

2019

# Repertoire selection practices of piano teachers of intermediate-level students as a function of teaching experience and training

---

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/35742>

*"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."*

BOSTON UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS

Dissertation

**REPERTOIRE SELECTION PRACTICES OF PIANO TEACHERS OF  
INTERMEDIATE-LEVEL STUDENTS AS A FUNCTION OF  
TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING**

by

**ELLEN BULOW**

B.A., University of Hawaii, 1992  
M.M., Winthrop University, 1996

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Musical Arts

2019

© 2019 by  
ELLEN BULOW  
All rights reserved

Approved by

First Reader

---

Casey J. Clementson, Ph.D.  
Lecturer in Music Education  
University of Minnesota

Second Reader

---

Karin S. Hendricks, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor of Music, Music Education

Third Reader

---

Ronald P. Kos Jr., Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor of Music, Music Education

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A study such as this involves the support and help of many individuals who stood behind me and encouraged my work on any levels. It involves those who assisted me with technical support, analytical insights and the solid guidance of those who I consider my mentors. I would like to thank the members of the committee who reviewed my dissertation. Special appreciation must be given to Dr. Casey Clementson for her supervision and thoughtful editorial assistance. Her patience and understanding were immeasurable. I also want to thank Dr. Richard Bunbury and Dr. Kathy Kerstetter for their guidance in preparing my research study.

The completion of this dissertation could not have been made possible without the continuous support and encouragement from my parents, my brother and his family. Finally, I am grateful to my husband and two children who endured this long journey with me. While it is not possible to express my sentiments fully, I am eternally grateful for all of those who contributed to my education, helping me grow as a teacher and researcher and who steadfastly believed in my work. I am humbled by the experience and am now even more dedicated to teaching others of the value of and significance of thoughtful inquiring into the study of music.

**REPERTOIRE SELECTION PRACTICES OF PIANO TEACHERS OF  
INTERMEDIATE-LEVEL STUDENTS AS A FUNCTION OF  
TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING**

**ELLEN BULOW**

Boston University College of Fine Arts, 2019

Major Professor: Casey J. Clementson, Ph.D., Lecturer in Music Education, University of Minnesota

**ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the repertoire selection practices of pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained private piano instructors concerning their intermediate-level students. The primary goal was to explore if there were any differences between pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained private piano instructors in their repertoire selections sources and criteria. I also examined the relationship between teacher experience and training and repertoire selection practices of the teachers. Using Shulman's pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) framework, the study provided an understanding of pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained private piano instructors' (a) curriculum knowledge of teaching materials and resources and (b) content knowledge of teaching materials and literature. I further explored how this knowledge interplayed with teaching experiences and pedagogical training.

I designed a 49-item questionnaire to collect private piano teachers' demographic information and musical backgrounds, as well as their repertoire selection sources and criteria. The population for the study included 157 private piano teachers from the Midwest. Results indicated that there was no significant difference between

pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers in regards to repertoire selection sources (curriculum knowledge) at the intermediate level. However, there were significant differences in two content-based influencing criteria, *musical quality* and *appeal of the work*, between pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers at the intermediate level. Regarding the intermediate-level repertoire selection practices of piano teachers as a function of experience and pedagogical training, the data indicated that these qualities and attributes significantly affected how piano teachers selected repertoire in two areas: the repertoire selection source *lists* and the repertoire selection influence *outside elements*. The findings suggest that non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers with fewer years of experience lacked pedagogical content knowledge when compared to pedagogically-trained teachers. Practical implications of these results include curriculum change in piano pedagogy courses at the collegiate level as well as encouraging professional music organizations to provide resources to assist non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers in skill development.

## Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1 .....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Intermediate-Level Private Piano Curricula.....	4
Pedagogical Content Knowledge: Theoretical Framework .....	7
Three Types of Knowledge.....	8
Seven Types of Knowledge .....	10
Repertoire Selection and “Text” .....	11
Repertoire Selection Sources and Curriculum Knowledge .....	12
Repertoire Selection Criteria and Pedagogical Content Knowledge .....	12
Statement of Problem.....	13
Purpose of the Study and Research Questions .....	14
Need for the Study .....	16
CHAPTER 2 .....	18
LITERATURE REVIEW .....	18
Teacher Pedagogical Content Knowledge .....	18
Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Music Education .....	19
Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Private Instrumental Teaching .....	27
Quality Repertoire Selection .....	29
Applied Piano and Intermediate-Level Teaching .....	30
Band Research.....	34

Orchestral Research.....	41
Choral Research .....	43
Alignment of Literature to Research Questions .....	52
Repertoire Selection Criteria .....	53
Repertoire Selection and Sources (Curriculum Knowledge).....	54
Repertoire Section and Teacher Experience.....	56
Repertoire Selection and Teacher Training.....	57
CHAPTER 3 .....	59
METHOD .....	59
Survey Design .....	60
Private Piano Teacher Questionnaire (PPTQ).....	61
Repertoire Selection Questionnaire (RSQ).....	62
Pilot Survey Instrument.....	66
Survey Administration.....	67
Population .....	67
Data Collection .....	68
Participants.....	69
Analysis.....	70
Repertoire Selection Practice.....	71
Teaching Experience and Training .....	71

Data Analysis .....	72
CHAPTER 4 .....	73
RESULTS .....	73
Demographic Data .....	74
Repertoire Selection Sources.....	77
Repertoire Selection Influences.....	82
Repertoire Selection Training.....	87
Experience and Training .....	89
Summary .....	96
CHAPTER 5 .....	99
DISCUSSION .....	99
Discussion of Findings.....	103
Repertoire Selection Sources .....	103
Repertoire Selection Criteria .....	105
Repertoire Selection Practices, Teaching Experience and Pedagogical Training ...	107
Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Further Research.....	108
Implications for Practice .....	113
Mentorship.....	113
Repertoire Selection .....	114
Subject Content Knowledge .....	117
Teacher Knowledge.....	117

Teaching Experience and Repertoire Selection Sources .....	119
Teaching Experience and Pedagogical Content Knowledge .....	120
Conclusion.....	122
APPENDIX A: Survey .....	124
APPENDIX B: Contact Letters.....	131
APPENDIX C: List of Other Professional Music Organizations and Number of Memberships.....	133
APPENDIX D: List of Other Music Publications and Number of Subscribers .....	135
REFERENCES.....	136
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	147

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. <i>Common Criteria of Repertoire Selection</i> .....	54
Table 2. <i>Common Top Sources of Repertoire Selection</i> .....	56
Table 3. <i>Distribution of Items on the Private Piano Teacher Questionnaire</i> .....	62
Table 4. <i>Distribution of Items on the Repertoire Selection Questionnaire</i> .....	64
Table 5. <i>Distribution of Invitations and Response Rate by State Music Teachers</i> <i>Association</i> .....	70
Table 6. <i>Distribution of Participants by Age and Gender</i> .....	74
Table 7. <i>Distribution of Participants by Years of Teaching Experience</i> .....	75
Table 8. <i>Distribution of Participants by Educational Backgrounds</i> .....	75
Table 9. <i>Distribution of Participants by Professional Music Organization</i> <i>Membership</i> .....	76
Table 10. <i>Distribution of Participants by Regularly Read Music Publications</i> .....	76
Table 11. <i>Distribution of Participants by professional Development</i> .....	77
Table 12. <i>Distribution of Students by Different Performance Level</i> .....	77
Table 13. <i>Level of Influence of Repertoire Sources</i> .....	78
Table 14. <i>Means and Standard Deviations of Repertoire Sources for</i> <i>Pedagogically-Trained Private Piano Teachers</i> .....	79
Table 15. <i>Means and Standard Deviations of Repertoire Sources for</i> <i>Non-Pedagogically-Trained Piano Teachers</i> .....	80
Table 16. <i>Level of Influence of Repertoire Selection Influences</i> .....	83

Table 17. <i>Means and Standard Deviations of Repertoire Selection Influences for Pedagogically-Trained Piano Teachers Training</i> .....	84
Table 18. <i>Means and Standard Deviations of Repertoire Selection Influences for Non-Pedagogically-Trained Piano Teachers</i> .....	85
Table 19. <i>Level of Influence of Repertoire Selection Training</i> .....	88
Table 20. <i>Means and Standard Deviations of Repertoire Selection Training for Pedagogically-Trained Private Piano Teachers</i> .....	88
Table 21. <i>Means and Standard Deviations of Repertoire Selection Training for Non-Pedagogically-Trained Private Piano Teachers</i> .....	89
Table 22. <i>Factors Constituting the Nine Dependent Variables</i> .....	91
Table 23. <i>Means and Standard Deviations for Lists, Previously Heard or Performed Music, and Music Materials by Pedagogic Training and Experience</i> .....	93
Table 24. <i>Means and Standard Deviations for Musical Quality, Outside Elements, Appeal, Cost Effectiveness, Student, and Educational Content by Pedagogic Training and Experience</i> .....	94
Table 25. <i>Results of Multivariate Analyses</i> .....	96

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

The selection of repertoire is of utmost importance in music education. Repertoire provides a foundation for learning, a source for teaching musical skills, and opportunities for students to be involved in aesthetic experiences (Canfield, 2009). In order for students to comprehend musical skills and gain aesthetic experiences, the repertoire chosen must be of high quality (Forbes, 2001; Meyer, 1973; Reimer, 1989). While the definition of “quality” may differ from individual to individual, most music scholars agree on common features such as expressivity, careful attention to detail, and respect for craft. Leonhard and House (1972) defined high quality or “good” music as music that possesses “craftsmanship and expressivity” (p. 102). Similarly, Reimer (1989) stated that craftsmanship is “the expertness by which the materials of art are molded into expressiveness” (p. 135). He also added that when a work lacks craftsmanship, it is signaled by “shoddiness, by disrespect for materials, . . . by skill that manipulates the material rather than serving its expressiveness” (p. 135). According to Ahn (1981),

It is a teacher’s responsibility to select repertoire which motivates the students and which meets particular technical and musical needs. Repertoire must be musically interesting if the student is to find the intrinsic satisfaction which is possible through his own performance. Repertoire must be technically challenging yet provide for sequential improvement of skills which are to be developed. (p. 3)

Forbes (2001) concurred, stating that the selection of appropriate and high-quality repertoire was one of the most important tasks for music teachers. According to Forbes, it is by playing repertoire that students learn technical skills, musical concepts, music history, and cultural awareness. Forbes suggested that when teachers presented carefully

selected literature to students, they exposed students to a more comprehensive knowledge of musical skills, music history and its cultural context and therefore, a greater appreciation of its value and significance. It was through repertoire that students began to develop their skills in distinguishing the quality and structural integrity of a musical work. Subsequently, Forbes argued, students would gain greater awareness of its musical meaning, cultural value, and aesthetic significance.

Selecting repertoire can be challenging because the musical pieces need to address certain technical needs related to a student's skill level as well as be musically and aesthetically satisfying. Should the work meet the technical demands and not speak to the student's intuitive musicality, it may not inspire the student to further study. Herein lies the challenge: to nurture the technical skills of students and also their expressive maturity at the same time. This attainment requires repertoire that is both musically substantive and that matches the student's skill level for growth and development. Jane Magrath (1997), a renowned piano pedagogue from the University of Oklahoma, stated:

Repertoire choices for students are what begin to foster and promote a student's passion for music. Good choices begin to create just the kind of intense learning experiences that gradually, with more and more similar occurrences, lead a student to the arts – just as we ourselves somehow were led to the arts. The repertoire is central, along with the role of the mentor, in creating passion and working to create an intense experience. (pp. 30–31)

In other words, according to Magrath, good repertoire is fundamental to developing a student's life-long love for music. When students have repeated positive experiences because of playing good literature, they may commit to learn pieces well and gradually build a strong devotion to music.

Choral music education experts such as Apfelstadt (2000), Leonhard and House (1972), Phillips (2004), and Roach (1989) suggested several traits that indicate quality literature. Apfelstadt explained that quality literature should be music with “the balance of tension and release, structural symmetry and asymmetry, and anticipation and surprise that makes listening and performing a worthwhile experience” (p. 19). Canfield (2009) added that arrangements of pieces should stay true to the original style and taste, and quality music must be able to withstand the change of time. These features correspond to Reimer’s (1989) criteria of judging the quality of any artwork including those in the performing arts discipline: craftsmanship, sensitivity, imagination, and authenticity.

As to the subject of whether music of different genres and historical periods should be included in the performance repertoire (Reimer, 1989), Reimer posited:

When a work of art is weak in craftsmanship and superficial in expressiveness, it is irrelevant to human experience no matter when it was made. Conversely, a work of excellence and genuine expressiveness, from any period in history, has the power to reveal a sense of feeling to all who are capable of responding to it musically. The point of using a wide variety of styles in music education is to ensure that good music of any age can be perceived relevantly and responded to feelingfully. (p. 142)

Reimer pointed out that it was important to include compositions of various musical styles and genres. However, the compositions must be well crafted. Many band and choral conductors included music of different styles and musical periods in their teaching and concert programming (Cooper, 2001; Davis, 1970; Forbes, 1998, 2001; Ogdin, 1981; Woike, 1990). Kraehenbuehl and Chronister (1972), two nationally recognized piano pedagogues, also suggested that the ultimate goal of intermediate-level piano study is to experience performing musical compositions in various styles from important composers

of keyboard music.

### **Intermediate-Level Private Piano Curricula**

Intermediate-level piano study is a pivotal step in a piano student's development (Ahn, 1981). It is a transitional stage for a student between their completion of the elementary method books and beginning to perform advanced-level repertoire. This stage typically takes two to five years, during which students develop higher technical and musical skills (Ahn, 1981). In other words, intermediate level is a stage between elementary-level method books and advanced repertoire or a stage after students complete elementary-level method books but before they play advanced literature such as piano sonatas composed by Ludwig van Beethoven.

In the early stages of piano study, instructors can rely on the systematic and sequential approaches provided by elementary method books (Wilson, 2000). However, upon completion of an elementary-level series, both instructor and student face a non-prescribed learning sequence to best address the student's learning needs (Dezio, 2009). There is an abundance of intermediate-level piano works and instructional series on the market, with new literature added every year (Dezio, 2009; Wilson, 2000). In addition, the intermediate-level books on the market usually offer little in the way of specifics or details related to particular technical problems present in the composition and often lack information related to placing the work historically. Thus, it becomes a difficult task for the instructor to find proper literature for students to develop individual musical skills (Dezio, 2009; Wilson, 2000). Kraehenbuehl and Chronister (1972) explained the situation and expressed the following:

The goal for beginning piano study, the student's first two to three years, is easy to state: fluent reading of music at the keyboard. This, of course, implies the necessary repertoire, theory, and technic to achieve and demonstrate reading fluency. The content of beginning study is determined by this goal, which is an end in itself. The goals and content of intermediate study, the next two to three years, are more open-ended and more difficult to define. For this reason, the substance of intermediate study is often poorly organized and the effect unsatisfactory. (p. 18)

The statement succinctly described the situation of intermediate-level piano teaching in the early 1970s. Due to the fact that the goal of intermediate-level piano studying was unclear and that there was a vast amount of intermediate-level piano literature, teachers found difficulties in determining the appropriate learning material for their students. The situation of intermediate-level piano teaching had not improved and it brought attention to the Second National Conference on Piano Pedagogy in 1980. At this conference, Fuszek presented a paper that emphasized the lack of college training in intermediate-level repertoire and described intermediate-level repertoire as a much-needed territory to explore:

We must thank our colleagues in the science domain for the discovery of the "black hole" for we in music have one also. This black hole in music becomes acute in the piano pedagogy courses. Something incredible happens between the beginning material and the collegiate repertoire. The leap between John Thompson, Book Three, and the first Beethoven Sonata creates a mind-boggling situation. This is the "black hole" into which too many pianists seem to disappear. (as cited in Scanlan, 1989, p. 71)

Scanlan (1989) addressed the state of intermediate-level piano teaching and training in intermediate-level repertoire by offering an alternative approach to use in a college-level piano pedagogy program to improve the situation. Scanlan suggested that each pedagogy class that focused on intermediate-level teaching should begin with reading assignments specifically written for intermediate-level piano teaching by well-known piano

pedagogues such as James Bastien, David Kraehenbuehl, Richard Chroniser, James Lyke, and Yvonne Enoch. After reading the material, pedagogy students would then start to analyze an assigned musical piece.

Although this concern was expressed some 30 years ago, it appears that the situation of teaching intermediate-level repertoire remains unresolved. The most recent study related to this situation was conducted by the Music Teachers National Association (MTNA) in 1990, in a report on the musical backgrounds of professional music teachers. The association sought to find out music teachers' pedagogical training, the effectiveness of the training, and ideas to improve training in music teaching skills. The survey participants were randomly selected from the MTNA membership.

Because the membership of MTNA was made up of music teachers of other instruments, the population of the survey likely affected the results of the survey. The results of the survey would be different from the results of a survey if the participants included piano teachers only. Fifty-five percent of the music teachers said that they had received pedagogical training when they were in college. They commented that they were comfortable with books and materials, the presentation and sequencing of materials, psychology of learning, and intermediate literature. The remaining 45% expressed that they had not received any pedagogical training when starting their teaching career. Within this group of music teachers, 32.5% of them rated their lack of knowledge of method books and materials as a shortcoming.

The results of the MTNA 1990 study indicated that a music teacher's comfort level with intermediate-level repertoire is a result of how much training or education they

received. The group of pedagogically-trained music teachers felt that they were well prepared for intermediate-level repertoire selection. However, within the group of non-pedagogically-trained music teachers, only 39% felt that they were fairly comfortable with their knowledge of intermediate-level repertoire and 30% reported their lack of knowledge of intermediate-level repertoire as either a shortcoming or a serious shortcoming. The results echoed Fuszek's (1980) suggestion of the existence of the "black hole" and the need for better piano pedagogy programs to prepare future piano teachers. Considering these views, questions arise in the repertoire selection practices of intermediate-level piano studies: To what extent do non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers possess the knowledge of the resources of literature when selecting repertoire for their intermediate-level students? To what extent do non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers possess the knowledge of identifying quality music when selecting literature for their intermediate-level students?

### **Pedagogical Content Knowledge: Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework of this study is pedagogical content knowledge developed by Shulman (2004). Particularly, I am using the framework to understand the pedagogical content knowledge of private piano teachers, to investigate how and in what ways pedagogical content knowledge might affect their choices of repertoire. At the 1985 American Educational Research Association conference, Shulman proposed a new way of teacher learning, moving from observing what experienced teachers do to examining what experienced teachers know and how they organize the material to teach their students effectively (Barrett, 2007). Shulman's proposed teacher knowledge

framework was a result of teacher education reform in the mid-to-late 20<sup>th</sup> century (Chandler, 2012). In the past, teacher education programs emphasized the training of the subject content and pedagogical theory but did not address the integration of content, theory, and practice (Cochran-Smith, 2001). The focus of the reform shifted to teacher attributes (personal qualities that teachers possessed and developed), effectiveness (progression to strategies and processes employed), and knowledge (Chandler, 2012).

Shulman (2004) developed the teacher knowledge framework, *Knowledge Growth in Teaching*, to study how new teachers learn to teach as well as to build a national board for teaching. Shulman realized the difficulties of explaining the relation among teaching-learning, theory, and practice (Leglar & Collay, 2002). He focused on the practices that demonstrate teachers' knowledge of the context, students, subject area content, and pedagogy (see Grossman, 1990). Shulman (2004) proposed that teaching must start with a teacher's understanding of what is to be learned in a subject matter and how to present it.

### **Three Types of Knowledge**

As part of the theoretical framework, Shulman (1986) defined content knowledge as consisting of three components: (a) subject matter content knowledge, (b) pedagogical content knowledge, and (c) curricular knowledge. *Subject matter content knowledge* refers to the knowledge of the subject and the organization structures of the subject. Teachers must know and understand the facts or concepts of the subject so that they can explain it to students (Shulman, 1986). For example, piano teachers know the three different types of staccato playing (finger staccato, wrist staccato, and arm staccato) and

the characteristics of each type.

*Pedagogical content knowledge* refers to the knowledge of “representing and formulating the subject that make it comprehensible to others” (Shulman, 1986, p. 9). In other words, the teachers must have a deep understanding of the concepts and structures underlying the subject so that they can organize them to instruct their students in an effective way. Following the scenario mentioned above, if piano teachers know the components of each different type of staccato playing, they can explain the terms and demonstrate for the student. In addition, the teacher can tell the student when to use which technique to best execute a musical phrase.

*Curricular knowledge* refers to knowing “programs designed for the teaching of particular subjects and topics at a given level,” various instructional materials available related to those programs, and characteristics of both programs and materials so that the teachers could use them in any situation (Shulman, 1986, p. 10). To put it simply, curricular knowledge is “the knowledge of how subject-specific content is structured and sequenced” and the associated materials and resources for teaching (Grieser, 2014, p. 10). These sources include method books or supplementary literature (Grieser, 2014). In the case of private piano instruction, the teacher has a deep understanding of the subject matter and knows the piano works and where to find the piano works that require the specific technique to present the songs so that the students can learn the subject matter and experience it through playing.

These three types of teacher knowledge are more “content-specific” and directly related to a teacher’s level of instruction. Grossman, Wilson, and Shulman (1989)

commented that a teacher's degree of understanding affects their pedagogical choices and their lack of content knowledge can affect their instruction. Grieser (2014) concurred that the teacher's understanding of the subject may affect what concepts to teach, how to teach a concept, and when to know if the students understand the subject.

### **Seven Types of Knowledge**

With time, Shulman expanded his concepts of teacher knowledge from three to seven categories. In addition to content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and curriculum knowledge formerly called curricular knowledge, Shulman (2004) added *general pedagogical knowledge; knowledge of learners and their characteristics; knowledge of educational contexts, and knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values, and their philosophical and historical grounds*. According to Grieser (2014), the four new types of teacher knowledge were relatively "general and broad" (p. 11). *General pedagogical knowledge* referred to the broad principles and strategies of classroom management and subject matter organization. *Knowledge of learners and their characteristics* referred to the recognition of how an individual student behaves and learns in classroom setting. *Knowledge of educational contexts*, ranging from the workings of the group or classroom, the governance and financing of school districts, and the character of communities and cultures, referred to the understanding of how to work with the others in the school as well as those in the community. *Knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values, and their philosophical and historical grounds* referred to the teacher's goals, values, and their beliefs in instructing their students (Shulman, 2004).

After expanding his concepts of teacher knowledge, Shulman (2004) redefined pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) as representation of “the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented, and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners, and presented for instruction” (p. 228). In other words, pedagogical content knowledge referred to the ability of combining knowledge of the subject, pedagogical teaching approach, and understanding of teaching-learning context into a knowledge base framework (Chandler, 2012). Shulman (2004) stated that PCK as “the category most likely to distinguish the understanding of the content specialist from that of the pedagogue” (p. 228) and Berliner (1986) described teachers who possess PCK distinguish themselves as subject matter “teachers” from subject matter “knowers” (pp. 9-10).

### **Repertoire Selection and “Text”**

Shulman (2004) wrote that most teaching involved with some type of “text.” The text could be a textbook, a syllabus, or a piece of material that the teacher or the student wanted to understand. When teachers have the texts in their hands, they need to understand the educational purposes of the material so that they can develop pedagogical ideas to present to the students. In private piano teaching, most teachers rely on piano compositions as the “text” to instruct their students. It is through this medium that intermediate-level students learn their performance skills. With the large number of piano compositions, or “texts,” available for teachers, it is possible that teachers with a strong sense of pedagogical content knowledge are able to carefully select repertoire that helps students develop the musical and technical skills that the teacher feels are

developmentally appropriate.

### **Repertoire Selection Sources and Curriculum Knowledge**

Although instrumental and choral conductors have utilized a wide variety of sources to choose quality literature for their students, little is known about the sources that piano teachers use. Instrumental and choral conductors draw from clinics and workshops, live performances, reading sessions, teachers' recommendations, recordings, contest and festival lists, and material from music publishers. For example, Crochet (2006) found that band directors tended to use previously-heard music and music pieces on festival and contest lists to select literature for their students to study. Howard (2001) learned that band conductors used compositions suggested in published material and songs on recordings as their main repertoire sources. Bolt (1983), Davis (1970), Forbes (1998), and Hunsaker (2007) recognized that choral conductors selected material obtained from professional workshops and clinics as well as pieces from live performances for their students. Devore (1989) and Diddle (2005) concluded that choral directors frequently used pieces recommended by their colleagues for their performance groups. It appears that instrumental and choral conductors have a strong curricular knowledge base, as they rely on multiple places to search for literature for their students. However, a lack of research exists concerning piano teachers and curriculum knowledge related to the sources of repertoire selection.

### **Repertoire Selection Criteria and Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

Music educators often blend their knowledge of content and pedagogy when choosing repertoire for performance. Additional factors for choosing repertoire might

include quality (craftsmanship and aesthetic values) of the work and historical importance, as well as styles and genres (Crochet, 2006; Forbes, 2001; Shulman, 1986). Many music education philosophers have also agreed that these were the criteria that constitute quality music (Leonhard & House, 1972; Meyer, 1973; Reimer, 1989). However, a teacher's experience and musical training could affect the selection of repertoire (Crochet, 2006).

