
208	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - periodically regroup classes 1 - educate the community about class piano 1 - set minimum technical requirements 1 - increase credit hour 1 - expand the number of classes 1 - brag on the students 1 - purchase better or more equipment

The recommended solutions, while positive in nature, are indefinite in how to effect the needed change.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

After taking piano pedagogy classes as an undergraduate, and after listening to the frustrations and complaints of classmates who were instrumental music majors required to enroll in class piano, the author decided to survey the colleges and universities in Kansas to discover what the higher institutions actually taught, in what manner they taught, and on what type of equipment they taught. Information from the survey would provide a general guideline to high school seniors planning a career in music, and to the class piano teachers themselves as concerns their abilities to coordinate instructional programs from school to school to facilitate student transfer.

An overall view of the survey and its results reveals that more similarities than differences occur between the two-year community colleges and the four-year colleges and universities. In this chapter, the results will be analyzed in accordance with each part of the survey.

Summary

Part I - Description of Institutions

The Schools. The survey was mailed to 48 two- and four-year schools in Kansas in November. When totaled in March, the author had received 41 responses from the schools. The 41 responses were sent through the computer for processing. The computer immediately discarded six

answer sheets on the basis that they did not possess laboratories or teach class piano in any manner. Statistics which follow are based upon a total of 34 school responses which represent 14 two-year or community colleges, 14 four-year schools which award bachelor's degrees, 5 five-year schools which award bachelor's and master's degrees, and 1 school which awards bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees. The school which awards the doctoral degrees answered two questionnaires. Two separate tracks are taught - one for music education and music therapy majors, the second for other music and non-music majors.

Laboratories. The majority of schools' laboratories are approximately ten years old, are from four to six pianos in size, use predominately electronic pianos, and do not use extra equipment as the tape recorder, self-instructional tapes, overhead projectors, and slide projectors. Differences occur in that nine of the community colleges use visualizers in comparison with five four-year schools. Community colleges own the Baldwin and Musictronic labs whereas the four-year schools prefer the Wurlitzer lab.

Class Time and Credit. The majority of all schools offer two years of class piano instruction (three or four semesters or terms), and meet their classes for two times or periods a week (two hours) for one hour credit. Differences occur in the doctoral-level school where classes meet three times per week for two hours credit.

Students. Results indicate that all of the schools permit all types of students to enroll in class piano regardless of their majors or backgrounds. Thirteen of the schools teach handicapped students while 19 of the schools do not. Figures indicate that the two-year schools more often teach handicapped students and people from the community than do the four-year schools.

Enrollment. The schools which award master's and doctoral degrees have more students enrolled in group piano classes than the community colleges or the four-year schools which award bachelor's degrees.

TABLE 10

ENROLLMENT IN CLASS PIANO PROGRAMS

Number of Schools	Number of Students in Class Piano
8	16 to 24 students
8	11 to 15 students
7	over 34 students
6	1 to 10 students

The majority of schools (26) allow one piano per student (students do not share pianos), and provide pianos outside of class for student practice. Fifteen schools noted little or no difference in enrollment changes over the past three years. Thirteen schools reported a definite increase in enrollment, and four schools reported a definite decrease in enrollment. Of the four schools reporting a decrease in enrollment, three of them were of the four-year schools.

Teachers. The schools with advanced degree programs employ more people to teach group piano than do the two-year schools. Most of the schools hire three teachers or less. The two-year schools and the schools which award bachelor's degrees as their highest degree use regular faculty only. In the schools where graduate assistants are available, the majority use the combination of graduate students and regular faculty as instructors.

The majority of teachers have backgrounds in various music fields. Of the 31 schools which answered, 9 indicated they use group piano teachers with applied piano backgrounds only. While the majority of teachers in all schools have had group piano training, 8 reported they have not had specific group training.

The majority of teachers felt they gained more knowledge from studying texts and books by piano specialists than from other sources. The two-year schools' instructors felt they were aided most by attending state, regional, and national conventions.

Instruction. All schools, with the exception of 2 two-year schools claim to stress the teaching of functional skills rather than traditional literature. The schools do not teach one skill at one level only, but follow a "spiral curriculum" in which specific topics are repeated at each level of increasing difficulty throughout the group piano program. The majority of the teachers reveals a preference for teaching piano by the multiple key approach, but 3 teachers continue to use the middle C

approach (2 of the 3 are community college teachers).

Nineteen schools stress solo playing and 13 schools stress ensemble playing. The figures indicate that the community colleges and the four-year schools which award bachelor's degrees stress solo playing while the schools which award master's and doctoral degrees stress ensemble playing.

