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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the status of keyboard harmony in NASM-Approved colleges and universities in the eleven states in the Southern Division of MENC.

Most music educators recognize the importance of keyboard harmony in the college music curriculum. However, much controversy appears to exist as to the position keyboard harmony should occupy at the college level. Music educators disagree as to whether keyboard harmony should be taught in the theory class, piano class, and/or as a separate course.

Questionnaires were mailed to the 124 schools which met the above delimitations, of which 70 percent were usable responses. The questions were designed to investigate the theory class, piano class, and keyboard harmony course, since related literature revealed the teaching of keyboard harmony to be restricted primarily to those areas.

The results revealed that approximately one-fourth of the schools offered a separate keyboard harmony course. Most of these schools offered it for four semesters for one credit hour per semester and required it for all music
majors. The majority of these schools had a relatively small college enrollment, indicating that perhaps keyboard harmony is more successfully taught in smaller classes. A wide variety of keyboard harmony, class piano, and theory textbooks were reported in use for this course.

Non-piano music majors at most schools were required to take class piano and to pass a proficiency examination. The items most frequently required on this examination in order from highest to lowest were the following: sightreading; harmonization; scales; memorized pieces; transposition; accompaniment; cadences; improvisation; non-memorized pieces; score-reading; and broken chords and arpeggios.

Most schools taught at least some elements of keyboard harmony in both piano and theory classes. These items were required in over 60 percent of theory classes: intervals, major and minor triads in root position, chord inversions, and cadences. These items were required in over 60 percent of piano classes: scales, transposition, sightreading, cadences, harmonization of melodies with I IV V, accompaniments, and harmonization of melodies with all studied chords.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, European music schools have placed a high degree of emphasis upon the use of the keyboard in learning theoretical concepts. At the Munich Hochschule für Musik, for example, keyboard skills assume a large role in the curriculum of all music majors. W. Kent Werner, Associate Professor of Theory at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, arrived at the following conclusions upon completion of a study of the pedagogical philosophies at the Hochschule:

There is a strong emphasis on keyboard skills in Hochschule theory courses. Not only is keyboard harmony an integral part of the theory classes themselves, but such specialized skills as score reading and figured-bass realization find their way into many of the Studienplan. As has already been noted, theory-composition majors must take two semesters of figured-bass realization, string players are required to take two semesters of score reading [playing], and repertory coaching is a part of many curricula. In addition, a good general command of the keyboard is a prerequisite to passing the Kunstlerische Staatsprüfung.1

Werner also indicated that the Munich Hochschule represents a basically Central European point of view.2 In America, however, many educators feel that keyboard skills such as figured bass are of lesser importance. Werner stated that "the inclusion of courses in figured bass playing is
unusual by American standards. In fact, keyboard harmony is often neglected in the American music curriculum.

**Statement of the Topic**

In today's American colleges and universities, keyboard harmony is taught either as a separate course offering, as a part of music theory and/or class piano, or is not included as a required ingredient in the music theory program. Controversy exists among music educators as to the precise role of keyboard harmony in the music curriculum. The purpose of this study was to determine the current status of keyboard harmony at the college level.

**Significance of the Topic**

Since a review of related literature does not indicate the current status of keyboard harmony, this project served as a means of determining this status. Furthermore, the results of this study could provide a basis for possible revisions of existing programs.

**Delimitations**

The eleven states included in the Southern Division of Music Educators National Conference (MENC) were chosen as a representative area of investigation, with colleges in that area limited to those approved by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). The Southern Division of MENC encompasses the states of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North
Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. The number of NASM approved colleges in this area totals 124.

Within the various departments of music, an investigation was made of all undergraduate music theory, class piano, and keyboard harmony classes, in order to determine the distribution of various aspects of keyboard harmony.

**Definition of Terms**

Whereas the MENC publication *Teaching Piano in Classroom and Studio*, edited by Helene Robinson and Richard L. Jarvis, uses the term "keyboard harmony" to encompass the areas of transposition, modulation, cadences, harmonization, improvisation, and playing by ear, James Bastien, in his book *How to Teach Piano Successfully*, employs the term "functional skills" to include those same items, with the exception of playing by ear, which he does not cite as a necessary part of the class piano curriculum. "Spontaneous keyboard skills," was coined by Flora C. Silini, coordinator of group piano and piano pedagogy at the University of Kansas, to denote "specific techniques that the pianist must often express and deliver without practice or preparation." The term "keyboard harmony" was chosen for use in this research project, as it appears to encompass a wider range of skills, including the realization of figured bass. "Keyboard harmony" also implies advanced techniques of harmonization, whereas "functional" or
"spontaneous" keyboard skills implies only those basic skills necessary for immediate application. Included also in this definition were rudimentary elements of theory at the keyboard, such as the formation of intervals and various scale forms.

Method of Research
The method of research followed in this study was descriptive—descriptive in that questionnaires were used in determining the status of keyboard harmony.

Organization of the Study
An outline of the material succeeding this introductory chapter follows.
Chapter II. Survey of Related Literature
Chapter III. Development and Evaluation of Questionnaire
Chapter IV. Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations
Bibliography
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2 Ibid., p. 36.

3 Ibid., p. 37.


CHAPTER II
SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

A review of the literature seemed to indicate that much debate and discussion has in recent years been given to the teaching and learning of functional skills. In many cases the term "keyboard harmony" was synonymous with functional skills, and in other cases "keyboard harmony" was listed as an isolated skill apart from transposition, playing by ear, sightreading, improvisation, and score playing. Due to the volume of material reviewed, this chapter will be divided into three distinct sections—books, periodicals, and dissertations. The books and periodicals will be discussed according to subject matter, and the dissertations will be reviewed in chronological order.

Books

The piano is considered by many musicians and music educators to be basic to music education. According to Robinson and Jarvis, it serves as the most practical and rapid means of building skills in listening and reading music, of developing knowledge about and understanding of music, and of supplying a foundation for other musical study. Because the instrument is capable of playing
harmony, melody, and rhythm, piano study trains the ear to hear music both horizontally and vertically. It enables the player to learn music fundamentals more readily because the player's auditory, visual, tactile, and kinesthetic senses reinforce each other. Because of the visible, chromatic arrangement of the black and white keys, the student not only sees, but hears and feels high-low, up-down, sharps and flats, intervals, scale formulas, triads, chord inversions, active and rest tones, and chord progressions. In addition, piano study affords the development of a dependable sightreading skill. On the piano, the student can see the pitch direction and measure the intervals.

Among the benefits music educators derive from piano study, Hoffer lists the following:

1. The vertical and horizontal reading and playing of notes from the Grand Staff is a good preparation for open-score reading, either four-part choral or full-page orchestra and band scores.

2. Piano experience helps the prospective conductor of a chorus, band, or orchestra to hear complete harmony as well as to isolate individual lines.

3. The ability to play the piano score of a composition for orchestra, band, or chorus helps the director to select works for his organizations to perform and enables him to develop his own interpretation prior to rehearsals.

4. The piano offers the conductor a ready means of illustrating many of the musical instructions he gives to his performers.

5. Knowledge of the keyboard helps the music student to learn and, later, to teach harmony and theory.

6. The teacher of general music classes uses the piano to accompany class singing and to illustrate themes and
The piano is useful for teaching vocal solos and for playing voice parts for small ensembles.

The teacher of beginning and intermediate instrumental classes uses the piano for accompanying his groups.

Often, the school music teacher must play assembly songs by ear, by sight, or by memory, and frequently needs to transpose and to improvise chordal accompaniments. In addition, he must be prepared to play written accompaniments for groups or soloists in emergencies when regular accompanists are unavailable.

The music teacher will need pianistic skill if he is asked to supervise piano classes in the school.

Musicianship is often equated with the ability to use the piano effectively.

With increased enrollments in colleges and universities, the trend toward group instruction rather than individual lessons at the minor level has increased during the past several years. Even at the pre-college levels of piano instruction, a 1953 survey by Carey showed significant increases in the number of class piano programs in elementary and secondary schools. Questionnaires were mailed to representative music educators or class piano instructors in 49 public schools in 11 southern states. The study revealed that over 62 percent of the schools offered instruction in class piano, and of this number, over 45 percent had instituted such a program within the past five years.

Many authors stated that the advantages of class versus private piano instruction far outweighed the disadvantages. Robinson, Jarvis, and Sur cited economical
cost as an important advantage in being able to make piano instruction available to more students. According to Robinson, Jarvis, Bastien, Enoch, and Mehr, group spirit and dynamics are important motivators in the class piano situation. In the group, students learn from one another, discover new things together, play together, and learn to criticize and be criticized constructively. The competitive spirit and the fact that the success of the group is dependent upon each individual leads to the necessity for practice, thus hastening progress.

Robinson and Jarvis discussed numerous ways in which students are able to acquire a rapid and thorough foundation for musicianship. Fundamentals of reading and writing musical notation, ear training, theory and harmony, and analysis of musical form can be taught more effectively to a group. Rhythmic feeling and security are also acquired more easily in a class, as well as the ability to read notes and to play at sight. Since the principles of piano technique are the same for every performer, these may also be taught effectively to a group. Other areas listed by Robinson and Jarvis as deriving benefits from the class situation include the principles of musical interpretation, creative activity, efficient ways of practicing, ensemble experience, and the exposure to more repertoire than in individual study.

The aforementioned advantages of class piano study may be applicable to all ages and levels of piano
instruction. At the college level, however, the primary function of the class piano program, according to James Bastien, is to provide the non-keyboard music major with functional keyboard skills. The ability to sightread, score-read, harmonize, transpose, and improvise will suit best the needs of choral and instrumental directors as well as general music teachers. Moreover, the class piano program may strengthen and unify other areas of college study, such as relating keyboard harmony to theory.10

Despite the numerous advantages of class piano, certain problems are recognized by Bastien. He cited the selection of the teacher as perhaps the most serious problem confronting group instruction. Often, the accomplished pianist is not prepared to teach class piano. In addition, he often lacks the interest, imagination, and creativity which are necessary to the success of class piano goals. The jury system which evaluates students enrolled in major and minor instruction is another problem. It is easier to prepare the class piano student to play repertoire and scales than to devote much of the class time to functional skills which might not show as much progress at the jury.11 Bastien recommends that the class piano curriculum be constructed to suit best the needs of the students. Piano teachers and music educators should devise a program based on practical piano study. In keeping with the philosophy of comprehensive musicianship, theory, keyboard harmony, and improvisation are incorporated into
class piano in order to relate piano study to other areas of music.\textsuperscript{12}

On the basis of Carey's findings in the 1953 study discussed above, she made several recommendations for the advancement of class piano programs which include the following:

1. All music educators should be trained in class piano and keyboard procedures so that they may be able to incorporate this instruction in their school music programs.

2. There should be classes in advanced piano for the purpose of giving training in these essentials of music: (1) fundamentals of theory, a subject in which most pianists are so deficient that they have difficulty covering the freshman theory course in one year; (2) practical experience in transposition; (3) harmonizing melodies; and (4) accompanying.\textsuperscript{13}

Bastien, Robinson, and Jarvis each have constructed a suggested class piano curriculum for the first two years of study for college piano minors. Both programs were designed to provide a balanced diet of repertoire, technique, sightreading, and functional skills. As this study is primarily devoted to keyboard harmony and functional skills, only the curriculum requirements of these items will be listed.

The suggested Bastien curriculum goals are as follows:

**Chords**

1. Play I, IV, and V chords in blocked style in all major and minor keys.
2. Play triads and seventh chords of the scale in root position, both blocked and broken style.

3. Play triads and inversions (especially major, minor, and dominant seventh chords) in blocked and broken forms.

4. Play dominant seventh and diminished seventh chords in blocked, broken, and arpeggio style.

Improvisation

1. Create simple melodies over ostinato basses showing a knowledge of period structure.

2. Complete "answer" phrases to the "question" phrases; harmonize melodies with I, IV, V, V'.

3. Play melodies and harmonic patterns in a variety of phrase structures to include binary and ternary forms. The harmony should include primary and secondary chords culminating with modulations to the dominant and sub-dominant.

Transposition

1. Transpose up or down a whole step (or more) culminating in songs the difficulty of songs in public school music texts.

Harmonization

1. Harmonize melodies initially with I, IV, V chords, culminating in harmonization incorporating modulations to closely related keys.