### **Statement of Problem**

According to PCK scholars and researchers, a teacher needs to possess subject matter content knowledge, curriculum knowledge, as well as pedagogical content knowledge to teach effectively (Chandler, 2012; Fernandez-Balboa & Stiehl, 1995; Grieser, 2014; Grossman, 1990; Shulman, 1986, 2004). The results of the MTNA survey in 1990 showed that approximately one third of the music teachers with no pedagogical training lacked musical knowledge (subject matter content knowledge) and knowledge of method books and materials (curriculum knowledge) at the beginning of their teaching career. According to the PCK theoretical framework, if teachers possess subject matter content and curricular knowledge, they have the skills and insights to teach and communicate effectively with their students. The lack of appropriate knowledge also affects their choices of curriculum and instruction (Grossman, Wilson, & Shulman, 1989; Grieser, 2014). Therefore, the students may not learn the necessary content and understand the concepts and underlying structures that help develop their skills.

In addition, based on music education research, philosophy, and teacher theory, repertoire is important to music education, and, even more, quality literature is essential

for students to hone their musical skills and gain aesthetic experience. For that reason, repertoire selection becomes an important responsibility and task for teachers. To be able to select sound literature for students to learn, teachers need to have curricular knowledge that informs them where and how to look for it. Repertoire selection can be a perplexing subject and has been the topic of many investigations in the field of ensemble-based music education. In the field of instrumental education, researchers have sought to find out the views of band and orchestra directors at different instructional levels towards repertoire selection practices (e.g., Howard, 2001; Pickney, 2000; Rotjan, 2017; Woike, 1990). Researchers have also used pedagogical content knowledge framework to investigate instrumental teachers' teacher knowledge (e.g. Forrester, 2018; Grieser, 2014; Grieser & Hendricks, 2018; Millican, 2007, 2008, 2013). In the area of choral education, investigators examined how choral conductors at different educational institutions selected repertoire for their students (e.g., Bolt, 1983; Hunsaker, 2007). However, there is little extant research on the repertoire selection of individual piano instructors and there has not been any substantive investigation on the problem since Fuszek conveyed it in the 1970s. Fuszek's (1980) use of the term "black hole" describes the high dropout rate of piano studying during the intermediate-level stage and how it is related to the importance of appropriate repertoire selection. The problem continues to be a persistent issue confronting the instruction of intermediate-level piano students.

### **Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the repertoire selection practices of private piano instructors concerning their intermediate-level students. I also compared

the repertoire selection practices between pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained private piano instructors for their intermediate-level students and examined the relationship between teacher experience, teacher training, and repertoire selection practices. The research questions for this study were:

1. What types of sources do pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers utilize when choosing intermediate-level repertoire?
2. What types of criteria do pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers utilize when choosing intermediate-level repertoire?
3. How do intermediate-level repertoire selection practices of piano teachers differ as a function of experience and pedagogical training?

For the purposes of this study, a pedagogically-trained piano teacher was defined as one who had received and completed formal training in piano teaching (such as taking piano literature and pedagogy courses as well as completing an internship for two or more semesters in colleges) or undergone Music Teachers National Association certification process to become a professionally certified music teacher. A non-pedagogically-trained-piano teacher is one who had not completed formal piano literature or pedagogy training as well as internship in colleges (such as having completed only one semester of piano literature or pedagogy course) or had not been certified as a professional music teacher by the Music Teachers National Association. Using the PCK theoretical framework developed by Shulman (1986, 2004), this examination of repertoire selection sources and repertoire selection criteria of pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers provided information with respect to the

curriculum knowledge and content knowledge of the two groups of piano teachers.

### **Need for the Study**

The circumstance of teachers lacking subject matter content knowledge and curriculum knowledge directly affects the quality of teaching and subsequently the quality of learning (Grossman, Wilson, & Shulman, 1989; Grieser, 2014). It is essential to examine the content knowledge and curriculum knowledge (repertoire selection sources) of pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers so that researchers know how the two groups of piano teachers view and differ in regard to those two types of knowledge, as they form and influence the teachers' pedagogical content knowledge (repertoire selection practices).

There are gaps in the existing research literature regarding private music instruction, such as how private instructors determine repertoire for their students and where they find such literature. Schmidt (1992) offered a reflection on private lesson material:

Little is known about the criteria that applied teachers use to determine lesson literature, content, sequence, and time allotment. Moreover, information concerning the philosophical underpinnings of applied instruction remains a major gap in the literature....The practice of applied instruction has tended to be idiosyncratic and based more on intuition than on a systematic examination of assumptions. (p. 44)

Hyry-Beihammer (2011) found that research within the private studio setting remains a relatively new and rare investigative domain. Although there has been extensive research in the areas of band and choral teaching, there is a paucity of literature in the realm of piano studio teaching, especially at the intermediate level. It is important to examine how

and where private piano teachers select their materials for their intermediate-level students because in doing so, we can begin to learn about teacher knowledge and how this information can better serve both students and those engaged with the teaching process.

This study will provide information regarding repertoire selections between pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers. The examination may also provide insights into the relationship between content and curriculum knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge, as expressed in Shulman's teacher knowledge framework, within a piano performance setting. In addition, research regarding repertoire selection practices of piano teachers and their criteria to determine appropriate piano literature for intermediate-level students is scarce. It may be that non-pedagogically-trained instructors have different ideas about repertoire selection in regards to criteria and sources because of their training backgrounds. Understanding how pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained-piano teachers use pedagogical content knowledge might help inform educational institutions and professional music organizations about the needs of non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers. The results of this investigation contributed to the body of research in the areas of music education, applied music instruction, and piano pedagogy.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study was to use Shulman's pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) framework to investigate the repertoire selection practices of private piano instructors for their intermediate-level students. This chapter contains reviews of studies that pertained to PCK and the topic of repertoire selection. As there was little extant literature on repertoire selection in the piano studio, I include literature about other performance-based fields of band, orchestra, and choral repertoire selection. This chapter is divided into three sections: (a) teacher pedagogical content knowledge, (b) quality repertoire selection, and (c) alignment of literature to research questions.

#### **Teacher Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

Teacher knowledge has been the subject of studies in the fields of education (Darling-Hammond, 2000) and music education (Ballantyne & Packer, 2004; Chandler, 2012; Duling, 1992; Forrester, 2018; Grieser, 2014; Grieser & Hendricks, 2018; Millican, 2007, 2008, 2013; Venesile, 2010). Shulman (1986) developed the teacher knowledge framework, *Knowledge Growth in Teaching*, to study how new teachers teach. He defined three types of knowledge: subject matter content, pedagogical content, and curricular. Shulman believed that teachers must have a deep understanding of the content so that they can organize the content to teach their students effectively. The results of these studies showed that the multiple types of teacher knowledge, particularly pedagogical content knowledge, were highly important to the success of teaching.

Druva and Anderson (1983) found that the teachers' science and teaching training

backgrounds had a positive relationship to their students' science achievement. Monk (1994) studied students' mathematics and science achievement and found that teacher education coursework had a positive impact on student learning and was often more influential than the teacher's additional subject matter training. Denton and Lacina (1984) concurred that teachers' professional education coursework and their teaching had positive impacts on their students' achievement. Stemming from the findings of her own study in 1997, Darling-Hammond (2000) suggested that student learning was best enhanced by teachers who were knowledgeable in their subject area and proficient in teaching the material to their students. She also commented that changing courses to take, curriculum content, testing or textbooks did not make much difference in students' learning, according to the reports of previous school reforms. She reasoned that if the teachers do not know how to teach, they would not know how to organize the course material, how to utilize the resources to teach, and how to diagnose their students' problems (Darling-Hammond, 1997).

### **Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Music Education**

In the field of music education, few studies have investigated the relationship between teachers and their pedagogical content knowledge. Duling (1992) investigated the pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) of two exemplary general music teachers. By using observations, interviews, videotaping, and analysis, Duling found that the two music teachers acquired PCK through reflection and self-examination of their own teaching, as well as examination the other teachers' teaching practices. In addition, they applied a number of teacher knowledges in their teaching such as music subject matter

knowledge, teaching experience, knowledge of teaching context, knowledge of student's characteristics, and informal mentor relationships. The application of these knowledges demonstrated their high level of pedagogical content knowledge. In other words, teacher knowledge and skills are related to the effectiveness of teaching.

According to the findings of previous studies (Carter et al., 1993; Temmerman, 1997; Darling-Hammond, 2000), the quality of teaching was directly linked to the quality of preservice preparation that teachers received. Using the information, Ballantyne and Packer (2004) surveyed 76 secondary school beginning music teachers in their early three years of teaching in Queensland, Australia. The participants answered a 24-item questionnaire built upon Shulman's teacher knowledge framework: music knowledge and skills; pedagogical content knowledge and skills; pedagogical knowledge and skills; and non-pedagogical professional knowledge and skills. The participants rated, in terms of importance, each knowledge or skill that helped them teach effectively in the classroom and the effectiveness of their teacher education program in developing the knowledge and skills in them. The researchers analyzed data using factor analysis and importance-performance analysis (IPA). The findings indicated there was a need for improvement in the training of pedagogical content knowledge and skills as well as non-pedagogical professional knowledge and skills. The majority of the 76 teachers gave a low rating of the effectiveness of pedagogical content knowledge and skills training in their preservice program.

Ballantyne and Packer categorized the 24 items into 4 groups: pedagogical content knowledge and skills, non-pedagogical professional knowledge and skills, music

knowledge and skills, and general pedagogical knowledge and skills. These 4 groups of teacher knowledge are part of Shulman's PCK theory (2004). Under the group of pedagogical content knowledge and skills, the teachers rated the knowledge of music teaching techniques and engaging students with music in a meaningful way *very* or *extremely important*. Under the non-pedagogical professional knowledge and skills section, they rated coordinating extra-curricular music activities *very* or *extremely important* and communication skills with colleagues, students, parents, and the community *highly important*. However, the teachers rated that their preservice program did not prepare them in those areas adequately. The teachers also reported that there was a need for more training in the legal issues and budgeting skills (non-pedagogical professional knowledge and skills) as well.

Regarding the category of music knowledge and skills, the teachers rated them *very important* but felt that the preservice program needed to provide more training in conducting and composing. As to the group of general pedagogical knowledge and skills, the teachers rated it *important* and felt the teacher education courses had covered it adequately. Ballantyne and Packer commented that college music educators might need to reconsider the planning and development of their music teacher education programs based on the issues that the beginning teachers addressed. The beginning teachers needed more preparation and support in their early teaching career in terms of their pedagogical content knowledge. Evidently, different types of teacher knowledge are important and essential to effective teaching. However, the skills of teaching and conveying the material to students remain one of the most crucial components in successful instructional

practice.

Similarly, Millican (2007, 2008) developed a questionnaire using Shulman's teacher knowledge framework to examine 214 randomly sampled secondary school band and orchestra teachers' perceptions of professional knowledge and skill. The participants, from across the United States, ranked different items related to knowledge and skill for successful teaching. The items were organized into categories according to Shulman's seven types of teacher knowledge: content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, curriculum knowledge, knowledge of learners and their characteristics, pedagogical content knowledge, knowledge of educational contexts, and administrative knowledge. The participants ranked pedagogical content knowledge as the top attribution to their success followed by content knowledge and general pedagogical knowledge. The findings of the study, that the beginning teachers considered the pedagogical content knowledge very important, corroborated those of Ballantyne and Packer (2004). The results of the survey also indicated that there was no significant difference in the rankings of various teacher knowledges between participants with different teaching or musical background. Millican suggested that pedagogical content knowledge was a necessary skill to effective teaching.

Venesile (2010) investigated different forms of pedagogical content knowledge needed by music educators as well as their acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge. Venesile developed the Vocal Jazz Educator Knowledge and Skill Inventory (VJEKSI) to survey 93 secondary and post-secondary vocal jazz teachers. The respondents rated all pedagogical knowledge and content subject matter knowledge items as important.

Regarding the acquisition of their pedagogical content knowledge, the participants provided a variety of sources including regular listening to live or recorded jazz, attending jazz festivals, participating in jazz workshops, and studying various topics related to jazz outside the classroom. The participants added professional music education conferences and vocal jazz festivals were the best sources for their professional development. The findings of Venesile's study corroborate with those of Millican (2007): Content and pedagogical content knowledge appeared in both cases to be essential knowledge and skills for teaching success.

Chandler (2012) investigated whether choral music instructors reflected Shulman's teacher knowledge in their teaching. The participants were 161 choral instructors from different NASM-accredited universities. Chandler developed an online survey, the Choral Methods Instructor Inventory (CMII), by adapting items from previous investigations on choral and instrumental method courses as well as music teacher studies using Shulman's framework. Chandler found that the instructors with a doctoral degree in music education or who taught music education classes tended to include pedagogical content knowledge development in the choral method classes. He suggested that this finding might be because doctoral music education coursework offered doctoral music education students opportunities to explore concepts of teacher knowledge and skills, while instructors with other doctoral degrees took courses designed for their specific areas. For example, a choral conductor with a doctoral degree in choral conducting would take courses such as choral literature, conducting techniques, music theory or history, etc. Therefore, choral methods instructors without the background of

studying knowledge and skill acquisition and development might not have the skills to effectively convey these concepts in their teaching. The choral instructors who participated in the survey also rated content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and pedagogical content knowledge critically important or very important. While in class, the choral instructors generally emphasized specific PCK knowledge and skill items the most, pedagogical knowledge items slightly less, and content knowledge items the least.

Millican (2013) used Shulman's pedagogical content knowledge framework to explore the thoughts of three expert beginning band teachers as they were watching first-year band students performing. During the interviews, he showed the participants 14 short clips of beginning band students playing their instruments and asked them to comment on what they might say or do to correct the problems they noticed in the performances. He coded and categorized the teachers' comments according to a list of instructional techniques from previous researches.

Millican reported that the expert teachers were clear with what they expected to see and hear in performances. They also used modeling, comparison, and questioning techniques to help students develop their awareness skills. Millican found that each technique was a combination of multiple teacher knowledges including a teacher's knowledge of students, knowledge of content, knowledge of curriculum as well as general teaching skills to communicate with students. He proposed that instrumental teachers develop skills that highly integrate their musical knowledge and performance skills so that they could explain the concepts effectively and demonstrate how to do it in front of their students.

Using a multiple case study method, Grieser (2014) examined the content and pedagogical content knowledges of six string specialists and non-string specialists in the intermediate-level string class who taught in Arizona. Grieser sought to understand how they used their pedagogical knowledge to teach string-specific techniques such as vibrato, shifting, and spiccato bowing. She observed and interviewed each string teacher, analyzed each case separately, and performed cross-case analysis. The findings indicate that the non-string specialists did not have adequate knowledge regarding the fundamental principles of the string-specific techniques. When compared to string specialists, the non-string specialists showed signs of more misconceptions and misunderstandings in their content knowledge of the string-specific techniques. Also, the non-string specialists with less content knowledge often used less demanding strategies to instruct than string specialists.

Grieser suggested that university music education professors and other music educators should evaluate the general effectiveness of method classes and teaching experience of their programs. Grieser also proposed an inclusion of a method class for each string instrument and a string pedagogy technique class for non-string music students in their programs. Additionally, it might be beneficial for music education students to observe and incorporate string pedagogy for teaching string-specific content into their studies as well as teaching experiences. Furthermore, Grieser and Hendricks (2018) recommended professional development workshops, partnership between community and university who offer string education programs, and mentorship programs because these opportunities might provide guidance and support to string

teachers who needed assistance in the areas that they were trained in.

Forrester (2018) designed a multiple-case study using Shulman's PCK as the framework as well. She investigated how instrumental music teacher knowledge interacted with instrumental music teaching and conducting. She observed, interviewed, and held focus group meeting with four experienced high school instrumental music teachers from a large Midwestern state. Forrester found that instrumental music teaching and conducting are closely linked and integrated; the participants frequently utilized both teaching and conducting knowledges at the same time when they practiced music teaching. Forrester also found that the practice of music teaching reflected a specialized knowledge that integrated multiple teacher knowledges. This specialized knowledge informed teachers "in-the-moment decision making, judgments, decision, and communication with students and the ensemble as a whole" (p. 475). This knowledge included subject matter knowledge, pedagogic knowledge, knowledge of students, and conducting knowledge and skills.

According to Shulman's pedagogical content knowledge framework, subject content, curricular, and pedagogical content knowledge are closely related to effective teaching. Stemming from the findings of Chandler's (2012), Millican's (2007, 2008), and Venesile's (2010) investigations, pedagogical content knowledge has been rated the most important knowledge or skill among all different types of teacher knowledge. Duling (1992) also found that different types of teacher knowledge and skills, particularly pedagogical content knowledge, were important components of effective teaching; similar results were found by Ballantyne and Packer (2004), Forrester (2018), and

Millican (2013). In addition, the beginning teachers in Duling's (1992) survey commented that their pre-service program did not provide them adequately in the area of content pedagogical content knowledge and skills. If a teacher lacks one of the knowledges, it may affect the teacher's choice of instructional material and strategies. Simply put, a teacher's knowledge of the subject content and pedagogy influences their decisions on what to teach and how to teach.

### **Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Private Instrumental Teaching**

While a number of studies suggest that PCK is a valuable skill to have in music education, investigations of PCK in private instrumental teaching are rare. Hyry-Beihammer (2011), and Crappell and Millican (2015) were among the few researchers that studied how private instrumental music teachers utilized pedagogical and/or content knowledge in their teaching.

Hyry-Beihammer (2011) and Crappell and Millican (2015) examined the pedagogical content knowledge of private piano teachers. While Hyry-Beihammer did not explicitly utilize Shulman's PCK framework to conduct her study, she explored teacher knowledge of a well-known piano pedagogue and artist in Finland, Matti Raekallio. Hyry-Beihammer audiotaped or videotaped Raekallio's lessons with 12 students ranging between 15 and 25 years in age and between beginning to postgraduate research level in performance skills, with most of them studying professionally. After content and narrative analysis, Hyry-Beihammer concluded that the master piano pedagogue had a rich content knowledge of the subject matters. He also demonstrated his knowledge of the pieces that his students were studying by relating them in musical

and historical contexts and how to perform the pieces on the piano. Both Hyry-Beihammer's and Duling's (1992) exceptional teachers possessed a rich and thorough understanding of the instructional material and they were also able to convey it to their students proficiently.

Instead of focusing on one subject, Crappell and Millican (2015) used Shulamn's PCK framework to investigate the pedagogical content knowledge of 164 private piano teachers during the Music Teachers National Conference. The participants watched three video excerpts of three piano students playing an early-intermediate-level work and answered open-ended questions regarding the performances. The findings showed that two-thirds of the piano teachers agreed on the three out of five performance issues, in spite of their different musical training backgrounds. Crappell and Millican explained that the finding could be because most of the participants were experienced teachers with over 15 years of teaching.

Over the years of teaching, teachers learn from their experience in regard to their content knowledge (Grossman, 1990). However, the findings of the survey also indicate that teachers needed to have better organized pedagogical thoughts and processes in their teaching. In other words, although the teachers knew their subject matter content well, they might not have the best strategies to present it to their students. Because teachers' pedagogical content knowledge was the focus of their study, Crappell and Millican did not explore teachers' curricular knowledge or aspects related to repertoire. They suggested examinations of actual lessons of a smaller group of piano teachers in the future so that we could learn how piano teachers use their different types of teacher

knowledge including curricular knowledge in real-life teaching setting.

According to the findings of various studies, pedagogical content knowledge is consistently rated the most important knowledge among music teachers (Chandler, 2012; Millican, 2007, 2008; Venesile, 2010). It has been deemed important for teachers to have the knowledge or skill because it is directly linked to the success of students' performances (Ballantyne and Packer, 2004; Chandler, 2012; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Denton & Lacina, 1984; Druva & Anderson, 1983; Duling, 1992; Grieser, 2014; Monk, 1994). Moreover, experienced teachers have frequently applied pedagogical content knowledge in their teaching (Duling, 1992; Hyry-Beihammer, 2011).

Pedagogical content knowledge is a special type of knowledge that is resulted from both content and pedagogical knowledges (Grieser, 2014). Teachers who possess this knowledge have the ability to blend the content and pedagogy in an organized way that they present the subject effectively to their students regardless of their students' various backgrounds and any situations (Shulman, 2004). Therefore, effective teaching requires a rich understanding of the subject matter, the knowledge of the teaching material, and the skill to present the subject matter.

### **Quality Repertoire Selection**

Quality repertoire has a significant place in the development of students' learning (Forbes, 2001). Ahn (1981) suggested that only structurally well-written musical compositions can provide students with opportunities to meet technical and musical demands, as well as have an aesthetic and artistic experience. Therefore, a music teacher has an important responsibility to select appropriate repertoire in curricular planning so

that the pieces the students learn and play have a positive impact on the students' technical and aesthetic development (Forbes, 2001).

In this section, I explore studies of repertoire selection practices of different types of music instructors. As described earlier, curricular knowledge is one of the teachers' knowledges that help teachers form pedagogical content knowledge, an important skill to become an effective teacher. Although the investigators of the studies did not use Shulman's (1986, 1987) PCK theory as the framework specifically, the variables and the results of the studies can be interpreted within the framework: a teacher's musical training (content knowledge), a teacher's pedagogical training (pedagogical knowledge), and the sources of repertoire selection (curricular knowledge).

### **Applied Piano and Intermediate-Level Teaching**

Interests and explorations in piano literature have been well documented in literature. However, a great quantity of the studies consisted of surveys of existing piano compositions and suggestions of how to use the compositions to instruct piano students (Brown, 1994; Dees, 1998; Fukiati, 2017; Hallbeck, 1992; Krueger, 2014; Winston, 2003; Yang, 2004). For example, Dees (1998) compiled a list of intermediate-level works for solo piano or harpsichord by 75 women composers born before 1900. There were musical and analytical descriptions, biographical information of the composer, as well as publication information of each piece. Nevertheless, there was no suggestion of how to instruct the students to learn and perform the works using the information effectively. Investigations specifically in piano repertoire selection practices and related matters are limited. The following studies consist of four systematic studies on applied piano

teaching, regardless of various levels. It is clear, when compared to the large amount of band and choral examinations, that investigations on applied piano teaching are relatively scarce.

Crum (1998) investigated the attitudes and opinions of 162 piano teachers from the Florida State Music Teachers Association regarding beginning through intermediate piano instruction. Crum developed a survey based on research about piano instruction and the National Standards for Music Education. Teachers rated performance-related skills of traditional and didactic repertoire, technique, and memorization as important to teach beginner and intermediate students. Teachers also reported that teaching students to read notated works was the most important thing for teachers to do. Survey results indicated that group instruction was rated best for beginning pianists but teachers preferred to teach performance and functional skills in individual lessons.

In his research, Crum (1998) also noticed that piano instruction and method books had undergone dramatic changes over time. The contemporary piano instruction and method books included a variety of skills that would help students become more comprehensive and independent musicians, whereas previously each skill was taught separately. Nevertheless, teachers tended to prefer traditional performance instruction rather than this newer approach that combined performance and other skills in a single lesson. Crum surmised that piano teachers generally teach how they were taught and suggested that piano pedagogy instructors may consider including current or newer methods in their course curriculum.

Daniel and Bowden (2013) were interested in exploring the key issues related to

teaching intermediate-level piano students by surveying 583 piano teachers throughout the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and India. The survey, developed by the researchers, consisted of both closed- and open-ended questions and survey items. Results showed that type of repertoire played a fundamental role in student engagement and continuation in piano study. While most teachers used traditional classical or western art music, many students tended to prefer to learn the pieces they heard from movies, video games, television, and popular artists. Daniel and Bowden (2013) suggested that there seemed to be an underlying disconnection because there was a gap between the repertoire that teachers were instructing and the repertoire that students were interested in learning. They recommended future research in intermediate-level piano study by exploring the views of students and parents instead of teachers. Based on the results of this study, it seems that research participants had lower opinions towards popular music.

Although the investigations and participants of Crum (1998) and Daniel and Bowden (2013) were from different parts of the world, piano teachers from both studies shared similar opinions toward teaching intermediate-level students. Piano teachers considered repertoire as a foundational component of intermediate-level piano teaching. Not only did they suggest that the repertoire provide material for students to study, but that it also was a key element to keep students interested in playing the piano (Crum, 1998; Daniel and Bowden, 2013).

Concerned about the abundance of intermediate-level piano books in the market, Wilson (2000) developed a database of intermediate-level piano works according to the

particular technical skills instilled in the compositions. Wilson argued that although there was a large sum of intermediate-level piano publications available, the books did not provide sequential musical and technical material as one would find in beginning method books. The intent of the study was to help piano teachers locate appropriate music literature for their intermediate-level students in a timely manner. Wilson reviewed and catalogued 756 individual pieces from 23 piano collections. She concluded that the database was a useful tool for instructors to locate piano pieces in collections efficiently.