The teaching of jazz and improvisation, traditional classical music, religious music, easy listening music, folk music, patriotic music and contemporary music were supported by the majority of teachers from the various level schools. The teaching of pop/rock music was supported by the majority of schools, but the schools which award advanced degrees were divided (4 in favor, 3 not in favor) in its teaching.

Of the 21 method books presented in the questionnaire, only 2 (Bastien and Diller-Quaile) received any noticeable support from the majority of teachers. All the methods (except the Gilbert method) received a few votes.

Part II and Part III - Skills - Importance and Effectiveness

Part II listed 15 functional skills which teachers were asked to rate along a 10-point scale according to their teaching importance.

Divisions did not seem to follow any particular level of instruction as a majority from each school level voted in the same manner.

In Part III, the functional skills were again listed and rated along a 10-point scale on how effectively the teacher believed he/she was

teaching the skills. Again divisions did not seem to occur between degree level schools, but rather a majority in all levels voted in the same manner. To illustrate the similarities and differences between Part II and Part III, the following summary was prepared.

TABLE 11

A COMPARISON OF SKILLS' IMPORTANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS

Skills	Part II			Part III		
	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
technique development:			X			X
chord progression development:			X			X
harmonization at the keyboard:			X		X	
transposition:			X			X
sight-reading:			X			X
repertoire:		X			X	
individual performance capabilities:			X		X (tie)	X
dictation:	X			X		
composition:	X			X		
playing by ear:		X			X	
history:	X			X		
score reading:	X			X		
improvisation:			X		X	
accompanying skills:			X		X	
evaluation of performance:			X		X	

*low=lower third of spectrum - includes scale numbers 1-3; middle=middle third of spectrum - includes scale numbers 4-7; high=higher third of spectrum - includes scale numbers 8-10.

The correlation between the importance of the skill and the effectiveness in teaching the skill were almost identical. Differences occurred in the areas of harmonization at the keyboard, improvisation, accompanying skills, and evaluation of performance. In these skills, the teachers rated them as most important skills, but felt they as teachers were in the middle range of teaching effectiveness.

The skills designated as most important and highly effective in teaching were: individual performance capabilities, technique development, chord progression knowledge, transposition, and sight-reading.

Skills listed as not important and not effective were: dictation, composition, history, and score reading. Perhaps these skills are not presented in the classes.

Falling in the middle range of importance and effectiveness were the skills of repertoire and playing by ear.

Part IV - Optional Questions

Sixteen teachers chose to respond to Part IV, question one. Loosely grouped, their ideas of what the purpose of group piano teaching should be fell into three major goals - 1) to acquire the skills necessary to playing the piano, 2) to use the piano laboratory as an inexpensive and fast means of educating a number of people, and 3) to develop the non-musical and personal characteristics of the students.

Eighteen teachers responded to Part IV, question two. Their

problems as they listed them can be grouped into three divisions:

1) teacher problems, 2) school or facility problems, and 3) student problems. Seven teachers offered solutions, but the solutions were indefinite in how to effect the needed changes.

Conclusions

The hypothesis is that no differences of teaching goals and programs occur between the two- and four-year colleges and universities in Kansas. Evidence gathered from this survey indicates that differences between the schools are minimal, and thus this hypothesis is supported.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Bastien, James. How to Teach Piano Successfully. Part Ridge, Illinois, and La Jolla, California: Kjos, 1973. 496 pp.
- Birge, Edward Bailey. History of Public School Music in the United States. Byrn Mawr, Pennsylvania: Oliver Ditson Co., 1937. 323 pp.
- Last, Joan. The Young Pianist: A New Approach for Teachers and Students. London: Oxford University Press, 1972. 2nd ed., 4th impression, 1978. x, 155 pp.
- Lyke, James, Elisabeth Hartline, and Ron Elliston. Keyboard Musicianship. Champaign, Illinois: Stipes Publishing Company, 1974. vi, 200 pp.
- McLain, Margaret Starr. Class Piano. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1974. xv, 284 pp.
- Pace, Robert. Piano for Classroom Music. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1971. xiii, 123 pp.
- Page, Cleveland L. The Laboratory Piano Course: Instructor's Manual. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1974. vii, 50 pp.
- Page, Cleveland L. The Laboratory Piano Course. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1974. xi, 131 pp.
- Swartz, Jack P. The Collegiate Piano Course. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971. vii, 142 pp.

