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ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

A Comparative Study of Two Generation of Female Piano Teachers and Their Independent Piano Studios
by
Katie C. Kinnaman
Master of Arts in Music
San Diego State University, 2010

The purpose of this thesis is twofold: first, to compare the generational similarities and differences of female piano teachers; and second, to discover if and how a former generation of teachers has adapted their studio practices to the twenty-first century. This study is specific to female piano teachers who (a) taught piano lessons between January 1, 1970, and December 31, 1979, and were between eighteen and forty years of age during the decade, or (b) taught piano lessons between January 1, 2000, and December 31, 2009, and were between eighteen and forty years of age during the decade. The study includes, but is not limited to, the following: demographics of teachers and their students; business procedures used in the private studio; choice of musical materials and teaching aids; and technological changes within the piano studio.

Comparisons were made in thirteen areas. Significant similarities were in the areas of student demographics and repertoire. The average student of both generations was female and between eight and ten years of age. Teachers from both generations incorporated a through mixture of repertoire from all musical periods and did not intentionally incorporate music by women composers. Although there were similarities between the generations, there were significant differences in education, professional involvement, teaching methods, and lessons and rates. When the two generations were compared, the younger generation possessed half as many bachelor’s degrees in piano as the older generation did in the 1970s. During their respective decades, the older generation taught six to ten students weekly, while the average teacher of the younger generation taught one to five students weekly. The older generation charged $2.00 more for private thirty-minute lessons than the younger generation, but the younger generation charged about $2.50 more for forty-five-minute lessons and about $4.00 more for hour lessons. Approximately one-fifth of the older generation adapted to the twenty-first century through the use of websites. The older generation’s use of computer programs, keyboards, and MIDI disks exhibited elements of modernization. Each generation favored a different published teaching method. Because the younger generation had not yet incorporated transposition, composition, and creative exercises into their lessons, the older generation reflected a more comprehensive approach to teaching. A majority of the older teachers indicated they were not the sole provider for themselves or their families. Approximately 47% of the younger teachers were not the sole financial providers for themselves or their families. When both generations were between eighteen and forty years of age, twice as many teachers of the older generation had the responsibility of children who lived with them.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The decade of the 1970s was a time of change. For the most part, a women’s life revolved around her home and family. According to music journals, the young female piano teacher during this time was more likely to marry, have children, and teach from her home.\(^1\) History shows that the social status of women was changing, allowing more women to attend school and to participate in musical opportunities in their communities.\(^2\) Additionally, more women found openings in colleges and universities to teach piano, although many experienced resistance from male peers.\(^3\) These were signs of the times, and women were determined to do what they loved and to be successful.

Further complicating independent piano teaching in the 1970s was the competition between college-educated piano teachers and those teachers without degrees, who began teaching immediately after high school and who had established many neighborhood studios. Due to this competition, college-educated teachers introduced discussions about national certification for piano teachers.\(^4\) Several articles in the major publications of the 1970s addressed music teacher associations’ concerns about teachers “unqualified to teach.”\(^5\) In response to the “neighborhood piano teacher,”\(^6\) some communities proposed apprenticeship


\(^6\) Ibid., 32.
opportunities and hosted local monthly meetings to offer help to local piano teachers seeking self-improvement.\(^7\)

A few additional factors that affected this earlier generation of piano teachers and their studios included a desire by many piano teachers for better training to impart a better musical education for the next generation.\(^8\) Also, there was the burden of taxes and local zoning laws on home businesses.\(^9\) Music journals from this time provided teacher highlights, which featured female piano teachers including Alexander,\(^10\) Baker,\(^11\) and Raucher,\(^12\) who maintained private piano studios in a basement or other large rooms attached to their homes.

Group lessons started becoming popular, too, due in part to method book authors who believed them to be beneficial.\(^13\) Electronic keyboard development contributed to the effectiveness of group lessons because a keyboard lab provided a more controlled environment through the use of headphones which also aided in the ability of students to “practice pieces and drills without disturbing others, both during class or when they arrive early for the lesson.”\(^14\) Furthermore, electronic keyboards allowed students to participate in ensembles using instrument settings.\(^15\) Music journals during this decade included several advertisements for electronic music labs manufactured by Wurlitzer and Baldwin. The potential for increased income by having multiple students in one session was another significant reason why group lessons grew in popularity.\(^16\)

---


\(^8\) Simmons, “Private Music Teaching,” 19, 38.


\(^14\) Ibid., 286.

\(^15\) Ibid.

The factors, as noted above, that influenced the changes in the way women taught piano in the 1970s provide a framework for understanding piano studio practices in the twenty-first century. According to a study in 1989, the typical college piano pedagogy instructor was a female between the ages of 46 and 55. A study of 2008 identified that the typical independent piano teacher was female and over the age of 55. Opportunities for higher education have increased and according to a recent report, “[w]omen today receive 62 percent of college associate’s degrees, 57 percent of bachelor’s degrees, 60 percent of all master’s degrees, half of all professional degrees, and just under half of all Ph.D.s.”

Teachers in the first decade of the new century are also especially aware of the issues concerning professional teacher certification as a means of providing state- and national-mandated educational teaching standards. With one-third of the nation’s businesses owned by women and almost half of all businesses in the United States home based, the need for balanced competition among area piano teachers is obvious.

The increasing opportunities for women have produced more piano students with busy, working mothers. With the increase in after school activities for children comes a growing need for the private piano teacher to develop clear and strict policy statements and contracts to ensure a stable income. On one hand, the children of the 1970s were finding

20 Jacobson, Professional Piano Teaching, 3.
22 Ibid.
time for piano lessons and practice as well as sports, Boys or Girls Scouts, fewer TV channels, and possibly the study of another instrument. In this decade, children have the option of choosing to play computer-games, to watch DVDs, to surf the Internet, to play any number of sports, to be a member of a club, to study another instrument, or to practice piano.  

The competition for the piano student’s time during the week is overwhelming, so many teachers today believe that group lessons are an excellent way to compete with non-music related activities. Group learning converts music lessons “from a solo sport into a fun, social, and enriching learning activity.”

Private instructors of this decade are also finding enjoyment and additional income in teaching the baby boomer generation, as “10,000 boomers turn 50 years old every day, and 8,000 of them turn 60,” many of whom have had a life-long desire to play the piano. A piano teacher today may earn supplementary income as a church musician, piano technician, performer, or accompanist.

Technology is another factor in the changing dynamics of piano instruction. In 2000, the Music Teachers’ National Association (MTNA) was focused on helping teachers to overcome their fears by teaching them about the tools becoming available to them; however, teachers are still hesitant to use new technologies in their studios. High-quality home video equipment allows teachers to videotape themselves teaching and to share their methods with other teachers. Computer theory and listening programs permit students to practice theory.

---


26 Ibid.


drills, rhythm exercises and even solfege at home between lessons. The Internet provides access to music and teaching journals, while email and discussion groups give teachers from around the world the opportunity to discuss their teaching-related experiences.30

Electronic synthesizers encourage keyboard ensembles with enhanced sounds, and CD-ROMs allow for an intensive study of musical performances, history, graphics, and an explorative learning process.31 Furthermore, teachers are just becoming acquainted with MIDI (Musical Instrument Digital Interface) and MP3 through websites of music technology businesses, product developers, and professional musicians that explain how to use new technology for teaching purposes.32

Today’s method books incorporate eclectic reading approaches and more opportunities for improvisation.33 Several method books of the most recent decade also include CD and MIDI accompaniments.34 Since the 1970s, the number of method books has grown, providing more creative options for teaching and learning piano. Teaching materials have become, literally, more colorful, as black-and-white is becoming a thing of the past.35

Lastly to be a piano teacher, one must have the knowledge and ability to play the piano. To be a good piano teacher, however, requires much more than a performance skill alone. The ultimate goal of the successful piano teacher should be to “inspire and nurture a student’s musical growth and instill a lifelong love of music.”36

30 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
35 Connie Arrau Sturm et al., “Celebrating 100 Years.”


**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this thesis is twofold: first, to compare generational similarities and differences of female piano teachers; and second, to discover if and how a former generation of teachers has adapted their studio practices to the twenty-first century. It is specific to female piano teachers who (a) taught piano lessons between the time period of January 1, 1970, and December 31, 1979, and were between eighteen and forty years of age during that decade, or (b) taught piano lessons between the time period of January 1, 2000, and December 31, 2009, and were between eighteen and forty years of age during that decade. The study includes, but is not limited to, the following: demographics of teachers and their students; business procedures used in the private studio; choice of musical materials and teaching aids; and technological changes within the piano studio.

**LIMITATIONS**

This comparative study focuses on female teachers between the ages of eighteen and forty and their piano studios during the specified decades: 1970 to 1979 and 2000 to 2009. It is not limited to teachers who are or are not members of music clubs or associations, as it has been advertised through venues that encouraged all types of piano teachers from around the country that had access to the survey.

**METHODOLOGY**

Statistics and data concerning the independent studio used in this study are gained from bibliographic sources. Questionnaires were developed using bibliographic resources to ensure that they were not offensive or harmful to the human subjects involved in the study. The author received a certificate of completion from the university’s training in ethical and regulatory issues associated with the protection of human subjects in research (see Appendix A). The human subjects were volunteers from anywhere in the United States who heard about this study through their local school system or local music store, were identified through the use of the yellow pages in the local directory, or saw the survey advertised on various piano teacher websites or on the social networking website, Facebook.com.

Three questionnaires were developed through an online survey and data collection system called SurveyMonkey. The front page of the survey included details about the study and its purpose, and was designed to direct respondents to the appropriate survey determined
by the respective age and decade. Invitations to take part in the online survey, including details about the study, its purpose, and respondent’s eligibility were emailed directly to respondents or posted on the above websites. There was a link in the email and on the websites that took participants directly to the survey where they were able to safely and securely complete and submit the questionnaire (see Appendices B, C, and D). The information from the questionnaires was tabulated using SurveyMonkey. The privacy of all human subjects was of primary concern in the presentation of this thesis. Participants were told that they would receive results from the study within three to six months of the completion of the thesis.

**DEFINITIONS**

The following paragraphs contain definitions for significant terms used in this study. Higher education includes any post high school work including undergraduate and graduate programs as well as professional schools. A piano method book is a systematic approach to teaching and learning how to play the piano that presents ideas (usually in accordance with the teacher’s music philosophy) in an orderly, progressive manner. Piano method books offer music concepts and pianistic skills through the presentation of technique, theory, improvisatory, creative, and aural skills and have repertoire that reinforce the newly learned concepts. A piano pedagogue is someone who is a piano teacher or educator, and piano pedagogy is the art or science of teaching piano.

The independent studio is usually managed by one piano teacher, and is either an in-home office or a rented space where the teacher may offer private or group piano lessons. The studio must include a piano and may or may not include other materials: a teacher’s seat; if possible, a second piano; a collection of educational books including musical scores and method books; a typewriter or computer; a metronome; a desk and chair away from the piano for theory work; a separate area for waiting parents or students working on theory homework or taking examinations; a phone; and any other materials that the teacher requires such as a chalkboard or whiteboard, a compact disc player, and flashcards.\(^37\) The studio might also include one or more keyboards and any other equipment that the teacher chooses to use for

learning purposes. The private studio is generally covered by liability insurance or renters insurance, and must meet safety codes. The definition of the independent studio varies from teacher to teacher, as this study shows.

**Organization**

This thesis is organized in four chapters. Chapter one includes an introduction to the topic followed by its purpose, the governing limitations, methods used in research, definitions of terms, and the organizational plan. Chapter two provides a complete review of literature and studies related to the topic. Chapter three presents original findings attained through the course of this study, which includes an analysis of data. Chapter four contains a comparison of data and concludes with significant similarities and differences between generations. Chapter five acts as a summary, containing conclusions drawn from research as well as recommendations for future studies related to the topic.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

There are several areas in the review of literature that have contributed to the components of this study. A review of similar studies shows the methodologies and survey findings from other piano teacher studies, which have preceded this thesis. These studies provide helpful comparisons of piano teachers and their studios from the latter half of the twentieth century to the present. The review of pedagogical sources, gives a synopsis of the piano teaching profession from the view of four accomplished pedagogues. A third section addresses the role of females as piano teachers in the United States from the late nineteenth century to the present.

SIMILAR STUDIES

Several studies regarding the independent female piano teacher and her private studio have been completed throughout the past century. The author seeks to review those studies that directly relate to this study and only those dating from 1970 to the present, although studies completed prior to 1970 will be mentioned.

Sandra Lee Camp’s doctoral dissertation, The Status of the Private Piano Teacher in Music Education in Selected Southern Central States (1975), stated that there were many piano teachers in the United States and addressed the lack of standard requirements to be a piano teacher. Her concern was that students were ill prepared to be music majors in college because their pre-college training did not equipping them properly. According to Camp, the factors that made her study important and necessary were as follows:

(1) recognition by music educators that the private piano teacher provides the foundation for nearly all advanced piano study as well as many other areas including vocal and instrumental music, (2) the neglect of researchers of the private piano teaching field, (3) universal concern over unqualified teachers, (4) the absence of controls which would effectively safeguard the profession from charlatans who would teach piano in order to ‘pick up a bit of extra money’, (5) concern by the college piano teachers over the lack of a solid music foundation found among large numbers of entering college piano majors, (6) concern of
many music educators over the weak pedagogical college programs, a situation which tends to perpetuate the problem. 38

The Camp study was limited to teachers in Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Oklahoma, and was made available to all piano teachers in these areas including “urban and rural, agricultural and industrial, wealthy and poverty stricken, highly cultured and under privileged, towns under 1,000 population and cities over 1,000,000, white collar and blue collar, and several large educational centers.” 39 Camp sent her survey to an equal number of teachers who were not involved in music clubs or associations equal to those who were. 40

Two sets of surveys were sent out: one to the piano teachers and another to forty selected colleges (eight from each of the five participating states). 41 The questionnaire for piano teachers explored questions about teacher demographics, business methods, piano methods and materials used, student data, and preparation for the profession. The college survey addressed the preparedness of incoming college piano majors, the contents of the piano pedagogy course if one was offered, degree offerings of the school, and continuing education or professional growth opportunities, such as workshops for private teachers. 42

The respondents in Camp’s study were 95.3% female and 4.7% male. 43 She reported that 90.1% of teachers taught lessons in their own studios, 0.8% taught entirely in students’ homes, and 1.6% did both. 44 Of those who taught in their own studios, 20.6% reported that they had a studio independent from their own home, and 0.4% taught in a studio, which they rented from a music store. Another 20.6% of teachers taught in studios provided by public and private schools, churches, and other various places of worship where they were rarely ever charged a rental fee. 45

39 Ibid., 13.
40 Ibid., 36.
41 Ibid., 37-39.
42 Ibid., 14.
43 Ibid., 43.
44 Ibid., 44.
45 Ibid., 46.
Only 5.1% of the respondents in the Camp study reported the use of electronic pianos. Colleges and universities were the primary users of electronic pianos at this time. Camp reported that the use of these pianos by leading pedagogues such as Francis Clark, Robert Pace, and Jane Bastien encouraged other teachers to incorporate them into their own studios for class piano teaching.\textsuperscript{46} Other tools more commonly used in the studio have included the metronome (82.2%) and tape recorders and/or cassette recorders (half of teachers reported using these). Slightly more than half of the teachers reported having record and/or piano music libraries from which their students could rent materials.\textsuperscript{47}

Most of the Camp respondents, 80.2%, reported that recommendations from their students and from other teachers were the most helpful tool in recruiting new students. About half of the respondents said that they were teaching all levels of students. The number of students taught weekly by these teachers ranged from under five students to eighty-five students; however, the average number of students was twenty-eight per week.\textsuperscript{48} The average teacher taught 19.6 hours per week. Approximately 91% of respondents indicated that they offered private lessons, making it the most common lesson type. The survey reported that 10.3% of teachers taught both private and group lessons; another 1.3% reported great success with group or class lessons taught by themselves and their colleagues.\textsuperscript{49} From 1974 to 1975, the average fee for a thirty-minute lesson ranged from two to three dollars.\textsuperscript{50} Students were commonly allowed to pay for lessons at the end of the month; however, 39.9% required their students to pay at the beginning of the month.\textsuperscript{51}

Camp also explored the professional activities of the piano teacher. Over half (56.1%) of the respondents said that they were members of National Guild of Piano Teachers. State Music Teacher Associations, Music Teachers National Association (MTNA), and National Federation of Music Clubs followed closely as other popular

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., 47.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 48.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., 52-53.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 56.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., 60.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 62.
professional organizations. Of the teachers surveyed, 48.7% were certified teachers and
61.3% said that they had attended one or more workshops in the previous year. Many of
these teachers remained active as performers as well: 73.1% appeared as accompanists, and
41.9% gave solo performances. A majority of the teachers gained extra income as church
organists.