Similar to Wilson (2000), Dezio (2009) argued most intermediate-level piano books on the market lacked focus and consistency and were merely a collection of musical pieces written in different musical periods. Dezio also conjectured that the shortfall of the books could cause a high dropout rate during the years of intermediate-level piano study and that approaching piano repertoire with theoretical understanding could help students develop a habit of looking at details of a composition and appreciate the artistry of composition. Dezio sought to develop an approach to teach intermediate-level piano repertoire through the use of theory. After examining the intermediate-level repertoire series on the market to evaluate if and how theory was approached, reviewing theory books for non-collegiate level students, reflecting on educational theory and developmental stages, as well as taking into account of the advice of pedagogy experts, Dezio wrote the first theory-focused intermediate-level piano series.

Based on the extant literature, it appears that the main attention of applied piano research was placed at the teaching material and practices piano teachers used and applied in their lessons. The criteria of the musical pieces and the process of literature

selection at the immediate-level has, however, not yet been explored. Therefore, to investigate how music teachers might apply a set of standards or pedagogical content knowledge to choosing repertoire for students, I considered other related fields in music education, including band and choral education.

### **Band Research**

Crochet (2006), Howard (2001), King (2001), McMullian (1997), Roseboom (2006), Young (1998), and Woike (1990) shared a common goal in their studies: to find out the repertoire selection practices of band directors at different instructional levels. The researchers explored the literature resources of the participants in their studies as well. Crochet, Howard, Roseboom, and Young investigated the selection practices of middle and high school level conductors while King, McMullian, and Woike examined repertoire selection practices of conductors at the university level. In general, most conductors ranked quality of music the most important repertoire selection criterion. However, some did not consider quality of music as an important factor. The results might be due to teachers' different levels of musical training and teaching experience.

Roseboom (2006) studied 64 middle school and high school band directors' repertoire selection practices in Florida. Stemming from different resources, he developed a survey containing factors that influenced repertoire selection practices. The directors ranked six criteria for the selection of band repertoire according to their significance: aesthetic elements, audience consideration, technical value, composer reputation, students' consideration, and educational elements. Aesthetic value was placed the highest for repertoire selection after computation. However, there was an

inconsistency between high school and middle school band directors: Whereas most high school band directors identified aesthetic value as the most important criterion, middle school band directors ranked aesthetic value along with composer recognition and student consideration the bottom three criteria for repertoire selection. Middle school directors also ranked technical criteria and educational elements higher than the high school directors. Roseboom suggested that the different goals of study of middle and high school band curricula could have affected how band teachers chose repertoire for their students. However, any generalizations of the study must be made with care because of the small sample size.

Likewise, Howard (2001) examined the repertoire selection practices of 130 middle school concert band directors throughout the United States. He developed a survey based on repertoire selection factors identified by expert middle school band directors, suggestions by respected colleagues, and his own experiences as a middle school band director. The respondents of the survey rated factors that influenced their repertoire selection as well as what sources they used to choose repertoire. Howard concluded that the three most important factors that influenced repertoire selection were the perceived quality of the music, the technical demands of the music, and student ability. The three most frequently used sources for repertoire selection were publisher materials, listening to live performances, and listening to recordings.

On a larger scale, Crochet (2006) compared the repertoire selection practices between 212 successful and less successful middle-school and high-school band directors in 29 states, while examining the relationships between selection practices and band

director experience, training, instructional level, and degree of success at the same time. It appears that Crochet and Howard (2001) had similar findings in both areas of repertoire selection criteria and sources. After reviewing different resources, Crochet designed two surveys, the Band Director Questionnaire (BDQ) and the Repertoire Selection Questionnaire (RSQ), in which respondents provided demographic information and rated factors that influenced their repertoire selection practices. Six common factors emerged to be influential in selecting repertoire by all band directors: (a) musical quality, (b) outside elements, (c) appeal, (d) cost effectiveness, (e) ensemble, and (f) educational content. The results showed that more successful directors were more likely to select repertoire because of the repertoire's high quality, craftsmanship, and aesthetic appeal than less successful band directors. Less-trained band directors revealed that they were highly influenced by the appeal of the repertoire (audience, student, band teacher, and colleague appeal, ability to prepare and perform, and potential for high rating).

Regarding the sources of repertoire selection, Crochet found that the top three sources were recordings, colleague recommendations, and live performances. Results also showed that repertoire selection practices differed greatly among band directors based on experience, training, instructional level, and degree of success. To determine the degree of success, Crochet asked the participants to answer items regarding success on the survey. The items were based on previous research. Crochet found that band directors with the same level of years of teaching experience ranked quality of music differently. More successful band directors with high and expert levels of experience reported that quality was a much more important influence than less successful band

directors with the same levels of experience did. Less successful band directors with low and medium levels of experience reported quality was a more important repertoire selection influence than more successful band directors with the same levels of experience. Low- and medium-experienced band directors who were considered to be less successful indicated that outside elements (music performed by an honor band, recently heard performance, new music, state or national lists, and music that has an established place in repertoire) highly influenced their repertoire selection. More successful directors with high experience revealed that outside elements were highly influential in their process of selecting repertoire as well. It is worthy to note that more successful directors with high experience ranked both quality music (musical factor) and outside elements (non-musical factor) highly influential. It appears that with more years of experience, the directors became well-informed with band repertoire and were able to choose appropriate literature that best suited their students.

Resembling the studies by Howard (2001) and Crochet (2006), Young (1998) examined the resources and criteria of repertoire selection, as well as the literature chosen for performances, of 150 high school wind bands in the United States. Data were collected, including concert programs submitted by the band directors, through telephone interviews and surveys. Young rated the quality of the repertoire performed using the Repertoire Evaluation Inventory (REI) developed by a group of experts in the field of wind band literature. The REI was a list of pieces that were considered to be of quality. The experts measured the quality of wind band compositions based on a point system. The more points the composition received, the higher the quality of the composition.

Young found that nearly half of the compositions performed by the bands did not reach the level of being “quality” music. However, Young warned that the results could only pertain to the sample itself due to a small sample size ( $N = 72$ ). Nevertheless, the findings were comparable to those of Howard (2001) and Crochet (2006) in that quality of music was the most important factor when selecting repertoire and recordings were one of the most frequently used sources for repertoire selection. The three most important factors influencing repertoire selection were: (a) the repertoire would challenge or improve students’ understanding of quality and musical style; (b) the repertoire would fit the instrumentation and style of the ensemble, as well as students’ ability to handle the technical demands of the piece within the rehearsal time; and (c) the repertoire would challenge or improve students’ technical ability. The three most common sources for repertoire selection were publishers’ recordings and material; workshops, clinics, and conventions; and works previously known.

Using the REI in Young’s (1998) investigation, King (2001) determined the quality of repertoire programmed by 45 band directors of small non-auditioned colleges in the United States and examined the criteria of repertoire selections for these directors. She also categorized the directors into two groups: high- and low-quality repertoire groups based on the REI. Results showed that a majority of the compositions were of high quality. The directors in the high-quality group tended to expose their students to music and composers of significance and those in the low-quality group tended to be more concerned with the approval and disapproval from the audience and students.

Although the conductors in King’s (2001) study were teaching at college level,

they shared similar repertoire selection criteria with the middle- and high-school level directors mentioned earlier. King determined that the three main criteria of selecting repertoire involved students meeting the technical demands in the amount of rehearsal time available, the music students should learn, and the repertoire that would challenge the student's understanding of musical style and interpretation. The top three sources of exploring repertoire were workshops, clinics, or conventions—along with private score study and works previously known but not conducted. King concluded that the teaching of theoretical concepts and historical period was unimportant to conductors at the collegiate level, who rated these criteria at the lowest level. In addition, performance-related criteria, audience, and student appeal were more important to the directors than quality of music and education-related criteria. Preference of non-musical elements to educational elements when selecting repertoire and less emphasis on theory and history when instructing students could be a sign of teachers lacking knowledge in those areas. The findings of King's study indicated a contrast to PCK scholars' and researchers' descriptions of an effective teacher; one who possess subject matter content knowledge, curriculum knowledge, as well as pedagogical content knowledge (Chandler, 2012; Fernandez-Balboa & Stiehl, 1995; Grieser, 2014; Grossman, 1990; Shulman, 1986, 2004).

Woike (1990) examined the repertoire selection practices of 30 university wind band conductors in the United States. He developed a survey in which the respondents rated factors that influenced their repertoire selection practices. The three major factors of selecting literature were (a) educational and artistic needs of students, audience, and

conductor; (b) artistic value of the composition; and (c) variety of interest for performer and audience. However, Woike concluded that the music selected for studying could be a result of the teacher's preference, experience, skills, or their philosophical and artistic beliefs. This conclusion was due to the fact that the conductors indicated a wide range of instructional goals and objectives on the questionnaire. These personal factors in regards to the music selection process tended to play a more important role than the educational needs of the students. Woike suggested that a commonly-endorsed undergraduate wind band curriculum be designed to address the educational needs of the undergraduate music student.

Likewise, McMullian (1997) examined the music selection process and concert programming of 77 concert band and wind ensemble directors in member institutions of the Coalition of Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). He developed a survey from studying previous investigations by Woike (1990) and others, while comparing the programming criteria of the conductors of the CCCU with those discovered in previous studies. Results indicated that band directors at CCCU colleges adopted the same music selection criteria as other non-CCCU college directors, with the most important concert programming criteria being quality music that served an educational purpose and inclusion of a variety of styles, moods, and tempi. The band directors rated the Christian commitment of the college as important in music selection. McMullian concluded that music selection was a multifaceted process that should include aesthetic, educational, and utilitarian considerations.

In sum, there were some common criteria in repertoire selection among different

band conductors. Most conductors—regardless of whether they taught middle school, high school, or college—considered quality music the highest criterion when selecting repertoire (Crochet, 2006; Howard, 2001; King, 2001; McMullian, 1997). While quality was the most important criterion, technical demand was considered essential as well. Conductors who tended to program lower quality music were more likely to be concerned about audience and student approval (King, 2001).

### **Orchestral Research**

There have been few studies related to orchestra conductors' repertoire selection practices. Pickney (2000), Rotjan (2017), and Smith (2004) examined how orchestra conductors of different educational and performance levels selected repertoire for their ensembles. Pickney (2000) investigated repertoire selection criteria used by directors and characteristics of the literature played by youth orchestras in the United States. She contacted 174 youth orchestras conductors listed in the January/February 1998, *American Symphony Orchestra League Directory*, and collected data through questionnaire, phone interviews, and programs performed by the orchestras for the past 4 years. Pickney found that the conductors tended to choose pieces that were of high quality, which consisted of musical integrity as well as artistic and educational value that challenges students' abilities and builds interests and motivation. She suggested universities to develop college-level courses to train future music teachers in the area of repertoire selection, specifically to help them assess student players' ability levels and to develop strategies to teach those students.

Rotjan (2017) explored factors influencing school orchestra teachers when

selecting repertoire for their students. He interviewed 6 public secondary-school orchestra teachers and 27 students as well as observed classroom environments in a suburban mid-Atlantic state. Rotjan concluded that selecting repertoire was a complex process for the six teachers because the process involved the teachers' personal teaching philosophies, their own training, and availability to resources. Overall, the teachers preferred to select music of high quality as determined by the "musical-aesthetic elements" and "technical-pedagogical elements" (p. 195) of the compositions. Rotjan also found that the teachers considered students' interests and current social elements when selecting literature. He suggested teachers and students should share views regarding repertoire selection as part of the orchestra class curriculum so that they could discuss about quality of music and what they should learn in the class.

Smith (2004) also interviewed orchestra conductors regarding their repertoire selection practices. However, his participants were 18 university and professional orchestra conductors across the nation. All the conductors agreed that selecting repertoire was the most difficult part of their job but had conflicting views towards their repertoire selection criteria. University conductors emphasized the education of the students, rather than the experience of the audience, when they selected literature in their programs. They used standard repertoire in their curriculum because they considered students' experience on performing the repertoire as the most important. Contrarily, professional conductors emphasized more on the education of the audience when programming their concerts. It was because they wanted to improve the audience's concert-going experience, as concert attendances affected ticket sales and the future of

orchestras in the United States. Smith commented that conductors needed to keep their goals and artistic philosophies in mind when designing their programming.

Although the orchestras in the aforementioned studies were at different educational and performance levels, the conductors of those ensembles appeared to share similar criteria when choosing literature for performances. The conductors of the youth and secondary-school orchestras considered quality of music as the most important criteria when selecting literature, and the quality of music was defined by the artistic, aesthetic, and technical value. Specific repertoire selection criteria were not part of Smith's (2004) investigation; however, the university conductors indicated that they used standard orchestral repertoire in their teaching. It was likely that the conductors had high regard for the quality of those orchestral masterworks. To put it another way, the university orchestra conductors considered quality of music the most important repertoire selection factor as well.

### **Choral Research**

There have been multiple studies regarding repertoire selection practices in choral education. The following section consists of investigations concerning repertoire selection criteria, repertoire selection sources, training, and experience of choral conductors. These choral conductors taught at different levels of education institutions including middle schools, junior high schools, high schools, and colleges.

Davis (1970) examined repertoire selection practices and repertoire sources used by 303 high school choral conductors in Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York. After an extensive review of published material, he developed a survey in which participants

rated 25 musical factors and 20 non-musical factors that influenced the conductors' selection of literature. Results indicated that the three most important factors were music that would raise the standards of musical taste of the performer, music worthy of required rehearsal time, and vocal range of each part. The three most important non-musical factors were the ability of students to learn and perform the music, the number of programs presented, and the amount of rehearsal time. The results also indicated that lists of choral music in publishers' publications and textbooks to be inadequate and that professional music organizations did not provide high school choral conductors with assistance in repertoire selection. In addition, the choral conductors reported that their undergraduate music education courses did not prepare them adequately to choose repertoire and found repertoire from other venues such as choral concerts, choral workshops, and publishers' condensed scores.

Ogdin (1981) also investigated repertoire selection practices used by choral teachers at secondary schools, but in San Diego. She designed a survey in which respondents rated factors that influenced their decision-making when selecting literature. Approximately 50% of the 97 choral teachers returned the survey. The top criteria for teachers were programming a variety of musical styles, the students' skill level when they were first enrolled in the ensemble, and student growth. Approximately 46% of the participants commented that they used festival participation guidelines as criteria for selecting music. Seventy-seven percent of the directors believed student interest was an important factor. Although the choral teachers used similar criteria when selecting content, they did not believe uniform criteria should be employed.

Dunaway (1986) studied 147 administrative and organizational factors influencing successful choral music programs of high schools in the western United States. He defined successful and average programs according to their performance success by using criteria from previous studies. For example, successful choral programs had to be recommended by state American Choral Directors Association (ACDA) and Music Educators National Conference (MENC) leaders and state supervisors of music as being successful. These choirs were most likely to have received superior ratings at contest festivals between 1983 and 1985. Average choral programs were those who were recommended by state ACDA and MENC leaders and state supervisors of music as being average in performance. The choirs had not received either superior (Division I) or Division III ratings at contest festivals between 1983 and 1985. Results indicated that successful directors programmed more compositions of established composers in their concerts when compared to average directors. Dunaway and King (2001) shared the same conclusions that directors of successful and high-quality bands tended to emphasize the musical quality (content) of the pieces.

Devore (1989) investigated repertoire selection practices of high school choral directors. He examined the repertoire selection process of high school choral directors who participated in the Ohio Music Education Association Large Group High School contests. Stemming from different resources, she developed an instrument in which participants rated factors regarding their repertoire criteria and sources. Approximately 222 choral directors returned the surveys. Results indicated that the most important factors in the selection of contest music were overall musical quality, educational value,

and number of voice parts. The least important factors were the cost of music, the editor or arranger, and length of the music. The best resources for selecting suitable contest music were music teachers' recommendations, music store files, and live choral music performances.

Similar to Crochet's (2006) study, teaching experience was the focus of Dahlman's (1991) investigation. Dahlman conducted a study to determine if the size of the choral program, teacher experience, and teacher education affected choral music literature choices for 148 high school choirs in Missouri. Dahlman developed the Missouri Choral Literature Survey (MCLS) in which teachers provided demographic information and rated factors that influenced their repertoire selection. Dahlman found significant correlations between selection criteria hierarchies used by teachers and different choral program sizes, experience level, and education level. Results indicated three levels of priority in regards to criteria. The highest priority factors were personal appeal to the teacher, musical quality of the piece, goals of the teachers, and preparation factors. The medium important factors included appeal to the student, programming, text of the piece, and appeal to the audience. The least important were stylistic and historical elements, accompaniment, score design, and cost of music. Results also showed that repertoire selection criteria remained the same regardless of teacher experience.

A similar study by Forbes (1998, 2001) involved the repertoire selection practices and sources of 297 high school choral directors in Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia. The choral directors were divided into two groups by a nomination process: Group 1 consisted of 89 directors identified as outstanding and

Group 2 consisted of 208 directors randomly chosen from the remaining population. Forbes designed a written survey in which the participants identified and ranked 26 influential factors in order according to their importance. The three most important criteria were quality music, vocal performance skills that can be taught through the composition, and the technical difficulty of the work. The least influential factor was the cost of the composition. Regarding quality as a selection criterion, there were no significant differences in opinions between Group 1 and Group 2. However, there were significant differences between groups when deciding what type of music to perform. When selecting classical literature, the most important criterion was musicianship and when selecting popular works, the emphasis was on entertainment value. Regarding sources of literature, the top three sources were as workshops and clinics, live performances, and choral reading sessions.

Forbes (1998, 2001) found significant positive correlations between the teaching experience of choral directors and the number of classical repertoire chosen for performances by the directors' most advanced choirs. In addition, Forbes conducted 52 interviews with directors who agreed to be interviewed. Results indicated that teacher preference of the music compositions was a primary criterion in the selection process; high appeal equaled high quality. Nearly all directors commented that their ability to determine the quality of music had improved with experience.

The purpose of Reames's (2001) study was also to investigate the criteria of repertoire selection for high school choirs. She developed a survey in which the choral directors rated factors influencing their repertoire selection. The participants were 263

beginning high school choir directors in Virginia. A majority of the choral directors expressed that both technical and aesthetic criteria were equally important when selecting repertoire for their high school beginning and advanced choirs. The most popular sources of beginning high school literature were live performances of choral music, choral reading sessions, personal libraries, and use of recordings. The least valuable sources of literature selections were reviews in professional journals, repertoire lists in textbooks, and music from college methods classes. According to the results, the choral directors understood the importance of the musical content of the repertoire. However, they were not prepared sufficiently with beginning high school choir literature. Reames suggested that the choral directors needed more help and training in the area.

Similarly, Diddle (2005) investigated the repertoire selection practices, sources, and skills of 723 beginning choral music educators in Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. Adopting previous studies by Forbes (1998, 2001) and Reames (2001), she developed a survey in which participants chose the most appropriate answers that best reflected his or her situation. Results from the study indicated the three most important criteria for repertoire selection were the number of voice parts, range and tessitura, and overall musical quality. The top five sources of repertoire selection of beginning choral music educators were live performances, director recommendations, choral reading sessions, choral workshops/clinics, and music publisher catalogues or repertoire lists. Results also indicated that most novice choral music educators believed that their personal performance experience had provided more skills to select repertoire than their collegiate training.

Using interviews as a data collection method, Hunsaker (2007) studied 11 successful public high school choral conductors to understand their choral literature selection processes and criteria of success. The conductors were defined as successful by being nationally recognized by performing at a national American Choral Directors Association (ACDA) convention. According to the results, the most important criteria of the music were the aesthetic qualities of the composition. The other three most common factors were teacher preference, music that would offer challenges to students, and audience or student appeal. Common sources for repertoire selection included choral concerts and recordings, professional conferences, reading sessions, and festival and contest literature. The directors also commented that when they searched for quality music, they identified it by the voice leading, sound part writing, marriage of text and music, and arrangements that were true to the original source. In conclusion, Hunsaker suggested that these successful choral conductors should share their ideas and experience in the area of repertoire selection with other choral directors.

Interested in the repertoire selection training in choral music programs, Bolt (1983) examined both high school and college-level choral teachers' perceptions of their competency in selecting effective literature and to find out if undergraduate music education programs offered sufficient training in the selection of repertoire. He developed a questionnaire in which the participants rated factors affecting their repertoire selection practices. There were two groups of participants in the study. The first group contained 102 high school teachers who were teaching in the states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah, and whose peers regarded them as

successful. The second group consisted of 42 choral music education instructors from National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) accredited institutions.

Upon the information collected from the questionnaire, Bolt concluded that undergraduate music education curricula did not provide enough training/skills that choral directors would use in their future professions, as reported the same by Davis (1970) and Diddle (2005). Results showed that high school directors utilized clinics and workshops, reading sessions, live performances, and material from their college education classes to select literature. Conversely, the college instructors relied on repertoire lists in textbooks, music performed in colleges, and materials presented in college music education courses. The most important musical factors were a consideration for unity, variety, and contrast within the music, the vocal range, and tessitura requirements of each part. The most important non-musical factors included the ability of the students, the amount of rehearsal time available, and the age of the students in choral groups.

Whereas the aforementioned researchers emphasized on the repertoire selection practices of high-school and college level choral directors, Canfield (2009) surveyed 78 middle school and junior high school choral directors in Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana regarding repertoire selection criteria and appropriate choral repertoire. Adopting items previously used in other studies (Beery, 1994, 1996; Dahlman, 1991; Davis, 1970; Diddle, 2005; Forbes, 1998, 2001; Hunsaker, 2007; Ogdin, 1981; Reames, 1995, 2001), Canfield designed a survey to learn the genres of vocal pieces performed in concerts, how the choral directors selected literature for their students, and the types of

compositions the choral directors considered as appropriate or quality. Canfield concluded that middle school directors purchased and used Holiday music the most, followed by spiritual or gospel and patriotic music. Most directors considered very important the vocal ability and maturity of the singers, technical difficulty of the piece, and vocal performance skills that could be taught within the work. The participants were asked to categorize the 20 criteria used in the selection of choral literature into either appropriate choral literature, quality choral literature, both appropriate and quality choral literature, or neither appropriate nor quality choral literature. All directors categorized 19 criteria as both appropriate and quality choral literature but categorized one criterion (popular music) as appropriate literature only. There was no significant difference in choral repertoire selection among novice, experienced, and master teachers.

The previously-reviewed studies indicate that a number of similarities and differences in repertoire selection criteria exist among various choral directors. For example, only two studies indicated that choral conductors ranked musical quality the most important criterion (Devore, 1989; Forbes, 1998, 2001). Forbes found that quality was a selection criterion for conductors of both average and outstanding choirs. Other common criteria included the difficulty of the compositions (Forbes, 1998, 2001; Reames, 2001), student appeal (Dahlman, 1991; Hunsaker, 2007), audience appeal (Dahlman, 1991; Hunsaker, 2007), teacher preference (Dahlman, 1991; Forbes, 1998, 2001; Hunsaker, 2007), student musical growth (Devore, 1989; Forbes, 1998, 2001; Hunsaker, 2007), vocal ability and maturity of the singers (Bolt, 1983; Canfield, 2009; Davis, 1970; Ogdin, 1981), and text (Dahlman, 1991; Hunsaker, 2007).

Regarding repertoire selection, there was one contrasting finding: Canfield (2009) found no difference among novice, experienced, and master teachers who taught middle school or junior high school while Davis (1970), Dunaway (1986) and Forbes (1998) found that more successful and outstanding directors selected a balance of musical styles whereas average directors selected more jazz and popular styles for their students. It should also be noted that Bolt (1983), Davis (1970), and Diddle (2005) determined that collegiate music education courses did not provide enough training in repertoire selection.

### **Alignment of Literature to Research Questions**

Although the results of the research studies reviewed in the previous sections did not indicate a consensus of important repertoire selection criteria or resources, I attempted to borrow aspects of those repertoire selection methods and apply them to those of private piano teachers. Therefore, this section serves to summarize the repertoire selection research and pedagogical content knowledge literature in relationship to the research questions. An understanding of these commonalities may assist in the interpretation of the data analysis in chapters 4 and 5. According to the reviewed literature pertaining to multiple types of knowledge in Shulman's teacher knowledge framework, teachers tend to consider pedagogical content knowledge the most important knowledge or skill for effective teaching. Among other considerations, these scholars suggest that an understanding of PCK guides and informs teachers how and where to select appropriate repertoire for their students.

### **Repertoire Selection Criteria**

After reviewing studies regarding repertoire selection criteria, I found no commonalities among music educators regarding what the most important selection criterion was. However, there is a general agreement that quality repertoire selection is a consequential part in a student's music educational development regardless of performance instruments. In addition, band, orchestra, and choral directors shared common opinions toward the criteria used for repertoire selection. Many directors viewed quality music as one of the most important criteria when selecting repertoire. The other criteria consisted of technical demand of the work, students' technical ability, teacher preference to the music, aesthetic quality of the work, and educational elements within the work. Table 1 shows the common top criteria of repertoire selection among directors in previously mentioned studies.