Zimmerman, Alex H. , Russell Hayton, and Dorothy Priesing. Basic Piano for the College Student. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1974. 2nd ed. 202 pp.

Periodicals

Almlie, Marie. Group instruction in the private studio. Clavier, January 1979, 18, 41-42.

Bashaw, Donna. Igniting the creative spark. Clavier, April 1980, 19, 34-35.

Bianchi, Louise. Curriculum: for success, make your program match your group. The Piano Quarterly, Spring 1978, 101, 19-22.

Buchanan, Gillian. Skills of piano performance in the preparation of music educators. Journal of Research in Music Education, Summer 1964, 12, 134-138.

Catron, Betty Schien. Class piano for senior citizens. Clavier, December 1979, 16, 23.

Chronister, Richard. Piano teaching - past, present, future. Keyboard Arts, Winter 1977, 3-6.

Dolence, Doris. Where are the electronic piano labs in the public schools? Clavier, January 1980, 19, 23, 47-48, 50.

Erlings, Billie. Goals and rewards: developing aesthetic sensitivity and independent learning. The Piano Quarterly, Spring 1978, 101, 4-11.

Fuszek, Rita. Sight-reading at the college level: the ignored skill. Keyboard Arts, Spring 1977, 5-7.

Fuszek, Rita. Sight-reading at the college level: the ignored skill.

Keyboard Arts, Winter 1977, 12-14.

Goss, Louise L. Why not have it both ways. The Piano Quarterly,

Spring 1978, 101, 30-34.

Hersh, Alan B. College piano teaching. Clavier, February 1979, 18,

32-33.

Kansas State Department of Education. Kansas Educational Directory,

1979-1980. Topeka, Kansas: Kansas State Building, 1979, 121-127.

Lancaster, E. L. Selecting materials for piano classes. Clavier,

March 1977, 16, 26-27, 42-43.

Lancaster, E. L. Selecting materials for piano classes. Clavier,

April 1977, 16, 38-40, 44.

Lancaster, E. L. Training the group piano instructor. The American

Music Teacher, April-May 1979, 28, 12-18.

Lowder, Jerry E. Evaluation of a sight-reading test administered to

freshman piano classes. Journal of Research in Music Education,

Spring 1973, 21, 68-73.

Lyke, James B. What should our piano minors study? Music Educators

Journal, December 1979, 56, 49-51, 53.

Mach, Elyse. Teaching piano beginners via television. The Piano

Quarterly, Spring 1978, 101, 26-27.

Ozanian, Carole. Teaching the older beginner. Clavier, December

1979, 18, 26-29, 36.

- Page, Cleveland L. Secondary piano students; a sometime disaster at the college level. Clavier, September 1973, 12, 20-21.
- Pardue, Tommic. Class piano instruction in your school. Clavier, December 1978, 17, 27, 33.
- Payne, Charles. Why not group piano? American Music Teacher, September-October 1979, 29, 32-33.
- Polk, Mary Ann. Piano by note and by ear. Clavier, October 1980, 19, 42-43.
- Rast, Lawrence. Functional piano for tomorrow's educators. Music Journal, February 1968, 26, 37, 65-67.
- Richards, William H. A brief chronology. The Piano Quarterly, Spring Spring 1978, 101, 12.
- Richards, William H. Success with the piano proficiency exam. Clavier, October 1977, 16, 31-34.
- Robinson, Helene. Piano classes at Arizona State University. The Piano Quarterly, Summer 1975, 90, 23-27.
- Simowitz, Carol. Young spirits in older pianists. Clavier, December 1977, 16, 22.
- Trantham, William E. A music theory approach to beginning piano instruction for the college music major. Journal of Research in Music Education, Spring 1970, 18, 49-56.
- Van Tress, Lester. The Russians are coming: piano study in the Soviet Union. Clavier, April 1979, 18, 32-41.

Well, Alfred R. Group piano. The Piano Quarterly, Spring 1978, 101,
3.

Yoder, Alene. The excitement of multi-piano concerts. Clavier, April
1979, 18, 27-29.

Interview

Silini, Flora. Coordinator of Group Piano Instruction, University of
Kansas. Interview, 7 October 1975.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Survey

November 4, 1980

Dear Group Piano Instructor:

Presently I am working on my thesis for a master's degree in music education at the University of Kansas. To help with the project, I am hoping that you will have the 12-15 minutes necessary to fill out the enclosed survey, and that you can return it to me as soon as possible. We hope to learn some very useful things about group piano instruction at the college level in Kansas, and if you wish a summary of the findings of this study, I will be pleased to provide one. Simply indicate this wish by sending me your name and address. Thank you for your cooperation and help.