The teachers mentioned various preferred teaching methods. Camp listed the
methods by author and the percentage of teachers who used each series:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Clark</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thompson</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Glover</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Schaum</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pace</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bastien</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Aaron</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Nevin</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the teachers had their students involved in performance opportunities.
Recitals for parents and/or the public were provided by 87.7% of respondents. Other
performance activities included playing in school/church programs (73.9%), auditions and/or
festivals (70.0%), small recitals for other students (58.5%), other competitions (49.4%),
concerto competitions (12.3%), and on local radio or TV stations (10.3%). These teachers
also did their best to create well-rounded students through efficient use of lesson time.
Theory teaching was included during lesson time by 92% of respondents while many of the
teachers stated that they offered theory classes on a regular basis. Theory books most used
were authored by Clark, Glover, Pace, and Schaum. Most teachers also reported the
following skills and styles that they incorporated into the lesson time: functional

---

52 Ibid., 91-92.
53 Ibid., 94.
54 Ibid., 96.
55 Ibid., 99.
56 Ibid., 102.
transposition, accompanying techniques, chamber music (only included by 14.2% of teachers), popular music, improvisation, church music, technique, and composition.  

Camp listed several insightful studies regarding the private piano teacher that were done prior to hers: (1) the Burg study (1944), *Problems of the Private Piano Teacher*; (2) the Robins’ study, *A Study in Variances in Private Piano Background of Selected Secondary School Students to Better Determine the Aims and Responsibilities of the Private Teaching Profession*; (3) the Hilton study (1960), “The Problem of Teenage Dropout in Private Piano Study”; (4) a report by Summy-Birchard Publishing in the September-October 1960 issue of *The Piano Teacher* regarding a survey of which the purpose was to identify the “typical private teacher” profile; and (5) a second report by Summy-Birchard Publishing (1974). Only the last of these five studies is discussed in this thesis since it was completed during one of the decades of focus.

Camp was given results of the 1974 Summy-Birchard study through correspondence with the publishing company’s contemporary Marketing Director. The Summy-Birchard representative stated that the piano teacher of 1974 was typically a forty-nine-year-old housewife who had been teaching for nineteen years. This typical piano teacher started a home studio around age thirty when her children had begun school. She averaged about twenty-four students per week. The teacher who had taken a piano pedagogy course in college charged about $3.70 per half-hour while those who had not taken a pedagogy course charge $3.25 per half-hour. The typical teacher from the study attended an average of one workshop per year.

---
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A similar study, completed by Sanders in 1982, profiled forty-seven independent piano teachers in Illinois.64 This study included information about the teachers’ professional training and resources, their studios, materials, and opinions the about changes in their students. This study did not provide information about the other forty-nine states, nor provide comprehensive information about demographics or business procedures. It is helpful in identifying teacher clubs and associations, teaching materials commonly used, and lesson fees from this time.

Of the one hundred fifty teachers to whom the questionnaire was sent, only forty-seven responded. Of these forty-seven responses, the study found that the teachers taught between four to 150 students per week in private or group lessons, but a majority of the respondents taught twenty to forty students weekly.65 Of these teachers, 36% had been teaching piano for sixteen to twenty-five years and 26% had taught for more than twenty-five years. The Sanders article included the following statistics regarding the teachers’ credentials:

- MTNA members, almost 75% were ISMTA members, and 30% were certified 70%
- National Guild members 38%
- Attendees of numerous workshops and seminars 79%
- Gave public performances 49%
- Had at least one college degree in music 64%
- Had a college degree in education or another area 8%66

Half of the respondents of this survey said that their training was lacking in some way, and 21% said that their training lacked most in the area of improvisation. When asked how they could improve their studios, 20% of the teachers concluded that they needed to offer group lessons and to provide more performance opportunities for their students.67 At least two thirds of these teachers incorporated new music (contemporary music, jazz, and
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pop) in their students’ repertoire. They also tried to improve their teaching by including time for improvisation, changing beginning method books, doing more group activities and lessons, and spending more time doing theory.

Of these forty-seven Illinois teachers, 55% had studios in living rooms or other multi-purpose rooms in their homes. Of these teachers who taught at home, 38% had two pianos. Sanders reported the use of other teaching aids including:

- Flashcards: 57%
- Lending music: 55%
- Metronome: 53%
- Pupil awards: 38%
- Writing equipment: 38%
- Bulletin boards; charts: 34%
- Blackboards: 30%
- Record players; tape recorders: 23%. 68

Only 15% of these teachers used commercial advertising. Twenty-nine percent of them said that they accepted 90% of prospective students who contacted them; and 70% said that they accepted 50% or more. 69 Many of the teachers had waiting lists. They taught a wide variety of students: 89% taught adult beginners, usually in private lessons; 38% taught pre-school beginners in groups or privately; and 26% had experience teaching handicapped children. 70 The Sander’s article provided the following teacher information on the types of lessons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Lesson</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private lessons only</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginners in pairs or small groups</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginners: 60-minute group and pair lessons</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginners: 30- minute private lessons</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginners: 40- minute private lessons</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediates: 45- and 60- minute private lessons</td>
<td>Given by most teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Advanced: 30- minute private lessons 23%\textsuperscript{71}

The Sanders article also stated that 13\% of these teachers began teaching group lesson in the 1960s, and another 28\% began in the 1970s.\textsuperscript{72} Of the teachers who taught group lessons, those who did not teach them weekly offered periodic classes or group lessons including studio recitals (70\%) and theory classes (51\%). Some teachers offered group lessons for three weeks with a private lesson on the fourth week, or private lessons for three weeks with a group lesson on the fourth week. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents offered summer lessons, and another 32\% offered special theory, sight-reading, pre-school, and other classes during the summer months.\textsuperscript{73} Of the respondents, 81\% prepared students for contests, exams, and auditions; 47\% of such performance opportunities were provided by the Illinois junior and senior high schools. Twenty-five of the teachers entered students into the ISMTA exams.

According to the Sander’s study, the fee for a 30- minute lesson in 1982 was:

- About $4.00 43\%
- Less than $4.00 11\%
- $5.00- $6.00 27\%
- $7.00- $8.00 three of the forty-seven teachers charged this rate.\textsuperscript{74}

The overall range of monthly group lesson fees ranged from twelve dollars and forty dollars a month. Two-thirds of these teachers charged between twenty dollars and thirty dollars per month. Of all the teachers from the Sanders study, 53\% billed monthly in advance of lessons. Another 35\% of the teachers billed weekly but were not pleased with that system. Seventy-two percent of the teachers had increased lesson fees within the past four years, most of those for the 1979 to 1980 school year.\textsuperscript{75} According to Sanders, “Sixty-six percent think that their price is about average for their area, but some believe that their

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid.
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credentials warrant a higher fee than they now charge.”

Eleven percent of the teachers thought their rates were high for their area, and 17% said their prices were low.

A majority of the teachers stated that they bought music for their students; 34% had their students buy their own music. Sixty-six percent of the teachers bought supplies from music stores in their area, and 55% music by mail. Studio changes for 1980-1981 included an added 5% yearly surcharge for materials used at the lesson.

Sanders noted that 47% of the teachers stated that there was a “shortage in quantity or quality of certain teaching materials.” Half of those teachers noted that the available teaching materials lacked ear training and improvisation resources. Several mentioned that they created their own ear-training materials due to a lack of published materials.

In the Illinois study, the teachers were encouraged to provide comments or observations about changes in their students from late 1970s to 1982. Fifty-seven percent of teachers listed numerous after school activities, lack of discipline (due to television addiction), “poor concentration in listening to directions and completing lesson assignments, less exposure to music in the schools, and uninterested parents” as negative characteristics of their students. Eleven percent of the teachers felt that there were no changes in their students, and 17% did not respond. Fifteen percent of the teachers listed the positive attributes of their students: “(1) a broader student interest in learning about various aspects of music, (2) more adults taking lessons for recreational use, and (3) parents studying piano along with their children.”

At the request of independent music teachers and pedagogy teachers, the Independent Music Teachers Forum of Music Teachers National Association designed a survey of independent music teachers. The results of the study were published by the IMTF Chairman, Carol Winborne, in a 1986 issue of American Music Teacher. Females represented 93% of
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the teachers surveyed. The article does not specify whether all respondents were MTNA members. Piano teachers represented 86% of the total respondents, although the statistics from this study are representative of private teachers of piano, voice, strings, organ, woodwinds, theory-composition, and a small percentage of other instruments (guitar, brass, percussion).

Of all independent teachers surveyed by the IMTF, the average teacher had been teaching for about twenty years. Of these teachers, about half had a bachelor’s degree:

- High School Only: 2%
- Attended College: 10%
- Associate Degree: 4%
- Bachelor’s Degree: 44%
- Master’s Degree: 29%
- Doctorate: 3%
- Other (artist diploma, etc.): 8%

When asked how they continued to maintain and improve their professional skills, 88% of the teachers said that they attended workshops; 68% attended conventions; and 72% participated in local, state, or National MTNA activities among other things.

The studio teaching income for 77% of these teachers was an addition to their family’s primary source of income, while the remainder of teachers said that their teaching income was either the primary source of income or equal to another source of income in their family. Of all respondents, families ranged in size:

- Self: 15%
- Self and Spouse: 32%
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Self and one or more dependents  18%
Self, spouse, and one or more dependents  35%  

The IMTF survey respondents, teachers of all instruments, taught an average of seventeen hours weekly, forty-two weeks per year, and twenty-nine students weekly.\(^{89}\) Exactly half of all teachers gave a combination of group and private lessons, while 47% gave only private lessons, and only 3% gave only group lessons.\(^{90}\) Private lesson lengths varied from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Minutes Only</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45 Minutes Only</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Minutes Only</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (15 minutes, more than one hour)</td>
<td>1% (^{91})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combination of private lesson lengths within the studio among students of differing ages and levels  51%.\(^{92}\)

Length of group lessons also varied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Minutes Only</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Minutes Only</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Minutes Only</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (15 minutes, more than one hour)</td>
<td>less than 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combination of group lesson lengths within the studio among students of differing ages and levels  23%\(^{93}\)

All teachers gave an average of thirty-seven private lessons and twelve group lessons per academic year.\(^{94}\) For 53% of respondents, all lessons were taught in a room used only for professional purposes. Another 37% of the teachers taught in their homes in a room that was

\(^{88}\) Ibid.
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also used for other purposes, while another 10% taught outside their residence, and only 1%
taught in more than one location.\textsuperscript{95}

The average hourly teaching fee was $16.91 with male teachers averaging $19.50 and
female teachers $15.87.\textsuperscript{96} Teachers whose teaching income was their primary source of
income averaged $17.83 per hour.\textsuperscript{97} When the teachers compared their rates to other music
teachers in their community, 6% said that their rates were below average, 52% thought theirs
were average, and 42% thought that their rates were above average.\textsuperscript{98} Fifty-three percent of
teachers said that they had increased lesson fee/tuition in the year previous to filling out the
survey, 26% within the two previous years, 11% within the three previous years, 3% within
the four previous years, and 7% had not increased fees in more than five years.\textsuperscript{99} Of the
IMTF teachers surveyed, 88% billed in advance and 12% did not. Respondents had various
billing schedules:

- Weekly: 8%
- Monthly: 78%
- Term: 19%
- Annual: 3%

(A number of people offer more than one billing option to students)\textsuperscript{100}

Within the same year, 1986, a similar study emerged that spanned the Eastern and
Midwestern regions of the United States. The purpose of the Wolfersberger study was
primarily to gain profiles of the independent piano teacher and of the piano teaching
profession. The study intended to show differences in practices, whether or not piano
teaching was the teacher’s original career choice, and the level of income earned from piano
teaching.\textsuperscript{101} Another purpose for Wolfersberger was to “define what professionalism is for
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piano teachers and identify those areas where most teachers do and do not qualify as ‘professionals’. "102 The subjects in this study were randomly selected from lists of teachers maintained by piano dealers in six metropolitan areas. “Teachers were included on these lists regardless of affiliation with a professional association, subscription to professional journals, or contact with an educational institution.”103

The demographic characteristics of the Wolfersberger study show that 93.4% of the respondents of this survey were female with 77.9% stating that they were homemakers.104 The average age of the respondent, both male and female, was forty-five years of age. When asked to describe their professional credentials, the teachers had various ideas of what was necessary to be a professional. Approximately 91% of the teachers claimed that their experience in teaching piano contributes to their professionalism, whereas 2.1% noted that their teaching experience was their only credential.105 Of all teachers, 72.2% claimed professional performance experience as another factor contributing to their professionalism.106 Those who either had a baccalaureate degree or had taken college courses in music comprised 66.6% of respondents, while 72% had a bachelor’s degree, 31.5% had a master’s degree in a music-related field, and 2.7% had a doctorate.107 Of the 77.1% percent of respondents who were members of professional organizations, 61.7% said that they were also associated with a local group of teachers.108 MTNA members comprised 44.3% of the respondents in the Wolfersberger study.109

The average teacher in this study had studied piano for 17.2 years and taught for 17.5 years. The number of students taught was an average of 22.4 students. The majority of these teachers gained their students through referrals (84.2%).110 The study showed that 90.7% of
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teachers taught in home studios, and that some taught in more than one location. The following table shows the levels of students taught:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Schoolers</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginners</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers or Professional Pianists 15.1%  

Wolfersberger also researched the types of lessons taught by her respondents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-to-one (private)</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average lesson was 35 minutes in length. Different regions charged different fees for lessons. The mean fee in the Southcentral region was $15.00 an hour. The Northeast, Midwest, and Mideast were nearly 20% lower at a mean of $12.50 an hour. The Southeast charged $17.90 an hour, and the Southwest charged the most at an average of $23.80 per hour. A larger percentage of the teachers in the Southwest (34.6%) also taught partner and/or group lessons.