2. Learn progressions such as I, ii\textsuperscript{6}, I\textsuperscript{4}, V, I.

3. Use secondary dominants and modulate to closely related keys.

4. Harmonize major scales with the following suggested progressions: Ascending: I, V, I, V\textsuperscript{4}, I\textsuperscript{6}, IV, V', I; Descending: I, iii, IV, I\textsuperscript{6}, ii\textsuperscript{6}, I\textsuperscript{4}, V', I.

Sightreading

1. Demonstrate proficiency in reading accompaniments such as those found in school texts.
2. Be able to read one or more parts of choral or instrumental literature.

Unlike the Bastien guide, the Robinson and Jarvis curriculum included playing by ear as an important part of their program. In addition, score-reading was listed in the fourth semester separate from sightreading:

**Keyboard Harmony**

1. Play authentic, plagal, and deceptive cadences in all keys.
2. Develop modulations to dominant and sub-dominant keys.

**Improvisation**

1. Create short pieces in binary, ternary, and theme and variation forms in duple and triple meters. Modulate to closely related keys.

**Transposition**

1. Transpose scale line and chord materials in major and minor keys.

**Harmonization**

1. Develop stylistic harmonizations of written melodies in pieces using secondary dominant chords in major keys and primary chords in white key minor tonalities.
2. Develop harmonization of written melodies using a variety of accompaniment styles.

**Sightreading**

1. Sightread in major tonalities and in minor tonalities starting on the white keys.
2. Read simple vocal and instrumental scores.
3. Read one or more parts of octavo music.
4. Read one or more parts of band or orchestral music.
Score-Reading (4th semester)

1. Play accompaniments to octavo scores.

2. Perform individual and combined parts to octavo music.

3. Play transposing and non-transposing parts to instrumental music—one or more melodic lines.

Playing By Ear

1. Begin by playing by ear familiar songs using the I and V chords and progress to songs employing modulations to closely related keys.  

Bastien further discussed requirements for the piano major. He advocated for these students a course or courses in functional piano which combines the areas of sightreading, keyboard harmony, and improvisation. He stated that the study of keyboard harmony is highly practical for all levels of piano study. Aural acuity will be enhanced by functional harmonization. An advanced keyboard harmony class would probably include work with figured bass realization, in order to understand more fully the practices of the Baroque period.

Bastien also felt that the ability to improvise would be coupled with a knowledge of keyboard harmony. Additional skills in jazz, pop-rock, etc. may be developed through the college keyboard harmony class and are useful to the private studio teacher.

Lyke stated that in the past, keyboard harmony training was generally delayed until undergraduate music instruction, where it was treated as a separate
course bearing little relationship to other aspects of music theory: ear training, sight training, and analysis and writing. Gradually, this approach was modified with a trend toward unifying the various components of music theory, in what became known as the "comprehensive musicianship" approach. Reinforcement is at work when students identify familiar chords in repertoire as sight-reading which have already been built at the keyboard, transposed, used in harmonization, and ear training. A sequential program of skill development in keyboard harmony should constantly relate to repertoire, technical patterns, and sightreading.  

Mehr felt that we must help our students discover the larger patterns of harmony and structure in music. The more relationships they perceive, the easier they will learn and the better they will perform. Mehr also felt that not only does the chord approach teach students to recognize and hear harmonies, but it is actually easier to play chords than to play single notes.  

Lyke advised that keyboard harmony reaches far beyond familiarity with tonic, subdominant, and dominant harmony. He recommended that students incorporate the following activities: build triads on scale degrees in a variety of keys; build triads on all twelve notes, changing the quality of each chord; build triads and inversions and arpeggiate in major and minor keys; and harmonize the major scale. In addition, students would benefit greatly
from experience with chromatic chords. Exposure to at least secondary and diminished sevenths in chord patterns, melody harmonization, and playing harmonic accompaniments by ear will add immeasurably to a student's harmonic vocabulary.

Goodkind stated that an essential step toward success in any piano program is to link the study of theory, in a practical keyboard-harmony program, with every piece of music played. Improvisation is one means by which this goal may be accomplished.

According to Rabinof, improvisation is the embodiment of rhythm, melody, harmony, and form. The ability to improvise will help make a student a better performer, give a superior tactile relationship to the keyboard, an aural awareness, a sense of "at homeness" in any key, better memory and sightreading ability, and a gift for compositional analysis, security, and poise. Improvisation can be taught privately or in class; however, the latter may be more effective. Improvisation, if taught with the onset of lessons, becomes as natural as other components of music training such as sightreading, transposition, and keyboard harmony-related skills.

Agay stated that a knowledge of elementary harmony is a necessary precondition for good sightreading. Practicing scales, chords, and arpeggios will help to develop a sense of harmony, facilitate transposition, and foster the student's technical ability and good fingering
habits—all very important skills in becoming competent in sightreading.26

According to Enoch, transposition is an extension of sightreading and reinforces all of its aspects. As the student begins to explore harmonies, transposing both the melody and accompaniment will reinforce harmonic reading. It is a means of making students play in all keys, not merely the easy keys of up to three sharps or flats that are commonly found in beginner's books.27 Knowledge of cadences and modulation will aid both the sightreader and transposer. Students should learn to play cadences in all keys, a skill which helps to facilitate chord recognition and chord playing.28

Periodicals

Howard and McGaughey stated that significant changes are taking place in the pedagogy of music theory at the college level. Howard reported that the study of music theory has in recent years been subjected to an immense amount of restructuring in order to make it a more practical and useful tool for the contemporary musician.29 Both by definition and tradition, theory stands apart from most other musical disciplines in its freedom to place fingers in every musical pie. Because of the growth of other areas of music study, theory courses in many state universities have been restructured to include intensive coverage of materials formerly dealt with elsewhere in the
music curriculum, often in the absence of the necessary additional teaching time or faculty with which to accomplish this effectively.\textsuperscript{30} Howard further stated that the drift toward expansion of theory study was partially due to the cry for relevance which culminated in the late 1960's.\textsuperscript{31} He recommended that it is essential for the entire music faculty to be aware of and to support the goals of the theory program in detail. The absence of this support invites friction among the teaching staff which will seriously undermine constructive attempts toward revision of curriculum or course content.\textsuperscript{32} MacGaughey also recommended promotion of communication with other faculties teaching the same group of students in order to establish reinforcing relationships between the various areas of music study.\textsuperscript{33}

Walton and McGee felt that music theory and music practice would reinforce each other. Walton reported that much criticism has been leveled at the teaching of theory. The traditional theory course is often narrow in scope and isolated skills are taught mechanically without reference to music literature or practical application. To establish theory as a vital part of the curriculum, Walton emphasized that teachers must help develop the student's abilities to identify the elements of music and develop their skills as "tools." The synthesis of all aspects of music is what is rightly called musicianship. In this context, "theory" should be more appropriately labelled the "practice of
music." Walton recommended six areas which must overlap and be balanced in their approach: listening, analysis, music reading, creativity, the writing of music, and keyboard harmony. It is this latter area which offers a practical means for applying all the other skills to an instrument, thus enhancing and clarifying the study and understanding of music. The activities include playing by ear, harmonizing melodies, improvising, score-reading, transposing, and deriving chord studies from the music itself.  

McGee stated, "theory should prepare the serious musician to deal successfully with his musical experiences outside the confines of the theory classroom." The theory student needs instruction in the general musical concepts and practices of all viable music. He should develop skill in critical listening. McGee advocated the use of sight-singing and keyboard assignments to help the student develop proficiency in these skills.  

Chrisman reported that class size today causes very practical changes to take place in theory teaching. Keyboard harmony, for example, is greatly hampered. Smaller courses can best provide the personal attention needed for sight-singing and keyboard harmony. In a larger college the entire class structure must change, so that the teacher can cover the basics for some students while maintaining the interest of the more advanced students.
Vernazza stated there is some doubt as to where the responsibilities of the theory class leave off and those of the basic piano class begin. He reported Dr. Jack Schwartz of Florida State University as clarifying the problem by saying, "The voice leading is not the same in pianistic progressions as in formal four-part keyboard harmony. If we try to teach both styles of progressions in the piano class, are we not trying to teach too much?" Whereas some schools have distinguished the responsibilities of the piano and theory classes, others have not.37

Trantham reported the results of his 1966 experimental study at Northwestern University in which he attempted to design a music theory approach to beginning piano instruction for the college music major. He concluded that the fragmented keyboard instruction given by theory departments would be more effective if placed in a keyboard course following the concepts of comprehensive musicianship. In addition, instruction in functional piano facility is more successful when keyboard harmony and piano literature are related.38

Lyke indicated that questions might be raised about the emphasis placed on keyboard harmony in minor piano study, since this area is usually a part of the theory program. Lyke concluded that the piano class presents an ideal situation to "take theory off the shelf." He viewed group piano as a laboratory in which to pull together various music programs.39
Lyke also stated the trend has recently been towards a unified concept of piano instruction, which is especially evident in colleges where group instruction is replacing individual instruction at the minor level. He indicated that the pendulum swing toward functional piano, with primary emphasis on keyboard and sightreading has de-emphasized or even replaced the study and performance of piano literature. Lyke felt that competencies in all the areas—keyboard harmony, sightreading, repertoire study, technique, and aural development—were valuable for the music and music education majors.

Results of a 1967 survey by Lyke showed that a consensus of class piano teachers and music education instructors believed the following skills to be most important: harmonization, sightreading, accompanying, critical listening, playing by ear, chord progressions, analyses, transposition, technical development, and improvisation. At the end of the scale were ranked instrumental score-playing, memorization, and figured-bass playing. Piano teachers considered repertoire important, but music educators placed this item near the end of the scale.

Lowder conducted a survey of the opinions of university faculty and practicing teachers concerning the relevance of keyboard skills taught in the class piano program at Ohio State University. From the results of this study, Lowder recommended that emphasis be given to accompanying; sightreading of single lines, scores, and
simple accompaniments; harmonization; and cadences. He noted that the low ranking of technical exercises, improvisation, patriotic songs, and arpeggios would suggest omission of these skills as course requirements. However, these items could be performed in a group ensemble or in solo performance followed by group evaluation.

On the basis of recent studies by Lyke and others, Lyke concluded that weaknesses in certain areas, particularly improvisation, aural training, and analysis, indicated that teachers are not well-trained in these skills or choose to ignore them. Piano pedagogy courses should emphasize functional approaches. In addition, piano teachers and music educators should plan a minor piano curriculum designed to fit the needs of students.

Both Lyke and Vernazza agreed that confusion in the area of minor piano curriculum needs to be eliminated. In a 1964 study, Vernazza investigated basic piano in 40 California junior colleges. Of this number, 34 offered piano classes. Though the curriculum for these classes included piano literature, technical exercises, sight-reading, and some functional skills, there seemed to be little uniformity of curriculum among the colleges.

Vernazza suggested that the emphasis may be shifted in basic piano to make it more specialized when necessary:

Theory and composition majors need emphasis on sight reading and score playing. Vocal majors need practice in reading open scores at the keyboard and in
playing accompaniments and vocalises. Organ majors need to develop skills in modulation and improvisation. Instrumental majors need to review music fundamentals at the keyboard and to play easy piano accompaniments written for their own instruments. Music education majors, both instrumental and vocal, find it important to learn to sight read, to improvise accompaniments and to harmonize and transpose melodies at the keyboard. All music students in basic piano classes need to develop basic techniques and a tactile sense. It is also important for all piano students to become proficient in reading easy literature at sight and to study literature written expressly for the piano.

In a 1978 survey completed by Marjorie Oldfield for a special issue on group piano in The Piano Quarterly, only 9 of 168 responding schools and colleges reported offering no group piano instruction. Of those offering group piano, 125 schools did not offer specialized classes for different music majors. Moreover, 100 schools emphasized functional keyboard skills for music majors as opposed to 13 schools reporting literature as the primary emphasis.