It appears that there are strong currents influencing repertoire selection in both instrumental and choral performance groups, both sharing some common guidelines and practices. Examining this trend and seeing if it applies in the same way to repertoire selection for intermediate-level piano students would benefit and expand knowledge in the area of music education and assist piano teachers in making informed decisions regarding repertoire selection. The sharing of common principles and practices between disciplines, whether they are found in instrumental or choral approaches, may have a lasting effect on the future of music and its educational and professional impact.

Table 1  
*Common Criteria of Repertoire Selection*

Researchers	Criteria					
	Quality of Music	Technical Demands	Students' Ability	Teacher Preference	Aesthetic Appeal	Educational Appeal
Canfield (2009)		X	X			X
Bolt (1983)			X			
Crochet (2006)	X				X	
Dahlman (1991)	X			X		X
Davis (1970)			X		X	
Devore (1989)	X					X
Diddle (2005)	X					
Forbes (1998)	X	X				X
Howard (2001)	X	X	X			
Hunsaker (2007)				X	X	X
King (2001)			X			X
McMullian (1997)	X				X	X
Ogden (1981)			X			X
Pickney (2000)	X		X			X
Reames (2001)		X			X	
Roseboom (2006)		X			X	
Rotjan (2017)	X	X			X	
Smith (2004)	X					
Woike (1990)	X					X
Young (1998)		X				X

*Note:* Educational appeal refers to elements that offer challenges or improve student's technical and performance skills as well as understanding of quality and musical styles.

### **Repertoire Selection and Sources (Curriculum Knowledge)**

Concerning the resources of repertoire selection, I found no commonalities among the music educators in terms of what the best resource for repertoire selections was as well. The results of the band (Howard, 2001; King, 2001; Young, 1998) and choral

(Bolt, 1983; Davis, 1970; Devore, 1989; Diddle, 2005; Forbes, 1998, 2001; Hunsaker, 2007; Reames, 2001) investigations showed that directors of both types of musical ensembles used material obtained from clinics and workshops, live performances, reading sessions, recordings, music publishers, and teachers' recommendations the most for their concerts. The results also indicated that live performances were the most common places for directors to find repertoire for their students. This finding may be because the conductors preferred to listen to the performances of the musical works live and in person and to evaluate the work based on their own criteria. Although most choral directors did not utilize repertoire lists in textbooks, reviews in professional journals, or material from undergraduate programs, some college choral conductors commented that they frequently visited those places for repertoire selections (Bolt, 1983). Unfortunately, both studies by Reames (2001) and Diddle (2005) were only confined to beginning choral teachers and there was no report on repertoire selection sources of experienced choral directors.

Accordingly, there were large collections of musical works for band and choral groups in the market as well. Conductors in the aforementioned studies stated that it was difficult and time-consuming to find quality and appropriate literature for their students. Table 2 shows the common top sources of repertoire selection among directors in previously mentioned studies. An investigation of where piano teachers acquire repertoire selections for their intermediate-level students would add knowledge to the field of music education.

Table 2  
*Common Top Sources of Repertoire Selection*

Researcher	Sources						
	Reading Sessions	Colleagues Recommendations	Private Collections	Workshops & Clinics	Published Materials	Live Performances	Recordings
Bolt (1983)	X			X		X	
Crochet (2006)		X				X	X
Davis (1970)				X	X	X	
Devore (1989)		X				X	
Diddle (2005)	X	X				X	
Forbes (1998)	X			X		X	
Howard (2001)					X	X	X
Hunsaker (2007)				X		X	X
King (2001)			X	X			
Reames (2001)	X		X			X	
Young (1998)				X	X		

### Repertoire Selection and Teacher Experience

The relationship between repertoire selection and teacher experience had also been investigated by a number of researchers (Dahlman, 1991; Crochet, 2006; and Forbes, 1998, 2001). Based upon the outcomes of their studies, more experienced teachers tended to select more classical literature and conduct a more balanced selection of styles within each major type of music. As to the subject of repertoire selection criteria, most teachers, regardless of their experience, viewed musical quality and various

musical styles as the most important. The results also showed that more successful music teachers tended to include a variety of musical styles in their repertoire selection while average and less successful teachers tended to use more popular music in their programming. It is an indication that the more celebrated or highly accomplished music teachers have an informed approach when making these kinds of decisions, and that they have a better understanding of the range and demands of the literature and its impact on student growth and development.

### **Repertoire Selection and Teacher Training**

Researchers have studied the relationship between repertoire selection and teacher training (pedagogical knowledge) as well. According to the findings of Davis (1970), Bolt (1983), and Diddle (2005), choral music educators opined that their undergraduate college training in repertoire selection was insufficient and their personal experience had given them more skills. Davis (1970), Bolt (1983), and Diddle (2005) suggested that the choral music education curriculum needed to expose students to a greater variety of styles and genres as well as to teach skills that students would use in their respective professions. Similarly, there were concerns that college methods and wind literature classes did not provide adequate training in repertoire selection for young bands (Howard, 2001).

In contrast to numerous studies related to repertoire selection practices in the fields of instrumental and choral education, there are a relatively minimal number of examinations in the area of private piano teaching. Daniel's and Bowden's (2013) investigation was the only one that explored issues related to intermediate-level piano

students. However, repertoire selection practices were not included in that study. There are, therefore, notable gaps in the literature related to repertoire selection in the field of private piano teaching. This study addresses the disparity by investigating the factors that influence repertoire selection and the sources of repertoire selection of piano teachers who have intermediate-level piano students in their teaching studios.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHOD

In this chapter I provide information regarding the data collection and analysis procedures used in this study. The purpose of this study was to investigate the repertoire selection practices of private piano instructors for their intermediate-level students as well as to compare these repertoire selection practices between pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained private piano instructors. In addition, I investigated the relationship between teacher experience and training and repertoire selection practices. This research was guided by the following questions:

1. What types of sources do pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers utilize when choosing intermediate-level repertoire?
2. What types of criteria do pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers utilize when choosing intermediate-level repertoire?
3. How do intermediate-level repertoire selection practices of piano teachers differ as a function of experience and pedagogical training?

According to the guidelines of The Frances Clark Center for Keyboard Pedagogy (2013) and National Association of Schools of Music (2012-13), undergraduate students who pursue a degree in piano performance need to take a minimum of two semesters of pedagogy courses and internship, while undergraduate students who pursue a degree in piano pedagogy need to take multiple-year (2, 3, and 4) pedagogy study and internship. For the purposes of this study, a pedagogically-trained piano teacher was defined as one who had received and completed formal training in piano teaching (such as taking piano

literature and pedagogy courses as well as completing an internship for two or more semesters in colleges) or undergone Music Teachers National Association certification process to become a professionally certified music teacher. A non-pedagogically-trained piano teacher is one who had not completed formal piano literature or pedagogy training as well as internship in colleges (such as having completed only one semester of piano literature or pedagogy course) or had not been certified as a professional music teacher by the Music Teachers National Association.

### **Survey Design**

I conducted a survey to examine the relationship between the repertoire selection practices of pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers in the study. I designed a survey instrument consisting of two sections—the Private Piano Teacher Questionnaire (PPTQ) and the Repertoire Selection Questionnaire (RSQ)—to gather the data regarding the intermediate-level repertoire selection practices of piano teachers. A copy of the PPTQ and RSQ may be found in Appendices A and B, respectively. I adapted items from the questionnaires used by Crum (1998) and Crochet (2006) as well as surveys by the Music Teachers National Association (1990) and Sabol (2010) to create the PPTQ. For the RSQ, I also adapted items from Crochet's questionnaire as well as professional documents from the National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy (Larimer and the Task Force on Pedagogy Curricula, 2004). Because Crochet wrote the questionnaire for band directors, I modified items to be appropriate for piano instructors, as described below.

The survey I used was in Likert-type scales format because it would be easy for

participants to understand and complete the questionnaire (see Sauro & Dumas, 2009).

The responses to each item are a set of responses in ordered levels with “equally spaced numbers” and “approximately equally spaced anchors” (Harpe, 2015, p. 239). The responses are then combined by summation or taking the mean to a set of items. From a statisticians’ perspective, it represents an intervallic measurement (Harpe, 2015).

Additionally, Carifio and Perla (2008) argued that the response format of Likert scales (collection of Likert items) can produce “empirically interval data” if the scale consists of at least eight reasonably related items, the standard psychometric principle. Norman (2010) agreed and added that modern parametric statistical method such as factor analysis was based on an assumption of “normally distributed, interval-level data.” Therefore, parametric tests can be used with Likert scales and when used to analyze Likert scale responses, they are acceptably robust to give valid answers (Norman, 2010; Sullivan & Artino, Jr., 2013).

### **Private Piano Teacher Questionnaire (PPTQ)**

The purpose of the PPTQ was to collect demographic information including state, age, gender, years of teaching experience, educational background, and professional development. I used this information to determine the pedagogical training background of the piano teachers; these data also provided useful information when discussing the results of this study in later chapters. I adapted Crum’s (1998) and Crochet’s (2006) instruments by eliminating those items that were irrelevant, combining those items that were redundant, and then modifying the wording to suit the present study. For example, participants in Crum’s study identified which publications they read but six of these

publications were no longer in circulation. These publications included *Clavier*, *Keyboard*, *Keyboard Companion*, *Piano and Keyboard*, *Piano Life*, and *Piano Today*. I replaced them by adding three publications that were current and available in the market: *Clavier Companion*, *National Federation of Music Clubs Magazine/Junior Keynotes*, and *Piano Guild Note Magazine*. After revising, combining, and eliminating items, the PPTQ used in this study consisted of 11 items, shown in Table 3.

Table 3  
*Distribution of Items on the Private Piano Teacher Questionnaire*

Factor	Number of Items	Item Numbers
State	1	1
Experience	1	2
Gender	1	3
Music Degrees	1	4
Training	2	5–6
Age	1	7
Student Levels	1	8
Development	3	9–11
Total	11	

### **Repertoire Selection Questionnaire (RSQ)**

The purpose of the RSQ was to collect information with regard to private piano teachers' repertoire selection practices for their intermediate-level students as well as repertoire selection training. The RSQ consists of three parts: Sources of Repertoire Selection, Factors Affecting Repertoire Selection, and Repertoire Selection Training. I adapted the items for the RSQ from Crochet's (2006) instrument. Because Crochet's study was related to band repertoire selection practices and sources, Crochet described

many terms in the survey with “band,” such as band festivals, band music reading sessions, as well as band workshops. Therefore, I replaced “band” with “piano.”

In addition, I modified several questions from Crochet’s RSQ to ensure brevity and clarity. For example, I combined four questions related to the sources of repertoire selection: (a) music you performed in college; (b) music you performed in high school; (c) music you performed in middle school/junior high school; and (d) music you performed in other groups into one. The new question became “Music you performed previously.” I also removed several questions from Crochet’s RSQ related to the training of repertoire selection: (a) undergraduate conducting course; (b) graduate conducting course or lessons; (c) wind band literature course, post college; (d) wind band literature clinic, post college; (e) participation in college performance ensembles. In place of those five questions, I added “Observations to teaching” and “Intern teaching” to better describe the repertoire selection training for piano teaching according to the guidelines of The Frances Clark Center for Keyboard Pedagogy (2013).

The first part, Repertoire Selection Questionnaire-Sources of Repertoire Selection (RSQ-SRS), contains 16 possible sources including publishers’ materials, live performances, and reading sessions. The second part, Repertoire Selection Questionnaire-Factors Affecting Repertoire Selection (RSQ-FARS), includes 14 elements that could influence private piano teachers in choosing musical pieces such as the performance level of the student, quality of the music, and social or historical significance of the selections. The third part, Repertoire Selection Questionnaire-Repertoire Selection Training (RSQ-RST), contains 8 items regarding the participant’s

pedagogical training background such as piano literature courses, piano pedagogy courses, observations, intern teaching, and post-college reading sessions. Table 4 lists the distribution of items on the repertoire selection questionnaire.

Table 4  
*Distribution of Items on the Repertoire Selection Questionnaire*

Element	Number of Items	Item Numbers
Sources	16	1–16
Influence	14	17–30
Training	8	31–38
Total	38	

Additionally, Crochet (2006) utilized a 5-point Likert-type scale in her instrument; I changed this to a 4-point Likert-type scale in for this study to eliminate the “neutral” option, so that the participants were to select a “forced choice” (Allen & Seaman, 2007). Most Likert scales consist of four to seven response categories (Asún, Rdz-Navarro, & Alvarado, 2015; Wakita, Ueshima, & Noguchi, 2012) because if there are too few (two or three) response categories in the questionnaire for the participants to select, it may decrease the validity of the scale and the participants may feel that they are not able to express their true opinions (Preston & Colman, 2000). However, if there are too many response categories, the subjects might not be able to discriminate among them (Miller, 1956). A neutral anchor or intermediate category may affect the validity of the results (Asún et al., 2015) because the subjects might use this category for different reasons such as having no opinion towards the question, having no desire to express their true opinions, having trouble understanding the question, or facing a non-applicable

question (Kulas, Stachowski, & Haynes, 2008; Raaijmakers, van Hoof, Hart, Verbogt, & Wollebergh, 2000). Originally, Crochet used 1 = *Never*, 2 = *Seldom*, 3 = *Sometimes*, 4 = *Often*, and 5 = *Very often*. In this survey, the choices were: 1 = *Not an Influence*, 2 = *Slight Influence*, 3 = *Moderate Influence*, and 4 = *High Influence*.

Crum's (1998) and Crochet's (2006) original surveys underwent a number of revisions as well as pilot studies. Before distributing the questionnaire to piano teachers in Florida, Crum had a panel of four expert piano teachers review the questionnaire for content validity of the instrument. These expert piano teachers had an average of 41 years of teaching experience, had taught students of all ages, and served as judges in festivals as well as worked on college-level facilities. Crum made revisions to the instrument for pilot testing after the experts' reviews. After the pilot test, Crum revised the questionnaire again based on the data and comments from the pilot participants.

Similarly, Crochet had three experienced instrumental music teachers review her survey and had the content validity of the survey established. A group of 16 band directors of varying levels of success who taught in south Florida completed a pilot study. After receiving the pilot study, Crochet made several revisions. The same 16 participants completed the revised instrument two weeks later to establish test/retest reliability. There were two parts to Crochet's questionnaire, Band Director Questionnaire and Repertoire Selection Questionnaire. Correlations between Crochet's two sets of questionnaires of .930 on the BDQ and .668 on the RSQ established the test/retest reliability of the instrument.

I conducted a reliability analysis to examine the subscales of the Repertoire

Selection Questionnaire in this study: Sources of Repertoire Selection, Factors Affecting Repertoire Selection, and Repertoire Selection Training. My analysis yielded Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .733, .777, and .770 respectively, indicating satisfactory reliability (Taber, 2017; Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). I was not able to carry out a reliability analysis on the Private Piano Teacher Questionnaire because there were too few cases for the analysis.

### **Pilot Survey Instrument**

The purpose of piloting the instrument was to evaluate the fluency and clarity of the questionnaire used in this study. I invited all 25 private piano teachers who were then members of both Tippecanoe Music Teachers Association of Indiana and Music Teachers National Association and had email addresses to participate in the pilot study. I chose Tippecanoe MTA because I was a member of the association. Of those, 7 returned their questionnaire. The respondents included private piano teachers of different years of teaching experience: (a) 5 years or less ( $n = 1$ ); (b) 6 to 10 years ( $n = 0$ ); (c) 11 to 15 years ( $n = 1$ ); (d) 21 to 25 years ( $n = 1$ ); and (e) 26 years and above ( $n = 4$ ).

The pilot testing of the instrument was conducted over a period of 10 days. Each participant was sent an invitation letter to the pilot study through e-mail that contained the link to the pilot study questionnaire at Qualtrics.com. I asked participants to make any comments regarding the survey at the end of the questionnaire. Comments could be anything related to the survey such as the design of the questionnaire, the wording of the questions and answers, or the ease of completing the questionnaire. I reviewed the questionnaires at the end of the pilot study period. There were no comments regarding

the structure or any items on the questionnaire. A teacher left a comment that said “I [am] absolutely sure that the correct repertoire is the main power of [private students’] success.” I did not retest the questionnaire due to the fact that the questionnaire was based upon previous research instruments that had already established test/retest reliability, and there was no indication that retest was necessary.

## **Survey Administration**

### **Population**

The population of this study was private piano teachers in the Midwest region of the United States. According to the United States Census Bureau (2000), there are 12 states in the Midwest region. Within this population, I recruited participants who met the following criteria: (a) they were private piano instructors, (b) they were members of their state music teachers associations and Music Teachers National Association, and (c) they had an email address. I first sent a message regarding the study to the president of each state music teachers association and requested the contact information of their members. If the members did not have email addresses, they were not contacted and asked to participate in the survey. Due to privacy issues or absent responses from the presidents of the state music teachers associations, private piano teachers in five of the twelve states did not participate. These five states included Iowa, Michigan, Nebraska, Ohio, and Wisconsin. As a result, I recruited participants of the study from the private piano teacher lists of seven state music teacher associations: Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, and Minnesota.

## Data Collection

I collected data between November 1 and November 15, 2014. After the initial contact with the seven associations' presidents, three different scenarios resulted from their responses: (a) I could obtain the membership lists without any obligations, (b) I could receive the membership list after paying a fee, or (c) the associations distributed the consent letters directly to their members without any direct contact from me. The Illinois State Music Teachers Association (MTA), Missouri MTA, and South Dakota MTA responded and requested a fee for their membership lists. I examined the lists to identify participants who met the three criteria listed in the preceding paragraph. Consequently, I sent an invitational letter directly to 614 out of 729 members in Illinois State MTA, 305 out of 343 members in Missouri MTA, and 107 out of 161 members in South Dakota MTA to participate in the study.

Because of privacy issues, some of the presidents preferred to email the letter to their members directly or to post it on their newsletters. Kansas MTA charged a fee for including the invitation letter in their electronic newsletters that were delivered to their 301 members. Minnesota MTA posted the invitation letter on their members-only website with no charge due to their large volume of memberships of approximately 800. North Dakota MTA emailed the invitational letter to their 104 members with no charge. The president of Indiana MTA suggested that I contacted the president of each local association to email the letter to their members. Because I was a member of Indiana MTA, I had possession of the Indiana MTA directory and was able to calculate the number of members who had email addresses. The association had 237 members but

only 221 had email addresses.

In sum, I invited 2,452 piano private teachers to participate in this study. I directly contacted 1,026 teachers in Illinois, Missouri, and South Dakota whereas the remaining 1,426 teachers had access to the invitation through websites, online newsletter, or an email from their association's president. The invitation letter contained a description of the study, a request to participate in an online survey, and a direct link to the survey at Qualtrics.com.

Shortly after I sent out the invitation letter, I received six returned letters electronically because of invalid addresses and eight more the following day because of the same reason. I also received seven electronic messages from letter recipients citing that they would not qualify for taking the survey due to their retirement from giving piano lessons, being teachers of other instruments, and being members of the associations but not giving piano instruction. In total, the number of contacts made for the study was approximately 2,431. Nevertheless, the exact number of prospective participants who were private piano teachers was unknown.

### **Participants**

While the survey was open, 173 participants started the questionnaire. However, only 157 participants completed the survey, which calculates to an overall response rate of 6.5%. One participant contacted me because she attempted to complete the survey twice but there were some technical difficulties that would not allow her to continue. I signed into Qualtrics.com to open the link to the survey and inspected the survey. I did not find any problems and reported back to the participant and encouraged her to try

again. Table 5 shows the distribution of invitations and response rate by state music teachers association. Copies of the contact letter to the state teachers association presidents and the invitation letter to the survey may be found in Appendix C.

Table 5  
*Distribution of Invitations and Response Rate by State Music Teachers Association*

	Total Number of Invitations 2452	Total Number of Completed Surveys 157	
Directly Contacted	Number of Invitations	Number of Completed Surveys	Response Rate (%)
Illinois	614	45	7.3
Missouri	305	16	5
South Dakota	107	18	17
Indirectly Contacted			
Indiana	221	26	12
Kansas	301	5	2
Minnesota	800	41	5
North Dakota	104	6	6

The total numbers of directly- and indirectly-contacted potential participants were 1,026 and 1,426, respectively. Out of the group of directly-contacted potential participants, 79 completed the survey and out of the group of indirectly-contacted potential participants, 78 completed the survey. The return rates of both groups were 7.7% and 5.5%, respectively. The analysis showed that directly-contacted potential participants completed more surveys than indirectly-contacted potential participants.

### **Analysis**

Pedagogical content knowledge is the knowledge that the teachers possess to instruct their students effectively because of their deep understanding of the concepts and

structure underlying the subject matter. For this study, repertoire selection practices are considered demonstrations of a teacher's pedagogical content knowledge. In order to determine if a piano teacher's teaching experience and training have any effects on their repertoire selection practices, I identified dependent and independent variables for analysis, as described below.

### **Repertoire Selection Practice**

Repertoire selection practice was the dependent variable in this study. As Forbes (2001) described, repertoire selection was one of the most important tasks a music teacher undertakes in teaching students. Researchers and philosophers have asserted that, through playing high quality repertoire, a student can best comprehend musical skills and involve in aesthetic experiences (Canfield, 2009; Forbes, 2001; Meyer, 1973; Reimer, 1989). The selections utilized in lessons provide sources for teaching and learning as well as aesthetic experiences. The RSQ was used to measure the private piano teachers' sources of repertoire selections and the influences affecting repertoire selection decisions.

### **Teaching Experience and Training**

Data collected from portions of the PPTQ measured the independent variables of teaching experience and pedagogical training. As discussed in the literature review, both experience and training have an effect on teachers' repertoire selection practices for their students. Teaching experience was categorized into six groups: (a) 5 years or less; (b) 6 to 10 years; (c) 11 to 15 years; (d) 16 to 20 years; (e) 21 to 25 years; and (f) 26 years and above. Training was categorized into two groups: (a) pedagogically-trained and (b) non-pedagogically-trained. Repertoire selection training was defined by the composite scores

of items identified by National Music Teachers Association and The Frances Clark Center for Keyboard Pedagogy and National Association of Schools of Music. The lists of identified training items for this study were undergraduate and graduate piano literature courses, undergraduate and graduate piano pedagogy courses, observation to teaching, intern teaching and certification by National Music Teachers Association.

### **Data Analysis**

After the closing date of the survey period at Qualtrics.com, I exported all the data of the surveys and entered them into an Excel spreadsheet. I analyzed the data by means of descriptive statistics because I needed to determine who would qualify as a pedagogically-trained piano teacher or a non-pedagogically-trained piano teacher. The answers to questions 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 were straightforward. Data of each of these questions were calculated and documented. There was no need for further analysis on these data for the rest of this study. For the answers to the remaining questions (2, 4, 5, 6, 12 to 38), I also calculated the frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation of these items so that I could rank them in order from high to low. Because I had two groups of teachers and was looking at mean scores for certain items, I applied *t* tests to the data using the computer software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 22.0). Additionally, I conducted a multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) because I had multiple groups of variables and multiple levels of comparisons to determine if there were any significant interactions between them.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the repertoire selection practices of private piano instructors concerning their intermediate-level students as well as to examine the relationship between teacher experience, teacher training, and repertoire selection practices. I designed a survey consisting of two sections, Private Piano Teachers Questionnaire (PPTQ) and Repertoire Selection Questionnaire (RSQ) to carry out the study. Piano teachers from seven states in the Midwest region of the United States were asked to answer 11 items in PPTQ regarding their teaching and training backgrounds and 38 items on the RSQ regarding their repertoire selection practices. However, they were not required to respond to all the items if they found any one of them uncomfortable to answer. I developed RSQ to measure the sources of repertoire selection used by private piano instructors and the influences upon their repertoire selection, as well as the functions of those influences with piano instructors' various backgrounds. The results presented in the following pages will provide demographic background of the participants and answer the research questions:

1. What types of sources do pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers utilize when choosing intermediate-level repertoire?
2. What types of criteria do pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers utilize when choosing intermediate-level repertoire?
3. How do intermediate-level repertoire selection practices of piano teachers differ as a function of experience and pedagogical training?

### Demographic Data

The purpose of the Private Piano Teacher Questionnaire (PPTQ) was to obtain demographic information for each participant so that I could use the information to classify teachers as either pedagogically- or non-pedagogically-trained, as well as to find out their teaching experiences. Respondents identified their age, gender, location, and years of teaching experience. In addition, respondents described their educational backgrounds and types of professional development they have been involved in during their years of teaching. Table 6 shows the distribution of participants by age and gender. Tables 7 and 8 show the distribution of participants by years of piano teaching experience and the distribution of participants by educational backgrounds respectively. A list of participating states and the number of participants from each state may be found in Appendix D.