The average number of teaching hours per week for all regions was 13.6 hours, and 55.3% of the teachers had other employment. These other activities included homemaking (77.9%), performers (63%), semi-retirement (8.7%), and other unspecified activities (30.6%). Such financial information in the Wolfersberger dissertation included:

a. the mean gross income from piano teaching was $6,320;

b. those holding other jobs reported an average income from piano teaching of $5,920;
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c. those who worked only at piano teaching reported a mean income of $6,825;

d. Southwest teachers reported significantly more income ($9,735.80) than each of the other five regional groups;

e. Southcentral ($6,962.10), and Southeast teachers ($6,270.50) realized greater income from piano teaching than did Northeast ($4,645.30), Midwest ($5,288.50), and Mideast ($5,553.10) teachers.  

In 1989, J.L. Crane conducted a study of independent piano teachers’ attitudes toward select attributes of the profession. Although the Crane study was an investigation of the teacher’s attitudes about piano teaching, the conclusions produced facts about the average piano teacher. Crane found that the average teacher in her study was a female who started teaching relatively late in life. This teacher relied on her spouse for the primary household income, and had other jobs such as church organist and accompanist to supplement teaching income.

Another MTNA study completed in 1990 was a national survey of independent music teachers’ incomes and lessons fees. The independent music teacher of this study was defined as “a person who derives a portion or all income from lesson fees (non-salaried).” Through random sampling, 1,500 MTNA members and 500 nonmembers were selected to have surveys mailed to them. Of the total surveys mailed, 822 were returned, and 816 were partially completed and therefore included in the results.

Teachers from the 1990 MTNA survey were from various regions of the United States with almost 70% of respondents living in the South or North Central regions, and 62% of them living in moderately sized or small cities. Respondents were 94.5% female with an average and median age of forty-eight years old. Of all the respondents, 50.2% hold a bachelors degree, 29.1% a graduate degree, 2.3% a performance diploma, and about 2% a
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Ph.D. Of the respondents with degrees, two-thirds obtained at least one college degree in music, and all of the respondents with Ph.D.s held at least one music degree.\textsuperscript{125}

Although most (95\%) of the respondents taught piano as their primary vocation, only 12\% earned 61%-100\% of their total family income from lesson fees.\textsuperscript{126} Almost half of the independent music teachers contributed less than 20\% of their total family income.\textsuperscript{127}

The MTNA study found that, although 86.7\% of the overall sample taught in their homes, the younger teachers were more likely to teach outside the home than teachers older than thirty years of age. Only 1.9\% of respondents taught in music stores. Only one-third of all respondents used music technology in their studios. Keyboards were used by 27.1\% of all respondents, MIDI interface by 9.7\%, and a synthesizer by 7.2\%.\textsuperscript{128} Teachers most inclined to use technology in their studios were ages thirty to fifty-nine, while only one out of five teachers sixty years and older used technology. Those less than thirty years of age also reported less use of technology.

In 1990, the average number of students taught weekly by all respondents was twenty-nine. Teachers who provided more than 60\% of their family income averaged about forty-four students per week, while the typical studio averaged thirteen students per week. The typical teacher taught sixteen private lesson hours per week and forty-two weeks out of the year. Thirty-minute private lessons were reported by 64\% of all respondents, forty-minute lessons by 30\%, and hour-long private lessons by only 8.1\% of respondents.\textsuperscript{129} Average fees for private lessons were as follows: $10.01 for thirty minutes, $15.36 for forty-five minutes, and $20.89 for an hour lesson. Very few teachers from the study taught group lessons. The median group lesson fees were $6.00 for a thirty-minute group lesson and $8.00 for both forty-five minute and hour group lessons.\textsuperscript{130}
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Other sources of income were reported by 70% of all respondents in the 1990 MTNA survey. Approximately 55% of the independent teachers earned additional income from church work. Free-lance performances (35.4%) were also reported as an additional source of income.\textsuperscript{131}

The majority (almost 80%) of respondents had studio policy statements. Over half of the teachers, about 56%, offered only one payment plan. Most (82.4%) of respondents collected payment in advance at the beginning of the month. Half of the teachers increased tuition within the previous year. “While 63.8% of the respondents under thirty raised tuition within one year, almost 20.8% of those over sixty years had not raised their rates in over four years or longer.”\textsuperscript{132} Of all teachers surveyed, 85.1% had no penalty for late payment.\textsuperscript{133} About half of the teachers offered makeup lessons within a twenty-four hour notice, 31.1% always rescheduled, and 25.8% never rescheduled.

Another survey was completed by MTNA in 2005 in an effort to inform the organization about the membership and their piano studios. Of the 80% of the 23,625 members that completed the survey, nearly 90% were female.\textsuperscript{134} The survey also showed that about 90% taught elementary and junior high students, 83% taught high school students, 30% taught college students, and 70% taught adults not in college.\textsuperscript{135} Seventy-seven percent of the teachers taught in home studios, and only a fifth of the total sample taught in a college or university setting.\textsuperscript{136} This MTNA study produced the unique finding that a large number of teachers were using technology in their studios: about 80% used computers, 60% used technological tools for digital recording, and 57% used digital keyboards.\textsuperscript{137} The specific tools that teachers used and hoped to use more in the future were “instructional software, digital accompaniments, musical notation, composition/sequencing and MIDI disks/files.”\textsuperscript{138}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{131} Ibid., 11.
\bibitem{132} Ibid., 12.
\bibitem{133} Ibid., 12.
\bibitem{134} Ibid., 83.
\bibitem{135} Ibid.
\bibitem{136} Ibid.
\bibitem{137} Ibid.
\bibitem{138} Ibid.
\end{thebibliography}
The average teacher of this study charged forty-three dollars an hour for private lessons and twenty-seven dollars an hour for group lessons.

Sumpter completed a similar, comprehensive study in 2009, which identified demographics, training, business procedures, and studio practices of the independent piano teaching occupation. The purpose of the Sumpter study was “to establish a profile of independent piano teachers and to investigate the professional status of the independent piano teaching occupation based on a sociological model.” This recent study established data about the independent piano teacher of 2009; however, all of the teachers surveyed were members of MTNA.

The Sumpter study revealed that the typical MTNA member “is female, is over 55 years of age, lives in a community of 100,000 people or less, teaches at home, works part-time an average of 17.5 hours per week, and has a studio of 27 students.” She gained a majority of her students through referrals. Most of her students were beginners who took 30-minute lessons and used Faber’s Piano Adventures. She charged $22.00 for a 30-minute lesson, collected tuition monthly, worked eleven months per year, and earned a yearly income of $22,684. Her husband provided the household’s primary income, she relied on her husband to support her, and she considered piano teaching her principle occupation. The Sumpter study also reported that, “She believes, even though a majority of respondents in this study are not doing it, that one can make a living being an independent piano teacher.”

The average teacher from the Sumpter study had a bachelor’s degree in music but was not a Nationally Certified Teacher of Music (NCTM) in MTNA. She entered her students into festivals and competitions, and allowed the MTNA code of ethics to influence decisions about her studio and teaching methods. She usually did not attend the MTNA national conventions, but was very active in local and state music teacher associations.

Sumpter identified the changes that occurred in the independent piano studio of 2008 since the 1986 Wolfersberger study:
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The teacher in this 2008 study is approximately 12 years older, has studied piano 5 more years, and makes almost double what the 1986 teacher made, both in terms of hourly rates and yearly income. She works a little longer each year (11 months instead of 10.5) and puts in, on average, 4 more hours of work per week. She utilizes an eclectic method book that combines aspects of the traditional middle-C approach with modern pedagogical techniques such as off-staff reading. She now bills students monthly instead of weekly. She is twice as likely to possess a doctorate in music and has a better chance of earning a master’s degree. The 2008 piano teacher still reads Clavier, but she reads American Music Teacher and other journals specifically geared to her area of expertise. She is also much more involved in her local music teachers association than her 1986 counterparts.143

PEDAGOGICAL SOURCES

The above studies thoroughly address many of the details of the piano teaching occupation. Several pedagogical books that discuss the relevant issues of the independent piano teaching profession have been written in the past couple of decades. The topics most often addressed are the professionalism of the studio and teacher, piano methods and recommended teaching materials, repertoire, learning styles, the art of teaching various types and levels of students, types of lessons, the studio environment (including equipment and technology), practice goals, and a plethora of ideas for teaching. Four commonly used pedagogy books discussed in this thesis include James W. Bastien’s How To Teach Piano Successfully (1995); Marienne Uszler, Stewart Gordon, and Scott McBride Smith’s The Well-Tempered Keyboard Teacher (2000); Martha Baker-Jordan’s Practical Piano Pedagogy: The Definitive Text for Piano Teachers and Pedagogy Students (2004); and Jeanine M. Jacobson’s Professional Piano Teaching: A Comprehensive Piano Pedagogy Textbook for Teaching Elementary-Level Students (2006).144

These texts include discussion about the professionalism of the teacher and the studio, which are crucial to the livelihood of the teacher. Jacobson defined a professional as one
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who has an education and training in a specialized body of knowledge, has committed to bettering one’s skills, has a professional code of conduct, meets regularly with others in their field to align ideas and practices, is professional certified, is actively participating and volunteering in the activities of professional organizations in their field, believes that their work is a calling that provides emotional satisfaction as well as financial support, and is able to identify the goals and objectives of their professional activity.\textsuperscript{145} All authors are concerned with the business of piano teaching and how to make it a business, not a hobby. Each author discussed professional resources for piano teachers and the development of teaching philosophies. Other issues in the business of piano teaching include whom to teach, where to teach, marketing strategies, policies and policy statements, determining tuition, scheduling summer lessons, record keeping, and communication with parents.

Each of the books addresses methods and teaching materials. The Uszler text includes a historical overview of keyboard pedagogy and pedagogues including a section on American piano methods from the nineteenth century to the present. Two of these pedagogical texts, those by Bastien and Jacobson, offer specific recommendations in the areas of repertoire, technique, theory, and supplementary materials. Jacobson’s focuses on elementary performance and study repertoire: selecting and evaluating teaching materials, organizing pieces in the proper teaching order, lesson planning, and diagnosing problems in pieces. Bastien’s text provides a survey of methods and method books for beginners and suggested repertoire, technique, theory, and sight-reading books for second and third year students and intermediate students.

All four pedagogical texts discuss the advantages and disadvantages of group and private instruction: equipment, materials, and games useful in these types of lessons; using digital pianos in group lessons; and lesson plans and assignments appropriate for both types of lessons. They also address some other unique topics related to the piano studio such as practice time and musical goals. The Baker-Jordan text discusses parent, student, and teacher roles in regards to practicing; lesson plans and structured assignments; realistic and effective practice goals; and performance procedures and goals.

THE ROLE OF WOMEN

It is evident by the studies addressed in this chapter that women have played an important role in the piano teaching profession. In fact, the United States has a deeply rooted history of female piano teachers. By 1880, 43% of all musicians and music teachers in the U.S. were women; and by 1910, 66% of all musicians and teachers were women. Music teaching ranked fifth on the list of most frequently pursued vocations by women following elementary school teaching, medicine, social and religious work, and law due to limited avenues of employment. Many distinguished music educators who were women founded their own music schools and conservatories, but a majority were private piano or voice teachers.

An account from Amy Fay, first published in Etude magazine in 1902, tells of her experience as a piano teacher in Chicago and New York in the early 1900s. She recounts how difficult it was for a woman to find piano students at this time. Parents of the early twentieth century wanted their children to study with “professors” and “gentleman teachers,” but school jobs as professors were rare because women were usually “under-teachers” and poorly paid. In the same article Fay also related how difficult it was for her to demand correct payment for lessons. She says that she would rather let a student cancel last minute and not paying for the lesson than to confront the student. The men of this time were taken more seriously and held more firmly to the motto “business if business.”

Crane organizes the statistics to illustrate that her study and those by Camp, Winborne, and Wolfersberger indicate that ninety-three to ninety-five percent of the piano teaching population is female. The picture of the independent female piano teacher from all of the previous studies is one of an older woman. In the Sumpter study, only 3% of the respondents were eighteen to twenty-five years old, 27.5% were twenty-six to forty-five years of age, 18.5% were forty-six to fifty-five years of age, and an overwhelming 50.9%
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were fifty-five years of age or older.\textsuperscript{151} Crane reports that 62\% of her respondents and 72\% of Winborne’s respondents were forty years or older.\textsuperscript{152} The demographic characteristics of the Wolfersberger study, as previously mentioned, show that 93.4\% of the respondents of this survey were female and in their mid-forties.\textsuperscript{153} For this reason, the study at hand hopes to shed some light on the younger female piano teacher.

\textsuperscript{151} Sumpter, “Professional Status,” 80.
\textsuperscript{152} Crane, “Independent Piano Teachers,” 137.
\textsuperscript{153} Wolfersberger, “A Study and Analysis,” 17.
CHAPTER 3

SURVEY RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is twofold: first, to compare generational similarities and differences of female piano teachers; and second, to discover if and how a former generation of teachers has adapted their studio practices to the twenty-first century. It is specific to female piano teachers who (a) taught piano lessons between January 1, 1970, and December 31, 1979, and were between eighteen and forty years of age during that decade, or (b) taught piano lessons between January 1, 2000, and December 31, 2009, and were between eighteen and forty years of age during that decade. The study includes, but is not limited to, the following: demographics of teachers and their students; business procedures used in the private studio; choice of musical materials; and technological advancements within the piano studio.