Buchanan reported results of her 1962 survey which studied the skills of piano performance in the preparation of music educators. The survey revealed that 64% of band and orchestra directors thought that their college training in piano did not adequately prepare them for their area of teaching. Buchanan noted that this deficiency may be attributed in part to the fact that 68% of these teachers had no piano study or no more than one year of such study prior to entering college. A larger percentage (71%) of elementary music education majors were adequately trained in piano prior to teaching which Buchanan
attributed to the high college piano requirements for these students. Of the choral directors, only 47% indicated they were not adequately prepared in piano.47

Because of the large number of music educators who have little pre-college piano, schools are faced with three main alternatives: (1) They can lower the standards of piano proficiency, (2) refuse to accept music majors with limited piano backgrounds, or (3) modify the curriculum to place more emphasis on functional piano. According to the survey, the highest ranking keyboard skills which the music teachers indicated they needed in their school teaching situation were accompanying, score-playing, sight-reading, improvising, playing by ear, and harmonizing. Buchanan recommended a separate class called "Functional Piano" which should be at least two semesters in length. The course should be divided into two to three class sections, each at a different level of advancement. A beginning piano class should prepare the student to enter the functional piano class after one year's study.48

Buchanan's survey also investigated piano proficiency examinations required by teacher-training institutions. The study revealed that one quarter of the respondents were not required to pass this test. The largest percentage of schools (30%) reported that their examination was based primarily on functional piano, while 21% included both functional piano and solos and technique on their test. Only 10% based their examination mainly on
solos and technique. In 52% of the schools, this examination was the same regardless of the area of teaching emphasis. The most commonly mentioned requirements for piano proficiency examinations for all music education majors were sightreading, transposing, improvising, technical facility, literature, accompanying, playing of assembly songs, playing of scales, chords, cadences, and progressions. The examining juries in 48% of the schools were composed of piano faculty only, while 37% of the schools used both piano and music education faculties.49

Most authors agreed that class piano is rapidly replacing the traditional private piano lesson as the favored means of instruction. Sheets summed up the most obvious differences in the two approaches as follows:

**Class Piano**

1. Functional Skills:
   - harmonic analysis
   - ear training
   - chording melodies
   - playing by ear
2. Technique: as it facilitates functional skills
3. Repertoire: as it illustrates functional skills

**Private Piano**

1. Repertoire:
   - polished performance
   - interpretive sensitivity
   - understanding of style
   - masterful technique
2. Technique: as it facilitates repertoire
3. Functional Skills: as they contribute to style and interpretation
Sheets pointed out that these two approaches share essentially the same components, but each is arranged in a different order of importance. Since some class students rarely learn about the piano as an instrument capable of making music and some private students seldom learn functional skills, he recommended that the two approaches be combined at the college level, each complementing the other.

Many authors agreed on the importance of functional skills in the training of all piano students. Silini and Havill stressed the interrelation of skills. They believed that the application of one skill to another increases the benefit of both techniques. Skills which were most often considered to be desirable in the curriculum of music education majors included sightreading, transposition, score-reading, harmonization, playing by ear, and improvisation.

Silini employed the term "spontaneous keyboard skills" to denote specific techniques that a pianist must often express without preparation. These techniques are those leading to keyboard proficiency in the area of sightreading, transposition, score-reading, melodic harmonization, playing by ear, and improvisation. Silini believed that to isolate deliberately one skill from the next would only foster a limited and inflexible keyboard experience. The teaching of spontaneous skills is primarily assigned to group-piano instructors, who often lack experience in this
area. The most advantageous manner of teaching transposition, according to Silini, is in direct relation to sight-reading. Even though students study theory along with piano, they need the benefit of relating the two subjects, which transposition affords. This added flexibility aids strongly in the development of other skills, particularly improvisation.

The art of score-reading, as reported by Silini, is greatly benefitted by simple preparatory exercises in which one melodic line is transposed to any other line or space on each clef. Few individuals attempt to achieve fluent instrumental score-reading.

Often, the seed of harmonization is planted in the theory classroom. Silini reported that membership into piano classes assumes that the student has received or is receiving training in keyboard harmony, which is generally part of the theory sequence. For many students, harmonization of a melody begins with the experience of playing by ear. For example, one might hear a melody, attempt to play it, then experiment with a chordal accompaniment. Thus, through harmonization in this manner, the student plays by ear, harmonizes a melody, and improvises an accompaniment.

Silini referred to playing by ear as "playing by recall." Key tools in this art are a developed sense of interval recognition and the ability to harmonize. The
piano classroom facilitates the learning of these skills.\textsuperscript{56}

According to Silini, free improvisation is best taught as a functional skill. It also functions well in the piano classroom.\textsuperscript{57}

Lowder reported that most teachers agree that every pianist should possess the ability to harmonize melodies and to play by ear. He advocated analysis as an accompaniment to performance skills at all levels of instruction. Lowder defined analysis as an examination of something by its separate elements in order to see their relationship to the whole. The four main elements of analysis would include melody, rhythm, harmony, and form. Lowder suggested that by the time a student is able to harmonize melodies with the I, IV, and V chords, he should also be able to improvise melodies employing the same chord progression. In order to accomplish this goal, students must understand the distinction between chord tones and non-chord tones. By learning to recognize these tones, students will not only improve their ability to sightread musical patterns, but will also develop their "inner ear."\textsuperscript{58}

Havill reported that most pianists recognize the importance of sightreading, but only in recent years has it become as desirable a skill as performance. Sightreading can be taught, contrary to the myth that sightreaders are born and not made. In order to obtain proficiency in sightreading, one must have a good feel of the
keyboard, and know note names and values, meters, intervals, chords, and melodic and harmonic progressions. The elements of rhythm, feel of the keyboard, intervals, and keyboard harmony should be studied separately, yet be integrated with each other.\textsuperscript{59} Simple keyboard transposition of exercises is recommended. After reading intervals, in which one is prepared to read horizontally, one should begin playing in three or four parts, or chordal style. Thus, a basic knowledge of keyboard harmony is essential. The student should understand and be able to recognize major, minor, and seventh chords and the formation of the I-IV-V\textsuperscript{7} chords. He should be able to play this progression in keys up to two sharps and flats.\textsuperscript{60} After mastering these basic chords, the student should expand his study with the II and VI chords; diminished and augmented chords; and secondary dominant chords and modulations.\textsuperscript{61}

Many authors agreed that improvisation is a valuable art which should be taught at all levels of instruction. According to Wunsch, Konowitz, Lindstrom, and Silini, however, improvisation is denied a place in most musical curricula.

Wunsch stated that improvisation is a vital element of music education which represents a bridge between the two disciplines of theory and instrumental or vocal instruction. It not only provides the student with an outlet for experimentation which illuminates abstract musical thinking, but it offers him the opportunity to
express himself intuitively. In addition, it serves the student as a release from a preoccupation with mechanical fingerwork, imitation, and interpretation. Despite its importance, however, improvisation is rarely featured in a musical curriculum. Most often, it is mentioned only in combination with a keyboard harmony course, and then takes only second place.\textsuperscript{62}

Konowitz noted that too often, improvisational ability is considered a special gift reserved for a privileged few. This myth has been perpetrated because technical development and repertoire expansion have constituted the primary emphases in traditional piano instruction. Konowitz emphasized that improvisation can be taught and the best improvisers are those who know the basic components of composition and who can manipulate these elements such that their performance appears to be spontaneous. Most of the fundamentals required for improvisation are also required for traditional piano study. Konowitz recommended that one should develop an improvisation based on scales and containing dynamic, rhythmic, and directional changes. He concluded by saying improvisation should be used as a tool by musicians to strengthen their understanding of music techniques and to aid in the expansion of basic keyboard skills.\textsuperscript{63}

Lindstrom reminded the reader that before the general availability of the printed score, improvisation was considered an essential tool of the competent keyboard
player. Today, however, improvisation plays little or no part in the training of the average piano student. Lindstrom acknowledged that improvisation remains basically a self-taught skill, and individual talents will tend to vary. He observed, however, that frustration with note-reading becomes noticeably diminished as a direct result of successful experience in simple melodic improvisation. Lindstrom listed the following factors which comprise the rationale for teaching keyboard improvisation:

1. Improvisation synthesizes the music experience.
2. Improvisation promotes technical security and allays psychological fear.
3. Improvisation relates theory study to relevant practise.
4. Improvisation explores the potentialities of the instrument.
5. Improvisation stimulates the imagination of the student.
6. Improvisation develops powers of concentration and hearing.
7. Improvisation provides direct and spontaneous means of musical expression.

Blum stated that improvisation allows students to increase their aural and intellectual control of music vocabulary, to learn to think creatively, and to expand the potentials for self-expression and participation in aesthetic experience. Keyboard improvisation, in particular, is especially valuable because the performer has at his disposal the elements necessary to weave a complete
web of musical sound—rhythm, melody, and harmony. The average piano student should be able to improvise, as long as he is guided through a logical sequence of specific objectives which correlate with musical concepts to be taught in the piano lesson, piano class, and/or theory class.65

Bradshaw labelled improvisation "instant musicianship," not only because it creates musicianship where none existed, but because it requires a student to call forth all his resources and use them instantly.66 Improvisation is a tool enabling a student to explore important concepts that instructors attempt to teach. Thus, a student who has mastered a concept well enough to improvise with it must understand it well. Bradshaw advocated the use of the piano for improvisation because of the possibilities of non-traditional sounds such as pedal effects, sounds inside the piano, clusters, and dissonances. He did not consider improvisation the remedy for all the ills of the theory class.67

Ward-Steinman reported that at San Diego State University improvisation is emphasized, together with composition, classroom performance, and sightreading, as part of their core program in comprehensive musicianship. He stated that to improvise convincingly requires as much analytical and musical skill as a written exercise or research paper, and reveals even more about the quality of musical intelligence.68
Dissertations

Freeburne attempted to determine what pianistic skills are of greatest importance to music educators whose primary instrument is not the piano. His study was delimited geographically to the nineteen states in the North Central area. Questionnaires were sent to 315 public school music teachers and 308 college music teachers, of which 64% were returned. 69

Based on the results of the questionnaires, numerous conclusions were drawn; however, only those specifically related to this study are listed:

1. The piano training of most teachers in the public schools and colleges was inadequate.

2. The amount of piano training did not determine how much certain skills were used in the classroom.

3. Teachers' evaluations of the importance of piano skills varied considerably according to the type of teacher.

4. The most valuable piano skills for public school music teachers were sightreading, keyboard harmony, accompanying, improvisation of simple accompaniments, transposition, and knowledge of how to practice effectively.

5. The skills most neglected in the piano training of public school music teachers were improvisation of simple accompaniments, transposition, sightreading, keyboard harmony, reading open score, accompanying, knowledge of how to practice effectively, reading alto or tenor clefs, and playing major instrument accompaniments.

6. The most important piano skills to the college teachers were sightreading, keyboard harmony, accompanying, knowledge of how to practice effectively, improvisation of simple accompaniments, reading open score, and transposition.

7. Skills which were most neglected in the training of
college teachers were reading open score, sight-reading, improvisation of simple accompaniments, keyboard harmony, principles of fingering and pedaling, accompanying, reading of alto or tenor clefs, and knowledge of how to practice effectively.

8. Class piano was most frequently offered by teachers colleges. About three-fourths of the teachers colleges teach class piano, and over half of the universities offered this instruction.

9. Only about one-fourth of the colleges with less than four teachers in the music department offered class piano. Schools of all sizes might investigate the possibility of teaching some of the neglected skills as improvisation, accompanying, and sightreading in the class situation.

10. Over half of the colleges gave piano proficiency examinations. It is questionable, however, if jury examinations are valuable in all instances since many teachers drill the students to perform well only on the examination. It is also questionable whether the jury is qualified to pass judgment on a student's progress.

11. N.A.S.M. approved schools were more conscious of the need to assure that their graduates have attained a certain degree of piano proficiency than were teachers colleges.

12. Music teachers and school of music administrators agreed on the order of importance of most piano skills, but teachers valued most of the skills more highly.

13. The value of keyboard harmony was considerably underrated by administrators. It must be recognized that this is not strictly a keyboard skill—that it involves total musicianship. It is possible that a difference in interpretation of the term "keyboard harmony" accounts for the difference in the evaluation of this skill.

Richards sought to determine the trends of the growth and development of piano class instruction. He reported that there was evidence of group piano teaching as early as 1815. Throughout its history, class piano has
received much adverse criticism. It has revealed, however, that group teaching can be an effective and musicianly means of instruction if certain factors are observed: adequate teacher training and supervised classroom experience, small groups, adequate time allotted for constant scrutinizing and modifying piano classes, adequate facilities, and periodic classification of students into more homogeneous classes. The author did not believe that piano classes are the "cure-all" for the profession. He recommended combining the two approaches of class piano and private instruction as indicated by the particular needs of the student. Richards indicated that the near future trend may be to teach all non-music majors and music education majors, regardless of the major instrument, primarily in groups.