Table 6  
*Distribution of Participants by Age and Gender*

Gender	20–30 years	31–40 years	41–50 years	51–60 years	61+ years
Male	3	2	2	3	3
Female	9	21	18	39	57

Table 7  
*Distribution of Participants by Years of Teaching Experience*

Years of Teaching Experience	Participants	Percentage
5 or less	14	9
6 to 10	11	7
11 to 15	11	7
16 to 20	13	8
21 to 25	14	9
26 or above	94	60

Table 8  
*Distribution of Participants by Educational Backgrounds*

Highest Music Degree	Participants	Percentage
High School	2	1
Performance Diploma	2	1
Some College Study, No Degree	20	13
Collegiate Minor	7	5
Bachelor Degree	45	29
Masters Degree	60	38
Doctorate Degree	21	13

Three survey items gathered data as to what professional development opportunities the participants utilized. First, participants indicated their professional music organization memberships. Table 9 lists the distribution of participants by professional organization memberships. Other professional music organizations included local music teachers associations, state music teachers associations, and College Music Society. A complete list of the 51 other professional music organizations provided by the participants may be found in Appendix D.

Table 9  
*Distribution of Participants by Professional Music Organization Memberships*

Professional Organizations	Participants
Music Teachers National Association	147
National Association for Music Teachers	5
National Guild of Piano Teachers	29
National Federation of Music Clubs	35
Other	51

Second, participants selected what music publications they read regularly. Table 10 shows the distribution of participants by regularly read music publications. A list of the 16 additional music publications provided by the participants may be found in Appendix F. Third, participants answered how many seminars or workshops on piano teaching they attended in last three years. Table 11 shows the distribution of participants by professional development activities. Participants also indicated the percentage of their students of different levels in their teaching studios. Table 12 lists the distribution of students by different performance levels.

Table 10  
*Distribution of Participants by Regularly Read Music Publications*

Publication	Participants
American Music Teacher	121
Clavier Companion	66
Music Educators Journal	18
National Federation of Music Clubs Magazine/Junior Keynotes	26
Piano Guild Note Magazine	23
Other	16

Table 11  
*Distribution of Participants by Professional Development*

Number of Seminars or Workshops	Participants
0 to 1	21
2 to 3	36
4 to 5	37
6 and above	48

Table 12  
*Distribution of Students by Different Performance Levels*

Students' Performance Levels	Percentage
Beginner	39
Intermediate	35
Advanced	13

### **Repertoire Selection Sources**

The purpose of the Repertoire Selection Questionnaire (RSQ) was to collect information with regard to the sources (RSQ-RSS) and criteria to determine repertoire selection that private piano teachers used for their intermediate-level students, and their repertoire selection training background (RSQ-RST). The information provided the types of sources piano teachers used while selecting literature for their students and how musical training of piano teachers influenced the types of sources they used. First, participants indicated the level of influence that each of the listed repertoire selection sources had on their decision to select literature for their intermediate-level piano students. Responses were measured on a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not an influence*; 4 = *high influence*). Means for each sources of repertoire selection are reported in Table 13.

Table 13  
*Level of Influence of Repertoire Sources (N= 126)*

Repertoire Sources	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Teacher's personal selections	3.72	0.50
Previously performed music	3.30	0.79
Other piano teachers' recommendations	2.96	0.92
Piano festival/contests	2.88	1.01
State music association repertoire lists	2.78	1.17
Piano workshops/clinics	2.77	0.98
Student's personal selections	2.71	0.82
Examination of scores in stores	2.63	1.04
Recording of any type	2.59	0.97
Live performances	2.56	0.88
National piano organization lists	2.50	1.06
Music publisher materials	2.48	0.91
Examination of scores at online websites	2.37	0.70
Published repertoire lists	2.34	0.90
Leading professional lists	2.33	1.01
Music publisher/distributor catalogues	2.17	0.85

To identify whether participants were pedagogically- or non-pedagogically-trained, the survey invited participants to answer two items on the PPTQ regarding their pedagogical training. The first item determined whether participants had completed two or more piano literature and/or pedagogy courses as well as an internship during their college years. The second item determined whether participants had been nationally certified by the Music Teachers National Association. If a participant answered “yes” to either item, the participant was considered to be a pedagogically-trained piano teacher. I used a median split of the participants' answers to define the pedagogically-trained ( $n = 113$ ) and non-pedagogically-trained ( $n = 44$ ) piano teachers.

Each possible repertoire source of pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers is listed in rank order in Tables 14 and 15. The results indicate that pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained teachers ranked the first three repertoire selection sources the same: their personal selections (i.e., compositions that teachers preferred and owned), previously performed music, other piano teachers' recommendations. The results also indicate that both groups of teachers ranked their least utilized repertoire selection sources, in different orders, as catalogs, leading professional lists, and websites.

Table 14  
*Means and Standard Deviations of Repertoire Sources for Pedagogically-Trained Piano Teachers (N = 91)*

Repertoire Sources	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Teacher's personal selections	3.77	0.47
Previously performed music	3.33	0.82
Other piano teachers' recommendations	2.95	0.94
Piano festival/contests	2.93	0.99
Piano workshops/clinics	2.84	1.15
State music association repertoire lists	2.78	0.91
Examination of scores in stores	2.68	0.86
Recordings of any type	2.67	1.04
Student's personal selections	2.66	0.99
Live performances	2.64	0.88
National piano organization lists	2.53	0.97
Music publisher materials	2.47	0.91
Published repertoire lists	2.47	0.97
Examination of scores at online websites	2.44	0.82
Leading professional lists	2.42	0.98
Music publisher/distributor catalogues	2.15	0.88

Table 15  
*Means and Standard Deviations of Repertoire Sources for Non-Pedagogically-Trained Piano Teachers (N = 33)*

Repertoire Sources	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Teacher's personal selections	3.58	0.71
Previously performed music	3.24	0.71
Other piano teachers' recommendations	3.00	0.87
Student's personal selections	2.85	0.56
State music association repertoire lists	2.82	1.24
Piano festival/contests	2.76	1.09
Piano workshops/clinics	2.58	1.17
Music publisher materials	2.48	0.94
Examination of scores in stores	2.48	1.00
National piano organization lists	2.45	1.28
Live performances	2.39	0.86
Recordings of any type	2.30	0.85
Music publisher/distributor catalogues	2.21	0.78
Examination of scores at online websites	2.18	0.95
Leading professional lists	2.12	1.08
Published repertoire lists	2.03	1.04

To answer the first research question, which addressed the types of sources pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers use when choosing intermediate-level repertoire, it was necessary to sort the 16 repertoire selection sources into groups for analysis. Following previous research by Crochet (2006), I divided the sources into three groups. The first group contained any repertoire selection sources regarding *lists*: repertoire lists from any state music association; repertoire lists published by any national piano organization; repertoire lists published in books, journals, or periodicals; any published or unpublished repertoire lists by leaders in the profession; and music recommended by other piano teachers. The second group contained any repertoire

selection sources of *previously performed or heard music*: live performances of piano music, piano festivals/contests, personal selections by a student, personal selections by oneself, piano workshops or clinics, and music the teacher performed previously. The third group contained any online or published *materials*: music publisher materials, music publisher/distributor catalogues, examination of scores in music stores, examination of scores at online music websites, and recordings of any type.

Because I sought to compare how frequently pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers used the sources, I applied an independent  $t$  test to each of the three groups to examine the differences in repertoire selection sources of pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers. I first calculated the mean score of each of the three groups of both groups of piano teachers, then applied an independent  $t$  test. The mean scores of the first group, *Lists*, of pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers were 2.64 and 2.54 respectively. The mean scores of the second group, *Previously Performed or Heard*, of pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers were 2.97 and 2.91. Regarding the mean scores of the third group, *Music Materials*, of pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers were 2.44 and 2.31.

The Levene's test for equality of variances signified the  $t$ -test results should be reported with an equal variance assumed. Results indicated that there was no significant difference in *repertoire lists* between pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers ( $t = 0.815$ ,  $df = 144$ ,  $p = 0.416$ ). There was also no significant difference in *music previously performed or heard* between pedagogically- and non-

pedagogically-trained private piano teachers ( $t = 0.692$ ,  $df = 144$ ,  $p = 0.490$ ). Last, there was no significant difference in *music materials* between pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers ( $t = 1.270$ ,  $df = 144$ ,  $p = 0.206$ ).

### **Repertoire Selection Influences**

Participants answered items on the second part of the RSQ to provide information regarding what influenced their repertoire selection for their students. Private piano teachers indicated the importance of each of the 14 listed possible repertoire selection influences that affected their choices of literature for their intermediate-level piano students on a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not an influence*; 4 = *high influence*). Table 16 shows the descriptive analysis of the 14 possible repertoire influences. Each possible repertoire source of pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers is listed in rank order in Tables 17 and 18, respectively. The results show that both pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers ranked the influences that affected their selections in almost the same order. The first five factors are: (a) ability and maturity of the students; (b) appeal of the work to the student, teacher, and audience; (c) physical and technical demands of the work; (d) quality and aesthetic appeal of the work; and (e) musical structure of the work. While pedagogically-trained piano teachers considered historical significance of the work as the sixth most important factor, the non-pedagogically-trained teachers ranked it the tenth.

Table 16  
*Level of Influence of Repertoire Selection Influences*

Repertoire Selection Influences	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Students' ability and maturity	146	3.90	0.31
Appeal to student, teacher, and audience	147	3.82	0.38
Physical and technical demands of the work	148	3.75	0.49
Quality and aesthetic appeal of the work	147	3.67	0.60
Musical structure of the work	146	3.08	0.72
Previously heard music	148	2.76	0.85
Historical significance of the work	147	2.73	0.82
Teachers' ability to demonstrate	147	2.72	1.04
State or national approval lists	147	2.69	0.99
Likelihood of future performances	146	2.49	0.92
Social elements of the work	146	2.25	0.83
Potential ratings	148	2.22	1.01
Publishers reputation	147	2.12	0.96
Cost	147	2.01	0.83

Table 17  
*Means and Standard Deviations of Repertoire Selection Influences for Pedagogically-Trained Piano Teachers (N =101)*

Repertoire Selection Influences	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Students' ability and maturity	3.92	0.27
Appeal to student, teacher, and audience	3.85	0.36
Physical and technical demands of the work	3.77	0.47
Quality and aesthetic appeal of the work	3.73	0.53
Musical structure of the work	3.16	0.70
Historical significance of the work	2.90	0.78
Previously heard music	2.78	0.84
Teachers' ability to demonstrate	2.77	1.04
State or national Approval lists	2.76	0.90
Likelihood of future performances	2.54	0.94
Social elements of the work	2.35	0.85
Potential ratings	2.27	0.98
Publishers' reputation	2.23	1.00
Cost	2.07	0.83

Table 18  
*Means and Standard Deviations of Repertoire Selection Influences for Non-Pedagogically-Trained Piano Teachers (N = 38)*

Repertoire Selection Influences	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Students' ability and maturity	3.82	0.39
Appeal to student, teacher, and audience	3.79	0.41
Physical and technical demands of the work	3.71	0.57
Quality and aesthetic appeal of the work	3.05	0.73
Musical structure of the work	2.89	0.76
Previously heard music	2.66	0.91
Teachers' ability to demonstrate	2.58	1.00
State or national approval lists	2.58	1.18
Likelihood of future performances	2.37	0.79
Historical significance of the work	2.26	0.76
Social elements of the work	2.05	0.73
Potential ratings	1.97	1.08
Cost	1.89	0.83
Publishers' reputation	1.79	0.70

To answer the second research question, which addressed the types of criteria pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers use when choosing intermediate-level repertoire, it was again necessary to group the repertoire selection influences into categories for analysis. Based upon Crochet's categorization, I divided the 14 factors into six groups. The first group concerned musical quality: quality and aesthetic appeal of the work, historical significance, and social elements. The second group contained outside elements: previously heard music, publisher reputation, state or national approval list, and teacher's ability to demonstrate the music. The third group related to how appealing the music may be: appeal to student, teacher, and audience as well as potential for ratings. The fourth group contained items referring to cost

effectiveness: cost of the music and likelihood of future performances. The fifth group contained a single item: student maturity and ability. The last group related to the educational content of the work: physical and technical demands of the work as well as musical structure and design.

I sought to find out if any of the criteria was a more prominent factor in the two groups of piano teachers' repertoire selection decision making, I used an independent sample *t* test to explore the differences in repertoire selection influences between pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers. The Levene's test for equality of variances where equal variances were assumed could not be rejected for musical quality, outside elements, appeal, cost effectiveness or educational content, signifying the *t*-test results should be reported with equal variances assumed. The Levene's test for equality of variances was rejected for student maturity and ability ( $F = 12.449, df = 142, p < 0.001$ ), and educational content ( $F = 5.555, df = 142, p = 0.020$ ), indicating that the *t*-test results should be reported with equal variances not assumed.

Results indicated there was a statistically significant difference for musical quality ( $t = 3.955, df = 143, p < 0.001$ ) and appeal ( $t = 2.233, df = 143, p = 0.027$ ). The mean score of musical quality of pedagogically-trained private piano teachers was significantly higher than that of non-pedagogically-trained teachers, 2.99 compared to 2.45. In regards to appeal, the mean score of pedagogically-trained private piano teachers was higher than that of non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers, 3.06 compared to 2.88. There were no statistically significant differences between the two groups of teachers in all other areas of influences. These influences include outside elements ( $t = 1.893, df = 144,$

$p > 0.05$ ), cost effectiveness ( $t = 2.037$ ,  $df = 142$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), student maturity and ability ( $t = 1.531$ ,  $df = .51.853$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), and educational content ( $t = 1.714$ ,  $df = 60.907$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ).

### **Repertoire Selection Training**

Participants answered items on the third part of the RSQ to provide information regarding their training. Private piano teachers also indicated how influential each of the listed training sources were in their repertoire selection practices on a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not an influence*; 4 = *high influence*). Table 19 shows the means, standard deviations, and skewness of the training sources. Each possible training source of pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers is listed in rank order in Tables 20 and 21, respectively. The results show that, while pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers ranked all the influences that affected their selections differently, the lowest-ranked factors were graduate courses and intern teaching.

Table 19

*Level of Influence of Repertoire Selection Training (N= 27)*

Repertoire Selection Training	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Observation to teaching	2.48	1.22
Other	2.33	1.33
Reading sessions, post college	2.26	1.02
Undergraduate piano literature course	2.04	1.09
Undergraduate piano pedagogy course	1.93	1.17
Graduate piano literature course	1.89	1.12
Intern teaching	1.78	1.09
Graduate piano pedagogy course	1.74	1.10

Table 20

*Means and Standard Deviations of Repertoire Selection Training for Pedagogically-Trained Private Piano Teachers (N = 18)*

Repertoire Selection Training	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Observation to teaching	2.72	1.28
Undergraduate piano pedagogy course	2.57	1.13
Undergraduate piano literature course	2.33	1.09
Other	2.33	1.33
Reading sessions, post college	2.28	1.07
Graduate piano pedagogy course	2.28	1.17
Graduate piano literature course	2.17	1.10
Intern teaching	2.11	1.18

Table 21  
*Means and Standard Deviations of Repertoire Selection Training for Non-Pedagogically-Trained Private Piano Teachers (N = 9)*

Repertoire Selection Training	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Other	2.33	1.41
Reading sessions, post college	2.22	0.97
Observation to teaching	2.00	1.00
Undergraduate piano pedagogy course	1.58	0.93
Undergraduate piano literature course	1.44	0.88
Graduate piano pedagogy course	1.35	0.88
Graduate piano literature course	1.33	1.00
Intern teaching	1.11	0.33

I applied an independent sample *t* test to explore the differences in repertoire selection training between pedagogically-and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers. The results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference ( $t = 4.113$ ,  $df = 135$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) between the two groups in regards to repertoire selection. The mean scores of all the repertoire training sources of pedagogically-trained piano teachers except *Other* were higher than those of non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers. The mean scores of *Other* of both groups of piano teachers were the same.

### **Experience and Training**

To answer the third research question, which pointed to how intermediate-level repertoire selection practices of piano teachers differ as a function of experience and pedagogical training, I used demographic data to determine years of teaching experience and amount of training in repertoire selection. I categorized teaching experience into six groups: (a) 5 years or less ( $n = 14$ ); (b) 6 to 10 years ( $n = 11$ ); (c) 11 to 15 years ( $n = 11$ ); (d) 16 to 20 years ( $n = 13$ ); (e) 21 to 25 years ( $n = 14$ ); and (f) 26 years and above ( $n =$

94).

I used a multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) to determine if teachers with different years of teaching experience and training have different repertoire selection sources and practices. In the model, the repertoire selection practice in its constitutive factors represented the dependent variables, and teacher experience and training in repertoire selection were the independent variables. Thus, data were subjected to a two-way (training x experience) multivariate analysis on the dependent variables. The data met the following assumptions: (a) observations are randomly and independently sampled from the population; (b) each dependent variable has an interval measurement; (c) dependent variables are multivariate normally distributed within each group of the independent variables (which are categorical); and (d) the population covariance matrices of each group are equal (this is an extension of homogeneity of variances required for univariate ANOVA). In view of the above assumptions, it can be stated that although the group sizes pertaining to the years of teaching were uneven, the homogeneity assumptions were met.

The dependent variables contained 16 possible sources of repertoire and 14 influences. Modeling after Crochet (2006), I categorized the 16 sources of repertoire selection into three groups and the 14 influences into six groups. These are the same groups used to answer the previous research questions and are listed in Tables 22. Table 23 lists the descriptive data for the repertoire selection sources grouped by training and experience while Table 24 lists the descriptive data for the repertoire selection influences grouped by training and experience.

Table 22  
*Factors Constituting the Nine Dependent Variables*

Variable	Survey Item
Repertoire Selection Sources	
Lists	Repertoire lists from any state music association
	Repertoire lists published by any national piano organization
	Repertoire lists published in books, journals, or periodicals
	Any published or unpublished repertoire lists by leaders in the profession
	Music recommended by other piano teachers
Previously performed or heard	Live performances of piano music
	Piano festivals/contests
	Personal selections by your student
	Personal selections by yourself
	Piano workshops/clinics
	Music you performed previously
Music materials	Music publisher materials
	Music publisher/distributor catalogues
	Examination of scores in music stores
	Examination of scores at online music websites
	Recordings of any type
Repertoire Selection Influences	
Musical quality	Quality of the music itself and its aesthetic appeal
	Historical significance of the music
	Social elements of music
Outside elements	Music previously heard on programs and recitals
	Reputation of the publisher
	Music appears on a state or national approval list
	Ability of the teacher to adequately demonstrate and perform the music
Appeal	Appeal of the music to the student, teacher, and audience
	Potential of the music to yield high scores in competition

Cost effectiveness	Cost of the music
	Likelihood that the music will be performed again in the future
Student	Musical ability and maturity of the student
Educational content	Physical and technical demands of the work
	Musical structure and design

---

Table 23  
*Means and Standard Deviations for Lists, Previously Heard or Performed Music, and Music Materials by Pedagogical Training and Experience*

	Main Effects	Repertoire Selection Sources						
			Lists		Previously Heard or Performed Music		Music Materials	
		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Trained								
	5 years or less	6	3.23	0.39	2.80	0.52	2.48	0.55
	6 to 10 years	6	2.83	0.66	2.83	0.27	2.72	0.67
	11 to 15 years	7	2.86	0.94	2.86	0.59	2.34	0.41
	16 to 20 years	8	1.93	0.71	2.81	0.29	2.30	0.56
	21 to 25 years	9	2.93	0.49	3.09	0.49	2.48	0.36
	26 years and above	70	2.60	0.61	3.01	0.45	2.43	0.58
Non-trained								
	5 years or less	7	2.17	1.19	2.43	0.24	1.91	0.58
	6 to 10 years	5	2.28	0.54	3.08	0.23	2.68	0.67
	11 to 15 years	3	2.58	0.33	3.58	0.52	2.03	0.70
	16 to 20 years	4	3.05	0.99	2.90	0.48	2.40	0.59
	21 to 25 years	3	2.93	0.23	3.13	0.50	2.40	0.53
	26 years and above	18	2.57	0.66	2.91	0.38	2.36	0.56

Table 24  
*Means and Standard Deviations for Musical Quality, Outside Elements, Appeal, Cost Effectiveness, Student, and Educational Content by Pedagogic Training and Experience*

Main Effect	Repertoire Selection Influences												
		Musical Quality		Outside Elements		Appeal		Cost Effectiveness		Student		Educational Content	
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Trained													
5 years or less	6	2.83	0.41	2.67	0.52	3.33	0.52	2.67	0.82	4.00	0.00	3.83	0.41
6 to 10 years	6	3.33	0.82	2.50	0.55	3.17	0.41	2.83	1.17	3.83	0.41	3.50	0.55
11 to 15 years	7	3.00	0.58	2.71	0.49	3.29	0.49	2.71	0.76	4.00	0.00	3.43	0.79
16 to 20 years	8	2.88	0.64	2.00	1.07	3.25	0.46	2.38	0.74	4.00	0.00	3.75	0.46
21 to 25 years	9	3.11	0.60	3.11	0.33	3.22	0.44	2.78	0.67	3.89	0.33	3.56	0.53
26 years and above	70	3.06	0.54	2.83	0.61	3.42	0.58	2.53	0.72	3.91	0.28	3.72	0.45
Non-trained													
5 years or less	7	2.29	0.49	1.86	0.38	2.71	0.49	1.86	0.69	3.71	0.49	3.14	0.38
6 to 10 years	5	2.40	0.55	2.60	0.55	2.80	0.45	2.80	0.84	3.80	0.45	3.40	0.89
11 to 15 years	3	2.67	0.58	3.00	0.00	3.67	0.58	3.00	0.00	3.67	0.58	3.67	0.58
16 to 20 years	3	2.75	0.50	2.75	0.58	3.50	0.58	2.00	0.82	4.00	0.00	3.50	0.58
21 to 25 years	3	3.00	0.00	2.33	0.58	3.67	0.58	2.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00
26 years and above	18	2.78	0.43	2.67	0.69	3.11	0.68	2.33	0.59	3.83	0.38	3.59	0.51

For the MANOVA, I used eta squared ( $\eta^2$ ) to determine the relationship strength. An alpha level of .05 was set for each test. Pillai's Trace was used for computation, due to its robustness. To determine the homogeneity of variance, I employed the Box's test of equality of covariance matrices. The results of the test were not statistically significant ( $p = 0.31$ ), indicating that the covariance matrices were assumed to be equal for the MANOVA test. The residual plots indicated a departure from normality for the standardized residuals. Results of the MANOVA showed a statistically significant

interaction of training and experience, Pillai's Trace = 0.459,  $F(45, 625) = 1.405$ ,  $p < 0.05$ . The main effects of training and teaching experience were not statistically significant (Pillai's Trace = 0.107,  $F(9, 121) = 1.606$ ,  $p = 0.12$  and Pillai's Trace = 0.375,  $F(45, 625) = 1.125$ ,  $p = 0.27$ , respectively).

I conducted post-hoc ANOVAs on the interaction between training and teaching experience. There was statistical significance for lists,  $F(5,129) = 2.774$ ,  $p < 0.050$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.096$ , and outside elements,  $F(5,129) = 2.477$ ,  $p < 0.050$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.088$ . The partial eta squared effect size for the interaction effect indicated that approximately 30% of the variability in repertoire selection influences and sources can be explained by the interaction between the two independent variables (training and teaching experience). According to Cohen's (1988) benchmark values, this represents a large effect size. A summary of the MANOVA results for main effects of training and teaching experience, and their two-way interactions appears in Table 25. Following the summary of the multivariate analysis results, results of the univariate analyses for the interaction of training and experience on the independent variables can be found.

Table 25  
*Results of Multivariate Analyses*

Multivariate Analysis			
Independent Variable	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Training	9	1.606	0.121
Teaching Experience	45	1.125	0.270
Training & Experience	45	1.405	0.045*

  

Univariate Analyses—Training x Experience			
Dependent Variable			
Lists	5	2.744	0.022*
Previously Heard or Performed Music	5	1.959	0.089
Music Materials	5	0.619	0.686
Musical Quality	5	0.836	0.527
Outside Elements	5	2.477	0.035*
Music Appeal	5	1.658	0.149
Cost Effectiveness	5	0.934	0.462
Student	5	0.745	0.591
Educational Content	5	1.764	0.125

*Note.* Significant at the  $p < 0.05$  level.

### Summary

In this chapter I presented the analysis and results for the research questions regarding repertoire selection practices of intermediate-level piano teachers. Specifically, I examined differences regarding repertoire selection sources and repertoire selection criteria between pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers. The repertoire selection sources (lists, music previously performed or heard, and music materials) of pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers did not differ significantly at the intermediate level. Although there were no significant

differences in the sources that the two groups of piano teachers utilized to choose repertoire for intermediate-level students, there were significant differences in the influencing criteria of repertoire selection of pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers at the intermediate level. The relative influence of musical quality and appeal were significantly different between the two groups of teachers, in that pedagogically-trained piano teachers considered musical quality and appeal more important than non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers.