Following the first four sections (Data Collection, Subjects, Data Analysis, and Independent Piano Teacher Profile), this chapter is divided into three main sections:

   Older Generation Studio Profile 1970-1979
   Older Generation Current Studio Profile 2000-2009
   Younger Generation Studio Profile 2000-2009

The Older Generation and Younger Generation Studio Profiles are divided into thirteen sections as they appear in each survey (see Appendices B and D for the profile questionnaires) as follows:

1. Education
2. Professional Involvement
3. Teaching Experience
4. Marketing and Communication
5. Student Demographics
6. Repertoire
7. Teaching Methods
8. Technology and Teaching Aids
9. Student life
10. Teacher Life
11. Lessons and Rates
12. Income
13. Child-Care

The Older Generation’s Current Studio Profile is divided into sections that match the order used in the survey (see Appendix C for questionnaire) as follows:

1. Current Teaching Status
2. Current Education and Professional Involvement
3. Current Teaching Experience
4. Current Marketing and Communication
5. Current Student Demographics
6. Current Repertoire
7. Current Teaching Methods
8. Current Technology and Teaching Aids
9. Current Student Life
10. Current Teacher Life
11. Current Lessons and Rates
12. Current Income

The chapter concludes with a summary of the data.

DATA ORGANIZATION AND COLLECTION

In January 2010, three questionnaires (see Appendices B, C, and D) were developed for an online survey and data collection system called SurveyMonkey. The survey was designed to require respondents to answer all necessary questions and to direct respondents to questions that pertained to them through the use of a tool called “Logic.” This process ensured that question skip patterns were properly administered and that survey data was recorded accurately.

An online link was created for the collection of surveys. This link was sent to respondents via email and posted on various websites that allowed respondents to select the link and open the first page of the survey. A letter on the first page of the survey explained
the purpose of the survey and stated the respondent’s eligibility (see Appendix E for the Survey Letter). To ensure that each respondent completed the survey only one time, each respondent was required to enter the city and state of residence; 75.6% of the one hundred seventy-two respondents whose responses were used for this study volunteered their names and email addresses and others provided a name or email address.

The surveys were made accessible to respondents from February 12, 2010, to May 3, 2010. Of the two hundred eight people who began the survey, one hundred fifty-nine (76.4%) completed the questionnaire. Sixty-seven (32.2%) of the total number of surveys started were teachers who taught piano lessons between January 1, 1970, and December 31, 1979, and who were between forty-eight and seventy years of age when completing the survey. Of this older generation of piano teachers, forty-seven completed the questionnaires pertaining to their studios during the 1970s and their current studios (see Appendices B and C). The other seven only completed the questionnaire pertaining to their studios in the 1970s (see Appendix B). The younger generation of piano teachers, who taught piano lessons between January 1, 2000, and December 31, 2009, were between eighteen and forty years of age and included one hundred forty-one (67.8%) respondents. Of this sample, one hundred eleven teachers completed Questionnaire C, and seven others completed the first half of the questionnaire. The answers of one hundred eighteen teachers from the younger generation were included in the data analysis.

**SUBJECTS**

The survey included two hundred eight online respondents among a nationwide sample of female piano teachers. The respondents were screened for eligibility in two groups of female piano teachers who (a) taught piano lessons between January 1, 1970, and December 31, 1979, and were between forty-eight and seventy years of age when completing the survey, or (b) taught piano lessons between January 1, 2000, and December 31, 2009, and were between eighteen and forty years of age when they completed the survey.

A small list of respondents was obtained through a variety of sources including local school districts, advertisements on two websites for music teachers (MTNA.org and PracticalPedagogy.com), email announcements from music stores of each state, telephone recruitments obtained through online directories, and advertisements on the social network,
Facebook.com. The nature of the survey primarily consisted of non-probability (or convenience) interviews obtained through Facebook.com.

Because the survey was designed to determine how many of the piano teacher respondents were members of music clubs and/or associations, the author decided that it would not be pertinent to obtain subject lists from clubs or associations. The author chose to use Facebook advertising due to the fact that respondents who were randomly selected from online directories did not list home addresses and frequently did not answer the phone. Facebook provided the means to reach a nationwide pool of piano teachers. As of January 4, 2009, there were a total of 42,089,200 Facebook users in the United States, and 23,429,960 (55.7%) users were women.154 According to the same report, Facebook users, ages eighteen to thirty-four, comprised 67.5% of the total number of people on Facebook in the United States. This website also reported that users thirty-five to fifty-four years of age and those fifty-five and over totaled 18.9% of the users. The same report showed that the thirty-five to fifty-four-age group was growing the fastest with a 276.4% growth rate in the six months between June 18, 2008, and January 4, 2009, and the fifty-five and over demographic also had a significant growth rate (193.4%). According to a recent article on InsideFacebook.com, “. . . the number of Americans over 35, 45, and 55 on Facebook is growing fast” and “the fastest growing demographic . . . is still women over 55.”155 In January 2010, it was announced that Facebook had reached an estimated one hundred million active users per month in the United States, and women constituted over 56% of the overall Facebook population.156

A majority of respondents (84.9%) found the link for the survey on a Facebook page entitled “Piano Teacher Survey” which the author created and advertised via the website. The Facebook advertisement targeted women, ages eighteen and older, living in the United States.


States, whose Facebook profile mentioned piano. The advertisement did not target teachers by their education or involvement in any musical organization or group. The page was also available to anyone who searched for any of the words piano, teacher, or survey on Facebook. The advertisement left impressions on 2,659,997 Facebook member profiles, and yielded the tracks of 1,081 clicks.

The link to the survey was also made available to piano teachers on the home page of the MTNA website for the month of March 2010, and yielded thirteen (7.8%) of the total two hundred eight respondents. Eight respondents, who learned about the survey from the MTNA website, answered half of the questions, allowing their responses to be included in the statistics. Those eight responses equaled 4.7% of the final survey respondents. Phone calls to the randomly selected teachers, whose names appeared in online directories, yielded four respondents (2.3% of the total respondents who completed the survey).

Of the respondents who completed the first half of the survey, forty-one states were represented. The nine states not represented were Alaska, Arkansas, Delaware, Iowa, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nevada, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Vermont. California and Texas had the largest number of respondents with 21.5% of respondents representing these two states.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

Survey data was analyzed by an online database called SurveyMonkey, and only the author had access to responses. Filters ensured that the author was able to view only the results of one set of respondents at a time and allowed for more accurate data analysis. Questions with controlled multiple choice answers were tallied by SurveyMonkey and presented in a table format, which provided the response percent and response count for each question. Most multiple-choice questions had the option of “Other” to allow respondents the opportunity to give more detailed personal responses. For these open-ended questions, responses were evaluated for keywords or similar phrases, tallied, and incorporated into the body of this study. Numerical answers were tallied and placed into groups or listed as they were in the responses. Groups of similar responses were given percentages of a specified group of respondents. All responses of eligible surveys were counted and the integrity of
those responses was maintained. For all tables in this chapter, answers with the greatest percentage of responses have been highlighted.

**OLDER GENERATION PROFILE 1970-1979**

This section is devoted to the answers of respondents who taught piano lessons between of January 1, 1970, and December 31, 1979, and were between forty-eight and seventy years of age at the time they completed the survey. The older generation of teachers were administered two surveys: the first pertaining to their independent piano studios during 1970s, and another pertaining to their studios in the most recent decade, 2000 to 2009, which only applied to respondents who were teaching at any time during the latter set of years. Incomplete surveys, those that did not complete the portion of the survey pertaining to the 1970s, were not included in the data analysis. These statistics are derived from the answers of fifty-four respondents.

**Education**

The teachers were asked about their highest level of education and degrees earned before or during the 1970s (see Table 1). Two of the fifty-four teachers had doctoral degrees in piano. None of the teachers had doctoral degrees in another field. Graduate degrees in piano were obtained by seven of the respondents. Four teachers had graduate degrees in music (general music degrees or emphasis on other instruments), and another four teachers had graduate degrees in something other than music. Identifying their highest degrees, five respondents held the bachelor’s degree in a field other than music, three held the bachelor’s degree in music in areas other than piano, and sixteen had a bachelor’s degrees in piano. Associate’s degrees were the highest degree earned by six of the teachers. Twelve teachers held a high school diploma as their highest level of education.

Teachers who did not complete a piano degree at the undergraduate or graduate level before or during the 1970s were asked about their reasons for not continuing in higher education. Of the thirty-nine people to whom this question applied, six responded saying that they had financial hardships; another six said that they had other interests at the time; and two did not think it was necessary. Three teachers said that they were working toward degrees in music in areas other than piano during the 1970s, which were completed in the
Table 1. Highest Level of Degrees Earned Before or During the 1970s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree in Piano</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree in Music, not piano</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree in something other than music</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree in Piano</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree in music, not piano</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree in something other than music</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree in Piano</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree in Music, not piano</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree in something other than music</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1980s. Four teachers said that they did not pursue degrees in music because they were married and/or raising children. Two teachers mentioned that they did not pursue piano degrees because they either studied or held apprenticeships with National Piano Guild teachers. One teacher claimed that she had studied piano from the age of five, which was the reason for her not completing a degree in piano.

**Professional Involvement**

Since this study was not limited to members of music association, the questionnaire asked respondents whether they were participants or members of any music associations or clubs during the decade of focus. Of the fifty-four respondents, thirty-two teachers (59.3%) affirmed their involvement and/or membership in music clubs or associations. State music teachers’ associations were the most commonly reported associations in which teachers were involved during the 1970s. A lower number of respondents were members of the National Guild of Piano Teachers, Music Teachers National Association, and Music Educators’ National Conference (currently identified as MENC: The National Association for Music Education) (see Table 2). Other music clubs or associations identified by at least one respondent included the following: International Piano Teaching Foundation, Suzuki Association of the Americas, and Kodaly Association of Southern California.
Table 2. Membership and/or Involvement in Clubs and Associations 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association/Club</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various State Music Teachers’ Associations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Teachers’ National Association (MTNA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guild of Piano Teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Music Clubs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Regional Piano Teachers’ Associations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Music Fraternities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Federation of Music Clubs (NFMC)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers who were involved in a music club, association, or studio that offered performance/competition opportunities were asked how many times per year that their average student performed in such events. Of the thirty-one respondents to whom this question applied, only two teachers (6.5%) said that they did not enter their students into these kinds of performance opportunities. Nine teachers (29.0%) said that their students averaged one performance opportunity through a club, association, or studio per year. Another two teachers (6.5%) said that they entered their students into such events one to three times per year, seven teachers (22.6%) said two to three times per year was the average for their students, one teacher (3.2%) said three to four times per year, and another teacher (3.2%) said that her students performed in club, association, or studio events an average of six to eight times per year. Three teachers (9.7%) preferred monthly performances and specified that their students performed or competed two to four times annually depending on their years of study.

Twenty-nine of the fifty-four teachers (53.7%), who were between the ages of forty-eight and seventy when completing this survey, attended workshops or seminars during the 1970s to further their expertise in piano teaching. Attendance and participation in local and regional workshops (included those hosted by music stores, churches, and local symphonies) equaled attendance at workshops hosted by colleges and universities (13.0% or seven teachers from the older generation identified each type of workshop). Workshops and seminars hosted by state associations were attended by five of the fifty-four teachers (9.3%),
and publisher-hosted workshops and seminars were attended by three of the respondents (5.6%). Other seminars listed by at least one person included the following:

- Music Educators’ National and State Conferences
- Yamaha Music School Training Seminars
- World Piano Pedagogy Conference
- Suzuki
- Kodaly Music Educator Piano Teacher Training
- MTNA Conferences
- Other unspecified workshops

**TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

During the 1970s, seven of the fifty-four teachers (13.0%) were unable to teach piano for an extended period of time (a year or more) due to family obligations. Each teacher was asked to describe her studio when she had the greatest number of students during this decade and to indicate what levels of students were taught. Teachers were allowed to identify all ages and levels of students taught. Beginning students were the most commonly taught, and intermediate students also yielded a larger percentage. See Table 3 for statistics on the levels of students taught.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Students Taught</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginners</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Adult</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the Above</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five respondents (9.3%) held adjunct faculty positions, and one teacher (1.9%) was a full-time faculty member. Forty-eight of the respondents (88.9%) did not teach in higher education during the decade of focus.

**Marketing and Communication**

Teachers were asked to rate the effectiveness of various types of marketing strategies used in their independent teaching studios during the 1970s. Various methods of marketing the piano studio included word of mouth, community newsletters, the yellow pages in the local phone directory, and advertisements or service in local schools, local churches, and
music clubs. Respondents also had the opportunity to indicate whether they worked at a studio/community music studio that recruited students for them (see Table 4). Fifty-four respondents answered this question, but the question was designed to allow respondents to select one or more answers that applied to their personal situation. Because the question could be individualized, the numbers of respondents who rated each marketing strategy varied.

**Table 4. Marketing Strategies and Their Effectiveness 1970-1979**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>I didn’t gain any students</th>
<th>I gained a few students</th>
<th>I gained many of my students this way</th>
<th>I gained most of my students this way</th>
<th>N/A Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>13.5% (7)</td>
<td>23.1% (12)</td>
<td>61.5% (32)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Schools</td>
<td>13.2% (5)</td>
<td>42.1% (16)</td>
<td>21.1% (8)</td>
<td>5.3% (2)</td>
<td>18.4% (7)</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Churches</td>
<td>5.0% (2)</td>
<td>30.0% (12)</td>
<td>30.0% (12)</td>
<td>15.0% (6)</td>
<td>20.0% (8)</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Clubs</td>
<td>30.3% (10)</td>
<td>15.2% (5)</td>
<td>12.1% (4)</td>
<td>3.0% (1)</td>
<td>39.4% (13)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Newsletters</td>
<td>35.5% (11)</td>
<td>12.9% (4)</td>
<td>6.5% (2)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>45.2% (14)</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Pages</td>
<td>43.8% (14)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>3.1% (1)</td>
<td>53.1% (17)</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worked at a studio/community music school</td>
<td>22.9% (8)</td>
<td>5.7% (2)</td>
<td>17.1% (6)</td>
<td>5.7% (2)</td>
<td>48.6% (17)</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey allowed respondents the option to select “Other” and to write other marketing strategies that they had used. Several teachers volunteered strategies, including four teachers who indicated that they advertised their studios in local newspapers; another said that she had a few students who were recommended by music stores; another teacher said that she distributed flyers advertising herself as piano teacher in the area; and one teacher said that she had distributed business cards. Another teacher said that she mailed postcards advertising her studio and built a studio of thirty students in twelve weeks.