In 1952, based on questionnaires sent to nearly 2000 colleges, only 137 schools reported including piano class pedagogy in the piano materials and procedures courses, though it was generally not offered as a separate course. Richards observed that a curious dichotomy exists in the fact that many universities offer piano classes as part of their applied program, but do not include group procedures in pedagogy courses.

In an experimental study, Baker compared two methods of teaching the reading of harmony to second semester freshmen college students. In one method, materials were presented and drilled by means of a tachistoscope; in
Though the results of the primary experiment were inconclusive, high correlations were found to exist in order from high to low between the skill of reading harmony and (1) keyboard proficiency, (2) the amount of previous piano study, and (3) grades in keyboard aspects of theory. Low correlations were found between the skill of reading harmony and (1) harmonic sensitivity, (2) musical achievement, and (3) musical ability to discriminate among intervals aurally.

Rast investigated the piano preparation of students enrolled in elementary education programs at 44 schools in Illinois. Based on his study, Rast made several recommendations which are summarized as follows: (1) that one or two semesters of functional piano be included as a distinct part of teacher-training programs in elementary education; (2) that the concept of group piano instruction be considered the most effective one for the development of functional piano facility; (3) that instructors of such piano courses should include either music education specialists who have strong backgrounds in the teaching of piano, or persons who have experience in the regular classroom music program, and who have an adequate performance and teaching ability at the piano; (4) that the following skills be included in functional piano courses: play single line melodies at sight, play the I IV V7 chords in major and minor, play major and minor triads and scales in all keys, play varied accompaniments to single line
melodies, play prepared accompaniments from classroom music series, transpose single line melodies at sight, play prepared transposed accompaniments, and improvise and harmonize short melodic phrases.  

Lyke investigated first and second year class piano programs for music education majors in the six state universities of Illinois. A set of criteria for first and second year programs was formulated so that class piano programs could be judged as adequate or inadequate in meeting the needs of music educators. The following weaknesses were found in first and second year programs: (a) construction and playing of scales and modes; (b) improvisation; (c) aural dictation; (d) musical analysis; and (e) vocal score reduction. Additional criteria not met in the first year programs included the following: (a) basic keyboard patterns; (b) accompanying; (c) chord patterns; (d) and critical listening and group interaction factors. Criteria not met in the second year programs were the following: (a) playing of chords and arpeggios; (b) modulation; (c) realization of figured bass; and (d) instrumental score reduction. Both first and second year programs met criteria in the areas of (a) repertoire study; (b) playing of songs by ear; (c) sightreading; (d) transposition; (e) harmonization; and (f) piano ensemble performance.  

Only 31% of the teachers had taken a piano pedagogy course, and none of those courses dealt with college-level
group instruction. All teachers possessed more than an adequate knowledge of music theory and felt qualified to teach keyboard harmony skills in their class piano courses. Not one teacher, however, included improvisation to any extent in their teaching. In addition to class piano, many teachers taught other subjects such as applied piano, music theory, and music appreciation.  

Standards of playing for instrumental students tended to be lower than those for vocal students. Lack of plans for placement of students at various levels of instruction created problems at three of the six schools.  

All but one university required a proficiency examination upon completion of the class piano curriculum. A variety of faculty members comprised the "jury": class piano teachers only, or members of the combined applied piano and music education faculties. Periodic changes in these examinations reflected shifts of emphasis in the class piano curriculum.  

Class piano teachers and music educators rated these experiences valuable in the group piano curriculum: (a) sightreading; (b) harmonization; (c) playing by ear; (d) accompanying; (e) critical listening; (f) chord progressions; (g) transposition; (h) technique; (i) improvisation; and (j) analysis. Other items viewed as less valuable both by class piano teachers and music educators included the following: (a) score reduction; (b) memorization; and (c) figured bass playing.
On the basis of his findings, Lyke made the following recommendations, among others: (1) A class piano conference involving all teachers of the study should be held in order to define competencies and insure more uniform standards among the schools. (2) The class piano program should be structured around practical keyboard harmony skills, sightreading, and easier piano literature. (3) Improvising should acquire a more important role in class piano. (4) Teachers should improve their techniques in the areas in which weaknesses were discovered. (5) Piano pedagogy courses should begin to emphasize group piano teaching.84

Frederickson conducted a study in 1971 to determine the basic concepts and skills in music theory and literature which music majors were expected to master by the end of two years of training in selected southern California state and community colleges. His findings were used as a basis for establishing minimum standards for the first two years of college music training in California. The author included harmony, keyboard harmony, counterpoint, and musicianship within the area of music theory.85 Of the 33 participating colleges, 25 (75.7%) offered keyboard harmony as a part of the harmony class and gave no additional credit for it; only 3 colleges (9.1%) offered keyboard harmony as a separate course earning one unit credit; and five colleges (15.1%) offered no keyboard harmony.86
Instructional materials used by students in 28 colleges offering keyboard harmony included 13 different titles. Most instructors related keyboard harmony to materials the student was studying in harmony class, thereby using material from the harmony text for keyboard harmony. Often, original materials written by the instructor or student were used. No materials for keyboard harmony were furnished by the colleges.\textsuperscript{87}

Much emphasis was given in the keyboard harmony course or harmony class to demonstration of progressions of triads, seventh and ninth chords; and major and minor scales and melodies. Moderate emphasis was given to demonstration of diatonic and chromatic intervals, and progressions using chromatically altered chords. The following items merited only brief study or were not included: modal scales and melodies, pentatonic and whole-tone scales and melodies, and progressions using eleventh and thirteenth chords. For the most part, non-tertian and non-functional chords, and polytonal and atonal chords were not included.\textsuperscript{88}

In the area of melody harmonization, there was much disagreement among the instructors. Therefore, only moderate emphasis was given to harmonizing a melody only, harmonizing a melody with Roman numerals, and harmonizing a melody with figured bass. Harmonizing a melody with jazz or popular chord symbols was generally not included by instructors.\textsuperscript{89}
Generally, transposition was given little emphasis. The largest portion of teachers did not include, or only briefly included transposing of melodies; simple accompaniments; and folksongs from two to four voices.\textsuperscript{90}

Another item on the questionnaire dealt with whether instructors had preferences in the manner in which the student performed the keyboard demonstration. Demonstration with block chords in the right hand and bass line in the left hand was the only item given moderate emphasis. Teachers disagreed with other ways of playing keyboard harmony: \textsuperscript{91} "soprano and alto in the right hand, bass and tenor in the left hand"; "melody in the right hand with chords in the left hand"; and "a melody in the right hand with a rhythmic accompaniment in the left hand."\textsuperscript{92} Four instructors indicated that their students could demonstrate keyboard harmony anyway they could do it.\textsuperscript{93}

Lowder attempted to determine whether the teaching of fingering patterns according to chordal configurations would improve the ability of secondary pianists to sight-read piano music based on tertian harmony. This concept was explored at Indiana University by means of comparing sightreading test scores which represented the achievement of experimental and control groups. Lowder remarked that secondary pianists complain that their class piano theory seems unrelated to their textbook theory. He felt that consistent theoretical terminology, combined with interval and chord-shape drills, might help reduce this confusion.\textsuperscript{94}
Based on the results of his study, Lowder made the following recommendations:

1. More drills on reading chords by interval should be included in the first semester of instruction for secondary pianists.

2. There should be closer relationship between the types of fingering used for chord progressions and cadences to the performance style of hymns and chorales. The majority of methods reviewed seemed inconsistent in this regard.

3. Musical examples of a linear, as well as chordal, texture should be included in a thorough method of study for secondary pianists.

4. Beginning students should not be permitted to stop at the bar line when sightreading. Hymns arranged with greater vertical distance between treble and bass clefs might be helpful in forcing the reader to use wider eye movements.

5. There should be close agreement between the music theorist and the class piano teacher as regards theoretical terminology.

Hunter attempted to (1) determine what techniques and materials were being used in the teaching of ten functional piano skills to undergraduate music education majors; (2) to determine what effectiveness ratings instructors assigned to these functional skills; and (3) to determine what recommendations these instructors offered for improving the instruction of these skills. Twenty-five West Coast four-year colleges and universities were included in the study.

These conclusions were drawn on the basis of interviews with instructors of functional piano:

1. The instructional needs of students were met with regard to these five skill areas—sightreading,
technical development, critical listening, analysis, and chord progression—and instructional approaches were uniform.

2. The five other skill areas—harmonization, playing by ear, transposition, improvisation, and accompanying—were not meeting the instructional needs of students, and adequate teaching materials were needed.

3. Teachers were experiencing problems in teaching skills because of the diversity of class membership.

4. Four of the five skills taught least effectively were also taught by the smallest percentage of instructors: playing by ear, transposition, improvisation, and accompanying.

5. All of the five skills taught least effectively, with the exception of accompanying, were ranked in importance above the skills taught most effectively.

Hunter made several recommendations which included the following: (1) that the five least effective skill areas be studied in-depth to determine more effective instructional approaches; (2) that instructors of functional piano skills need more training; and (3) that education and publisher representatives collaborate to make available needed materials in the areas of harmonization, accompaniment, playing by ear, and transposition.

Goltz conducted a survey of class piano laboratories by means of questionnaires, interviews, letters, and telephone conversations. Two hundred and twenty-four instructors (67%) in NASM-approved schools responded. Of that number, 81.7% indicated that class piano was included in the curriculum. Goltz noted that there had been an increase in the training of teachers for class piano from 1968 to 1975. In 1975, 70% of responding
instructors teaching on conventional pianos and 59% of those teaching on electronic pianos had received special training in class piano instruction.  

Sightreading was taught by more class piano instructors than any other functional skill. Other skills taught, in order from most to least, were harmonization, transposition, technical development, chord progressions, critical listening, playing by ear, analysis, improvisation, and accompanying. It appeared that the less traditional skills such as improvisation and playing by ear were gaining emphasis.

Exline developed and implemented original keyboard materials for a two-semester class piano program for non-music majors at the State University College at Oswego, New York. In order to design this program, questionnaires were mailed to class piano students and piano faculty at Oswego, as well as class piano instructors in various colleges in the United States in order to determine those keyboard skills and competencies students and teachers felt should be given the highest priority in class piano. Eight skills were identified by the writer as most important: technique, repertoire, sightreading, accompanying, harmonization, improvisation, knowledge of musical terminology and symbols, and interpretation. The results of students, Oswego faculty, and class piano faculties in the United States were then compared. Based on student responses, the author ranked these skills in
order of preference: technique, sightreading, repertoire, interpretation, improvisation, accompanying, harmonization, and knowledge of terms. The class piano faculties rated the skills in the following order: sightreading, technique, accompanying, harmonization, interpretation, repertoire, knowledge of terms, and improvisation. All faculty members believed that competency in sight-reading constituted the most important objective for class piano programs. The author stated that the relatively low preference for improvisation might be accounted for because faculty members believed this competency to be closely correlated with harmonization and did not view it as a separate skill. He gave another possible explanation that faculty members viewed improvisation as associated with a specific style of playing and did not wish to restrict the type of literature presented in class piano.

Exline observed that students and faculty members differed primarily in their preference for the functional skills of accompanying and harmonization. He explained that the reason for this preference was that many class piano programs exist to afford secondary instruction to non-piano music majors and minors. Accompanying and harmonization are needed competencies in applied performance and music education.

Both students and faculty members believed that of all skills, technique and sightreading should be given the primary emphases in class piano programs. The percentage
of preference given the other six skills by both groups suggested that both populations were not able to discriminate between the relative importance of each skill. The writer also suggested that possibly both groups believed that a high degree of correlation existed among the six skills. 106

Case attempted in his 1977 study to determine whether music education teachers in selected public schools in North Carolina demonstrated in their current teaching situations those piano skills which had been stressed in college training. Questionnaires were mailed to selected music teachers in North Carolina, representing teachers from the band, choral, elementary general music, and orchestra categories. The questionnaire requested information pertaining to teaching experiences, piano skills employed in training and teaching, and piano literature studied in college. In addition, approximately one third of the responding teachers were visited for at least one teaching period. Rating sheets were used to evaluate each teacher's piano skills. An audio tape was also made to assist a panel of music specialists in evaluating the teaching sessions. 107

The results revealed that the five most emphasized piano skills in the respondents' training were note accuracy, fingering, rhythm, scales, and technique. In contrast, the five skills most emphasized in teaching were chords, note accuracy, rhythm, accompanying, and
In college training, the five least emphasized skills were score reduction, improvisation, sightreading, open score reading, and transposition. On the other hand, the five skills least emphasized in teaching were score reduction, ensemble playing, open score reading, compositions, and pedaling. Significant relationships were found to exist between the following skills emphasized in college piano and used in the teaching situation: compositions, dynamics, ensemble playing, improvisation, note accuracy, pedaling, rhythm, and score reduction.