Sincerely,

Gayle Umberger

enclosures: survey, envelope, pencil, computer answer sheet

Class Piano Survey

DIRECTIONS:

PART 1: Read each question carefully and, using the black lead No. 2 pencil enclosed, mark each answer on the computer answer sheet. You may keep the question sheet.

PART 2 and PART 3: Mark your answers directly on the survey.

PART 4: This section is purely optional. If you have any comments you would like to make, please make them here.

Please return to me in the envelope provided: the computer answer sheet, and Parts 2, 3, and 4.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Class Piano Survey

Part 1

1. Is your institution:
 - a) a two-year institution awarding associate degrees?
 - b) a four-year institution awarding bachelor's degrees in music and/or music education?
 - c) a graduate level institution awarding bachelor's and master's degrees in music and/or music education?
 - d) a graduate level institution awarding bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees in music and/or music education?
2. Does your school offer group piano classes?
 - a) yes
 - b) no
3. How many years has your school had a piano lab?
 - a) five years or less
 - b) six to ten years
 - c) eleven to fifteen years
 - d) sixteen to twenty years
 - e) over twenty-one years
4. Are your group piano classes for:
 - a) music education/music therapy students only?
 - b) composition, theory, and applied music students only?
 - c) a and b combined?
 - d) for any student who wishes to take piano lessons regardless of major?
 - e) all of the above?
5. Is your lab used in the teaching of any handicapped students?
 - a) yes
 - b) no
6. Is your piano lab used in any type of adult or community education program?
 - a) yes
 - b) no

Part 1, cont'd

7. How many pianos are used in your teaching lab?
- a) one piano only
 - b) two or three pianos
 - c) four to six pianos
 - d) seven to ten pianos
 - e) eleven to fourteen pianos
8. Does your piano lab consist of:
- a) entirely acoustical pianos?
 - b) entirely electronic pianos?
 - c) a mixture of acoustical and electronic pianos?
 - d) other?
9. What type (brand name) of electronic lab equipment do you use?
- a) Wurlitzer lab
 - b) Baldwin lab
 - c) Musictronic lab
 - d) other
 - e) none
10. Do you use a tape recorder in your class piano instruction?
- a) yes
 - b) no
11. Do the students record their performances and listen to them?
- a) yes
 - b) no
12. Do you use self-instructional tapes (for example, Music Minus One) in your teaching?
- a) yes
 - b) no
13. Do you use an overhead projector in your instruction?
- a) yes
 - b) no
14. Do you use a slide projector in your instruction?
- a) yes
 - b) no

Part 1, cont'd

15. Do you use a visualizer in your instruction?

- a) yes
- b) no

16. Is the group piano staff composed of:

- a) graduate assistants only?
- b) regular faculty only?
- c) a combination of graduate assistants and regular faculty?
- d) other?

17. What types of educational backgrounds do your piano lab staff have?

- a) applied piano majors
- b) music education or music therapy majors
- c) theory and/or composition majors
- d) any combination of the above
- e) other

18. Has your group piano faculty had specific group or class piano training?

- a) yes
- b) no

19. Which of the following have been most helpful to you and your staff in your continuing education as group piano teachers?

- a) magazines
- b) state, regional, and national conventions
- c) studying texts and books by piano specialists
- d) professional organizations
- e) other

20. How many persons teach group piano in your school?

- a) one person
- b) two or three people
- c) four or five people
- d) six or seven people
- e) over eight people

21. In your group piano lab, how many students use one piano at a time?

- a) one student at a time only
- b) two students
- c) three students
- d) four students
- e) over four students

Part 1, cont'd

22. How many years of group piano does your school offer?
- a) one year only
 - b) two years
 - c) three years
 - d) four years
 - e) over four years
23. What is the average length of the group piano instruction for your music majors?
- a) one or two semesters or terms
 - b) three or four semesters or terms
 - c) five or six semesters or terms
 - d) seven or eight semesters or terms
 - e) other
24. How many times per week do your group piano classes meet?
- a) one time or period only
 - b) two times or periods
 - c) three times or periods
 - d) four times or periods
 - e) over four times or periods
25. Approximately how many hours per week is the student in group piano class?
- a) one hour
 - b) two hours
 - c) three hours
 - d) four hours
 - e) over four hours
26. How many hours credit does a student earn for each term (semester) of group piano?
- a) one-half hour credit
 - b) one hour credit
 - c) two hours credit
 - d) three hours credit
 - e) four hours credit