Teachers were asked how they most frequently communicated with students and parents during the 1970s. All fifty-four respondents answered this question, which allowed for multiple responses. Face to face interaction was the most commonly used form of communication, but calls to students’ home phones and snail mail also ranked high (see Table 5). In the “Other” section, two teachers indicated that they communicated with
Table 5. Forms of Communication 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Phone</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snail Mail</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students and their parents through individual student assignment notebooks; three used studio newsletters; two sent students home with letters to be given to parents; and one teacher used post-it notes.

**Student Demographics**

The fifty-four piano teachers of the older generation had studios ranging in size from an average of one to five students (14.8%) to over forty students (9.3%) that they taught weekly during the 1970s (see Table 6). Most teachers (20.4%) taught six to ten students per week.

Table 6. Average Number of Students Taught Weekly 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the 1970s, most piano students were female. Twelve of the fifty-four teachers (22.2%) said that females comprised about 60% of their students, and another twelve teachers said that 70% of their students were females. Three of the respondents (5.6%) reported that all of their students were females (see Table 7).

The age of most students of either gender during the 1970s was eight to ten years old. Children who were three to four years old were the least likely to take piano lessons. In the
Table 7. Percentage of Female Piano Students 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Ages of Male and Female Students 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>All of the Above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>18.5% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-18</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Repertoire

Respondents were asked what kinds of piano repertoire were used during the decade of focus. The majority of teachers indicated that they taught a thorough mixture of music from all musical periods (see Table 9). In the comment, or “Other” portion of the questionnaire, teachers listed other types of repertoire that they taught including gospel, jazz, soundtracks from movies, simplified classics, contemporary church music, and improvisation.

Most of the teachers (81.5%) were not intentionally incorporating music by women composers within their students’ repertoires. When asked if other teachers were teaching music by women composers, 55.6% of the teachers said that they did not know, and only 16.7% answered affirmatively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods of Music Taught Primarily 1970-1979</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Keyboard Music</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baroque</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary pedagogical authors</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I taught a thorough mixture of all the above-mentioned musical periods</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching Methods

The teachers were asked if they used published method books in their studios from 1970 to 1979. A majority (90.7%) replied positively. The most frequently cited method books were those written by Jane and James Bastien (42.6%) or those distributed by Alfred Music Publishing (31.5%). Teachers were not asked to identify the specific books used. In three instances, however, respondents listed D’Auberge Piano Course Book published by Alfred. Willard Palmer was mentioned once. Two teachers specified the Bastiens’ Piano Basics course. Responses also included methods published by Alfred that were designed for various ages from kindergarten or preschool to adult. Authors who were mentioned multiple times included John Thompson (22.2%), John Schaum (18.5%), David Carr Glover (14.8%), Frances Clark (Frances Clark Library and Music Tree mentioned once each) (11.1%), and Robert Pace (7.4%). Receiving three or fewer mentions were methods written by Denes Agay (Joy of . . . Series); Belwin; Richard Chronister and David Kraehenbuehl (Keyboard Arts); Edna Mae Burnam (Dozen A Day); Guy Duckworth (Keyboard Series); Hanon; Leila Fletcher; William Gillock; Gordon (Learning to Play); Russell E. Lanning (Music by the Masters); Martha Hilley (Developing Musician for college students); Walter and Carol Noona (The Noona Digital Piano Method series and The Young Pianist); Olson, Bianchi, and Blickenstaff (Music Pathways); Ada Richter; Schirmer; Stecher and Horowitz; and Suzuki. Other books mentioned were Pageants for Piano by Waxman, and general books with contemporary arrangements of Christian songs.

Teachers, who did not use published method books in their studios (16.7%), preferred a variety of other materials. Four respondents (7.4%) indicated that they developed their own materials including original compositions. Rather than a published method, four teachers (7.4%) used a variety of books and piano literature.
Activities that the teachers most frequently incorporated in lessons were technique, theory, and sight reading. Activities less commonly used were transposition, ear training, and composition or other creative exercises (see Table 10). Activities specified in the “Other” section included ensemble music.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10. Learning Activities Incorporated in the Lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time 1970-1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition and Creative Exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technology and Teaching Aids

Respondents, ages forty-eight to seventy, were asked to list technology that they used in their studios during the 1970s. Devices listed in the multiple-choice question were vinyl records (35.2%), tape cassettes (64.5%), keyboards (31.5%), headsets (16.7%), and typewriters (14.8%) (see Table 11). Approximately 32% of the teachers specified the use of other forms of technology: digital metronomes, video, computer-generated tests and games, piano labs, and overhead projectors. Eleven teachers said that they used an acoustic piano and no technological devices in their studios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11. Technology in the Piano Studio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape Cassettes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headsets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typewriters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metronomes, flashcards, and pupil awards were popular teaching aids during the 1970s (see Table 12). Other teaching tools included magnet boards, percussion instruments,
Table 12. Teaching Aids Used in Studio 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flashcards</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metronome</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin boards; charts</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackboards</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Awards</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

workbooks, white boards, mimeographed practice sheets, floor staffs, blocks, posters, art media, magazines, and books.

**Student Life**

During the 1970s, the number of practice hours that most teachers required of students per level were as follows: beginner, zero to two hours per week (50.0%); intermediate, three to five hours per week (61.5%); advanced, six to ten hours per week (36.4%); and beginning adult, three to five hours per week (37.8%). Although the majority of respondents did not teach college students, those who were college instructors (16.7%) required their college students to practice six to ten hours per week (see Table 13). Most teachers (96.3%) kept parents informed about the student’s practice and musical progress, and a small majority of teachers (55.6%) required parents of young students to participate in practice time.

Students were involved in many other types of extra curricular activities including religious groups and meetings (85.2%), Girl Scouts or Boys Scouts (75.9%), and sports (90.7%) (see Table 14). Teachers specified other activities in which their students participated that included other private instrumental lessons, voice lessons, dance, gymnastics, babysitting, drama (including theatre and musicals), community and school choral and other performing music groups, art, horsemanship and dressage, multi-cultural events, pageants, and membership or participation in the Boys and Girls Club, Kiwanis, Knights of Pythias, the Optical Club, FFA (Future Farmers of America), or JA (Junior Achievement). When asked if they established practice requirements in consideration of students’ extra curricular activities, 51.9% of teachers said that they did.
Table 13. Required Weekly Practice Hours 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-2 Hours/week</th>
<th>3-5 Hours/week</th>
<th>6-10 Hours/week</th>
<th>11-15 Hours/week</th>
<th>16-20 Hours/week</th>
<th>20+ Hours/week</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginners</td>
<td>50.0% (27)</td>
<td>38.9% (21)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>13.5% (7)</td>
<td>61.5% (32)</td>
<td>19.2% (10)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>3.8% (2)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>9.1% (3)</td>
<td>12.1% (4)</td>
<td>36.4% (12)</td>
<td>12.1% (4)</td>
<td>3.0% (1)</td>
<td>3.0% (1)</td>
<td>24.2% (8)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>12.5% (3)</td>
<td>4.2% (1)</td>
<td>16.7% (4)</td>
<td>8.3% (2)</td>
<td>12.5% (3)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>45.8% (11)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Adult</td>
<td>32.4% (12)</td>
<td>37.8% (14)</td>
<td>10.8% (4)</td>
<td>2.7% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>2.7% (1)</td>
<td>13.5% (5)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Extra Curricular Activities of Students 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Sport at a Time</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one sport at a time</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl Scouts or Boy Scouts</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious groups/meetings</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most teachers (90.7%) provided recital opportunities for students (recitals hosted privately by the teacher and not by clubs or associations). Forty-eight of these teachers volunteered information about how many recitals they hosted yearly. Twelve of these teachers (25.0%) hosted one recital per year, twenty-two (45.8%) hosted two per year, five (10.4%) hosted one to two recitals per year, three (6.3%) teachers said two to three per year, and two (4.2%) hosted five or six recitals per year. One teacher invited parents into group lessons every six weeks, another had a recital once per semester, and two others hosted twelve recitals per year. One teacher said that she had many informal performances with peer critiques throughout the year.

When exploring the student/teacher relationship, teachers were asked about whether or not they kept in touch with students once they no longer studied. Most teachers (66.7%) said that maintained contact with most of their students, a smaller group of teachers (16.7%) maintained contact with most, and a few teachers (5.6%) communicated with all of their former students. Approximately 11% of the teachers have not kept in touch with any of their students from the 1970s.

**Teacher Life**

During the busiest year or years in the decade of focus (1970 to 1979), the most common teaching schedule for the older generation of respondents was six to ten hours per week, although hours varied (see Table 15). Most piano teachers spent one to two hours per week lesson planning (see Table 16). Lesson planning hours varied from one to more than five hours weekly.

Of the fifty-four respondents from the older generation, the number of teachers who commuted to another location to teach lessons was exactly the same as teachers who taught in their homes (50.0%). Respondents who commuted to lessons were asked how many hours per week were spent traveling to teaching locations (including studios, community music schools, students homes, etc.). A commuting time of one hour per week was the response of seven teachers (13.0%). Three teachers (5.6%) indicated a commuting total of about two hours per week. Four teachers (7.4%) spent three hours per week in commute and another
Table 15. Weekly Teaching Hours 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Hours/week</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Hours/week</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Hours/week</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Hours/week</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 Hours/week</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 Hours/week</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Weekly Lesson Planning Hours 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Hours/week</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hours/week</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Hours/week</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hours/week</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hours/week</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 hours/week</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4% spent four hours commuting to teaching locations weekly. Three teachers (5.6%) indicated a five to ten-hour weekly commute. A commute of ten minutes, twelve hours, twenty hours, or thirty-two hours weekly was listed by at least one teacher.

The average miles per week that teachers commuted to teaching locations also differed greatly. Only two respondents traveled under five miles per week. Four teachers (7.4% of the total fifty-four respondents) traveled ten to twelve miles per week, a similar sampling (7.4%) traveled twenty miles per week, and another group (7.4%) commuted one hundred miles per week to teaching locations. Three teachers traveled one hundred fifty to two hundred miles per week. One or two teachers traveled thirty, forty-five, fifty, or sixty miles per week to teaching locations.

Ten teachers indicated that their commuting situations changed within the decade of focus. Moves to a new location or graduation from college precipitated change in students and commuting times. Three teachers said that they taught at their colleges until they
graduated, at which time they began teaching in their homes. Only four teachers (7.4%), who taught in their homes, were subject to zoning restrictions.

**Lessons and Rates**

The thirty-minute private lesson was the most popular lesson type in the 1970s (see Table 17). Only three people (5.6%) taught fifteen-minute lessons with rates ranging from $5.00 or $10.00. Fees for thirty-minute private lessons ranged from $2.00 to $25.00, and the most common charge was $10.00 per half hour with an average of $9.19 per half hour for all teachers. The fee for a private forty-five minute lesson averaged $13.40, and the most common fee was $15.00. The eleven respondents (20.4%) who offered forty-five minute lessons had rates that ranged from $2.50 to $22.50. One-hour private lessons were taught by a quarter of the teachers (25.9%). Rates for hour lessons ranged from $5.00 to $30.00, but the most common fee for an hour lesson was $20.00, and the average charge was $18.39 per hour. Group lessons, taught by 13.0% of the respondents, had hourly rates ranging from $7.50 to $25.00 per student and an average rate of $17.25 per student per hour. Partner lessons, taught by two respondents, were listed as $10.00 and $30.00 per person per hour.

**Table 17. Types of Lessons Offered 1970-1979**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private: 15 min.</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private: 30 min.</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private: 45 min.</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private: 1 hr.</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught in a studio that charged their own rates</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked how their rates compared to other teachers in their area, 74.1% of respondents thought their rates were average, 9.3% of teachers believed that their rates were lower than others, and 16.7% thought their rates were higher. A majority of the teachers (59.3%) from the older generation billed for lessons monthly, and 35.2% billed weekly (see Table 18). Only three people billed quarterly or yearly. Three teachers specified that they charged by school semester. Other teachers indicated that although they had a billing period, they were sensitive to the parents’ needs and would allow adjustments to the payment cycle.
Table 18. Billing Schedules 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know because worked at a studio</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most respondents offered studio recitals, master classes, and theory classes as supplementary activities to lessons (see Table 19). Teachers also mentioned Saturday listening parties, a musical game session, and field trips to concerts and music or drama productions as events that they provided for their students. Teachers were asked if they included extra fees for any other services or expenses in the studio such as transportation, books, materials used in the lesson, or recitals (see Table 20). A majority of the respondents said that they did not include any of the above in lesson fees; however, one teacher specified that she required a prepaid book and materials deposit at the beginning of each academic year.

Table 19. Supplementary Studio Events 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master classes</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Recitals</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Classes</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not offer any of the above</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income

A majority of respondents (61.1%) from this generation were not the sole financial providers for themselves or their families from 1970 to 1979 (see Table 21). Only seven teachers, who confirmed that they were the sole provider for themselves at any time during the decade, relied on piano teaching as their primary income. Other jobs that filled financial
Table 20. Extra Fees Covered in Lesson Fees 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation fees</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials used in the lesson not including students’ own books</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recital Fees</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not include any of the above things into lessons fees.</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. Were You the Sole Financial Provider for Yourself and/or Your Family? 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, for myself</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, for my family</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I was not the sole provider for myself or for a family</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I had a combined income</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, for myself, but only for a portion of the decade</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, for my family, but only for a portion of the decade</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

gaps in a piano teacher’s income included band musician; wedding and funeral musician; church musician; elementary and secondary school teacher or music educator; substitute teacher; children’s musical theatre director; registered nurse; banker; accompanist for musicians at church, elementary and secondary schools, colleges, and universities; veterinary technician; clerical worker; accountant; waitress; secretary; and resident advisor in university housing.

Respondents were asked to describe their musical involvement in religious and community organizations and to label it as paid or volunteer (see Table 22). Of the fifty-two respondents who completed this portion of the survey, 26.9% were paid and 46.2% volunteered for religious groups. Approximately one-fifth of the respondents (20.9%) were paid for community musical participation, while 34.9% volunteered their musical skills. For both types of organizations, the majority of respondents were committed to less than an hour of service weekly (see Table 23).
Table 22. Musical Involvement in the Community 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Volunteer</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>26.9% (14)</td>
<td>46.2% (24)</td>
<td>26.9% (14)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>20.9% (9)</td>
<td>34.9% (15)</td>
<td>44.2% (19)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23. Weekly Hours of Involvement 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31+40</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.5% (12)</td>
<td>8.2% (4)</td>
<td>20.4% (10)</td>
<td>20.4% (10)</td>
<td>6.1% (3)</td>
<td>12.2% (6)</td>
<td>6.1% (3)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>2.0% (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.5% (15)</td>
<td>15.0% (6)</td>
<td>22.5% (9)</td>
<td>5.0% (2)</td>
<td>2.5% (1)</td>
<td>15.0% (6)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>2.5% (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child-Care

A majority of the teachers (61.1%) in the 1970s had the responsibility children who lived with them and for whom they were responsible. Only 24.1% of the teachers had another person watch their children while they were teaching, and only 14.8% of the respondents said that they paid this person. One teacher said that she exchanged unspecified services for childcare. Mothers who gave piano lessons to their own children started lessons when the child was five years old. A child usually studied piano with the parent for an average of two and a half years; however, one mother taught her child for twelve years while another was the primary piano instructor for sixteen years.