Based on the author's findings, Case drew the following conclusions:

1. Certain specific skills stressed in piano study have little relationship to the skills actually used in the teaching situations.

2. Public school music teachers used the piano in their current teaching assignments.

3. Public school music teachers' training in piano both prior to and during college did not prepare them to use the piano in practical application in teaching.

4. Public school music teachers may have received piano training through private or class instructors who emphasized note accuracy, fingering, rhythm, scales, and technique and failed to emphasize pedaling, compositions, open score reading, ensemble playing, and score reduction.

5. Class piano was not being widely utilized in the degree-granting institutions where these teachers received music degrees.

6. Piano literature studied by the public school music teachers in college may be unrelated to their teaching situations.
Public school music teachers would possibly utilize the piano more in teaching if piano skills emphasized in college training prepared them for the teaching situations.

Case recommended that more emphasis be given in college piano to the five piano skills which the respondents were most often required to demonstrate in teaching. He further recommended that a more practical selection of piano literature be introduced in college piano.

All writers of the dissertations reviewed recognized the importance of functional piano skills in the training of secondary pianists, however, most disagreed on the order of importance of these skills. The majority of authors placed sightreading at the head of the list of functional skills which are most desirable in the training of non-piano music majors. The studies seemed to indicate a trend towards teaching these skills in class piano, rather than in the theory classroom or in private piano. Most authors agreed that class piano is an effective approach to teaching, and that more teacher training in class instructional procedures is needed.

Finally, keyboard harmony was valued highly by class piano teachers and music educators, but also recognized as one of the weakest skill areas. Weaknesses were found to exist in the teaching and performance of the following items: scales, chords, chord progressions, modulation, figured bass realization, and score reduction.
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CHAPTER III
DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

To gather the information related to the status of keyboard harmony in selected colleges and universities, a questionnaire was devised. The questionnaire is the result of many consultations with college teachers, graduate assistants, and fellow graduate students, whose suggestions contributed greatly to its effectiveness. Question 24, which ascertains the elements students are required to demonstrate at the keyboard, was the result of extensive study of numerous existing theory and class piano textbooks in order to ensure the inclusion of the most commonly taught elements of keyboard harmony. A copy of the questionnaire may be seen in appendix A.

After the questionnaire was devised, delimitations were imposed in order to ensure a high rate of return, a factor which significantly affects the validity of such a study. A delimitation was first placed upon geographical area. The Southern Division of Music Educators National Conference (MENC) was chosen because this study was initiated at an institution in this region. This division consists of the following eleven states: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina,
South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

A further delimitation was placed upon those schools accredited by the National Association of the Schools of Music (NASM). Junior colleges and upper-division schools were eliminated in order to obtain uniformity of data via four-year institutions granting undergraduate degrees in music. The NASM directory (1980-1982) provided names and addresses for the 124 institutions which met the above delimitations. An initial cover letter and questionnaire were mailed in January 1981, with explicit instructions for the questionnaire to be returned by February 15, 1981. A second letter and questionnaire were mailed in July 1981 to those schools not responding by the initial deadline. Every questionnaire was accompanied by an addressed, stamped envelope to facilitate returns. All correspondence may be found in appendix B.

Of the 124 designated institutions, 89 responses were received. However, one institution declined to contribute to the study. Eighty-three of the remaining responses were usable ones, giving the survey a return rate of 70.34%. A list of the 83 institutions may be found in appendix C.

Analysis and Evaluation of Data

The first five questions in the questionnaire are concerned with demographic information about each responding institution. The first three questions deal
more specifically with the size of theory and class piano classes, that is, classes in which the teaching of keyboard harmony is a definite possibility.

In reference to question 1, table 1 shows categorical sizes of the institutions and the number and percentage of schools in each category. As can be seen from the table, the largest percentage of schools falls within the 1,001-5,000 student population (42.2%).

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001-5,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001-10,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-15,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001-20,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001-15,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2, in reference to question 2, indicates the percentages of students seeking B.M. and B.M.E. degrees. A large percentage of institutions have a student enrollment in music of 26-200 (74.1%).

Question 3 requests the number of full-time and part-time faculty employed at the various institutions. The percentages of full-time and part-time faculty may be seen in table 3. A large percentage of schools employ
full-time faculty (39.8%). When added to the percentage of faculties with 11-20 full-time members, this figure comprises a total of 66.3% of faculties consisting of between 5 and 20 members. Between 0 and 5 persons are employed as part-time faculty in the majority of named schools (58.5%).

TABLE 2

STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN MUSIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3

MUSIC FACULTY EMPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Music Faculty</th>
<th>Percentage Full-Time</th>
<th>Percentage Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 4 and 5 exhibit the percentages of undergraduate students enrolled in theory and piano classes, respectively. The rationale for including questions 4 and 5, from which the information was drawn, was the fact that the teaching of most keyboard harmony is confined to either or both of these music classes. It can be seen from table 4 that most institutions have an enrollment in theory classes of between 0 and 24 students; that is, for each of the four years of undergraduate theory, freshman through senior, the percentages of theory classes possessing a student enrollment of 0-24 students is 41.3%, 67.5%, 77.9%, and 92.2%, respectively.

**TABLE 4**

**THEORY ENROLLMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-24</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-125</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-150</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-175</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176-200</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class piano enrollment, as can be seen in table 5, is at its highest peak in the 11-20 student population range (25.4%). In the remaining three years of theory, sophomore through senior, the highest percentages of
students enrolled in class piano may be found in the 0-10 student population with 39.7% at the sophomore level, 72.5% at the junior level, and 82.1% at the senior level.

TABLE 5
CLASS PIANO ENROLLMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 90</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 6 asks if class piano is required for all music majors (B.M., B.M.E.), with the exception of keyboard majors. Class piano is required for a large majority (77.6%) of music majors. Added to this figure is an additional 11.8% of schools which responded that class piano is not required for all, but for some music majors. Of this 11.8%, some of these schools indicated that class piano was exempt for those students already possessing a high degree of keyboard proficiency. At some institutions, students could elect to enroll in private piano lessons in place of class piano. Only 10.5% of responding institutions indicated that class piano is not required
for any music majors.

Multiple responses were given for question 7, which deals with the times in one's four-year curriculum at which class piano is required to be taken. Table 6 shows the percentages of students who must take class piano in conjunction with freshman, sophomore, junior, and/or senior theory. From this table, it can be seen that a large percentage of music majors must take class piano simultaneously with either freshman theory (39.4%), and/or sophomore theory (33.7%). Only 10% each of junior and senior theory students are required to enroll in class piano. For 15.4% of responding institutions, the time at which one enrolls in a required piano class is optional. An additional 9.6% of the schools require music majors to take class piano until a proficiency examination is passed.

**TABLE 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Piano Required in Conjunction with the Following</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Theory</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore Theory</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Theory</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Theory</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Until proficiency examination is passed</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In reference to question 8, tables 7 and 8 display the number of semesters or quarters of class piano which are required for all music majors (B.M. and B.M.E., respectively). For the B.M. degree, most students are required to take four semesters or six quarters of class piano. For students on the semester system, the following music majors must take four semesters of class piano: Vocal (68.9%), Instrumental (75.0%), History (63.6%), Theory (66.7%), and Composition (61.3%). For students on the quarter system, two-thirds or 66.7% of all B.M. majors must take at least six quarters of class piano.

Class piano requirements for the B.M.E. degree are comparable to those for the B.M. degree. Most vocal and instrumental students also must complete at least four semesters or six quarters of class piano. 58.1% of vocal majors and 67.4% of instrumental majors must take four semesters of class piano. Comparably, 62.5% of vocal majors and 66.7% of instrumental majors are required to take six quarters of class piano.

Question 9 asks if a proficiency examination is required upon completion of class piano requirements. Most institutions require such an examination (82.1%). In reference to question 10, 88% of responding schools permit a student to take a proficiency examination to remove any or all of the class piano requirements. The remaining 12% of institutions do not allow students to take a proficiency examination for this purpose.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semesters</th>
<th>Vocal</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarters</th>
<th>Vocal</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8

**CLASS PIANO REQUIREMENTS: B.M.E. DEGREE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semesters</th>
<th>Vocal</th>
<th>percentages</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarters</th>
<th>Vocal</th>
<th>percentages</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 11 identifies the various items which are included on the piano proficiency examination. Table 9 exhibits those items and the percentage of institutions requiring each one. Sightreading and harmonization head the list with 95.2% of schools including these items on the examination. Following in close proximity are scales (90.5%), transposition (85.7%), accompaniment (79.4%), and cadences (77.8%). Considered of least importance and listed under "Other" were playing by ear; triads and inversions; and chord progressions and modulations, each category with a 4.8% response. Miscellaneous items required by 7.9% of the institutions included the reading of rhythmically complex melodic lines, form analysis, reading in F and C clefs, and the transposition of an orchestral or band part to be played on the keyboard at concert pitch.

Question 12 lists which departmental division is responsible for administering the piano proficiency examination. As shown in table 10, the piano department administers this examination in 75% of all institutions. Only 9.4% of music education departments and no applied music (non-keyboard) departments have the responsibility of administering this examination. Other combinations of departments comprise 15.6% of the total number of participating institutions. These combinations are as follows: piano and music education (6.3%); class piano (3.1%); piano and theory (1.6%); piano, music education, and
### TABLE 9

**PIANO PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scales</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadences</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance of memorized pieces</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightreading</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonization</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposition</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompaniment</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-memorized pieces</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic songs, hymns, folksongs</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score-reading</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken chords, arpeggios</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing by ear</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triads and inversions</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chord progressions, modulations</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 10

**ADMINISTRATION OF PIANO PROFICIENCY EXAMINATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied music (non-keyboard)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano and music education</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class piano</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano and theory</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano, music education, and therapy</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 examiners of various departments</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not specify</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
theory (1.6%); and three examiners of various departments, one of which must be from the student's major area (1.6%). Some schools (1.6%) did not specify which department administers this examination.

Question 13 asks whether keyboard harmony is taught as a separate course. It is taught as a separate course at 22 (26.5%) of the 83 responding institutions. Sixty-one institutions (73.5%) do not offer a separate keyboard harmony course.

Table 11 shows the correlation between college enrollment and the number and percentage of schools offering a separate course in keyboard harmony. Nine of the institutions (40.9%) with a college enrollment of 1,001-5,000 offer such a course. This percentage corresponds closely with the percentage of participating institutions with an enrollment of 1,001-5,000 students (42.2%). (Refer to table 1.) On the other hand, the second largest number of institutions (6) offering a separate keyboard course have an enrollment of 501-1,000 students (27.3%), as compared with 14.5% of participating institutions which have an enrollment of 501-1,000 students.

Question 14 asks for the year of study at which keyboard harmony is generally offered as a separate course. Table 12 shows that most institutions offer a separate keyboard harmony course at the freshman (50%) and sophomore (72.7%) years. No institutions reported offering this
course at the graduate level.

TABLE 11
COLLEGES OFFERING KEYBOARD HARMONY AS A SEPARATE COURSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Enrollment</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001-5,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001-10,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001-20,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001-25,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 12
YEAR AT WHICH KEYBOARD HARMONY IS OFFERED AS A SEPARATE COURSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 15 and 16 deal with the number of semesters/quarters a keyboard harmony course is offered and the number of credits for which it is offered, respectively. Table 13 displays the number of semesters/quarters this course is available. Most institutions (47.1%) with a keyboard harmony course, offer it for four
semesters. The remaining institutions offer the keyboard harmony course for either one (17.6%) or two (35.3%) semesters. Three-fifths (60%) of institutions on the quarter system offer a keyboard harmony course for one quarter only. The remaining two-fifths (40%) of these schools offer this course for six quarters. The data from question 16, as tabulated in table 14, show that most institutions offer this course for one credit hour (66.7%).