Lastly, in regard to the intermediate-level repertoire selection practices of piano teachers as a function of experience and pedagogical training, the data indicated that these qualities and attributes significantly affected how piano teachers selected repertoire for their students in two areas: the repertoire selection source *lists* and the repertoire selection influence *outside elements*. Pedagogical training had a significant effect on piano teachers with 20 years or less of teaching experience in terms of *lists* when selecting repertoire. However, pedagogical training had almost the same effect on all piano teachers who had 21 years or more teaching experience in terms of *lists*, regardless of their different pedagogical backgrounds. In other words, pedagogically-trained teachers utilized *lists* more in their earlier years of teaching when compared to the non-pedagogically-trained teachers in their earlier years of teaching.

Similarly, pedagogical training had a significant effect on piano teachers who had 25 years or less of teaching experience in terms of *outside elements* while selecting repertoire. However, pedagogical training had almost the same effect on all teachers who had 26 years or more of teaching experience in terms of *outside elements*, regardless of

their different pedagogical backgrounds. In other words, non-pedagogically-trained teachers were more influenced by *outside elements* in their earlier years of teaching when compared to the pedagogically-trained teachers. As previously described, *outside elements* included: (a) music previously heard on programs and recitals; (b) reputation of the publisher; (c) music appears on a state or national approval list; and (d) ability of the teacher to adequately demonstrate and perform the music. This means that a non-pedagogically-trained teacher in this study was more likely to become familiar with repertoire and feel comfortable demonstrating this music to students during their earlier years of teaching when compared to pedagogically-trained teachers in their earlier years of teaching. Strictly speaking, from years 6 to 20, the non-pedagogically-trained teachers relied on *outside elements* more than the pedagogically-trained teachers.

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the repertoire selection practices of pedagogically-and non-pedagogically-trained private piano instructors concerning their intermediate-level students. A pedagogically-trained piano teacher was defined as one who had received and completed formal training in piano teaching (such as taking piano literature and pedagogy courses as well as completing an internship for two or more semesters in colleges) or undergone Music Teachers National Association certification process to become a professionally certified music teacher. A non-pedagogically-trained piano teacher is one who had not completed formal piano literature or pedagogy training as well as internship in colleges (such as having completed only one semester of piano literature or pedagogy course) or had not been certified as a professional music teacher by the Music Teachers National Association.

I also examined the relationship between teacher experience, training, and repertoire selection practices incorporating Shulman's (2004) teacher knowledge framework, *Knowledge Growth in Teaching*. Shulman (2004) asserted that teaching should start with understanding what has to be learned and how to present the subject matter to learners. Utilizing the PCK theoretical framework developed by Shulman (1986, 2004), I conducted an examination of repertoire selection sources and repertoire selection criteria of pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers provided information with regards to the curriculum knowledge of the two groups of piano teachers. The importance of repertoire selection to educational and aesthetic

development had been confirmed in previous studies, yet the majority of the investigations focused on band, orchestra, and choral programs. Forbes (2001) stated that a music teacher has a responsibility to select appropriate repertoire in curricular planning, so that the pieces the students learn have a positive impact on their technical and aesthetic development.

In contrast to numerous studies related to repertoire selection practices in the fields of instrumental and choral ensemble education, there are a minimal number of examinations administered in the area of private piano teaching. Shulman (2004) described pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) as a representation of “the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented, and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners, and presented for instruction” (p. 228). Hyry-Beihammer (2011) and Crappell and Millican (2015) are a few of the researchers who studied how private piano teachers utilized PCK in their teaching. However, the researchers did not investigate how music teachers used PCK in their repertoire selection practices.

In 1990, MTNA conducted a survey regarding the pedagogical training of professional music teachers. However, teachers’ repertoire selection practices were not studied. In 1988, Crum investigated the attitudes and opinions of piano teachers toward the instructional material at the beginning through intermediate levels but did not incorporate the investigation of repertoire selection into the study. Daniel and Bowden (2013) explored the issues related to intermediate-level piano students. However, repertoire selection practices were also not included in this investigation. There are gaps

related to the repertoire selection in the area of private piano teaching. According to Shulman (2004) – and supported by Chandler (2012), Forrester (2018), Millican (2007, 2008, 2013), and Venesile (2010) – pedagogical content knowledge is important because it affects a teacher's decisions on what to teach. Moreover, PCK scholars and researchers commented that a teacher needs to possess subject matter content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, as well as pedagogical content knowledge to be able to teach effectively (Chandler, 2012; Fernandez-Balboa & Stiehl, 1995). Given the importance of repertoire selection in a student's educational development, it is imperative to examine repertoire selection practices in the context of private piano teaching.

As described in the literature review, repertoire selection is a consequential part in a student's music educational development regardless of their performance instrument. Previously surveyed instrumental and choral directors generally agreed that quality music was the most important criterion for selecting music for their students (Crochet, 2006; Dahlman, 1991), followed by technical challenges of the works (Forbes, 1998; Howard, 2001), students' ability (Davis, 1970; Howard, 2001), teacher preference (Dahlman, 1991; Hunsaker, 2007), aesthetic appeal (Crochet, 2006; McMullian, 1997), and educational appeal (Devore, 1989; King, 2001).

I adapted two surveys, the Private Piano Teachers Questionnaire (PPTQ) and the Repertoire Selection Questionnaire (RSQ), from previous literature (Crochet, 2006; Crum, 1998) to examine how pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers selected literature for their intermediate-level students. Crum (1998) examined piano teachers' opinions regarding beginning and intermediate-level piano instruction but

did not include the examination of repertoire selection practices of the piano teachers. Within the questionnaire, Crum acquired the piano teachers' demographic information and types of professional development. I adapted and revised those questions to suit the current study. Crochet (2006) examined the factors that influenced band teachers' repertoire selection practices and teachers' sources of repertoire selection. Because the nature of Crochet's investigation was similar to the present study, I adapted the questions of that questionnaire to collect information in regards to repertoire selection criteria and sources. I edited the questions so that they would be appropriate for piano teachers. I also used the data collected from the questionnaire to investigate how repertoire selection practices served as a function of teaching experience and training. Participants who completed the questionnaire were private piano teachers and members of their state music teachers associations and Music Teachers National Association, had email addresses, and lived in Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, or Minnesota.

The response rate of the questionnaire was 6.5%: 157 out of the 2,431 participants recruited for the study. Nulty (2008) argued that online surveys generally did not yield response rates as high as surveys administered on paper. Rohwer (2015) also suggested that electronic surveys tend to be deleted or ignored by recipients. Other factors for the relatively low completion rate may have included: (a) invalid email addresses; (b) the receivers of the invitational letter were not private piano teachers; and (c) the invitational letter could have been relayed to a folder for unidentified email addresses automatically by the email provider. In addition, because of the private policy of several music teachers associations, I had limited contact with participants regarding the survey, which

may have resulted in the misinterpretation of questions and a lack of urgency to complete the survey. I analyzed survey data with descriptive statistics, *t* tests, multiple analysis of variance, and univariate analysis of variance to determine the differences in repertoire selection practices between pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers.

## **Discussion of Findings**

### **Repertoire Selection Sources**

Research question 1 addressed the types of sources used by pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers when choosing intermediate-level repertoire. The results showed that there were no significant differences in the types of sources teachers utilize when making decisions as to what their intermediate-level students should study. Both groups of teachers agreed that their personal selections, previously performed music, and pieces recommended by other piano teachers were the most important sources. They also agreed that the least useful sources were music publisher/distributor catalogues, online websites, published repertoire lists, and leading professional lists. Findings of this study align with the results of several previous researchers in the areas of band and choral music. Band and choral directors considered recommendations by their colleagues (Crochet, 2006; Devore, 1989; Diddle, 2005) and teachers' personal selections (King, 2001; Reames, 2001) as key sources in repertoire selection. The directors in Crochet's, Devore's, and Diddle's studies ranked their colleagues' recommendations as one of the top three sources for repertoire selection. Meanwhile, the directors in King's and Reames' studies ranked personal selections one of their top three (see Table 2).

However, a majority of band and choral directors in prior studies considered reading sessions (Bolt, 1983; Diddle, 2005; Forbes, 1998; Reames, 2001), workshops and clinics (Bolt, 1983; Davis, 1970; Forbes, 1998; Hunsaker, 2007; King, 2001; Young, 1998), published materials (Davis, 1970; Howard, 2001; Young, 1998), live performances (Bolt, 1983; Crochet, 2006; Davis, 1970; Devore, 1989; Diddle, 2005; Forbes, 1998; Howard, 2001; Hunsaker, 2007; Reames, 2001), and recordings (Crochet, 2006; Howard, 2001; Hunsaker, 2007) as common sources for selecting repertoire. The results are in contrast to the results of this study. In the current study, there were 16 choices provided to participating piano teachers. Piano teachers ranked workshops and clinics sixth most important as sources for repertoire selection: Recordings were ranked ninth, live performances tenth, and music publisher materials twelfth.

It appears that piano teachers in my sample had a different approach compared to band or choral teachers regarding repertoire selection sources. As a piano teacher with over 20 years of teaching experience, I suggest several reasons. First, piano workshops and reading sessions are rare for piano teachers. If there is any, the workshop will most likely be offered by a publisher who is trying to promote their new publications. The content of the workshop is not necessarily designed for intermediate-level piano instruction. Therefore, workshops and clinics are generally not top repertoire selection sources for piano teachers who teach intermediate-level piano students. Second, piano teachers prefer to review a composition by playing through it or examining it with the complete composition in their hands before presenting it to their students. As a result, they can assess the piece carefully to see if it is appropriate for their students in terms of

technical, musical, and physical demands. However, recordings, live performances, and music publisher materials do not offer that option to piano teachers. There are, at times, brief descriptions or a few pages of the compositions in music publisher materials, but they are not sufficient enough for piano teachers to evaluate them thoroughly. Hence, recordings, live performances, and music publisher materials are likely not relatively important repertoire selection sources for piano teachers. Lastly, as Dezio (2009) and Wilson (2000) described, there are abundant supplies of intermediate-level piano music on the market and it is difficult for piano instructors to review all the compositions to find appropriate literature for their students. As a result, piano teachers tend to teach the pieces that they are familiar with and the pieces that their colleagues recommended.

### **Repertoire Selection Criteria**

Research question 2 concerned the degree of difference of influencing criteria of pedagogically-trained and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers at the intermediate-level. The criteria that influenced teachers' decisions on the repertoire they choose to teach students included the physical and technical demands of the work, the historical significance of the work, and the musical structure and design. While there were no statistically significant differences in terms of *outside elements*, *cost effectiveness*, *student maturity and ability*, and *educational content*, there was a statistically significant difference in the areas of *musical quality* and *appeal*. In this study, the category of *musical quality* consists of three items: quality and aesthetic appeal of the work, historical significance of the work, and social elements of the work. The category of *appeal* consisted of two items: appeal of the music to the students, teachers, and audience, and

potential of the music to yield high scores in competition. Pedagogically-trained piano teachers considered *musical quality* and *appeal* more important than non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers, as evidenced by higher mean scores.

I speculate that different views regarding *musical quality* and *appeal* between the two groups of piano teachers were due to their musical background. Pedagogically-trained piano teachers took music and pedagogy courses at their colleges that helped them understand the components and significances of a composition. For example, in a piano pedagogy course, future piano teachers learn how to introduce complicated rhythmic patterns to students. During the intermediate-level piano study, students begin to play compositions of late-classical and romantic periods. These pieces often consist of complex rhythmic passages for both hands playing simultaneously. By taking piano pedagogy courses, future piano teachers may learn to analyze these passages in depth so that they can explain and demonstrate them to their students. Therefore, their students may understand and perform better.

In addition, these difficult passages are often the components that draw the attention of judges at competitions and festivals. When piano teachers recognize the judges' expectations, they will likely ensure their students play those passages correctly and musically. By so doing, their students may fully understand the intention of the composers of the compositions and attain the technical and musical requirements of the compositions. These insights may help students receive a higher quality of instruction and perform at a higher level.

Nevertheless, the results of this study suggest that both groups of piano teachers

put their students first when selecting repertoire, as indicated by high ratings of student-centered criteria. They consider their students' physical and mental capacities and how appealing or enjoyable the music might be for their students and audience members at recitals. These two criteria are highly related to Shulman's theory of teacher knowledge (2004): Knowing student interests and what students are able to do affects how teachers select material and instruct their students.

### **Repertoire Selection Practices, Teaching Experience and Pedagogical Training**

Research question 3 focused on the difference in the intermediate-level repertoire selection practices of piano teachers as a function of teaching experience and pedagogical training. Results of a MANOVA analysis indicated that training and teaching experience did not have an effect on repertoire selection sources and repertoire selection influences when considered individually. However, there was a significant interaction between teaching experience and training when considering repertoire selection sources and influences. Independent univariate analyses revealed that teaching had a significant effect on *lists* (considered in this study as a repertoire source) and *outside elements* (considered in this study as a repertoire influence). Lists contained repertoire from any state music association, national piano organizations, books, journals, periodicals, leaders in the profession, and recommended by other piano teachers. Outside elements consisted of previously heard music, publisher reputation, state or national approval lists, and a teacher's ability to demonstrate the music (See Table 22).

I surmise that the results were due to training in repertoire selection. When pedagogically-trained teachers first began their teaching career, they likely already had

the information as to where to look for literature and what compositions to teach because of their pedagogical training. Contrarily, non-pedagogically-trained teachers likely did not have that prior knowledge. Therefore, when they selected repertoire for their students, they were more influenced by elements such as approved repertoire lists, publisher's reputation, and pieces that they had heard of. However, over the years of teaching, non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers likely became familiar with piano repertoire on the market and places to look for literature for their students, and likely became more experienced in selecting pieces and less influenced by other elements.

#### **Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Further Research**

To my knowledge, there has not been any investigation regarding piano repertoire selection previously and one that used pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) as the framework. This study can, therefore, be seen as exploratory. In addition, the population size of this study was relatively small. Only 6.5% of invited participants returned and completed the survey, so generalization of the findings needs to be carefully considered. However, this study was the first attempt to examine repertoire selection practices of pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers. Future research on the same or similar topic can be built upon the results and knowledge gained from this study.

Based on these findings, a number of recommendations can be made for further research. First, it might be notable to further investigate each of the repertoire selection sources and influences variables used in this study to gain greater depth with regard to repertoire selection practices. Although the results of this study show that there was no

significant difference in repertoire selection sources between pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers when selecting literature for their intermediate-level students, they also showed that both groups of piano teachers ranked publishers' materials and catalogues the lowest source of repertoire selection. However, generally, publishers advertise the newest or most current compositions in their catalogues. If piano teachers do not use the catalogues to find new publications, where do they go to find new works for their students? How do they get information regarding up-to-date repertoire that might interest their students?

The second finding of this study is that pedagogically-trained piano teachers considered musical quality and appeal of the pieces more important than non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers. It may be useful to investigate why there was a difference between the two groups. Music of high quality is essential in learning because it provides opportunities for students to develop their musical and technical skills as well as to gain aesthetic experiences (Forbes, 2001; Meyer, 1973; Reimer, 1973). The situation that non-pedagogically-trained teachers do not consider music of quality important is highly concerning because it affects what students learn and experience. This study, being quantitative in nature, provides descriptions of how piano teachers select repertoire for their students but it does not provide details about why piano teachers make such decisions. One method to gain deeper knowledge regarding repertoire selection is through qualitative research. Duling (1992), for example, found that pedagogically-trained teachers possessed subject matter content knowledge and apply pedagogical content knowledge in their teaching. Therefore, interview and observation

methods might allow piano teachers to provide more elaborate information regarding repertoire selection practices, and also allow a study of how the piano teachers select repertoire in an actual and natural environment (Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Lichtman, 2006). The information gathered may provide insight behind the situation mentioned above and new variables, ideas, or areas for future researchers to explore.

Third, it may be useful to replicate this study among piano teachers with beginning and advanced-level students to examine their repertoire selection practices. It would be interesting to establish the similarities and differences, should there be any, among teachers with students of different levels. As previously described, elementary method books are systematically written in terms of musical and technical difficulties (Wilson, 2000); piano teachers can follow the instructions provided by the authors to instruct students. However, similar to intermediate-level piano music, advanced-level piano books do not offer systematically graded musical or technical guidelines (Appleby & Magrath, 1993; Freundlich, 1987; Prescott & Chidester, 1938; Scanlan, 1988; Winston, 2003). It would be useful to inquire whether teachers of advanced-level students have the same “black hole” situation that Fuszek (1980) described about piano teachers of intermediate-level students. If so, what approaches do these teachers take in selecting pieces for their students?

Fourth, it may also be important to compare repertoire selection practices between pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers of elementary- and advanced-levels students. This information could be further analyzed and compared with the findings of the current study, which focused on intermediate-level piano instruction

alone. Similarities and/or differences between the two levels may reveal subtle and informative issues that can inform researchers about the curricular knowledge of piano teachers of different pedagogical backgrounds. If it is found that non-pedagogically-trained teachers need help with selecting literature for their students, for example, such a finding might provide information to support the creation of professional development opportunities to assist teachers. Further study would inform those teaching piano pedagogy as to how private piano teachers approach the practice of teaching students of different levels. The information may help college piano teachers in developing curricula that affect the teaching of piano at different levels.

Fifth, it is recommended that research be conducted to gain information and insight into the relationship between student and teacher preferences in making decisions about repertoire selection. Students often discontinue lessons during the intermediate-level piano studies (Daniel and Bowden, 2013; Scanlan, 1988, 1989; Winston, 2003), and the reasons for this occurrence should be investigated. This situation was further supported by the results of this survey. The results showed that a large number of intermediate-level piano students dropped out before reaching the advanced level, from 35% to 13% (see Table 12). This phenomenon may include factors such as the selection of repertoire, a student's responsibilities or activities, or how learning changes for young people in the formative years between 10 and 18 years of age.

Findings of this study suggest that both groups of pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers highly consider their students' ability and maturity and the appeal of the music to their students when selecting literature. However,

student's personal interests, life, and learning patterns were not part of this study. In addition, reports from previous studies suggest that these factors were important issues related to repertoire selection and piano studies. For example, Daniel and Bowden (2013) suggested that there might be a disconnection between the literature the teachers require their students to learn and the literature the students want to learn. Thus, exploring the personal perspectives of students regarding intermediate-level piano literature may reveal the differences and similarities in repertoire selection goals between teachers and students, and may give insight into how and what teachers select literature for their students in the future.

Previous studies relating to repertoire selection were conducted on music teachers alone. There is a need for more investigation and exploration into how students learn and engage with the music making process. Lammers (2006), Macmillan (2004), and Rife, Shnek, Lauby, and Lapidus (2001) commented that the motivation of learning to play the piano were made up of many factors including repertoire selection, quality of teaching, and the relationship between the student and teacher. Students' views on repertoire selection are important issues to be considered.

Furthermore, it would be noteworthy to investigate the types of piano pedagogy courses being offered at the college level. The results of this study showed that approximately 28% of piano teachers who participated in the survey were not pedagogically-trained. In addition, when collecting the information of potential participants for this study, I noticed that there were a lot of piano teachers who did not have a music degree in piano, who majored in other musical instruments or voice, or who

did not have a music degree. If this investigation is carried out, the results may be informative for colleges and universities that might be interested in offering a fundamental piano pedagogy course to those who are interested in becoming or might consider a career as a piano teacher in the future. Future research studies could also focus on new types of pedagogical approaches that are creative, innovative, and speak to the needs of a new generation of students and piano teachers.

### **Implications for Practice**

This study has a number of implications for pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained private piano teachers related to musical training and piano teaching. Repertoire selection remains one of the most important and difficult tasks for private piano teachers of intermediate-level piano students. Reynolds (2000) expressed that a music teacher's main objective was to help students receive a music education through experiences and information. However, Wilson (2000) argued that intermediate-level piano books did not provide sequential musical and technical material similar to beginning method books; there was not an organized course of study for intermediate-level piano students. Consequently, piano teachers are faced with the problem of what and how to teach.

### **Mentorship**

According to the findings of this study, both groups of pedagogically- and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers rated *musical quality* (quality and aesthetic appeal of the work, historical significance, and social elements) as an important factor when selecting repertoire. However, the group of pedagogically-trained teachers rated this

factor significantly higher than the group of non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers. In other words, when pedagogically-trained piano teachers make curricular decisions, they may place more emphasis on the quality of the compositions than the non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers. As a result, their perspectives regarding repertoire selection may be different, which may affect a students' experience studying piano.

In reference to what has been mentioned in the last paragraph, a beginning or non-pedagogically-trained piano teacher may have difficulties determining what to select for their intermediate-level students. They may learn by trial and error, from the pedagogy courses while they were in college, or from workshops and clinics. In other words, beginning or non-pedagogically-trained teachers are largely left on their own to determine what to select for their students. This might suggest that additional assistance might be needed for these two groups of teachers. Having a mentor while starting a teaching career provides many benefits to the teachers (Krueger, 1999; Turner, 2002). The mentor may provide advice and guidance regarding repertoire selection in addition to encouragement, perspectives, as well as methods and strategies. The mentor can also help the mentee make networking connections with other piano teachers. Universities offering piano pedagogy programs might consider providing a mentoring service to newly graduated piano pedagogy students for a period of time. Music Teachers National Association (MTNA) might also consider establishing a mentoring program to help any teacher who acquires assistance in teaching.

### **Repertoire Selection**

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of

Labor (2017), the minimum educational requirement of a high school teacher is a bachelor's degree. If the teacher works at a public school, the teacher must also have a state-issued teaching license. The licensure process may require the teacher to pass an examination in the particular subject area that they are assigned to teach. Ensemble directors at public high schools typically have a minimum of a bachelor's degree in music education along with a state music teaching license. Music education majors must take courses related to pedagogy in their college experience. In those classes, they learned about various methods and materials that contribute to expanding their understanding and knowledge about available musical resources. Reading sessions, workshops and clinics, and published materials were among those sources.

In contrast, there is no minimum academic or state licensing requirement to be a private piano teacher. If the individual attains certain level of piano skills and feels confident in giving lessons, the individual can offer lessons regardless of their musical or pedagogical training. For example, 45% of the participants/music teachers in the MTNA (1990) survey claimed that they had not had any pedagogical training when they started their teaching career. In this study, approximately 28% of the participants were not pedagogically-trained. If the non-pedagogically-trained teachers did not complete any pedagogical training, they might not be exposed to different repertoire selection sources. Therefore, they might not have any familiarity with or basic knowledge on how to access a significant body of repertoire for their students. As a result, works that they previously played and personally favored would become key elements in their repertoire selection process. They might also utilize the literature recommended by other teachers as

resources.

Moreover, as previously mentioned in chapter 1, there are an abundant supply of intermediate-level piano works on the market (Dezio, 2009; Wilson, 2000) and they are generally not sequentially ordered in terms of musical and technical skills (Dezio, 2009). Piano teachers often find it difficult to select the appropriate literature for their students (Dezio, 2009; Wilson, 2000). In addition, Uszler (1992) and James (1994) commented that piano teachers generally teach how they were taught because of the “imitation” approach (James, 1994). Therefore, it is likely that the piano teachers would simply use the same teaching material with which they already had experience.

Piano teachers in this study relied on their prior knowledge when selecting music for their intermediate-level students. For example, they reported that they often used the pieces that they had taught before from their personal collection ( $M = 3.72$ ,  $SD = 0.50$ ) or those recommended by their colleagues who were familiar with the compositions ( $M = 2.96$ ,  $SD = 0.92$ ). In addition, based on the results of this study, both groups of pedagogical- and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers rated the technical demands and musical structure of the compositions as important influences when selecting repertoire. It is possible that familiarity with the literature may have been important to these piano teachers because they understood the musical and technical content of the compositions. In terms of Shulman’s theory (1986), it might be said that they possessed the curricular knowledge they needed to understand which pieces could help their students develop their skills.

### **Subject Content Knowledge**

The results of this study also indicated that piano teachers who had completed pedagogical training in colleges or had been certified by Music Teachers National Association ranked one criterion *musical quality* (quality and aesthetic appeal of the work, historical significance of the work, and social elements of the work) as more important than non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers ( $t = 3.955$ ,  $df = 143$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). This difference could be explained by the training obtained by pedagogically-trained teachers, in that they may have been more exposed to various attributes of music and the history of music in comparison to non-pedagogically-trained teachers. As Shulman (2004) described, a teacher needs to have thorough comprehension of the teaching material (subject matter content knowledge) so that they know the underlying meaning and importance of the subject matter. This form of knowledge usually leads to better informed instruction and has, in turn, a significant impact in the quality and effectiveness of learning.

### **Teacher Knowledge**

Pedagogically-trained piano teachers in this study satisfied the standard of educational requirements for The Frances Clark Center for Keyboard Pedagogy and Music Teachers National Association. Although these professional music organizations do not offer any musical and pedagogical training for music teachers, they provide literature, journals, seminars, workshops, and conferences to develop and enrich the curricular, content, and pedagogical knowledge of piano teachers. Moreover, the Music Teachers National Association awards professional certification to music teachers upon

their fulfillment of five professional standards and approval by a panel of professional music educators. One of these standards is professional preparation. Teachers need to demonstrate their knowledge of their performance area and their understanding of their students' needs and backgrounds.