OLDER GENERATION PROFILE 2000-2009

Respondents, ages forty-eight to seventy, were directed to answer questions about their studios during the 1970s and their studios during the first decade of the 2000s. The following analysis of data shows how this generation of teachers has or has not adapted their studio practices to the twenty-first century. Of the fifty-four responses used for the analysis, fifty-one of the teachers (94.4%), who taught piano during the 1970s, continued to teach piano between 2000 and 2009.

Current Education

Eighteen teachers (35.3%) specified degrees earned since 1980, and one other mentioned receiving the Kodaly Music Educator Certificate. Degrees obtained by teachers after the 1970s included the following: Associate of Arts, Bachelor of Arts in Music Education, Bachelor of Science in Music Education, Bachelor of Arts in Music, Bachelor of

**Current Professional Involvement**

The questionnaire asked the older generation of respondents whether they were involved in or a member of any music associations or clubs during the most recent decade, 2000 to 2009. Of the fifty-one respondents who completed the second half of the survey, thirty-five respondents (68.6%) affirmed their involvement and/or membership in music clubs or associations. As was the case for the 1970s questionnaire, state music teachers’ associations were the most commonly reported association during the early 2000s. Fewer respondents were members of Music Teachers National Association, and the National Guild of Piano Teachers, regional piano teachers’ associations and local music clubs (see Table 24). Other music clubs and associations in which only person had membership or involvement included the following:

- NFMC (National Federation of Music Clubs)
- College Music Society
- NEPTA (New England Piano Teacher’s Association)
- American College of Musicians
- Music Educators’ National Association
- Kindermusik Educators’ Association
- Kodaly Association of Southern California
- Music Educator’s National Association

A few teachers also listed involvement in associations for the following musicians: choral directors, composers, and orchestral conductors.

The teachers who were between the ages of forty-eight and seventy at the time of survey completion listed the workshops, seminars, and conventions that they attended between 2000 and 2009. Forty-nine of the fifty-one teachers (96.1%) who taught piano during both decades (the 1970s and the first decade of the 2000s) attended workshops, seminars, and/or conventions. Of these experienced teachers, thirteen (26.5%) attended local
Table 24. Membership and/or Involvement in Clubs and Associations 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association/Club</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various State Music Teachers’ Associations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Teachers’ National Association (MTNA)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guild of Piano Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Regional Piano Teachers’ Associations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Music Clubs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Music Clubs (including religious music groups)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Music Fraternities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzuki Association of the Americas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENC: The National Association for Music Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and/or regional workshops (those hosted by music stores, churches, the local symphony, or city music festivals). Other workshops, seminars, and conferences that yielded larger numbers of attendees were those hosted by state associations (20.4%), MTNA (10.2%), and publishing companies (10.2%). Master classes hosted by independent piano teachers (classified in this study as a type of workshop) were attended by 8.2% of the teachers, who also reported attending college or university workshops (6.1%), Kindermusik seminars (4.1%), and Suzuki seminars (2.0%). Several of the piano teachers attended state conferences for orchestra, choir, and voice (6.1%), and 16.3% of the forty-nine teachers said that they attended workshops or seminars, but they did not list the workshop names (referred to as workshops unspecified). Unique to this decade was the attendance of online seminars (4.1%). Conferences attended by some of the teachers included the NCKP (National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy, 4.1%) and the WPPC (World Piano Pedagogy Conference, 4.1%).

Current Teaching Experience

The teachers were then asked to describe the busiest time in their studio during the first decade of the 2000s and to indicate what levels of students they taught during this period. Beginner and intermediate students were the most commonly taught. Table 25 presents the statistics on the levels of students taught. Nine of the fifty-one teachers (17.6%)
taught in colleges or universities, five were adjunct faculty (9.8%), and four were full-time faculty members (7.8%).

**Current Marketing and Communication**

The older respondents were asked to list the ways that they marketed themselves as piano teachers during the most recent decade, 2000 to 2009. Word of mouth received the highest response, but teachers used a wide variety of strategies (see Table 26). Only five of the fifty-one teachers (9.8%), who completed this portion of the survey, said that they did not advertise or use marketing strategies to recruit students to their studios.

**Table 25. Level of Students Taught 2000-2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Students Taught</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginners</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Adult</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the Above</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Replies from the eleven teachers, who selected “Other,” identified the following advertising methods:

- Recommendations by students
- Home school networks
- Yard signs and car magnets
- Local music educators’ association website
- Facebook
- Church website
- Professional websites and newsletters

**Table 26. Marketing Strategies 2000-2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing Strategies</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Schools</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Churches</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Clubs</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Newsletters</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Pages</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Teacher Search Websites</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Website</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Student Demographics

The fifty piano teachers of the older generation who responded to this portion of the survey had studios ranging in size from an average of one to five students (18.0%) to more than forty students (4.2%) who were taught weekly between 2000 and 2009 (see Table 27). The average number of students increased from six to ten students in the 1970s to sixteen to twenty students during the first decade of the twenty-first century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Repertoire

Respondents were asked about their choices of teaching repertoire during the decade of focus (2000 to 2009). Of the fifty responses, the majority indicated that they taught a thorough mixture of music from all musical periods (see Table 28). In the “Other” portion of the question, teachers specified other types of repertoire that they taught including gospel, jazz, soundtracks, church music, and improvisation. Most of the teachers (70.0%) were not intentionally incorporating music by women composers into their students’ repertoires.

Current Teaching Methods

The teachers were asked if they used published method books in their studios during the most recent decade (2000 to 2009) and 89.8% of the teachers responded positively. The most frequently named method was written by the Fabers (50.0%) and their Piano
Table 28. Periods of Music Taught Primarily 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Keyboard Music</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baroque</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary pedagogical authors</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I taught a thorough mixture of all the above-mentioned musical periods</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adventures were specifically mentioned by 13.0% of respondents. The next most commonly used books were those published by Alfred (40.7%). Teachers did not distinguish between the Alfred Basic Piano Library and the Premier Piano Course. In two instances, respondents listed the Premier Piano Course, and in one instance the Basic Piano Library was mentioned. Written responses also included other Alfred methods designed for various ages including kindergarten or preschool and adults. Methods by the Bastiens, the third most popular method book authors for this group of respondents, were listed by 33.3% of the respondents.

Authors who received at least four responses included Frances Clark, specifically for the Frances Clark Library and Music Tree, and Music Pathways authored by Olson, Bianchi, and Blickenstaff. Receiving three or fewer mentions were methods, repertoire collections, or materials written by Cathy Albergo, J. Mitzi Kolar, and Mark Mrozinski (Celebrate Piano!); Flo Arnold (Pianimals); Celebration Series; Edna Mae Burnam (Dozen a Day and Step by Step); Guy Duckworth (Keyboard Series); Leila Fletcher; Hanon; John Thompson; David Carr Glover; Edwin E. Gordon; Hal Leonard; Noona (Artistry at the Piano); Keith Snell; Suzuki; and Vogt and Bates (Piano Discoveries). A variety of books, including repertoire and etudes, was specified by two teachers. Three teachers said that they used materials, including original compositions, developed by themselves with two of these teachers expressing a desire to publish their materials. Finally, one teacher specified Maranatha Praise published by Maranatha Music, and another teacher used Keys for the Kingdom, a progressive Christian piano method authored by Joseph Martin, David Angerman, and Mark Hayes.

Learning activities that teachers incorporated into the lesson time were balanced between technique, theory, sight reading, transposition, ear training, and composition and creative exercises (see Table 29). Over half of the teachers (61.2%) said that they used all of
Table 29. Learning Activities Incorporated into Lesson Time 1970-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sight reading</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposition</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear Training</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition and Creative Exercises</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the Above</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Above</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the previously mentioned activities during the lesson time. Activities specified in the “Other” section included imagery with color, number, and picture association; computer games for theory; melody studies; movement; and various music games.

Current Technology and Teaching Aids

Respondents, ages forty-eight to seventy, were asked to list technology that they used in their studios from 2000 to 2009. Devices listed in the multiple-choice question were records (12.2%), tape cassettes (22.4%), keyboards (59.2%), typewriters (0.0%), computers (63.3%), MIDI disks (34.7%), compact discs (81.6%), video recorders (22.4%), and MP3 recorders (20.4%) (see Table 30). Only four of the forty-nine teachers (8.2%) who answered

Table 30. Technology in the Piano Studio 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Records</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape Cassettes</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboards</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typewriters</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDI Disks</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact Discs</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Recorders</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP3 Recorders</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not use any of the above</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the question indicated that they did not use any of the above technology. Other forms of technology specified by three teachers included theory software, music computer games, and earphones. One teacher explained that she sent music links to her students via Facebook.

Metronomes, flashcards, and pupil awards were popular teaching aids used by most teachers, ages forty-eight to seventy, from 2000 to 2009 (see Table 31). Computer learning programs were also used by more than half of these teachers (51.0%). Other teaching tools these teachers mentioned were whiteboards and unspecified musical games unspecified.

Table 31. Teaching Aids Used in Studio 2000-2009

| Response Count | Response Percent | |
|----------------|------------------|
| Flashcards     | 83.7%            | 41 |
| Metronome      | 89.8%            | 44 |
| Computer Learning Programs | 51.0% | 25 |
| Bulletin boards; charts | 38.8% | 19 |
| Pupil Awards   | 75.5%            | 37 |
| Blackboards    | 14.3%            | 7  |

Current Student Life

This section of questions also applied to the fifty-four respondents, ages forty-eight to seventy, who taught piano lessons between 2000 and 2009. Students of these teachers were involved in many types of extra curricular activities including religious groups and meetings (87.5%), Girl Scouts or Boy Scouts (60.4%), one to three sports (see Table 32). Teachers specified other student activities including the following: community or school music groups (band and choir), drama and theatre productions, academic clubs (such as Science Olympiad, Foreign Language Fair, Math Club), other instrumental lessons, cheerleading, dance, gymnastics, 4-H, FFA (Future Farmers of America), JA (Junior Achievement), horsemanship and dressage, art, biking, fitness, summer camps, volunteer work/community service, and video games.

Most of the forty-eight teachers (83.3%) who completed this portion of the survey provided recital opportunities for students (recitals hosted privately by the teacher and not by clubs or associations). An equal number of teachers hosted either one or two recitals per year.
Table 32. Extra Curricular Activities of Students 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Sport at a Time</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Sports at a Time</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Sports at a Time</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl Scouts or Boy Scouts</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious groups/meetings</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(27.1% each), 14.6% provided three per year, 4.2% hosted four per year, 2.1% hosted five per year, and 8.3% hosted more than five recitals per year.

This group of teachers was asked whether they were involved in a music club, association, or studio that offered performance or competition opportunities between 2000 and 2009, and how many times their average student performed in such events per year. Thirty-one of the forty-eight teachers who completed this portion of the survey (64.6%) said that their students performed in events provided by music clubs and/or associations. Results showed that 29.2% of the teachers entered their students into two performances or competitions per year. One (12.5%) or three (14.65) events per year were also common.

Current Teacher Life

During the busiest year or set of years in the decade of focus (2000 to 2009), the most common weekly teaching schedule for the older respondents was twenty-one to thirty hours per week; however, the hours varied (see Table 33). The respondents’ teaching schedules ranged from one to forty hours per week.

Table 33. Weekly Teaching Hours 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours/week</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Hours</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Hours</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Hours</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 Hours</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 Hours</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the forty-eight respondents who completed this portion of the survey, the number who commuted to another location to teach lessons (45.8%) was slightly lower than the number of teachers who taught in their homes (54.2%). Respondents who commuted were asked how many hours a week were spent traveling to teaching locations (including studios, community music schools, students homes, etc.). Six teachers (12.5%) said that they spent one hour or less commuting per week, the most popular response. Three teachers (6.3%) indicated a commute of about one and a half to two hours per week. Two teachers (4.2%) spent three hours commuting, 4.2% spent five to six hours weekly commuting to teaching locations, and another 4.2% indicated a twenty-hour weekly commute. At least one teacher indicated a ten, fifteen, and thirty-hour weekly commute.

The average distance of travel to teaching locations also varied greatly. No respondents traveled under five miles per week, although three traveled five to ten miles per week. Six respondents traveled fifteen to twenty miles per week, and three (6.3%) had a forty to fifty-mile commute. One respondent mentioned a one hundred-mile weekly commute, and three others (6.3%) said that their commute was one hundred fifty to two hundred miles per week. One teacher indicated a two hundred fifty-mile commute another identified a three hundred-mile commute per week.

**Current Lessons and Rates**

The thirty-minute private lesson was the most popular lesson from 2000 to 2009 (see Table 34). Only two respondents (4.2%) taught fifteen-minute lessons with fees of either $0.00 or $11.50. Fees for thirty-minute private lessons ranged from $10.00 to $60.00, but the most common charge was $20.00 per lesson. The average rate for the thirty-minute lesson was $20.72. Three teachers indicated a fee increase during the decade: $15.00 in 2000 to $20.00 in 2009; $10.00 in 2000 to $15.00 in 2009; and $12.00 in 2000 to $20.00 in 2009. The lesson fee for a private forty-five minute lesson averaged $30.24, and the most common fee was $30.00. Twenty-five respondents (52.1%) indicated that they taught forty-five-minute lessons and listed rates ranging from $15.00 to $60.00. Approximately 46% of the forty-eight respondents indicated that they taught one-hour private lessons. Rates for the hour lesson ranged from $20.00 to $100.00, but the most common fee for an hour lesson was $40.00 to $50.00, and the average teacher charged $42.91 per hour. Two teachers mentioned
Table 34. Types of Lessons Offered 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private: 15 min.</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private: 30 min.</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private: 45 min.</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private: 1 hr.</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught in a studio that charged their own rates</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

giving free lessons to an exceptional student. Group lessons, taught by 12.5% of the respondents, had hourly rates ranging from $10.00 to $35.00 per student or the average rate of $18.00 per student per hour. Partner lessons, taught by two respondents, were listed as $45.00 per person per hour. Five respondents combined private and group lessons. The teachers listed many other types of lessons and rates including extra fees as follows: $10.00 fee for recital preparation; $5.00 weekly charge for driving to students’ homes; no fee because piano lessons exchanged for Spanish lessons; additional $100.00 per semester for participation in musical theatre; $20.00 for a thirty-five-minute lesson; and unique rates for online piano lessons through a piano website. When asked how their rates compared to other teachers in their area, 68.8% of the respondents thought their rates were average, 14.6% thought they were low, and 16.7% thought they were high.