TABLE 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SEMESTERS/QUARTERS KEYBOARD HARMONY IS OFFERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semesters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CREDIT HOURS FOR KEYBOARD HARMONY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 17 asks the type of degree program for which the keyboard harmony course is required. As can be seen in table 15, this course is required for all music majors at 63.6% of the institutions at which it is offered. A small percentage of these schools (4.5%) do not require this course for any degree program. "Other" groups (13.6%) which are required to take keyboard harmony include organ majors, and the combination "only theory/keyboard" majors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All music majors</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only theory and/or composition majors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only keyboard majors</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 18 requests the title, author, edition, publisher, and date of publication of the keyboard harmony textbook(s) currently used. A complete listing of these textbooks may be found in appendix D. Heading this list were Arthur Frackenpohl's *Harmonization at the Piano* and Stanley N. Shumway's *Harmony and Eartraining at the Keyboard*, each being used at four different institutions. Two schools reported using Norman and Ruth Lloyd's
Creative Keyboard Musicianship: Fundamentals of Music and Keyboard Harmony Through Improvisation. Of the remaining institutions, there was no duplication of textbooks.

Questions 19 and 20 ask for the theory and class piano textbooks, respectively, which are currently in use at each institution. Due to the large number of responses, a complete listing of these textbooks has been placed in appendices E and F, rather than in the body of this chapter. The number preceding the listing of each textbook indicates the number of institutions at which the textbook is being used. All editions being used are listed as given in the returned questionnaire. Also included in this list are anthologies, as well as textbooks used for courses in sight singing and ear training, counterpoint, form and analysis, orchestration, twentieth-century music, and arranging, when this information was given.

Leading theory textbooks at the freshman level are as follows: (For the purposes of this chapter, whenever more than one edition is in use, the latest edition is listed. The number preceding each listing reflects the total number of all editions used.)


Undisputed leaders at the sophomore level of theory are the same authors as found at the freshman level:


Also at the sophomore level, Charles Burkhart's *Anthology for Musical Analysis* (9) had a rather high ranking.

Textbooks at the junior and senior levels become more diversified as course offerings expand to include twentieth-century music, counterpoint, form and analysis, orchestration, and arranging. At the junior level, no textbook comes to fore with the exception of Burkhart's *Anthology for Musical Analysis* (8) and Douglass M. Green's *Form in Tonal Music: An Introduction to Analysis* (6). At the senior level, as only a few textbooks were reported
for each course offering, none will be highlighted in this chapter.

In class piano textbooks, James Lyke's *Keyboard Musicianship: Group Piano for Adults* (Vol. 1) was the undisputed leading freshman textbook (18). Falling far behind that number are Elmer Heerema's *Progressive Class Piano* (8); James and Jane Bastien's *Beginning Piano for Adults* (6); and Elyse Mach's *Contemporary Class Piano* (5). At the sophomore level, James Lyke's *Keyboard Musicianship* (Vol. 2) again headed the list (15). At the junior and senior levels, class piano textbooks are evenly divided among the responding institutions; therefore, it is not necessary to list any one textbook here. A complete listing of all the class piano textbooks may be found in appendix F.

Varied responses were given to question 21, which asks which approach is used if no text is used for teaching elements of keyboard harmony. A summary of these responses is listed here in order of frequency: (a) Teacher-made exercises are assigned in conjunction with current topics in the theory class (13). (b) Exercises contained in the theory textbooks are assigned (4). (c) Keyboard harmony is incorporated into the class piano curriculum (4). (d) Exercises contained in the class piano textbooks are assigned (4). (e) A keyboard harmony manual developed by the theory faculty is employed (1). (f) Keyboard harmony
is incorporated into the total theory/class piano program (1).

Questions 22 and 23 ask for information concerning the instructor of a separate course in keyboard harmony. Question 22 asks for the department with which their instructor is associated, and question 23 asks for his own formal background in keyboard harmony. The data from these two questions have been displayed in table 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Formal Training</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>No course</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>One course</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>More than one course</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty percent of instructors of keyboard harmony are associated with the piano department and 72.7% have had more than one course in keyboard harmony. The second highest response came from instructors associated with both the piano and theory departments (35%). Other departments with which some instructors are associated (10%) are the organ department and the combination piano and music education departments. Those responding "Other" for the type of formal training of its keyboard harmony instructor indicated that experience was their teacher
(18.2%). Few respondents (13.6%) had one course in keyboard harmony and no instructor had not had any such course.

Question 24 asks respondents to check which elements students are required to demonstrate at the keyboard and to indicate whether these elements are taught in the theory class, piano class, or both classes. At some schools, in particular those not offering class piano, it was indicated that these elements were taught in private piano lessons and these responses have been included. The results of this question are displayed in table 17. A majority of schools (73%) teach at least some elements of keyboard harmony in both theory and piano classes. Only 9% of participating institutions teach elements in just theory classes, and only 19% teach these elements in just piano classes. Of the twenty-five elements listed on the table, four are required in over 60% of the theory classes: intervals (69.2%), major and minor triads in root position with correct doublings (65.4%), chord inversions (67.9%), and cadences (65.4%). On the other hand, eight of these items are required in over 60% of piano classes: scales in octave formation (64.1%), major and minor forms of scales (70.5%), transposition (69.2%), sightreading (74.4%), cadences (70.5%), harmonization of melodies with I IV V (73.1%), accompaniment of melodies with various accompanimental patterns (66.7%), and harmonization of melodies with all studied
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Class Piano</th>
<th>Private Piano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervals</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scales in tetrachord formation</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scales in octave formation</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scales (major &amp; minor forms)</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scales (chromatic, whole tone, pentatonic forms)</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposition</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightreading</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing by ear</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major &amp; minor triads in root position with correct doublings</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chord inversions</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadences</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonize melodies with I IV V</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompany melodies with various accompanimental patterns</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonize the scale</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonize melodies with all studied chords</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressions with secondary dominants</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulation</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-harmonic tones</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Class Piano</td>
<td>Private Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figured bass</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score-reading</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromatic Harmony</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th-century techniques</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice specific chord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progressions in all keys</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
chords (60.3%). Since information regarding the teaching of keyboard harmony in private piano lessons was not requested, the column "Private Piano" should be considered incomplete.

Also in table 17, close correlations exist between certain elements taught in both theory and piano classes. The closest correlations exist between the teaching of chromatic, whole tone, and pentatonic scales (44.9%/41%, respectively), and harmonization of the scale (28.2%/25.6%). The greatest discrepancy occurs in the area of sightreading (25.6%/74.4%).

Items listed under "Other" comprise only 2.6% of the theory responses and include the use of commercial chord nomenclature and verbal analysis while playing. "Other" items listed as taught in class piano (3.8%) include clef reading, and modal analysis with those scales in tetrachord formation. One institution did not specify a response to this item.

Question 25 asks whether teachers of theory courses also teach class piano. Table 18 shows that a large majority of theory teachers for each level of theory do not teach class piano. At the freshman level, 39.7% of theory teachers also teach class piano. This percentage diminishes each year until the senior year in which only 6.5% of theory teachers also teach class piano.
Question 26 indicates the consensus of music schools that keyboard harmony is a necessary part of the curriculum for the music major. For the B.M. and B.M.E. degree, a large number of music schools (88.9% and 89.9%, respectively) feel that keyboard harmony is necessary for the music major. Some institutions also included their consensus for A.B. and B.A. degree programs. For these degrees, all (100%) of the respondents endorsed keyboard harmony as a necessary part of the music curriculum.

Questions 27 and 28 furnish information regarding the adding or dropping of keyboard harmony courses in recent years and the reasons for doing so. In response to question 27, two schools have added such a course for these reasons: (1) The music department feels it is necessary for all keyboard majors. (2) A piano proficiency course for four semesters was found necessary. Four institutions recently dropped a keyboard harmony course from the curriculum for these reasons: (1) There were too
many skills to cover and not enough room in the curriculum. (2) Keyboard harmony was incorporated into class piano and pedagogy. (3) It was difficult to teach many students successfully. (4) Class piano for theater majors was incorporated into regular classes.

Question 29 asks the opinion of music schools with regard to courses in which keyboard harmony should be taught. Table 19 shows that 62.5% of all participating music schools feel that keyboard harmony should be taught in both theory and piano courses. Moreover, an additional 6.3% of schools feel that keyboard harmony should be taught not only in theory and piano courses, but as a separate course. Some schools feel that keyboard harmony should be taught in theory courses only (10%) or class piano courses (17.5%). Very few schools (2.5%) feel keyboard harmony should be eliminated from the curriculum. The percentage of music schools which feel keyboard harmony should be taught as a separate course (20%) may be compared with the actual percentage of schools offering this course (26.5%). (Refer to question 13.)

Question 30 asks whether the respondent feels that available textbooks are adequate for teaching keyboard harmony. Most respondents (77%) feel that they are indeed adequate, however, some (23%) disagree.

Question 31 asks if the respondent feels available textbooks are adequate for teaching keyboard harmony,
TABLE 19
OPINIONS OF WHERE KEYBOARD HARMONY SHOULD BE TAUGHT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where Keyboard Harmony Should Be Taught</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory courses</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class piano courses</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both theory and piano courses</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate course</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminated from the curriculum</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both theory and piano courses, and as a separate course</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory courses and as a separate course</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class piano courses and as a separate course</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which ones do they value. A complete listing of these textbooks may be found in appendix G. Heading this list are Arthur Frackenpohl’s *Harmonization at the Piano* (6), and James Lyke’s *Keyboard Musicianship: Group Piano for Adults*, Volumes 1 and 2 (5). This list includes numerous class piano and theory textbooks in addition to basic textbooks in keyboard harmony.

Question 32 asks whether respondents feel a keyboard harmony textbook is necessary for use in freshman-level theory classes. Though over three-fourths of the respondents (77%) feel it is not necessary, 13% feel it is necessary and an additional 9% feel it would be helpful. The remaining 1% of respondents were undecided.
CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Most musicians and music educators agreed that piano study is vital to the education of music majors and minors. Moreover, this piano study should be designed to teach more relevant skills, as opposed to the traditional methods which emphasized the playing of memorized pieces and technical drills. A strong foundation in keyboard harmony would best suit the needs of choral and instrumental directors, as well as general music teachers.

A review of the related literature revealed that not all music educators agreed upon the definition of "keyboard harmony." In many cases this term was used synonymously with functional skills, and in other cases "keyboard harmony" referred to an isolated skill apart from transposition, playing by ear, sightreading, improvisation, and score-reading, for examples. For the purposes of this study, the term "keyboard harmony" was chosen to encompass a wide range of skills including transposition, harmonization, improvisation, playing by ear, the playing of cadences, modulation, figured bass realization, score-reading, and the playing of rudimentary elements of theory at the keyboard, such as intervals and
various scale forms.

The purpose of this study was to determine the status of keyboard harmony in selected colleges and universities in the Southern United States. In order to obtain the necessary data, questionnaires were mailed to the NASM-approved four-year institutions in the eleven states of the Southern Division of MENC. This division consisted of the following states: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. Of the 124 institutions which met the imposed delimitations, 89 responses were received, of which 83 responses (70%) were usable ones.

The related literature revealed that in recent years class piano has become the favored medium of teaching elements of keyboard harmony. Since many educators indicated that keyboard harmony was also taught in the theory classroom, and as a separate course, the questionnaire was designed to provide insights into the teaching of keyboard harmony in all three areas—the piano class, the theory class, and the keyboard harmony course.

In the area of class piano, a large majority of the schools required class piano for all non-piano majors. A few of these schools indicated that class piano is exempt for students already proficient in required keyboard skills. Most music majors were required to take class piano simultaneously with freshman and/or sophomore theory.
The time at which students enroll in class piano was optional at only a few schools. For both the B.M. and B.M.E. degrees, most students were required to take four semesters or six quarters of class piano.

Most institutions required a proficiency examination upon completion of class piano requirements. Most schools permitted a student to take a proficiency examination to remove any or all of the class piano requirements. Items which were included on this examination are listed here in order from highest to lowest: sightreading; harmonization; scales; the playing of memorized pieces; transposition; accompaniment; cadences; improvisation; the playing of non-memorized pieces; score-reading; and broken chords and arpeggios. Other items listed but reported by only a few schools included playing by ear; triads and inversions; chord progressions and modulations; the reading of rhythmically complex melodic lines; form analysis; reading in F and C clefs; and the transposition of an orchestral or band part.