Part 1, cont'd

27. In one semester or term, what is the average total number of students enrolled in class piano (all sections combined)?
- a) 1 to 10 students
 - b) 11 to 15 students
 - c) 16 to 24 students
 - d) 25 to 34 students
 - e) over 34 students
28. Has enrollment changed in your class piano program over the past three years?
- a) little or no change
 - b) a definite increase in enrollment
 - c) a definite decrease in enrollment
29. Are pianos available for your students to practice other than in class?
- a) yes
 - b) no
30. In your teaching, which do you emphasis more?
- a) functional skills (transposition, sight-reading, improvisation)
 - b) traditional literature
31. Do you follow an intense program where one skill is taught at one level only (for example, harmonization is taught only at level one, transposition is taught only on level two)?
- a) yes
 - b) no
32. Do you follow a "spiral curriculum" in which specific topics (for example, transposition) are repeated at each level of increasing difficulty throughout the group piano program?
- a) yes
 - b) no
33. Does your personal philosophy concerning the teaching of piano reveal a preference for:
- a) multiple key approach
 - b) the middle C approach
 - c) the black key (learning groups of twos and threes) approach
 - d) other
34. In your teaching, which do you stress more?
- a) ensemble playing
 - b) solo playing

Part 1, cont'd

QUESTIONS NUMBERING 35 THROUGH 43 ALL PERTAIN TO THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT:

Are your classes designed to help students develop skills in playing...

35. country and western music?

a) yes

b) no

38. pop/rock music?

a) yes

b) no

41. folk music?

a) yes

b) no

36. jazz and improvisation?

a) yes

b) no

39. religious music?

a) yes

b) no

42. patriotic music?

a) yes

b) no

37. traditional classical music?
(includes Baroque, Romantic, etc.)

a) yes

b) no

40. easy listening music?

a) yes

b) no

43. contemporary music?
(for example, atonal, tone clusters)

a) yes

b) no

Part 1, cont'd

QUESTIONS NUMBERING 44 THROUGH 65 ALL PERTAIN TO THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT OF TEACHING MATERIALS:

Do you use the following series of materials in your teaching of group piano?

- | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| 44. Francis Clark | 51. Pace | 54. CMP Library | 60. Swartz |
| a) yes | a) yes | a) yes | a) yes |
| b) no | b) no | b) no | b) no |
| 45. Jane or James Bastien | 52. Diller Quaille | 55. Noona | 61. Zimmerman |
| a) yes | a) yes | a) yes | a) yes |
| b) no | b) no | b) no | b) no |
| 46. John Thompson | 53. Wurlitzer (Lawrence Rast) | 56. Olson | 62. Page |
| a) yes | a) yes | a) yes | a) yes |
| b) no | b) no | b) no | b) no |
| 47. Glover | 49. Burnam | 57. Richter | 63. Bradley |
| a) yes | a) yes | a) yes | a) yes |
| b) no | b) no | b) no | b) no |
| 48. Schaum | 50. Hartline, Lyke, Elliston | 58. Eckstein | 64. Gilbert |
| a) yes | a) yes | a) yes | a) yes |
| b) no | b) no | b) no | b) no |
| | | 59. McClain | 65. Palmer |
| | | a) yes | a) yes |
| | | b) no | b) no |

Class Piano Survey

Part 2

Following is a list of functional piano skills. On a scale of one through ten with one being listed as "least important" and ten being listed as "most important", please rate the importance of each of these goals in your particular program.

	LEAST IMPORTANT					MOST IMPORTANT				
technique development:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
chord progression knowledge:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
harmonization at the keyboard:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
transposition:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
sight-reading:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
repertoire:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
individual performance capabilities:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
dictation:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
composition:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
playing by ear:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
history:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
score reading:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
improvisation:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
accompanying skills:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
evaluation of performance:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Class Piano Survey

Part 3

Following is the same list of functional piano skills as was found in part two. This time, please rate how effectively you feel you are helping the students to attain these goals. On the list of one to ten, please note that one is rated "not effective" and that ten is rated "highly effective".

	NOT EFFECTIVE					HIGHLY EFFECTIVE				
technique development:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
chord progression development:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
harmonization at the keyboard:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
transposition:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
sight-reading:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
repertoire:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
individual performance capabilities:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
dictation:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
composition:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
playing by ear:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
history:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
score reading:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
improvisation:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
accompanying skills:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
evaluation of performance:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Class Piano Survey

Part 4

Please understand that the questions in this section are purely optional. Feel free to write any comments that you wish.