Most respondents offered studio recitals, master classes, and theory classes as supplementary activities to lessons (see Table 35). Teachers also mentioned group or partner lessons, musical theater productions, and family picnics as a reward for summer practice.

Table 35. Supplementary Studio Events 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master Classes</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Recitals</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Classes</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not offer any of the above</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Income

Respondents were asked to describe their musical involvement in religious and community organizations and to label this involvement as paid or volunteer (see Table 36). Of the forty-seven respondents who completed this portion of the survey, 31.1% of the teachers were paid and 48.9% volunteered for religious groups. Approximately 24% of the respondents were paid for participating in community musical events, and 37.8% volunteered their musical skills. For both religious and community service, the majority of respondents spent less than an hour per week; however, an equal number of respondents were also involved in two hours of religious service per week (see Table 37).

Table 36. Musical Involvement in the Community 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Volunteer</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>31.1% (14)</td>
<td>48.9% (22)</td>
<td>20.0% (9)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>24.3% (9)</td>
<td>37.8% (14)</td>
<td>37.8% (14)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37. Weekly Hours of Involvement 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>20.5% (9)</td>
<td>15.9% (7)</td>
<td>20.5% (9)</td>
<td>9.1% (4)</td>
<td>9.1% (4)</td>
<td>11.4% (5)</td>
<td>11.4% (5)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>2.3% (1)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>28.1% (9)</td>
<td>21.9% (7)</td>
<td>25.0% (8)</td>
<td>3.1% (1)</td>
<td>3.1% (1)</td>
<td>12.5% (4)</td>
<td>3.1% (1)</td>
<td>3.1% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Younger Generation Profile 2000-2009

This section is devoted to the answers of respondents who taught piano lessons between January 1, 2000, and December 31, 2000, and were between eighteen and forty years of age at the time they completed the survey. Respondents from the younger generation of teachers were administered one survey pertaining to their studios in the most recent decade, 2000 to 2009. Incomplete surveys where the respondents did not complete the first half of the survey (including questions pertaining to “Student Life”) were not included in the data analysis. One hundred eighteen respondents completed a minimum of fifty percent of the survey and the data was incorporated into this study.
Education

The teachers were asked about their highest level of education and degrees earned before or from 2000 to 2009 (see Table 38). None of the one hundred eighteen respondents had doctoral degrees. Eleven teachers had graduate degrees in something other than music, seven had graduate degrees in music but not in piano, and fourteen had graduate degrees in piano. The highest degree earned by eighteen respondents was a bachelor’s degree in something other than music; seventeen respondents achieved bachelor’s degrees in music in areas other than piano; and twelve respondents held bachelor’s degrees in piano. Fourteen of the teachers had associate degrees, and another twenty-five teachers claimed the high school diploma as the highest level of education.

Table 38. Highest Level of Degrees Earned Before or During 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree in Piano</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree in Music, not piano</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree in something other than music</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree in Piano</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree in music, not piano</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree in something other than music</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree in Piano</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree in Music, not piano</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree in something other than music</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers who did not complete undergraduate or graduate degrees were asked their reasons for not pursuing a higher education in music or piano. Of the eighty-four people to whom this question applied, six responded that they had financial hardships; another thirty-three said that they had other interests at the time; and six did not think it was necessary. Thirteen of the teachers were enrolled in college courses during this decade and planned to graduate with a degrees in piano between 2010 and 2020. Thirty-four teachers specified other reasons for not continuing to major in piano at the undergraduate and graduate levels.
These other reasons included the following: medical problems, marriage and children, busy lives as performing musicians, feelings of inadequacy to become a piano major, beliefs that an education degree would be better preparation for teaching piano than a piano degree, views that piano teaching is a hobby rather than a career, and beliefs that a degree is not necessary in order to be a piano teacher.

**Professional Involvement**

Of the one hundred eighteen respondents between the ages of eighteen and forty, sixty-one teachers (51.7%) were involved in or a member of a music associations or club between 2000 and 2009. Membership in a state music teachers’ association was most commonly reported and MTNA membership ranked second. Fewer respondents were members of Music Educators’ National Conference (currently identified as MENC: The National Association for Music Education), NFMC (National Federation of Music Clubs), and the National Guild of Piano Teachers. College/university clubs or fraternities, local music clubs, and regional piano teachers associations were also listed. Associations for other instruments, music therapy, and band as well as opera societies were also mentioned (see Table 39). Membership mentioned by one or two respondents included the following: Music Education Network for the Visually Impaired, the National Education Association, Christian Music Trade Association, College Music Society, or Suzuki Association of the Americas.

Teachers who were involved in a music club, association, or studio that offered performance/competition opportunities were asked about their students’ participation in these events. Forty-seven of the one hundred eighteen teachers (39.8%) responded to this question. One teacher said that a majority of her students do not participate in performances due to scheduling conflicts and other demands, and only one other teacher said that her students do not participate in any club, association, or studio performances. Twenty-nine teachers (24.6%) said that their students performed one to two times per year. Three teachers (2.5%) said that two to three performances per year is average for their students, and another teacher said that her students sometimes perform more than four times per year depending on the student. Nine teachers (7.6%) said three to five per year, and two (1.7%) said that their students averaged ten performances per year. One teacher indicated that she tried to have
Table 39. Membership and/or Involvement in Clubs and Associations 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association/Club</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various State Music Teachers’ Associations</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Teachers’ National Association (MTNA)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Federation of Music Clubs (NFMC)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations for other instruments, band, music</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>therapy, and opera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Music Clubs or Fraternities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Music Clubs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guild of Piano Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Regional Piano Teachers’ Associations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

one performance opportunity available to her students each month but did not say how often the average student performed.

The teachers were asked to list any workshops or seminars attended from 2000 to 2009 that increased their expertise in piano pedagogy. Thirty-nine of the one hundred eighteen teachers from the younger generation (33.1%) listed workshops and seminars attended during the decade of focus. Fifteen teachers (12.7%) listed attendance at state association workshops/seminars, six teachers (5.1%) listed attendance at unspecified workshops (one focusing on group teaching), and five teachers (4.2) identified one of the following workshops/seminars: college or university workshops or master classes, MTNA events, and workshops or master classes offered by independent piano teachers. Three of the teachers (2.5%) attended the WPPC (World Piano Pedagogy Conference) where they attended various workshops, and another three (2.5%) indicated that they went to international conferences outside the United States (two in Canada and one in the United Kingdom). Three teachers (2.5%) attended local workshops at music stores. Other workshops and seminars attended by at least one teacher were hosted by:

- Yamaha Music School
- Kodaly Association
- National Conference on Keyboard Pedagogy (NCKP)
Seventeen of the one hundred eighteen respondents (14.4%) from the younger generation of piano teachers said that they were unable to teach piano for an extended period of time (a year or more) during the first decade of the 2000s due to family obligations. When maintaining a studio, the teachers reported that a majority of the students were beginners, but a significant number were intermediate students and adult beginners. Table 40 presents statistics on the levels of students taught.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginners</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Adult</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the Above</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One teacher said that she teaches students of all ages with autism or who are elderly with arthritis, and another teacher indicated that she teaches toddlers and senior citizens.

When asked if they taught in higher education during the decade of focus, seven teachers (5.9%) said that they were adjunct faculty members. The remaining one hundred eleven teachers said that they did not have adjunct or full-time faculty positions at any time between 2000 and 2009.
Marketing and Communication

Teachers were asked to rate the effectiveness of marketing strategies used for their independent teaching studios during the first decade of the twenty-first century. Various methods of marketing the piano studio included word of mouth, community newsletters, yellow pages from the local phone directory, piano teacher search websites, personal websites and advertisements or service in local schools, local churches, and music clubs. Respondents were also able to indicate whether they worked at a studio/community music studio that recruited students for them (see Table 41). One hundred eighteen respondents answered this question, but the question was designed to allow respondents to select multiple answers that applied to their situation; thus the numbers of respondents who rated each form of marketing strategy varied.

Table 41. Marketing Strategies and Their Effectiveness 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>I didn’t gain any students</th>
<th>I gained a few students</th>
<th>I gained many of my students this way</th>
<th>I gained most of my students this way</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td>0.9% (1)</td>
<td>18.8% (22)</td>
<td>27.4% (32)</td>
<td>51.3% (60)</td>
<td>1.7% (2)</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Schools</td>
<td>19.8% (19)</td>
<td>41.7% (40)</td>
<td>3.1% (3)</td>
<td>5.2% (5)</td>
<td>30.2% (29)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Churches</td>
<td>14.1% (14)</td>
<td>39.4% (39)</td>
<td>10.1% (10)</td>
<td>8.1% (8)</td>
<td>28.3% (28)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Clubs</td>
<td>33.7% (32)</td>
<td>10.5% (10)</td>
<td>7.4% (7)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>48.4% (46)</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Newsletters</td>
<td>34.7% (33)</td>
<td>13.7% (13)</td>
<td>4.2% (4)</td>
<td>2.1% (2)</td>
<td>45.3% (43)</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Pages</td>
<td>36.8% (35)</td>
<td>5.3% (5)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>1.1% (1)</td>
<td>56.8% (54)</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Teacher Search Websites</td>
<td>32.7% (32)</td>
<td>18.4% (18)</td>
<td>2.0% (2)</td>
<td>3.1% (3)</td>
<td>43.9% (43)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Websites</td>
<td>26.5% (26)</td>
<td>19.4% (19)</td>
<td>7.1% (7)</td>
<td>5.1% (5)</td>
<td>41.8% (41)</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worked at a studio/community music school</td>
<td>13.3% (13)</td>
<td>16.3% (16)</td>
<td>12.2% (12)</td>
<td>24.5% (24)</td>
<td>33.7% (33)</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey allowed respondents to select “Other” and to list various marketing strategies that they had used. Four teachers advertised by posting signs in front of their houses, and four other teachers posted and distributed flyers locally.

Another teacher created a studio logo for signs and t-shirts to be worn at parades, community festivals, and competitions; the teacher who volunteered this information said
that it was a very effective marketing tool. Other teachers listed performances, a press release, and a newspaper article about a current student’s achievements that gained several student referrals. Seven teachers used Craigslist or other online classifieds; one teacher said that a majority of her students found her this way. Recommendations from music stores and community centers on military bases also helped teachers to find students. Another teacher inherited students from a former teacher.

The same one hundred eighteen teachers shared their most common methods for communication with students and their parents from 2000 to 2009. All respondents answered the question, which allowed multiple answers. Face to face interaction was the most commonly used form of communication, and cell phones, email, and home phones followed as the next forms of communication (see Table 42). In responding to “Other,” four teachers said that they used Facebook to communicate with students and their parents; two sent text messages to communicate; one posted information for students and parents on her blog; four indicated that they wrote notes to parents in weekly journals or student assignment notebooks; three prepared studio newsletters; one delivered messages via school voicemail; and one teacher asked her students to bring handouts to their parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face Interaction</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Phone</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snail Mail</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Phone</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pager</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42. Forms of Communication 2000-2009

Student Demographics

The one hundred eighteen piano teachers of the younger generation had studios that ranged in size from an average of one to five students (28.8%) to over forty students (7.6%) per week between 2000 and 2009 (see Table 43). Most of the teachers taught one to five students per week.
According to the survey statistics, the majority of piano students were female during the first decade of the twenty-first century. Thirty-eight of the one hundred eighteen teachers (32.2%) of this generation said that females comprised about 60% of their students. None of the teachers said that they taught only male students; however, seven of the respondents (5.9%) reported that all of their students were female (see Table 44).

The largest age group of students (both male and female) taught between 2000 and 2009 was eight to ten year-old students. Children, ages three to four, were the smallest group of piano students. Also, responses showed that many of the teachers in this study did not teach lessons to students of all ages (see Table 45). There is a significant difference in the percentage of adult male students (35.6%) and adult female students (50.8%) and the ratio of
Table 45. Ages of Male and Female Students 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>5-7</th>
<th>8-10</th>
<th>11-13</th>
<th>14-18</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>All of the Above</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.8% (21)</td>
<td>68.6% (81)</td>
<td>73.7% (87)</td>
<td>71.2% (84)</td>
<td>50.8% (60)</td>
<td>50.8% (60)</td>
<td>17.8% (21)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.4% (17)</td>
<td>61.9% (73)</td>
<td>70.3% (83)</td>
<td>55.9% (66)</td>
<td>45.8% (54)</td>
<td>35.6% (42)</td>
<td>11.0% (9)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

boys to girls of ages eleven to thirteen also showed that significantly more females were taking lessons than males (see Table 45).

**Repertoire**

Respondents were asked to describe the music they primarily taught during the first generation of the twenty-first century. Of one hundred eighteen respondents, half (50.8%) indicated that they taught a thorough mixture of music from all musical periods (see Table 46). In general, all musical periods were represented. Over one-tenth (12.7%) of the respondents selected “Other” and listed repertoire that they taught, including gospel, religious, pop, jazz, rock, blues, playing by chords, improvisation from lead sheets, and choral accompaniments.

Table 46. Periods of Music Taught Primarily 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Keyboard Music</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baroque</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary pedagogical authors</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I taught a thorough mixture of all the above-mentioned musical periods</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of the teachers (90.7%) did not intentionally incorporate music by women composers into their students’ repertoire. When asked if other teachers that they knew were
teaching music by women composers, 71.2% of the teachers said that they did not know, and only 11.0 % answered affirmatively.

**Teaching Methods**

The teachers were asked if they used published method books in their studios during the most recent decade (2000 to 2009). About 96% of one hundred eighteen respondents replied positively. Method books used most often were those published by Alfred (58.5%) were mentioned most often and those authored by Nancy and Randall Faber (44.1%), or Jane and James Bastien (36.4%), and methods published by Hal Leonard (11.9%) followed. Teachers were not asked to identify the specific books used. In ten instances, however, respondents listed Alfred’s Basic Piano Library. Responses also included Alfred’s methods for kindergarten or preschool students and adult students. Many of the younger teachers also mentioned specific Faber books, particularly Piano Adventures, which was mentioned thirteen times. Methods for beginners or older beginners and adults authored by the Bastien’s as well as those published by Hal Leonard were also mentioned.