In three-fourths of the schools, the piano department administered the piano proficiency examination. In a few cases, the music education department administered this examination, and in isolated cases, combined faculties from various departments were employed.

Keyboard harmony was taught as a separate course in approximately one-fourth of the schools. The majority
of schools which offered such a course had a relatively small college enrollment, from 501-5,000 students. Most institutions offered this course at the freshman (50%) and sophomore (73%) levels. Most schools on the semester system offered keyboard harmony for four semesters, whereas schools on the quarter system offered it for either one quarter or six quarters. Two-thirds of the schools offered a keyboard harmony course for one credit hour. The second largest number of schools offered this course for two credit hours.

Keyboard harmony was required for all music majors at 64% of the institutions at which it was offered. A few schools required this course for only keyboard majors.

A large number and variety of keyboard harmony, theory, and class piano textbooks were reported in use at the responding institutions. The keyboard harmony textbooks used at the largest number of schools were Frackenpohl's *Harmonization at the Piano* and Shumway's *Harmony and Eartraining at the Keyboard*. The leading theory textbooks at the freshman and sophomore levels were Benward's *Music in Theory and Practice* and Ottman's *Elementary Harmony* and *Advanced Harmony*. Due to the variety of course offerings at the junior and senior levels, a diversity of theory textbooks was reported in use at these levels. Lyke's *Keyboard Musicianship*, volumes 1 and 2, headed the list of class piano textbooks.
A variety of approaches were reported by schools which used no textbook for teaching elements of keyboard harmony. A summary of these responses is listed here: (a) Teacher-made exercises were assigned. (b) Exercises contained in theory or class piano textbooks were assigned. (c) Keyboard harmony was incorporated into the piano and/or theory class. (d) A keyboard harmony manual developed by the theory faculty was employed.

Almost three-fourths of schools taught at least some elements of keyboard harmony in both theory and piano classes. Of the 25 selected elements of keyboard harmony, four are required in over 60% of the theory classes: intervals, major and minor triads in root position with correct doublings, chord inversions, and cadences. In addition, eight of these items are required in over 60% of piano classes: scales in octave formation, major and minor scales, transposition, sightreading, cadences, harmonization of melodies with I IV V, accompaniments, and harmonization of melodies with all studied chords.

Close correlations were found to exist between certain elements taught in both theory and piano classes. The closest correlations existed between the teaching of chromatic, whole tone, and pentatonic scales; harmonization of the scale; intervals; chord inversions; and cadences. The greatest discrepancy occurred in the area of sight-reading, in which more emphasis was placed upon this skill
in the piano class.

A large majority of theory teachers for each level of theory did not teach class piano. The percentage of theory teachers who also taught class piano was higher at the freshman level and diminished each year until the senior year.

Most institutions felt that keyboard harmony is necessary for the music major. Only six schools have added or dropped a keyboard harmony course in recent years. The two schools which have added such a course did so for these reasons: (1) It was found to be necessary for all keyboard majors. (2) A piano proficiency course for four semesters was found necessary. Four schools dropped such a course for these reasons: (1) There were too many skills to cover and not enough room in the curriculum. (2) It was incorporated into other classes, such as class piano and pedagogy. (3) It was difficult to teach many students successfully.

Most institutions felt that keyboard harmony should be taught in both theory and piano courses. The percentage of schools which felt keyboard harmony should be taught as a separate course (20%) was compared with the actual percentage of schools offering this course (27%).

Most respondents also agreed that available text­books were adequate for teaching keyboard harmony. Cited in the list of textbooks valued for teaching such a course were numerous class piano and theory textbooks as well as
basic textbooks in keyboard harmony. Frackenpohl's *Harmonization at the Piano* and Lyke's *Keyboard Musicianship* textbooks headed this list. Though over three-fourths of schools felt that a keyboard harmony textbook was not necessary for use in freshman-level theory classes, many indicated that it would be helpful.

**Conclusions**

The findings of this investigation support the following conclusions:

1. The related literature and the data from the questionnaire indicate an increasing awareness of music educators of the benefits and problems of teaching keyboard harmony skills at the college level.

2. Music educators are in disagreement as to the precise definition of the term "keyboard harmony." Some educators confine this definition to harmonization, while others expand this definition to include other functional skills such as improvisation, transposition, score-reading, playing by ear, and sightreading, as well as demonstration of rudimentary elements of theory at the keyboard.

3. The large number of keyboard harmony skills which students are required to demonstrate in both theory and piano classes supports the importance music educators place upon the learning of these skills in the college music curriculum.

4. Class piano was required for all music majors
in 77.6% of responding schools. An additional 11.8% of schools required class piano for some music majors, of which some students could be exempted by means of a proficiency examination. From the resultant high percentage (89.4%), and from a review of previous studies, it appears that the trend to teach piano in the classroom situation has somewhat stabilized in recent years, and that the effectiveness of teaching keyboard skills in the classroom has become generally accepted by music educators.

5. A proficiency examination was required upon completion of class piano requirements in 82.1% of schools, and most institutions permitted a student to take this examination to remove any or all class piano requirements. This would indicate that most schools expect students not only to enroll in class piano, but to achieve a certain level of mastery of various keyboard skills.

6. Items considered of greatest importance on the piano proficiency examination by over three-fourths of schools offering class piano were sightreading; harmonization; scales; transposition; accompaniment; and cadences. Playing by ear; triads and inversions; and chord progressions and modulations were considered of least importance. It may be concluded that the simpler aspects of keyboard harmony were preferred to the more advanced pianist techniques such as chord progressions and modulations which are more difficult for students.
to perform.

7. The fact that only approximately two-fifths of schools required improvisation on the piano proficiency examination indicates the relatively small degree of importance music educators placed on the learning of this skill. Though many music educators in recent years have encouraged the teaching of this skill, its position in the class piano curriculum remains relatively unchanged. This may be attributed in part to the lack of teacher training in this skill area.

8. In three-fourths of responding institutions, the piano department was responsible for administering the piano proficiency examination. This seems possibly to indicate a lack of coordination between theory and piano departments, thus the greater emphasis on functional skills in the piano class.

9. Most theory teachers did not also teach class piano, which again indicates that possibly there was less coordination than desirable between the teaching of keyboard harmony in both theory and piano classes.

10. The demonstration at the keyboard of intervals, major and minor triads in root position with correct doublings, chord inversions, and cadences were required in over 60% of the theory classes. On the other hand, students were required to demonstrate various scale forms, transposition, sightreading, cadences, harmonization of melodies, and accompaniment of melodies in over 60% of
piano classes. It may be concluded that the more theoretical aspects of keyboard harmony are indeed confined for the most part to the theory class, whereas functional and technical skills are limited to the piano class.

11. A separate keyboard harmony course was offered at 26.5% of responding schools. This would indicate that the majority of music majors acquired keyboard harmony skills in either the theory or piano class.

12. The fact that the largest percentage of schools offering such a course have a relatively small enrollment indicates that keyboard harmony is perhaps more effectively taught in smaller colleges where class enrollment is also smaller and where more individual attention is possible.

13. The majority of schools which offered a separate keyboard harmony course, offered this course, as well as class piano, at the freshman and sophomore levels. This seems to indicate that music educators rely on the acquisition of keyboard skills in the piano class to support those learned in the keyboard harmony course.

14. Few schools have added or dropped a keyboard harmony course in recent years. This supports the fact that music educators are for the most part in agreement with the current status of keyboard harmony, that is, its preferred inclusion in both theory and piano courses.

15. Many schools recommended both class piano, theory, and keyboard harmony textbooks for teaching
elements of keyboard harmony. This seems to indicate that there is some disagreement among music educators as to where keyboard harmony should be taught—the piano class, theory class, and/or in a separate keyboard harmony course.

16. For those schools which reported using no text for teaching elements of keyboard harmony, the majority indicated the use of teacher-made exercises, or exercises contained in theory or class piano textbooks. It is apparent that these exercises were designed to correlate with subjects taught in the piano or theory class.

17. Most instructors of keyboard harmony courses have had more than one course in keyboard harmony. This would possibly indicate that more schools might offer such a course if there were more adequately trained teachers.

**Recommendations**

On the basis of the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Such an investigation should be made periodically within the same population sample in order to obtain current data relative to the status of keyboard harmony programs.

2. Attempts should be made to standardize a definition of the term "keyboard harmony," since many erroneous decisions by music educators and administrators appear to have been made in the past due to a misunderstanding of this term.

3. It is recommended that the interview method and classroom visitation be employed in order to evaluate further the effectiveness of teaching keyboard harmony in separate courses, theory courses, and piano courses.

4. Further study should be given to the degree of
coordination between music theory and class piano faculties in their attempts to correlate the teaching of keyboard harmony.

5. The examining committee for piano proficiency examinations should be comprised of both theory and piano faculty members in order to promote greater coordination and uniformity of instruction between the two subjects.

6. More training should be given to class piano instructors in order that they might be able to incorporate all aspects of music theory, as well as functional skills, in the piano class.

7. Based on a review of numerous studies, improvisation should be given a more prominent role in the piano class. More teacher training in this area is also needed if teachers are to feel adequately prepared to teach this skill area.

8. A keyboard harmony course should be offered at all institutions at the freshman and sophomore levels and be required for all music majors. The class should be taken at the same time as freshman and sophomore theory in order to correlate the areas of theory and piano. In order to achieve the desired results, class size should be limited, and students should be placed in sections according to levels of advancement.

9. More graded materials and textbooks should be written which would offer a music theory approach to piano instruction and encompass all aspects of keyboard harmony.
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QUESTIONNAIRE

Institution Name______________________________________________

Address____________________________________________________________________

Name of Person Completing Questionnaire______________________________

Position/Rank___________________________________________________________

Titles of Courses Taught__________________________________________________

1. Indicate the total enrollment of your institution.

   0-500
   _____ 501-1,000
   _____ 1,001-5,000
   _____ 5,001-10,000
   _____ 10,001-15,000
   _____ 15,001-20,000
   _____ 20,001-25,000
   _____ over 25,000

2. Indicate the total number of students seeking B.M. and B.M.E. degrees at your institution. _________________

3. List the number of music faculty employed at your institution.

   Full-Time_______ Part-Time_______

4. Indicate the number of undergraduate students enrolled in theory classes at your institution in the fall of 1981.

   Freshman_______ Sophomore_______ Junior_______ Senior_______

5. Indicate the number of undergraduate students enrolled in piano classes at your institution in the fall of 1981.

   Freshman_______ Sophomore_______ Junior_______ Senior_______
6. With the exception of keyboard majors, is class piano required for all music majors (B.M., B.M.E.)?

______ yes
______ no

7. Is it required that class piano be taken at the same time as

______ freshman theory
______ sophomore theory
______ junior theory
______ senior theory
______ optional

8. How many semesters/quarters of class piano are required?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B.M.</th>
<th>Semesters</th>
<th>Quarters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B.M.E.</th>
<th>Vocal</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Is a proficiency exam required upon completion of class piano requirements?

______ yes
______ no

10. May a student take the proficiency exam to remove any or all of the class piano requirements?

______ yes
______ no

11. Please check any or all of the following items which are included on the piano proficiency exam.

______ scales
______ cadences
______ performance of memorized pieces
______ sightreading
______ harmonization
______ improvisation
______ transposition
______ accompaniment
______ other (please specify): __________________________
12. Which departmental division is responsible for administering this exam?

_____ piano
_____ music education
_____ applied music (non-keyboard)
_____ other

13. Is keyboard harmony taught as a separate course at your institution?

_____ yes
_____ no

14. At which year of study is keyboard harmony generally offered as a separate course?

_____ freshman
_____ sophomore
_____ junior
_____ senior
_____ graduate

15. How many semesters/quarters is this course offered?

_____ semesters
_____ quarters

16. How much credit is offered for each semester/quarter of this course? _____ credit hours

17. Check if this course is required for

_____ all music majors (B.M., B.M.E.)
_____ only theory and/or composition majors
_____ only keyboard majors
_____ not required
_____ other

18. If keyboard harmony is taught as a separate course, please give name, author, edition, publisher, and date of publication of the text(s) currently used.