1. What do you feel should be the main purpose of group piano instruction in higher education today?

Part 4, cont'd

2. Please list and describe the more important problems that you face daily as a group piano teacher. If you have suggestions for improving these problems, please discuss.

APPENDIX B

Addresses

FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Emporia State University
1200 Commercial
Emporia, Ks. 66801
phone: 316-343-1200

Fort Hays State University
Malloy Hall
Hays, Ks. 67601
phone: 913-628-4000

Pittsburg State University
1701 South Broadway
Pittsburg, Ks. 66762
phone: 316-231-7000

Kansas State University
Anderson Hall
Manhattan, Ks. 66506
phone: 913-532-6110

University of Kansas
Murphy Hall
Lawrence, Ks. 66045
phone: 913-864-2700

Wichita State University
Wichita, Ks. 67208
phone: 316-689-3456

Washburn University
1700 College Avenue
Topeka, Ks. 66621
phone: 913-295-6300

Baker University
8th and Grove
Baldwin City, Ks. 66006
phone: 913-594-6451

Benedictine College
Atchison, Ks. 66002
phone: 913-367-6110

Bethany College
Lindsborg, Ks. 67456
phone: 913-227-3311

Bethel College
North Newton
Newton, Ks. 67117
phone: 316-283-2500

Friends University
2100 University
Wichita, Ks. 67213
phone: 316-261-5800

Kansas Newman College
3100 McCormick
Wichita, Ks. 67213
phone: 316-942-4291

Kansas Wesleyan
Santa Fe and Claflin
Salina, Ks. 67401
phone: 913-827-5541

Marymount College of Kansas
Salina, Ks. 67401
phone: 913-825-2101

McPherson College
1600 E. Euclid
McPherson, Ks. 67460
phone: 316-241-0731

TWO-YEAR AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Allen County Community College
1801 North Cottonwood
Iola, Ks. 66749
phone: 316-365-5116

Fort Scott Community College
2108 South Horton
Fort Scott, Ks. 66701
phone: 316-223-2700

Barton County Community College
Great Bend, Ks. 67530
phone: 316-792-2701

Garden City Community College
Box 977, Campus Drive
Garden City, Ks. 67846
phone: 316-276-2611

Butler County Community College
Box 888
El Dorado, Ks. 67042
phone: 316-321-5083

Haskell Indian College
Lawrence, Ks. 66044
phone: 913-841-2000

Cloud County Community College
2221 Campus Drive
Concordia, Ks. 66901
phone: 913-243-1435

Highland Community College
Box 68
Highland, Ks. 66035
phone: 913-442-3238

Coffeyville Community College
P. O. Box 571
Coffeyville, Ks. 67337

Hutchinson Community College
1300 North Plum
Hutchinson, Ks. 67501
phone: 316-663-5781

Colby Community College
1255 South Range
Colby, Ks. 67701
phone: 913-462-3984

Independence Community College
Box 708
College Ave. and Brookside Drive
Independence, Ks. 67301
phone: 316-331-4100

Cowley Community College
125 South Second
Arkansas City, Ks. 67005
phone: 316-442-0430

Johnson County Community College
College Boulevard at Quivira Road
Overland Park, Ks. 66210
phone: 913-888-8500

Dodge City Community College
14th Ave. and Bypass 50
Dodge City, Ks. 67801
phone: 316-225-1321

Kansas City, Ks. Community College
7250 State Avenue
Kansas City, Ks. 66112
phone: 913-334-1100

Labette Community College
200 South 14th, Box 957
Parsons, Ks. 67357
phone: 316-421-6700

Neosho County Community College
1000 South Allen
Chanute, Ks. 66720
phone: 316-431-2820

Pratt Community College
P. O. Box 309
Pratt, Ks. 67124
phone: 316-672-5641

Seward County Community College
Box 1137
Liberal, Ks. 67901
phone: 316-624-1951

Central College
1200 South Main
McPherson, Ks. 67460
phone: 316-241-0723

Donnelly College
1236 Sandusky Avenue
Kansas City, Ks. 66102
phone: 913-621-6070

Hesston College
Hesston, Ks. 67062
phone: 316-327-4221

Manhattan Christian College
Anderson and Fourteenth
Manhattan, Ks. 66502
phone: 913-539-7582

St. John's College
Seventh and College
Winfield, Ks. 67156
phone: 316-221-4000