According to Shulman (2004), teachers need to have seven different types of knowledge including content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, curriculum knowledge as well as knowledge of learners and their characteristics. These four types of knowledge are essentially the underpinning of the first standard, *professional preparation*. Accordingly, teachers who apply to be certified by MTNA are required to demonstrate their substantial knowledge of their specialized performance area, music theory, music history/literature, and pedagogy/teacher education to satisfy the first standard. The teachers must also show that they have an understanding of their students' physical and cognitive needs, as well as previous musical experiences.

Because of these requirements, professionally certified music teachers have a more thorough understanding of repertoire selection in contrast to those without training. This knowledge helps them develop an in-depth comprehension of the works as well as the needs of their students. Teachers without training might not be as capable of explaining the subject to their students or notice if the student has gaps in their knowledge and understanding of the topic. As a result, the teachers who had received pedagogical training may likely be more aware of the craftsmanship, historical significance, and technical and musical demands of the compositions.

When piano teachers have a better understanding of their students' interests and

concerns, they will likely communicate better with their students regarding choices of repertoire. A teacher's knowledge of repertoire, and their understanding of the its musical content and its meaning, play an important role regarding repertoire selection that cannot be overlooked or underestimated. It is the role of the teacher to be an inspirational guide in the process of musical instruction. Understanding where the students are with regard to their skills, desires, and limitations—coupled with the teacher's thoughtful understanding of repertoire—can inspire and direct a student to grow and develop into a mature performer and a person who understands and appreciates musical content and meaning.

### **Teaching Experience and Repertoire Selection Sources**

Deriving from the results of this study, I also found that more pedagogically-trained piano teachers used *lists* in their early years of teaching when compared to the non-pedagogically-trained teachers in their early years of teaching and non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers were more influenced by *outside elements* in their early years of teaching when compared to the pedagogically-trained piano teachers. The category of *outside elements* includes music heard from previous recitals, publishers' reputation, music appears on a state or national approval list, and teachers' abilities to play the music. These significant differences between pedagogical and non-pedagogical teachers could be because of the training pedagogically-trained teachers had received when they were in college.

When piano students take piano pedagogy courses in college, they are typically taught about what to teach and where to look for teaching material. They may have also

been more involved with professional music organizations, music activities, and other professional music teachers that present information and insights in the area of repertoire selection. Therefore, when they started their teaching career, they already had the knowledge. As for the non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers, they do not have the information and experience of what to teach, how to teach, and where to look for teaching material. They rely on the opinions of the other teachers and professionals regarding literature. Finding quality music becomes a process of trial and error.

However, according to one of the findings of this study, the situation of finding good teaching material changes because professional experience eventually catches up with academic training over the years. It implies that the experience of teaching has an important effect on teachers' knowledge of repertoire selection resources. Teachers become more aware of repertoire selection sources as they teach. In addition, attending professional development programs may have helped non-pedagogically-trained teachers become more informative of where to look for literature for their students, as most of the participants of the survey indicated that they had attended 2 or more professional seminars or workshops in the past three years (see Table 11).

### **Teaching Experience and Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

In addition, a teacher generally gains knowledge in the area of content, curriculum, and pedagogical content over time by having more contacts with content, teaching material, and students. Wilson (1992) expressed that more experienced teachers may have a better general view of the content; therefore, they may have better strategic teaching plans. Crappell and Millican (2015) commented that experienced piano teachers

+(with over 15 years of teaching)—regardless of their various musical training backgrounds—agreed on three out of five performance issues (technical or physical setup, tempo/pulse, and expression/style) when watching video excerpts of performances from three intermediate-level students. It appears from their research that, through the years of teaching, teachers may have become more aware of content and performance issues of the compositions, and their experience may have helped them become more consistent in their musical and pedagogical knowledge

Similarly, the results of Crochet's (2006) study suggested that directors became better informed with band repertoire and were able to select appropriate literature for their students with years of teaching experience. Almost all the directors in Forbes' (1998, 2001) study commented they had improved their ability to determine the quality of music with experience. Grossman (1990) concurred that teachers become more knowledgeable with subject matter and effective in conveying them to students over time. It appears from the aforementioned studies that, through the years, teachers have opportunities to enrich their knowledge regarding topics using different sources and learn the best strategies to represent them. In other words, teachers gain content, curriculum, and pedagogical knowledge as they gain teaching experience. These three types of knowledge are the essential components that contribute to effective teaching in Shulman's pedagogical content knowledge framework (1986, 2004).

The results of the current study also showed that several piano teachers—regardless of their pedagogical background—attended clinics, workshops, and conferences to develop or further enrich their knowledge in piano teaching. There is

much interest in professional programs. MTNA and The Frances Clark Center for Keyboard Pedagogy have been the dominant forces in offering professional programs for current and potential piano teachers. Findings of this study support the popularity of these programs for supporting current piano teachers and to encourage explorations in private piano instructions. It would be helpful for MTNA to provide basic guidelines of what constitutes quality music and teaching for music teachers. Subsequently, non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers could have some type of fundamental ideas of how to identify appropriate music and they could assess compositions by themselves instead of relying on professional and other teachers' opinions. They could also use and incorporate the teaching guidelines to improve their instructional skills.

### **Conclusion**

Previous studies regarding repertoire selection have indicated that repertoire is an important component in music learning. Past scholars have suggested that only repertoire of high quality can provide students with opportunities to gain musical skills and aesthetic experiences (Forbes, 2001; Meyer, 1973; Reimer, 1989). Therefore, selecting the appropriate literature for students is an important responsibility for teachers.

Repertoire selection practice is a reflection of a piano teacher's level of understanding and experience regarding pedagogy. According to Shulman's (1986, 2004) pedagogical content knowledge framework, a teacher needs to have subject matter content, curriculum, and pedagogical knowledge to teach effectively. In short, the essential issues come down to knowing what to teach (repertoire) and how to teach it (pedagogy). A weakness in either of these areas may greatly affect the quality of

teaching and, subsequently, students' learning.

The results of this study showed that both training and experience play important roles in repertoire selection practices. This research may add information to the existing literature regarding intermediate-level piano instruction and offer insights to professional music teachers as well as musical organizations regarding the needs of non-pedagogically-trained piano teachers. It is important for music educators to provide sufficient musical and pedagogical training to potential and current piano instructors so that piano instructors will become effective teachers. Having solidly trained and informed piano teachers may impact the future of piano performance, the study of its literature, and an appreciation of the rich cultural ties that many have found to be profoundly rewarding.

## APPENDIX A: Survey

Thank you very much for your participation in this study. Your opinions and information are very important.

There are two sections in this survey. The first section is Private Piano Teacher Questionnaire and the second section is Repertoire Selection Questionnaire. Please complete all items that apply by checking the responses or filling in the required information. You may skip any questions without any consequences. All responses will be kept confidential.

Upon completion of both sections, please return it by clicking the ">>" button at the end of the survey.

Thank you again for your help.

**Please do not include your name or any identifying information.**

---

### Section 1: Private Piano Teacher Questionnaire (PPTQ)

---

1. In which state do you teach?

2. How many years have you been active as a piano teacher?

- 5 years or less
  - 6 to 10 years
  - 11 to 15 years
  - 16 to 20 years
  - 21 to 25 years
  - 26 years and above
-

3. What is your gender?

4. Please indicate your highest music degree. (Check one)

- High School Diploma
- Performance Diploma
- Some college study, no degree
- Collegiate Minor
- Bachelors
- Masters
- Doctorate

5. Did you complete two or more piano literature and/or pedagogy courses as well as an internship in your higher education?

- Yes
- No

6. Are you nationally certified by MTNA?

- Yes
- No

**7. What is your age?**

- 20-30 years
  - 31-40 years
  - 41-50 years
  - 51-60 years
  - 61 + years
- 

**8. What percentage of your students are:**

Beginners	<input type="text" value="0"/>
Intermediate	<input type="text" value="0"/>
Advanced	<input type="text" value="0"/>
<hr/>	
Total	

---

**9. Which professional music organizations do you currently hold membership? (Check all that apply)**

- Music Teachers National Association
  - National Association for Music Education
  - National Guild of Piano Teachers
  - National Federation of Music Clubs
  - Other (Please specify)
-

---

10. Which music publications do you regularly read? (Check all that apply)

- American Music Teacher
- Clavier Companion
- Music Educators Journal
- National Federation of Music Clubs Magazine/Junior Keynotes
- Piano Guild Note Magazine
- Other (Please specify)

---

11. How many seminars or workshops on teaching piano have you attended within the last three years?

- 1
  - 2-3
  - 4-5
  - 6 and above
-

## Section 2: Repertoire Selection Questionnaire (RSQ)

### A) Sources of Repertoire Selection

Below you will find a list of sources of repertoire selection. Indicate the frequency you have used each listed source to select literature for your intermediate-level piano students.

	1 Not an Influence	2 Slight Influence	3 Moderate Influence	4 High Influence
1. Live performances of piano music	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Piano festivals/contests	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Personal selections by your student	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Personal selections by yourself	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Piano workshops/clinics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Music publisher materials (scores, recordings)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Music recommended by other piano teachers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Music publisher/distributor catalogues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Music you performed previously	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Examination of scores in music stores	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Examination of scores at online music websites	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Recordings of any type	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. Repertoire lists from any state music association	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Repertoire lists published by any national piano organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Repertoire lists published in books, journals, periodicals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Any published or unpublished repertoire lists by leaders in the profession	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### B) Factors Affecting Repertoire Selection

Below you find a list of possible factors influencing your repertoire selection practices. Indicate how influential each element in your repertoire decision making.

	1 Not an Influence	2 Slight Influence	3 Moderate Influence	4 High Influence
17. Level of quality of the music (This is quality music to which the student should be exposed)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Piano performance skills that can be taught through the music (phrasing, balance, articulations, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Historical elements of the music (musical period, historical period, style)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. Social elements of the music (multi-cultural, social influences of the time, relation of history to society)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Music to fit the piano recital program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. The potential of the music to earn high ratings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23. The audience appeal of the music	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24. The student appeal of the music	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25. Appeal of the music to colleagues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
26. Appeal of the music to yourself	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
27. The music appears on a state or national approval list of some type	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
28. Musical elements that can be taught through this music (style, form, compositional techniques, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
29. Melodic considerations within the music (melodic line, phrasing, harmonic considerations, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
30. Technical considerations within the music (scales, arpeggios, large skips, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**C) Repertoire Selection Training**

Below you will find a list of possible training sources. Indicate how influential each source affects your repertoire selection practices.

	1 Not an Influence	2 Slight Influence	3 Moderate Influence	4 High Influence
46. Undergraduate piano literature course	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
47. Graduate piano literature course	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
48. Undergraduate piano pedagogy course	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
49. Graduate piano pedagogy course	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
50. Observation to Teaching	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
51. Intern Teaching	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
52. Reading sessions, post college	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
53. Other <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**APPENDIX B: Contact Letters**

Ellen Bulow  
bubulow@yahoo.com

Dear Dr. \_\_\_\_\_,

My name is Ellen Bulow and a doctoral student at Boston University. I am currently preparing to carry out my doctoral research study. The goal of my study is to investigate repertoire selection practices of private piano teachers for their intermediate-level students in the mid-west region.

I am writing to seek your permission to use the email list of your current members so that I can send my questionnaire to them. The questionnaire will be approximately 15 minutes in length and all responses will be kept confidential. If you have any questions regarding my study, please contact me at the address above or my supervisor, Dr. Richard Bunbury, at Boston University Department of Music Education. His contact information is [rbunbury@bu.edu](mailto:rbunbury@bu.edu).

Please respond by September 26. Thank you very much for your time and consideration. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Ellen Bulow

Ellen Bulow  
bubulow@yahoo.com

Dear Fellow Piano Educator,

One of the most difficult and important challenges piano teachers face is the selection of appropriate literature for their students. Different students have different needs, and familiarity with what is available in the market place can be a demanding and time-consuming process. Selecting challenging and rewarding literature is a very important part of one's responsibilities as a music teacher. While there have been many studies in this area centered around band and choral music, there remains a significant gap in investigating this issue among piano teachers.

You are invited to participate in an investigation of repertoire selection practices of piano teachers for their intermediate-level students. The study is being conducted by Ellen Bulow, a doctoral student, under the supervision of Dr. Richard Bunbury at Boston University Department of Music Education. The questionnaire consists of two sections, Private Piano Teacher Questionnaire and Repertoire Selection Questionnaire. The completion of both sections will take approximately 15 minutes.

Your participation is voluntary but vital. Any information will make an impact on the understanding of repertoire selection practices of piano teachers for their students. If you choose not to participate, there will not be any penalties. You may also skip any item on the questionnaire if you do not want to answer. The information received from the questionnaire and the results of the investigation will be available via Dissertation Abstracts International. If you prefer, a summary of the results could be sent to you from the researcher after the study. Your responses however will be kept confidential.

The questionnaire can be found at the following web address: [Qualtrics.com](http://Qualtrics.com). Please respond by November 15. If you have any questions regarding this study, please do not hesitate to contact me at the email above. You may also obtain further information about your rights as a research subject by calling the **BU CRC IRB Office at 617-358-6115**. Thank you very much for your time and consideration in participating. Without your help, this project would not be possible.

Sincerely,

Ellen Bulow

**APPENDIX C: List of Other Professional Music Organizations and Number of Memberships**

Professional Music Organizations	Frequency
American Composers Forum	1
American Federation of Musicians Union	1
American Guild of Organists	6
American Matthay Association for Piano	1
APPI	1
CAMTA	1
Chamber Music America	1
Chicago Area Music Teachers Association	1
Choristers Guild	1
College Music Society	2
Early Music America, Westfield Center	1
Fellowship of Christian Art Music Composers	1
Gordon Institute of Music Learning	1
Handbell Musicians of America	1
Illinois State Music Teachers Association	2
Iowa Composers Forum	1
Joplin Piano Teachers Association	1
Kansas Music Teachers Association	1
Local Community	5
Local Chapter of MTNA	2
MAMA	1
Minneapolis Music Teachers Forum	1
Minnesota Music Teachers Association	5
Missouri Music Teachers Association	1
Monday Musicians	1
Music Educators Association	1
Music Educators National Conference	1
National Association of Teachers of Singing	1
National Band Association	1
Northwest Suburban Music Teachers Association	1
Pi Kappa Lambda	1
Pianist	1
Piano Teachers Round Table	1
Royal Conservatory of Music – Canada	1
SAA	1

SFAMTA	1
Sigma Alpha Iota	2
South Dakota Music Teachers Association	1
South Dakota Symphony	1
SPPTA	1
St. Paul Piano Teachers Association	3
Suzuki Association of the Americas	2
WMTA	1
WMMTA	1

**APPENDIX D: List of Other Music Publications and Number of Subscribers**

<u>Other Music Publications</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
American Suzuki Journal	2
BBC Music/Piano Literature Published in England	1
Chamber Music	2
Early Music America	2
English Piano Journal	1
Fun Music Online	1
International Musician	1
Listen	1
Pianist	1
Piano Explorer	1
Piano International	1
SAA Journal	1
Strings	1
The American Organist	4
The Chorister	1

## REFERENCES

- Ahn, M. (1981). *A compilation of selected intermediate-level solo piano repertoire from the classical period with an analysis of the inherent performance problems* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Publication No. 8205873)
- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, C. A. (2007). Likert scales and data analyses. *Quality Progress*, 40(7), 64-65. Retrieved from <http://rube.asq.org/quality-progress/2007/07/statistics/likert-scales-and-data-analyses.html>
- Apfelstadt, H. (2000). First things first. *Music Educators Journal*, 87(1), 19-22. doi:10.2307/3399672
- Appleby, M., & Magrath, J. (1993). Beyond the beginning -how do you choose repertoire for your intermediate students? *Keyboard Companion*, 4(1), 36-38.
- Asún, R. A., Rdz-Navarro, K., & Alvarado, J. M. (2015). Developing multidimensional Likert scales using item factor analysis: The case of four-point items. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 45(1), 109-133.
- Ballantyne, J. & Packer, J. (2004). Effectiveness of preservice music teacher education programs: Perceptions of early-career music teachers. *Music Education Research*, 6, 299-312. doi:10.1080/1461380042000281749
- Barrett, J. (2007). Music teachers' lateral knowledge. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 174, 7-23. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40319476>
- Berliner, D. C. (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. *Educational Researcher*, 15(7), 5-13. doi:10.3102/0013189X015007007
- Bolt, G. R. (1983). *Choral repertoire selection competency development in undergraduate music education curricula*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Publication No. 8315795)
- Brown, J. A. (1994). *Maurice Hinson's pedagogical collections for intermediate-level piano students*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 9508553)
- Canfield, J. L. K. (2009). *Middle and junior high school choral repertoire: Directors' criteria for selection, quality, and appropriateness*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Publication No. 3386184)

- Carifio, J., & Perla, R. (2008). Resolving the 50-year debate around using and misusing Likert scales. *Medical Education*, 42(12), 1150-1152. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2923.2008.03172.x
- Chandler, K. W. (2012). *A survey of choral methods instructors at NASM-accredited institution: Pedagogical content knowledge orientation and the choral methods class*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Publication No. 3527275)
- Chronister, R. (1976). Elementary repertoire vs. intermediate repertoire. *Keyboard Arts*, 3-5.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2001). Constructing outcomes in teacher education: Policy, practice and pitfalls. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 9(11), 1-56. Retrieved from <https://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/340/466>
- Cooper, T. L. (2001). Adults' perceptions of piano study: Achievements, experiences, and interests. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 49, 156-168. doi:10.2307/3345867
- Crappell, C. & Millican, J. S. (2015). Describing independent studio piano teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. *MTNA e-Journal*, 6(4), 2-12. Retrieved from ProQuest database.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational Research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Crochet, L. S. (2006). *Repertoire selection practices of band directors as a function of teaching experience, training, instructional level, and degree of success*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Publication No. 3215250)
- Crum, J. T. (1998). *Attitudes and opinions toward beginning through intermediate piano instruction among Florida state music teachers association piano teachers*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 9912915)
- Dahlman, H. N. (1991). *The effect of choral program size, teacher experience, and teacher education level on the selection of high school choral music literature*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 9207596)

- Daniel, R., & Bowden, J. (2013). The intermediate piano stage: Exploring teacher perspectives and insights. *British Journal of Music Education*, 30, 245-260. doi:10.1017/S0265051713000041
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8, 1. Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/392/515> \t “\_new
- Davis, J. L. (1970). *A study of choral repertoire in selected high schools and factors affecting its selection*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 7019683)
- Dees, P. Y. (1998). *An annotated catalog of available intermediate-level keyboard music by women composers born before 1900*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 905041)
- Denton, J. J., & Lacina, L. J. (1984). Quantity of professional education coursework linked with process measures of student teaching. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 39-64. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED219355>
- Devore, D. M. (1989). *Choral music repertoire selection in the Ohio Music Education Association Large Group High School contests*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 9006125)
- Dezio, B. A. (2009). *Music through the piano: Approaching intermediate repertoire theoretically*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Publication No. 3400142)
- Diddle, L. D. (2005). *The repertoire selection practices and skills of beginning choral music educators*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 32013269)
- Druva, C. A., & Anderson, R. D. (1983). Science teacher characteristics by teacher behavior and by student outcome: A meta-analysis of research. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 20, 5, 467-479. doi:10.1002/tea.3660200509
- Duling, E. B. (1992). *The development of pedagogical-content knowledge: Two case studies of exemplary general music teachers*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 9227261)

- Dunaway, J. S. (1986). *Administrative and organizational characteristics of successful high school choral music programs in the western United States*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 8706381)
- Eisner, E. (2002). *The arts and the creation of mind* (pp. 70-92). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Fernandez-Balboa, J. and Stiehl, J. (1995). The generic nature of pedagogical content knowledge among college professors. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11(3), 293-306. doi:10.1016/0742-051X(94)00030-A
- Forbes, G. W. (1998). *The repertoire selection practices of public high school choral directors in Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 9905945)
- Forbes, G. W. (2001). The repertoire section practices of high school choral directors. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 49, 102-121. doi:10.2307/3345863
- Forrester, S. H. (2018). Music teacher knowledge: An examination of the intersections between instrumental music teaching and conducting. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 65(4), 461-482. doi:10.1177/0022429417742124
- The Frances Clark Center for Keyboard Pedagogy. (2013). Pedagogy Curriculum Resources. Retrieved from <http://keyboardpedagogy.org/national-conference-info2/resources/pedagogy-curriculum>
- Freundlich, I. (1987). Preface. In M. Hinson, *Guide to the pianist's repertoire* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.) xiii-xiv. Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Fukiat, A. (2017). *A survey of selected piano concerti for elementary, intermediate, and advanced-levels*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 10683140)
- Fuszek, R. (1980). *The Black Hole*. Unpublished paper presented at the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy, Urbana, Ill.
- Grieser, D. R. (2014). *String specialists' and non-string specialists' content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge of string-specific techniques in the intermediate strings class*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 3662707)

- Grieser, D. R. & Hendricks, K. S. (2018). *Review of literature: Pedagogical content knowledge and string teacher preparation*. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 22(2), 51-64. doi:10.1177/8755123318760970
- Grossman, P. L., Wilson, S. M., & Shulman, L. S. (1989). Teachers of substance: Subject matter knowledge for teaching. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 23-36). New York, NY: Pergamon.
- Grossman, P. L. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hallbeck, P. G. (1992). *The development of a computer database to select piano repertoire from the Romantic era for intermediate students*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 9311009)
- Harpe, S. E. (2015). How to analyze Likert and other rating scale data. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, 7(6), 836-850. doi:10.1016/j.cptl.2015.08.001
- Howard, R. L. (2001). *Repertoire selection practices and the development of a core repertoire for the middle school concert band*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 3039773)
- Hunsaker, T. C. (2007). *Processes and criteria of nationally recognized high school choral directors in the selection of performance literature*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest and Theses database. (Publication No. 3300746)
- Hyry-Beihammer, E. K. (2011). Narratives in teaching practice: Matti Raekallio as narrator in his piano lessons. *Music Education Research*, 13(2), 199-209. doi:10.1080/14613808.2011.577767
- James, M. J. (1994). *The evolution of pedagogical thought in American piano teaching in the twentieth century*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 9430900)
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- King, R. E. (2001). *The quality and technical difficulty of repertoire performed by non-auditioned, small college bands and the criteria considered in the selection of this literature*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 3022512)
- Kraehenbuehl, D., & Chronister, R. (1972). Intermediate study-what are the goals? Part one: Repertoire. *Keyboard Arts*, 18-19.