Name ________________________________________________________
Author _______________________________________________________
Edition _______________________________________________________
Publisher ______________________________________________________
Date of Publication _____________________________________________
18. (Continued)

Name_____________________________________________
Author ____________________________________________
Edition ___________________________________________
Publisher ________________________________________
Date of Publication _____________________________

Name_____________________________________________
Author ____________________________________________
Edition ___________________________________________
Publisher ________________________________________
Date of Publication _____________________________

19. What theory texts are currently in use at your institution?

Freshman:
Name_____________________________________________
Author ____________________________________________
Edition ___________________________________________
Publisher ________________________________________
Date of Publication _____________________________

Sophomore:
Name_____________________________________________
Author ____________________________________________
Edition ___________________________________________
Publisher ________________________________________
Date of Publication _____________________________

Junior:
Name_____________________________________________
Author ____________________________________________
Edition ___________________________________________
Publisher ________________________________________
Date of Publication _____________________________

Senior:
Name_____________________________________________
Author ____________________________________________
Edition ___________________________________________
Publisher ________________________________________
Date of Publication _____________________________

20. What class piano texts are currently in use at your institution?

Freshman (First Year):
Name_____________________________________________
Author ____________________________________________
Edition ___________________________________________
Publisher ________________________________________
Date of Publication _____________________________
20. (Continued)

Sophomore:
Name ____________________________________________
Author ____________________________________________
Edition ____________________________________________
Publisher __________________________________________
Date of Publication ________________________________

Junior:
Name ____________________________________________
Author ____________________________________________
Edition ____________________________________________
Publisher __________________________________________
Date of Publication ________________________________

Senior:
Name ____________________________________________
Author ____________________________________________
Edition ____________________________________________
Publisher __________________________________________
Date of Publication ________________________________

21. If no text is used for teaching elements of keyboard harmony, what approach is used? _______________________

22. If keyboard harmony is taught as a separate course, check the department with which the instructor of this course is associated.

_____ theory
_____ piano
_____ both
_____ other (please specify): _______________________

23. Check the type of formal training which the instructor of keyboard harmony has had.

_____ no course in keyboard harmony
_____ one course in keyboard harmony
_____ more than one course in keyboard harmony
_____ other (please specify): _______________________

24. Check which of the following elements the students are required to demonstrate at the keyboard. Please indicate whether taught in the theory class, piano class, or both. For the year in which each element is taught, please use the following scale:

- Freshman = 1
- Sophomore = 2
- Junior = 3
- Senior = 4
- Graduate = 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Piano</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intervals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scales in tetrachord formation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scales in octave formation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scales (major &amp; minor forms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scales (chromatic, whole tone, pentatonic forms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sightreading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playing by ear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major &amp; minor triads in root position with correct doublings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chord inversions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harmonize melodies with I IV V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accompany melodies with various accompanimental patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harmonize the scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harmonize melodies with all studied chords</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progressions with secondary dominants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-harmonic tones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>figured bass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>score-reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chromatic harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th-century techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice specific chord progressions in all keys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Do the teachers of theory courses also teach class piano?

- Freshman Theory: yes_______ no_______
- Sophomore Theory: yes_______ no_______
- Junior Theory: yes_______ no_______
- Senior Theory: yes_______ no_______

26. Is it the consensus of your music school that keyboard harmony is a necessary part of the curriculum for the music major (B.M., B.M.E.)?

- B.M.: yes_______ no_______
- B.M.E.: yes_______ no_______

27. Has your school recently added a keyboard harmony course to the curriculum?

- yes_______ date_______ no_______

Explain: _______________________________________________

28. Has your school recently dropped a keyboard harmony course from the curriculum?

- yes_______ date_______ no_______

Explain: _______________________________________________

29. Is it the opinion of your music school that keyboard harmony should be

- taught in the theory courses
- taught in the class piano courses
- taught in both theory and piano courses
- taught as a separate course
- eliminated from the curriculum

30. Do you feel that available textbooks are adequate for teaching keyboard harmony? yes_______ no_______
31. If yes, which text(s) do you consider most valuable?

Name _________________________________
Author ________________________________
Edition ________________________________
Publisher ______________________________
Date of Publication ______________________

Name _________________________________
Author ________________________________
Edition ________________________________
Publisher ______________________________
Date of Publication ______________________

32. Do you feel that a keyboard harmony text is necessary for use in the freshman-level theory classes?

_______yes
_______no

33. Should you wish a copy of the summary of this report, please check below.

_______yes
_______no

34. Comments:
APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER AND FOLLOW-UP LETTER
January 5, 1982

Dona (Sanders) Lusted
1100 South Foster #81
Baton Rouge, LA 70806

Dear Sir:

I am currently a graduate student at Louisiana State University, pursuing a Ph.D. in Piano Pedagogy. I have selected as my dissertation topic "The Status of Keyboard Harmony in NASM-Approved Colleges in the Southern United States." The results of questionnaires sent to those specified colleges will be used to determine the status of keyboard harmony.

Keyboard harmony is taught either as a separate course, as a part of music theory and/or class piano, or is not included as a required ingredient in the music theory program. Much controversy exists today among music educators as to the precise role of keyboard harmony in the music curriculum. For this reason, I feel that the results of this study should prove beneficial to music educators, as it could provide a basis upon which to make revisions of existing programs.

Therefore, I am requesting that you complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope no later than February 15. As some questions are directly related to either class piano or theory courses, perhaps those items can best be answered by an instructor in one of those areas. In addition, if the publisher and date of publication of certain textbooks are not readily known, please feel free to omit that information, if it would delay the questionnaire being returned by the requested date.

Your prompt assistance in this matter will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dona (Sanders) Lusted

Enclosure
July 1, 1982

Dona (Sanders) Lusted
1100 South Foster #81
Baton Rouge, LA 70806

Dear Sir:

This letter is in reference to a questionnaire which was mailed to your institution on January 5 of this year. As of yet, the questionnaire has not been returned. As it is most important to the completion of my dissertation at Louisiana State University, another copy of the questionnaire is enclosed with a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience in replying.

As stated previously, the topic of my dissertation is "The Status of Keyboard Harmony in NASM-Approved Colleges in the Southern United States." As keyboard harmony at the college level is a much debated topic today, I feel that the results of such a study should prove beneficial to music educators, as it could provide a basis upon which to make revisions of existing programs.

Kindly complete the enclosed questionnaire at your earliest convenience and return it to me no later than July 31.

Your prompt assistance in this matter will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dona (Sanders) Lusted

dsl
Enclosure
APPENDIX C

LIST OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS
1. Alabama State University, Montgomery, Alabama
2. Anderson College, Anderson, South Carolina
3. Asbury College, Wilmore, Kentucky
4. Atlantic Christian College, Wilson, North Carolina
5. Augusta College, Augusta, Georgia
6. Baptist College at Charleston, Charleston, South Carolina
7. Berry College, Mount Berry, Georgia
8. Belmont College, Nashville, Tennessee
9. Brevard College, Brevard, North Carolina
11. Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport, Louisiana
12. Columbia College, Columbia, South Carolina
13. Converse College, Spartanburg, South Carolina
14. Cumberland College, Williamsburg, Kentucky
15. East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina
16. East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee
17. Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida
18. Georgia College, Milledgeville, Georgia
19. Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia
20. Georgia Southern College, Statesboro, Georgia
21. Grambling State University, Grambling, Louisiana
22. Greensboro College, Greensboro, North Carolina
23. Jacksonville University, Jacksonville, Florida
24. James Madison University, Harrisonburg, Virginia
25. Judson College, Marion, Alabama
26. Kentucky State University, Frankfort, Kentucky
27. Limestone College, Gaffney, South Carolina
28. Louisiana College, Pineville, Louisiana
29. Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana
30. Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, Louisiana
31. Loyola University, New Orleans, Louisiana
32. McNeese State University, Lake Charles, Louisiana
33. Mary Washington College, Fredericksburg, Virginia
34. Maryville College, Maryville, Tennessee
35. Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee
36. Mercer University, Macon, Georgia
37. Meredith College, Raleigh, North Carolina
38. Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee
39. Mississippi College, Clinton, Mississippi
40. Morehead State University, Morehead, Kentucky
41. Newberry College, Newberry, South Carolina
42. Norfolk State University, Norfolk, Virginia
43. Northeastern State University of Louisiana, Natchitoches, Louisiana
44. Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia
45. Pembroke State University, Pembroke, North Carolina
46. Pfeiffer College, Misenheimer, North Carolina
47. Queens College, Charlotte, North Carolina
48. Radford University, Radford, Virginia
49. Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida
50. Samford University, Birmingham, Alabama
51. Shenandoah College, Winchester, Virginia
52. Shorter College, Rome, Georgia
53. Southeastern Louisiana University, Hammond, Louisiana
54. Southern Missionary College, Collegedale, Tennessee
55. Southwestern at Memphis, Memphis, Tennessee
56. Tennessee State University, Nashville, Tennessee
57. Trevecca Nazarene College, Nashville, Tennessee
58. Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana
59. Union University, Jackson, Tennessee
60. University of Alabama, University, Alabama
61. University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida
62. University of Georgia, The, Athens, Georgia
63. University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky
64. University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky
65. University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi
66. University of Montevallo, Montevallo, Alabama
67. University of New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana
68. University of North Carolina, Greensboro, North Carolina
69. University of South Alabama, Mobile, Alabama
70. University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina
71. University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, Mississippi
72. University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, Louisiana
73. University of Tampa, Tampa, Florida
74. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee
75. University of Tennessee at Martin, Martin, Tennessee
76. Virginia State University, Petersburg, Virginia
77. West Georgia College, Carrollton, Georgia
78. West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia

79. West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, West Virginia

80. William Carey College, Hattiesburg, Mississippi

81. Wingate College, Wingate, North Carolina

82. Winston Salem State University, Winston Salem, North Carolina

83. Xavier University of Louisiana, New Orleans, Louisiana
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KEYBOARD HARMONY TEXTBOOKS


APPENDIX E

THEORY TEXTBOOKS
FRESHMAN THEORY TEXTBOOKS

Theory Textbooks


1--Spencer, Peter. The Practice of Harmony. 2d ed. n.p., n.d.

Sight Singing and Ear Training Textbooks


Anthologies


Miscellaneous Textbooks


**SOPHOMORE THEORY TEXTBOOKS**

**Theory Textbooks**


124


Sight Singing and Ear Training Textbooks


Anthologies

2—Benjamin, Thomas; Horvit, Michael; and Nelson, Robert. *Music for Analysis: Examples from the Common Practice Period and the Twentieth Century*.


Counterpoint Textbooks


Form and Analysis Textbooks


Miscellaneous Textbooks


JUNIOR THEORY TEXTBOOKS

Theory Textbooks


Twentieth-Century Music Textbooks


Anthologies


Counterpoint Textbooks


Form and Analysis Textbooks


Orchestration Textbooks


Miscellaneous Textbooks

SENIOR THEORY TEXTBOOKS

Theory Textbooks


Anthologies


Counterpoint Textbooks


1--Vogel, Roger. "Introduction to Counterpoint." Reproduced by UGA bookstore, n.d.


Form and Analysis Textbooks


**Orchestration Textbooks**


**Twentieth-Century Music Textbooks**


**Arranging Textbooks**
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CLASS PIANO TEXTBOOKS
FRESHMAN TEXTBOOKS


**SOPHOMORE TEXTBOOKS**


**JUNIOR TEXTBOOKS**


SENIOR TEXTBOOKS


APPENDIX G

TEXTBOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR TEACHING

KEYBOARD HARMONY


VITA

The author was born on October 2, 1951, in Washington D.C., and attended public schools in Stuttgart, Germany; Atlanta, Georgia; and Jacksonville, Alabama. Upon graduation from high school, she completed one year's study at the Evangelische Landeskirchenmusikschule in Dusseldorf, Germany, where she completed the C-Examen for church musicians in 1969. She attended Jacksonville State University in Alabama where she received the B.M. degree in music education and German in 1973. During her undergraduate program she was entered in Who's Who Among American Colleges and Universities. In 1975 she received the M.M. degree in piano from Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge. She was instructor of piano, organ, and music theory at Northeastern Oklahoma State University in Tahlequah from 1975 to 1976. Since 1977, she has maintained a private piano studio and served as organist of Broadmoor United Methodist Church in Baton Rouge.
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