- Krueger, J. D. (2014). *An exploration of conceptual teaching in piano study: Pedagogical analysis of three selected intermediate piano works by two American composers, William Bolcom and Lowell Liebermann*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 3618115)
- Krueger, P. J. (1999). New music teachers speak out on mentoring. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 8(2), 7-13. doi:10.1177/105708379900800203
- Kulas, J. T., Stachowski, A. A., & Haynes, B. A. (2008). Middle response functioning in Likert-responses to personality items. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 22(3), 251-259. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10869-008-9064-2>
- Lammers, W. (2006). *Factors affecting performance proficiency: A case study involving intermediate piano students* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from Library and Archives Canada. ISBN: 978-0-494-17999-4.
- Larimer, F., and the Task Force on Pedagogy Curricula. (2004). Retrieved from <http://keyboardpedagogy.org/national-conference-info2/resources/pedagogy-curriculum>
- Leglar, M., & Collay, M. (2002). Research by teachers on teacher education. In R. Colwell & C. P. Richardson (Eds.), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 855-873). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Leonhard, C., & House, R. W. (1972). *Foundations and principles of music education*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Lichtman, M. (2006). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Macmillan, J. (2004). Learning the piano: A study of attitudes to parental involvement. *British Journal of Music Education*, 21, 295-311. doi:10.1017/S0265051704005807
- Magrath, J. (1997). Classical literature – off the beaten path. *Piano Life*, 1, 30-31.
- Maris, B. E. (1991). Repertoire and the intermediate student. In M. Uszler, S. Gordon, & E. Mach (Eds.), *The well-tempered keyboard teacher* (pp. 183-212). New York, NY: Schirmer.
- Marks, R. (1990). Pedagogical content knowledge: From a mathematical case to a modified conception. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(3), 3-11. doi:10.1177/002248719004100302

- Mayhall, B. (1994). The quest for high-quality repertoire. *Choral Journal*, 35(2), 9-15. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.bu.edu/stable/23550506>
- McMullian, N. E. (1997). *Music selection and concert programming of concert bands and wind ensembles in the Coalition of Christian Colleges and Universities*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 9817853)
- Meyer, L. B. (1973). *Music—the arts and ideas: Patterns and predictions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Miller, G. A. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review*, 63(2), 81-97. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/buy/1994-28291-001>
- Millican, J. S. (2007). *Secondary instrumental music teachers' evaluation of essential knowledge and skills for successful teaching*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Publication No. 3271246)
- Millican, J. S. (2008). A new framework for music education knowledge and skill. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 18(1), 67-78. doi:10.1177/1057083708323146
- Millican, J. S. (2013). Describing wind instrument teachers' thinking: Implications for understanding pedagogical content knowledge. *Update: Applications of Research in Music*, 31(2), 45-53. doi:10.1177/8755123312473761
- Monk, D. H. (1994). Subject matter preparation of secondary mathematics and science teachers and student achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 13, 2, 125-145. doi:10.1016/0272-7757(94)90003-5
- Music Teachers National Association. (1990). *Pedagogic training of music teachers: A survey report*. Cincinnati, OH: Author.
- National Association of Schools of Music. (2012-13). *National Association of Schools of Music Handbook 2012-13*. Reston, VA: Author.
- Norman, G. (2010). Likert scales, levels of measurement and the “laws” of statistics. *Advances in Health Sciences Education: Theory and Practice*, 15(5), 625-632. doi:10.1007/s10459-010-9222-y
- Nulty, D. D. (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: What can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(3), 301-314. doi:10.1080/02602930701293231

- Ogdin, P. K. (1981). *An analysis of criteria by which secondary choral teachers select course content*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 8106955)
- Perkes, V. A. (1967-1968). Junior high school science teacher preparation, teaching behavior, and student achievement. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 6, 4, 121-126. doi:10.1002/tea.3660050205
- Philips, K. H. (2004). *Directing the choral music program*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Pickney, L. M. (2000). *A study of youth orchestras: Repertoire selection and criteria*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 9965246)
- Prescott, G. R., & Chidester, L. W. (1938). *Getting results with school bands*. New York: Carl Fischer.
- Preston, C. C., & Colman, A. M. (2000). Optimal number of response categories in rating scales: Reliability, validity, discriminating power, and respondent preferences. *Acta Psychologica*, 104, 1-15. doi:10.1016/S0001-6918(99)00050-5
- Raaijmakers, Q. A., van Hoof, A., Hart, H., Verbogt, T. F. M. A., & Wollebergh, W. A. M. (2000). Adolescents' midpoint response on Likert-type scale items: Neutral or missing values? *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 12(2), 208-126.
- Reames, R. R. (2001). High school choral directors' description of appropriate literature for beginning high school choirs. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 49, 122-135. doi:10.2307/3345864
- Reimer, B. (1989). *A philosophy of music education* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Reynolds, H. R. (2000). Repertoire is the curriculum. *Music Educators Journal*, 87(1), 31-33. doi:10.2307/3399675
- Rife, N., Shnek, Z., Lauby, J., & Lapidus, L. (2001). Children's satisfaction with private music lessons. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 49, 21-32. doi:10.2307/3345807
- Roach, D. W. (1989). *Complete secondary choral music guide*. West Nyack, NY: Parker.
- Rohwer, D. (2015). *Session: Research 101: A Crash Course for college pedagogy teachers*. The National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy.

- Roseboom, J. D. (2006). *Criteria for curricular literature selection among Florida band directors*. Unpublished master's thesis, Florida State University, Tallahassee.
- Rotjan, M. S. (2017). *In-between and together with: Exploring the complexity of repertoire selection with school orchestra teachers and their students*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 10284642)
- Sabol, F. R. (2010). *No Child Left Behind: A study of its impact on art education*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University.
- Sauro, J., & Dumas, J. S. (2009). Comparison of three one-question, post-task usability questionnaires. In *Proceeding of CHI 2009* (pp. 1599-1608). Boston, MA: ACM. doi:10.1145/1518701.1518946
- Scanlan, M. (1988). *The development of guidelines to assess the relative difficulty of intermediate level romantic piano repertoire*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 8908826)
- Scanlan, M. (1989). The structuring, analysis, and teaching of intermediate piano repertoire: An approach for use in a piano pedagogy course. In R. Chronister & T. McBeth (Eds.), *The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy: Proceedings of the Chicago Conference in Oakbrook, Illinois, October 20-22, 1988* (pp. 71-72). Princeton: New Jersey.
- Schmidt, C. P. (1992). Systematic research in applied music instruction: A review of the literature. *The Quarterly*, 3(2), pp. 32-45.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14. doi:10.3102/0013189X015002004
- Shulman, L. S. (2004). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. In S. M. Wilson (Ed.), *The wisdom of practice: Essays on teaching, learning, and learning to teach* (pp. 217-248). San Francisco, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Smith, B. R. (2004). *Philosophies, goals and challenges of selecting repertoire for the collegiate and professional orchestra*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 3156154)
- Sullivan, G. M., & Artino Jr., A. R. (2013). Analyzing and interpreting data from Likert-type scales. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 5(4), 541-542. doi:10.4300/JGME-5-4-18

- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's Alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48, 1273-1296. doi:10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2
- Tavakol, M. & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53-55. doi:10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd
- Turner, K. M. (2002). *Mentoring practices of music teachers in school districts of the northwest states*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 3049125)
- Uszler, M. (1992). Research on the teaching of keyboard music. In R. Colwell (Ed.), *Handbook of research on music teaching and learning: A project of the Music Educators National Conference* (pp. 584-593). New York: Macmillan.
- Uszler, M., Gordon, S. & Smith, S. (2000). *The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Schirmer.
- Venesile, C. J. (2010). *The acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge by vocal jazz educators*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from [https://etd.ohiolink.edu/rws\\_etd/document/get/case1278521556/inline](https://etd.ohiolink.edu/rws_etd/document/get/case1278521556/inline)
- Wakita, T., Uechima, N., & Noguchi, H. (2012). Psychological distance between categories in the Likert scale: Comparing different numbers of options. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 72(4), 533-546. doi:10.1177/0013164411431162
- Wilson, J. M. (1992, December). Secondary teachers' pedagogical content knowledge about chemical equilibrium. Paper presented at the International Chemical Education Conference, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Wilson, P. N. (2000). *A practical guide to exploring intermediate piano literature found in collections: The development of a computer database to select piano repertoire from collections for the intermediate student*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Publication No. 9966723)
- Winston, B. K. (2003). *The development of a multimedia Web database for the selection of 20<sup>th</sup> century intermediate piano repertoire*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 3119654)
- Woike, D. O. (1990). *Wind band performance repertoire at the university level: A survey of collegiate wind band curricula and current repertoire selection process*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 9031177)

- Yang, C. S. (2004). *Exploring new techniques in contemporary piano music: A guide for the intermediate-grade student*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (Publication No. 3131248)
- Young, C. S. (1998). *The quality of repertoire chosen by high school wind band conductors and the resources and criteria used to choose this literature*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Publication No. 9911293)

## CURRICULUM VITAE

### Ellen Bulow

[ebulow@purdue.edu](mailto:ebulow@purdue.edu)

[bubulow@yahoo.com](mailto:bubulow@yahoo.com)

#### Education

Doctor of Musical Arts in Music Education, Boston University (2019)  
 Master of Music in Piano Performance, Winthrop University (1993–1995)  
 Bachelor of Arts in Music, University of Hawaii (1989–1992)  
 Performer's Diploma, Trinity College of Music, London (1988)  
     Post Graduate Work, University of North Carolina at Greensboro (1992–1993)  
     Masterclass with Walter Hautzig, Winthrop University (1995)  
 Studied Piano Performance with Walter Hautzig and Eugene Barban, Winthrop  
     University, SC, Joseph DiPiazza, University of North Carolina at Greensboro,  
     Kayleen Yuda, University of Hawaii, Edmund Tam, Hong Kong  
 Studied Organ Performance with David Lowry, Winthrop University

#### Teaching Experience

Continuing Lecturer, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN (2009–present)  
 Visiting Professor, Lamar State College at Port Arthur, TX (2006–2009)  
 Adjunct Professor, Lamar University, Beaumont, TX (2008–2009)  
 Visiting Professor of Piano, University of North Carolina at Charlotte (1995–2005)  
 University of Hawaii Performing Arts Department, Teaching Assistant (1989–1992)

Courses Taught: Music Theory I-II-III  
 Ear Training I-II-III-IV  
 Piano Performance  
 Piano Lab I-II-III-IV  
 Music Fundamentals  
 Music Appreciation (online)

#### Accompanying Experience

Professional Accompanist (1993–present)  
 Indiana State School Music Association Regional and State Solo Ensemble Accompanist  
 (2010–present)  
 Opera Workshop Accompanist, Lamar University, Beaumont, TX (2005–2009)  
 Accompanist, Lamar University, Beaumont, TX (2005–2009)  
 Pianist/Accompanist, Symphony of Southeast Texas (2006–2009)  
 Accompanist, University of North Carolina at Charlotte (1999–2003)  
 Graduate Assistant in Accompanying, Winthrop University (1993–1996)  
 Opera Workshop Accompanist, Winthrop University (1993–1996)  
 Graduate Assistant in Accompanying, University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
 (1992–1993)

University of Hawaii at Hilo, University Chamber Singers Accompanist, University  
Chorus, Wind Ensemble Percussionist, Japanese Ensemble (1989–1992)

### **Adjudicating Experience**

Young Hoosier State Piano Competitions, IN (2012–2018)  
Young Performers Showcase Piano/Instrumental Competition, Carmel, IN (2016)  
Camel Young Artists Piano Competitions, IN (2014)  
Achievement in Music Festival, West Lafayette, IN (2014–Present)  
National Federation Junior Festivals, West Lafayette, IN (2010–Present)  
National Federation Junior Festivals, Southeast Region District, TX (2008)

### **Other Professional Activities**

Vice President, Indiana Music Teachers Association (2015–present)  
President, Tippecanoe Music Teachers Association (2013–2015)  
Co-President, Tippecanoe Music Teachers Association (2011–2013)  
Monster Concert Repertoire Committee, Indiana (2013)  
Choir Director/Organist, Congress Street United Methodist Church, Lafayette, IN  
(2009–2018)  
Pianist, Commencement, Lamar State College at Port Arthur, TX (2008)  
Choir Director/Organist, St. Paul’s Episcopal Church, Orange, TX (2006–2009)  
Private Piano/Theory/Ear-training Instructor (1993–present)  
Director of Music, Back Creek Presbyterian Church, Charlotte, NC (1993–2005)  
Director of Handbell Choir, Back Creek Presbyterian Church, Charlotte, NC (1993–2005)  
Piano Instructor, Back Creek Christian Academy, Charlotte, NC (2001–2005)  
Director of Music, Davidson Country Day School (2000)  
Church Organist and Pianist, Harrisburg Presbyterian Church, Harrisburg, NC  
(1999–2000)  
Church Organist and Pianist, Southpark Christian Church, Charlotte, NC (1992–1993)

### **Awards, Scholarships and Distinctions**

Music Teachers National Association Teacher Enrichment Grant (2015)  
Melle B. Casey Award (1994)  
Who’s Who Among Students in American Universities & Colleges (1992)  
Dean’s List, University of Hawaii (1989–1992, 6 Semesters)  
Hawaii Concert Society Scholarship (1991)  
Paul Goulides Memorial Grant for Pianists (1991)  
Big Island Music Educators Association Scholarship (1989)  
John Philip Sousa Award, Konawaena School (1989)  
Fine Arts Scholarship, Kona Jaycees (1989)  
Sterling Scholar Nominee (1989)  
Hong Kong Annual Music & Speech Festival Piano Solo: Romantic Period  
Third Place (1980)  
Hong Kong Annual Music & Speech Festival Piano Solo: Classical Period  
Second Place (1979)

**Special Concerts, Seminars, Workshops and Conference Participation**

The College Music Society, Region V, Great Lakes Regional Conference, Performance: *Inventions for Alto Saxophone and Piano* by Harry Bulow, Harry Bulow, alto saxophone, Ellen Bulow, piano, Riley Hall, Otterbein University, Westerville, OH, April 6, 2018

Society of Composers National Conference, Performance: *Inventions for Alto Saxophone and Piano* by Harry Bulow, Harry Bulow, alto saxophone, Ellen Bulow, piano, Schneebeck Hall, Puget Sound University, Tacoma, WA, March 2, 2018

Purdue University Faculty Recital, Performance: *Improvisations on Londonderry Air and Amazing Grace*, Harry Bulow, soprano saxophone, Ellen Bulow, piano, Rueff Gallery, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, March 1, 2017

Indiana Music Teachers Association, IN, conference attendance (2011–17)

Purdue University Faculty Recital, Performance: *Chaconne for Eb Alto Saxophone and piano* by Harry Bulow, Harry Bulow, alto saxophone, Ellen Bulow, piano, Rueff Gallery, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, November 2, 2016

Purdue University Faculty Recital, Performance: *Phoneum III* by Robert Beckstrom, Harry Bulow, flute, Ellen Bulow, piano, Rueff Gallery, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, November 4, 2015

National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy, Lombard, IL (2015), conference attendance

Purdue University Faculty Recital, Performance: *Boulevard Blues* by Harry Bulow, Ellen Bulow and Gail Deagan, piano, Rueff Gallery, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, April 24, 2015

Purdue University Faculty Recital, Performance: *Chaconne for Clarinet and Piano* by Harry Bulow, Harry Bulow, clarinet, Ellen Bulow, piano, Rueff Gallery, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, April 24, 2015

Purdue University Faculty Recital, Performance: *Allegro for Alto Saxophone and Piano* by Harry Bulow, Harry Bulow, saxophone, Ellen Bulow, piano, Rueff Gallery, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, October 1, 2014

National Group Piano and Piano Pedagogy Forum, University of Cincinnati College-Conservatory of Music, OH (2014), conference attendance

Purdue University Faculty Recital, Performance: *Chaconne for Flute and Piano* by Harry Bulow, Harry Bulow, flute, Ellen Bulow, piano, Mallett Theatre, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, April 2, 2014

Purdue University Faculty Recital, Performance: *Presto for Alto Saxophone and Piano* by Harry Bulow, Harry Bulow, alto saxophone, Ellen Bulow, piano, Mallett Theatre, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, April 2, 2014

Purdue University Faculty Recital, Performance: *Inventions for Flute and Piano* by Harry Bulow, Harry Bulow, flute, Ellen Bulow, piano, Rueff Gallery, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, November 7, 2012

Music Teachers National Association National Conference, New York (2012), conference attendance

Purdue University Faculty Recital, Performance: *Inventions for Alto Saxophone and Piano* by Harry Bulow, Harry Bulow, alto saxophone, Ellen Bulow, piano, St. Thomas Aquinas, West Lafayette, IN, April 3, 2011

Lamar University Opera Workshop Concert, Performance: Ellen Bulow, piano, Brooks-Shivers Hall, Lamar University, Beaumont, TX, March 5, 2009

Lamar University Contemporary Recital, Performance: *Sonata for Alto Saxophone and Piano* by Gordon Ring, Harry Bulow, alto saxophone, Ellen Bulow, piano, Art Museum of Southeast Texas, Beaumont, TX, April 6, 2008

Lamar University Opera Workshop Concert, Performance: Ellen Bulow, piano, Setzer Student Center Ballroom, Lamar University, Beaumont, TX, March 6, 2008

Lamar University Chamber Orchestra Recital, Performance: Various Pieces, Ellen Bulow, piano, Art Museum of Southeast Texas, Beaumont, TX, May 1, 2007

Lamar University Faculty Recital, Performance: *Inventions for Alto Saxophone and Piano* by Harry Bulow, Harry Bulow, flute, Ellen Bulow, piano, Art Museum of Southeast Texas, Beaumont, TX, April 1, 2007

Lamar University Faculty Recital, Performance: *Sonata, op. 2 No. II* by Michel Blavet, Harry Bulow, soprano saxophone, Ellen Bulow, piano, Art Museum of Southeast Texas, Beaumont, TX, April 1, 2007

Lamar University Opera Workshop Concert, Performance: Ellen Bulow, piano, Brooks-Shivers Hall, Lamar University, Beaumont, TX, March 7, 2007

Lamar University Faculty Recital, Performance: *Inventions for Flute and Piano* by Harry Bulow, Harry Bulow, flute, Ellen Bulow, piano, Art Museum of Southeast Texas, Beaumont, TX, April 9, 2006

College Music Society, South Central Conference, Modern Music Concert II, Performance: *Inventions for Flute and Piano* by Harry Bulow, Harry Bulow, alto saxophone, Ellen Bulow, piano, Recital Hall, Texas State University, San Marcos, TX, March 10, 2006

Lamar University Contemporary Music Recital, Performance: *Piano Phase* by Steve Reich, Ellen Bulow and Lindsey Cauthen, piano, Mobil Oil Federal Credit Union, Beaumont, TX, November 14, 2006

Lamar University Faculty Recital, Performance: Various Pieces, Ellen Bulow, piano, Jefferson Theatre, Beaumont, TX, February 14, 2006

University of North Carolina at Charlotte Contemporary Composers Concert, Performance: *Inventions for Flute and Piano* by Harry Bulow, Harry Bulow, flute, Ellen Bulow, piano, Robinson Hall, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, NC, April 22, 2005

Texas Music Educators Association Conference, San Antonio, TX, Lamar University Representative (2005–2009)

Society for Composers Inc., Region IV Conference, Performance: *Inventions for Flute and Piano* by Harry Bulow, Harry Bulow, flute, Ellen Bulow, piano, Barnes Recital Hall, Winthrop University, SC, November 11, 2004

Walter Hautzig Piano Masterclass, Performance: *Piano Sonata in D*, K. 576 by W. A. Mozart, Byrnes Auditorium, Winthrop University, SC (1995)

University of North Carolina at Charlotte Contemporary Composers Concert, Performance, Title: Unknown by Sheridan Stokes, flute, Ellen Bulow, piano, Rowe Recital Hall, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, NC, March 18, 1996

University of Hawaii at Hilo Saxophone and Clarinet Recital, Performance: Various Selections, Ellen Bulow, piano, First United Protestant Church, April 26, 1992

### **Instrumental/Chamber Music Repertoire**

- Beckstrom, Robert. *Phoneum III*
- Blavet, Michel. *Sonata, op. 2, No. 2 for Soprano Saxophone and Piano*
- Bolling, Claude. *Suite for Flute and Jazz Piano: Irlandaise*
- Brahms, Johannes. *Sonata No. 1 in F Minor for Clarinet and Piano*
- Brahms, J. *Sonata No. 2 in E<sup>b</sup> for Clarinet and Piano*
- Bulow, Harry. *Boulevard Blues for Two Pianos*
- Bulow, H. *Chaconne for Flute and Piano*
- Bulow, H. *Chaconne for Saxophone and Piano*
- Bulow, H. *Concerto for E<sup>b</sup> Alto Saxophone and Piano*
- Bulow, H. *Concerto for Flute and Piano*

Bulow, H. *Inventions for Alto Saxophone and Piano*  
 Bulow, H. *Inventions for Flute and Piano*  
 Chaminade, Cecilli. *Concertino for Flute and Piano*, ed. Louis Moyse  
 Copland, Aaron. *Rodeo for Four Hands*  
 Corelli, Arcangelo. *Sonata, op. 5, No. 8 for Chamber Orchestra*  
 Couperin, François. *Carnival for Clarinet and Piano*, tran. Erikson  
 Creston, Paul. *Sonata for Alto Saxophone and Piano*  
 Dancla, Charles. *Air Vaire*, op. 8, No. 6.  
 Debussy, Claude. *La Fille aux Cheveux de Lin for Clarinet and Piano*  
 Dvorak, Antonin. *The New World Symphony*, trans. Henry Davis  
 Eisengrübner, J. *Variations for Contra Bass*  
 Eccles, Henry. *Sonata for Alto Saxophone and Piano*  
 Finzi, Gerald. *Five Bagatelles for Clarinet and Piano*  
 Galway, James. *Spanish Love Song*, Traditional, trans. Galway  
 Gavrilin, Valery. *Sketches for Two Pianos*  
 Glazounov, Petiot. *Concerto in E<sup>b</sup> for Alto Saxophone and Piano*  
 Guilmant, Alexandre. *Morceau Symphonique* for Trombone or Baritone  
 Handel, George Frideric. *Concerto Grosso, op. 6, No. 4 for Chamber Orchestra*  
 Handel, G. F. *Sonata No. 1 for Flute and Piano*  
 Handel, G. F. *Sonata No. 6 for Violin and Piano*  
 Handel, G. F. *Sonata in F for Clarinet and Piano*  
 Handel, G. F. *Sonata No. 7 for Flute and Piano*  
 Hindemith, Paul. *Sonata for Flute and Piano*  
 Hummel, Johann Nepomuk. *Concerto in E for Trumpet and Piano*  
 Ibert, Jacques. *Concerto for Flute and Piano*  
 Ibert, J. *Histories for Alto Saxophone and Piano*  
 Lantier, Pierre. *Sicilienne for Alto Saxophone and Piano*  
 LeFebvre, Charles. *Fantasie-Caprice for Clarinet and Piano*  
 Lunde, Lawson. *Alpine Sonata for Soprano Saxophone and Piano*  
 Martin, Frank. *Ballade for Flute and Piano*  
 Maurice, Paule. *Tableaux de Provence for Alto Saxophone and Piano*  
 Mendelssohn, Felix Bartholdy. *Sonata for Clarinet and Piano*  
 Messenger, André. *Solo de Concours for Clarinet and Piano*  
 Milhaud, Darius. *Scaramouche for Saxophone and Piano*  
 Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus. *Concerto in G Major*  
 Mozart, W. A. *Concerto in G Minor for Flute and Piano*  
 Mozart, W. A. *Divertimento for Clarinet and Piano*, trans. Alamiro Giampieri  
 Poulenc, Pierre. *Sonata for B<sup>b</sup> Clarinet and Piano*  
 Rameau, Jean-Philipp. *Le Tambourin*, trans. Hovey and Leonard  
 Reich, Steve. *Piano Phase*  
 Ring, Gordon. *Aeolian Toccata/Aria for Alto Saxophone and Piano*  
 Ring, G. *Gymnopedie and Variations for Flute and Piano*  
 Ring, G. *Sonata for Alto Saxophone and Piano*  
 Rutter, John. *Suite Antique for Flute and Piano*

Saint-Saens, Camille. *Carnival of the Animals* for Four Hands  
 Saint-Saens, C. *Sonata for B<sup>b</sup> Clarinet and Piano*, op. 167  
 Stamitz, Carl. *Clarinet Concerto No. 3 in Bb*  
 Strauss, Franz. *Nocturno for Horn and Piano*, op. 7  
 Verhey, Thomas. *Concerto in G Minor for Clarinet and Piano*  
 Warlock, Peter. *Capriol Suite for String Orchestra*  
 Von Weber, Carl Maria. *Concertino for Clarinet and Piano*, op. 26  
 Von Weber, C. M. *Variations for Clarinet and Piano*, op. 33, ed. Eric Simon  
 Whitney, Maurice. *Rumba for Alto Saxophone and Piano*  
 Zambarano, Alfred. *Neapolitan Tarantella for Clarinet and Piano*

### **Vocal/Choral Music Repertoire**

Bernstein, Leonard. *West Side Story*  
 Bizet, Georges. *Carmen*  
 Blitzstein, Marc. *Regina*  
 Bock, Jerry. *Fiddler on the Roof*  
 Copland, Aaron. *Old American Songs*  
 Floyd, Carlisle. *Susannah*  
 Donizetti, Gaetano. *Don Pasquale*  
 Gershwin, George. *Porgy and Bess*  
 Gilbert, William, and Sullivan, Sir Arthur. *The Mikado*  
 Gluck, Christoph Willibald. *Orfeo*  
 Handel, G. F. *Giulio Cesare*  
 Handel, G. F. *Messiah*  
 Handel, G. F. *Samson*  
 Humperdinck, Engelbert. *Hansel and Gretel*  
 Mascagni, Pietro. *Cavalleria Rusticana*  
 Menotti, Gian-Carlo. *The Medium*  
 Menotti, G-C. *The Old Maid and the Thief*  
 Menotti, G-C. *The Telephone*  
 Mozart, W. A. *Don Giovanni*  
 Mozart, W. A. *The Magic Flute*  
 Mozart, W. A. *The Marriage of Figaro*  
 Offenbach, Jacques. *The Tales from Hoffmann*  
 Pergolesi, Giovanni. *La Serva Padrona*  
 Ponchielli, Amilcare. *La Gioconda*  
 Porter, Cole. *Kiss Me Kate*  
 Puccini, Giacomo. *Gianni Schicchi*  
 Puccini, G. *Madama Butterfly*  
 Purcell, Henry. *Dido and Aeneas*  
 Rossini, Giacchino. *The Barber of Seville*  
 Vivaldi, Antonio. *Gloria*  
 Weill, Kurt. *The Rise and Fall of the City of Mahagonny*  
 Weill, K. *Street Scene*

**Association Memberships**

National Association for Music Education  
Music Teachers National Association  
Indiana Music Teachers Association  
National Federation of Music Clubs  
Tippecanoe Music Teachers Association