Authors who were mentioned multiple times included John Thompson (7.6%), John Schaum (7.6%), and Frances Clark (5.1%). Suzuki was used by 5.2% of respondents and *Celebration Series* by 4.2%. Authors with three or fewer mentions were Michael Aaron; Denes Agay (*The Joy of First Year Piano*); Albergo, Kolar, Mrozinski (*Celebrate Piano!*); Alan Carr; Czerny; Leila Fletcher; William Gillock; David Carr Glover; Hanon; Joan Last; Martin, Angerman, and Hayes (*Keys for the Kingdom*, a Christian method); Noona (*Pathways to Artistry*); Vogt and Bates (*Piano Discoveries*); Donald Waxman (*New Pageants for Piano*); and Yamaha (*Keyboard Encounters*). Other books mentioned by teachers were *Mastering the Piano* Bigler and Lloyd-Watts, *That’s Jazz* by Sowash, Exploring Piano by Backus, *Way Cool Keyboarding* and *Musical Moments* Perez and Bailey, *Play Piano Now! Adult Beginners Lesson Book* by Hilley, *Fingerpower* by Schaum, *Music for Young Children* by Balodis, *Succeeding with the Masters* by Marlais, the Albert series, and Musikgarten (a classroom method).

Teachers who did not use published method books in their studios (9.3%) used a variety of other materials. Six teachers said that they created their own materials and original compositions, one of who said that she devised a small improvisational course. Ten of these
teachers used a variety of materials including method books, books by many different composers, anthologies, and sheet music to fit their students’ requests and learning goals.

Teachers incorporated various learning activities into the lesson time including technique, theory, sight reading, transposition, ear training, and composition and creative activities (see Table 47). Activities used by over half of all teachers were in the areas of theory, technique, and sight reading with exactly half of all teachers incorporating ear training activities into the lesson time. Less than half of the teachers (37.3%) said that they used all of the previously mentioned activities during the lesson time. Activities specified in the “Other” section included musical games (interactive review games), improvisation, singing (including solfege), playing with rhythm instruments, playing in ensembles (including the use of digital pianos), music history, music projects, listening to recordings of famous piano works, using MIDI, and recording music.

Table 47. Learning Activities Incorporated into Lesson Time 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sight reading</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposition</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear Training</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition and Creative Exercises</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the Above</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technology and Teaching Aids

Respondents, ages eighteen to forty, were asked to list technology that they used in their studios from 2000 to 2009. Devices listed in the multiple-choice question were records (0.8%), tape cassettes (11.9%), keyboards (55.1%), headsets (15.3%), typewriters (0.0%), computer learning programs (22.0%), MIDI disks (16.1%), and compact discs (64.4%) (see Table 48). Other forms of technology specified by three teachers included digital pianos, iTunes, YouTube, online resources (such as worksheets and sheet music), MP3 players,
Table 48. Technology in the Piano Studio 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Records</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape Cassettes</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboards</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headsets</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typewriters</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Learning Programs</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDI Disks</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact Discs</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

video, a sound system, karaoke, laptops, compact disc recording devices, digital recording devices, iPhones, and iPods.

Metronomes, flashcards, and pupil awards were popular teaching aids used by most teachers, ages eighteen to forty, from 2000 to 2009 (see Table 49). Other teaching tools these teachers used included wall posters, rhythm instruments, whiteboards, puppets, theory manipulatives, musical board and card games, crafts related to music, home-made visual aids (this teacher specified that she uses them to teach students with Down’s Syndrome and young beginners), stickers, grand staff floor mats, assignment notebooks, prize boxes, photographs, and music story books.

Table 49. Teaching Aids Used in Studio 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flashcards</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metronome</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin boards; charts</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackboards</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Awards</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Life

This section of questions also applied to one hundred eighteen respondents, ages eighteen to forty. During the first decade of the 2000s, the number of practice hours that most teachers required of students per level were as follows: beginner, 0-2 hours per week (64.4%); intermediate, three to five hours per week (74.3%); and beginning adult, three to five hours per week (46.2%). Although the majority of respondents did not teach advanced or college students, the majority of those who did required their advanced students to practice six to ten hours per week (27.6%) and their college students to practice three to five hours per week (7.7%) (see Table 50). Most teachers (94.9%) kept parents informed about the student’s musical progress from practice, and just over half (52.5%) required parents of young students to participate in practice time. Approximately 80% of the teachers indicated that they established practice requirements in consideration of students’ extra curricular activities.

Students were involved in many other types of extra curricular activities including religious groups and meetings (92.4%), two or more sports (70.3%), one sport at a time (57.6%), Girl Scouts or Boy Scouts (66.9%), and tutoring (40.7%) (see Table 51). Teachers specified other activities in which their students participated including other private instrument lessons, dance, drama (including theatre and musicals), community and school music groups, private rock bands, student government, cotillion, rodeo, horsemanship and dressage, pageants, driver’s education, part-time jobs, modeling, language classes, gymnastics, cooking classes, home-school activities, debate, cheerleading, ice skating, and membership or participation in Heritage Festivals.

Many of the teachers (72.0%) provided recital opportunities for students (recitals hosted by the teacher and not by clubs or associations). Respondents volunteered information about how many recitals they hosted yearly. Twenty-three of all one hundred eighteen teachers (19.5%) hosted one recital per year, thirty-eight (28.0%) hosted two per year, six (5.1%) hosted one to two recitals per year, five teachers (4.2%) said two to three per year, six (5.1%) hosted three to four performances per year, one (0.8%) hosted five or six recitals per year, and another teacher hosted eight. Thirty-four teachers (28.8%) indicated that they did not provide recital opportunities for students outside of those made available to them through
Table 50. Required Weekly Practice Hours 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-2 Hours/week</th>
<th>3-5 Hours/week</th>
<th>6-10 Hours/week</th>
<th>11-15 Hours/week</th>
<th>16-20 Hours/week</th>
<th>20+ Hours/week</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginners</td>
<td>64.4% (76)</td>
<td>28.8% (34)</td>
<td>3.4% (4)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>3.4% (4)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>3.5% (4)</td>
<td>74.3% (84)</td>
<td>9.7% (11)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>12.4% (14)</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>1.1% (1)</td>
<td>17.2% (15)</td>
<td>27.6% (24)</td>
<td>5.7% (5)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>48.3% (42)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>2.6% (2)</td>
<td>7.7% (6)</td>
<td>6.4% (5)</td>
<td>3.8% (3)</td>
<td>1.3% (1)</td>
<td>1.3% (1)</td>
<td>76.9% (60)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Adult</td>
<td>20.9% (19)</td>
<td>46.2% (42)</td>
<td>2.2% (2)</td>
<td>1.1% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>29.7% (27)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 51. Extra Curricular Activities of Students 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Sport at a Time</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one sport at a time</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl Scouts or Boy Scouts</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious groups/meetings</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
clubs or associations, schools, etc. Six (5.1%) teachers indicated that they hosted performance classes on a monthly or semester basis in addition to one or two recitals per year. One teacher said that she provided eight to ten studio performances opportunities per year, but only four of them were required. Two teachers had their students perform at community events and in nursing homes in addition to the two annual recitals.

When exploring the student/teacher relationship, teachers were asked about whether or not they kept in touch with former students. Over half of the teachers (60.2%) said that they kept in touch with some of their students, 23.7% with most, and 3.4% communicated with all of their former students. Approximately 3% of the teachers did not keep in touch with any of their students from the most recent decade, 2000 to 2009.

**Teacher Life**

During the busiest year or years in the decade of focus (2000 to 2009), a weekly teaching schedule of anywhere from one to ten hours per week was common for the younger generation of respondents, although hours varied (see Table 52). Of the one hundred fifteen respondents who completed this portion of the survey, most spent one to two hours per week on average lesson planning (see Table 53). Lesson planning hours also varied from one to more than five hours weekly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 52. Weekly Teaching Hours 2000-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 53. Weekly Lesson Planning Hours 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>More than 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| of one hundred fifteen respondents from the younger generation, the number of teachers who commuted to another location to teach lessons (72.2%) was much greater than teachers who taught in their homes. Respondents who commuted to lessons were asked how many hours per week they spent traveling to teaching locations (including studios, community music schools, students homes, etc.). Hours varied, as seen in Table 54.

Table 54. Weekly Hours of Commute 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Less than 1 Hour/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 Hour/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1-2 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2-3 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-4 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4-6 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6-10 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-20 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20-30 Hours/week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| of one hundred fifteen respondents from the younger generation, the number of teachers who commuted to another location to teach lessons (72.2%) was much greater than teachers who taught in their homes. Respondents who commuted to lessons were asked how many hours per week they spent traveling to teaching locations (including studios, community music schools, students homes, etc.). Hours varied, as seen in Table 54.

The average miles per week that teachers commuted to teaching locations also varied greatly. Percentages in Table 55 are of the total one hundred fifteen respondents who completed this portion of the survey.
Table 55. Miles Commuted Weekly 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miles Commuted Weekly</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 Miles/week</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-20 Miles/week</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40 Miles/week</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60 Miles/week</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-100 Miles/week</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-200 Miles/week</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-400 Miles/week</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 Miles/week</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventeen teachers indicated that their commuting situations changed within the decade of focus. Eleven teachers, who had previously commuted to students’ homes or to schools, opened their own studios or started teaching at a community music school and had students start coming to them for lessons as a way to cut down commuting time. Moves to homes in new locations and child bearing were other causes of change in students and commuting times. One teacher said that her busiest time during the decade was when she was commuting to a college to teach private lessons to college students. Only four of the teachers who taught in their homes were subject to zoning restrictions.

Lessons and Rates

Only six people (5.2%) taught fifteen-minute lessons. The rate for the fifteen-minute lesson was either $10.00 or $15.00. The thirty-minute private lesson was the most popular with the younger generation from 2000 to 2009 (see Table 56). Fees for thirty-minute private lessons ranged from $5.00 to $45.00 and average $18.29. Private forty-five minute lesson fees averaged $32.95 from a low of $10.00 to a high of $63.33 and were taught by forty-five respondents (39.1%). One-hour private lessons were taught by 48.7% of the teachers. Rates for hour lessons ranged from $7.50 to $70.00 and the average teacher charged $46.70 per hour. Approximately 18% of respondents taught group lessons; 7.0% of the teachers offered partner lessons; 4.3% of respondents combined group and partner or private lessons.

When asked how their rates compared to other teachers in their area, 55.7% of the one hundred fifteen respondents thought their rates were average, 35.7% thought their rates were low, and 8.7% thought their fees were high. One teacher mentioned that her rates were
Table 56. Types of Lessons Offered 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private: 15 min.</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private: 30 min.</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private: 45 min.</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private: 1 hr.</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught in a studio that charged their own rates</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

highest among teachers in her area, but low for someone with her background. A majority of the teachers (80.0%) from the younger generation billed for lessons monthly, and 25.2% of these teachers billed weekly (see Table 57). Only seven people billed quarterly or yearly. Other forms of payment included every other week, ten-week terms, school semester or trimester, parent-specified payment packages, and other special payment arrangements.

Table 57. Billing Schedules 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know because worked at a studio</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most respondents offered only studio recitals as supplementary activities to lessons (see Table 58). Teachers also mentioned extra group lessons, songwriting workshops for teens, show choir classes, early childhood music and movements classes, ensemble classes, fundraisers, television appearances, week-long music camps, recital parties, project presentations, soundtrack festivals, composition and improvisation workshops, award
Teacher were asked if they included extra fees for any other services or expenses in the studio such as transportation, books, materials used in the lesson, or recitals (see Table 59). Approximately 31% of the respondents said that they did not include any of the above items in lesson fees; however, several teachers specified that they had separate fees for recitals, workshops, and studio rent.

### Table 59. Extra Fees Covered in Lesson Fees 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation fees</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials used in the lesson not including students’ own books</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recital Fees</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not include any of the above things into lessons fees.</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Income**

Less than half of respondents (47.3 %) from the younger generation were not the sole financial providers for themselves or their families between 2000 and 2009 (see Table 60). Only 21.8% of the teachers, who confirmed that they were the sole provider for themselves at any time during the decade, relied on piano teaching as their primary income. Other jobs that filled the financial gaps in a piano teacher’s income included the following: sales worker; free lance accompanist, performer, or evaluator/adjudicator; Mary Kay Independent Beauty Consultant; secretary; flight attendant; manager; parts clerk; church staff; instrumentalist;
Table 60. Were You the Sole Financial Provider for Yourself and/or Your Family? 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Counts</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, for myself</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, for family</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I was not the sole provider for myself or for a family</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I had a combined income</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, for myself, but only for a portion of the decade</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, for my family, but only for a portion of the decade</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

conductor; music administrator; vocal coach; full-time school teacher; nanny or governess; systems analyst; newspaper reporter; realtor; substitute teacher; bank teller; music education coordinator for local piano store; piano salesman; school music teacher; social worker; vocal actress; office assistant; hotel gallery host; photographer; babysitter; receptionist; cocktail waitress; business consultant; design consultant; administrative assistant for a law office; college professor of English as a second language; and dental assistant.

Respondents were asked to describe their musical involvement in religious and community organizations and to label it as paid or volunteer (see Table 61). Of the one hundred ten respondents who completed this portion of the survey, 27.1% were paid and 51.4% volunteered for religious groups. More than a tenth of respondents (14.1%) were paid for community musical participation, while 35.9% volunteered their musical skills. The majority of respondents were involved in religious work two hours per week, and less than an hour of service weekly in the community (see Table 62).

Table 61. Musical Involvement in the Community 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Volunteer</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>27.1% (29)</td>
<td>51.4% (55)</td>
<td>21.5% (23)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>14.1% (13)</td>
<td>35.9% (33)</td>
<td>50.0% (46)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child-Care

A small number of one hundred ten younger generation teachers (30.0%), who completed this portion of the survey, had children living with them for whom they were responsible from 2000 to 2009. Only 18.2% of the teachers had another person watch their
Table 62. Weekly Hours of Involvement 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31+40</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

children while they were teaching, and only 7.3% of the respondents said that they paid this person to do so. Mothers who gave piano lessons to their own children started lessons when the child was just over six years old. Students studied with their parents for an average of one year.

**SUMMARY OF DATA**

This section summarizes the typical piano teacher from each generation and is divided into three sections:

- Older Generation Profile 1970-1979
- Older Generation Profile 2000-2009
- Younger Generation Profile 2000-2009

Characteristics of the typical piano teacher are drawn from the statistics that represent the majority of the respondents in each generation.

**Older Generation Profile 1970-1979**

The typical eighteen to forty year-old female piano teacher in the 1970s had either a high school diploma or a bachelor’s degree in piano. If she did not complete a degree in higher education, it was due to financial hardships or other interests at the time. She was a member of a state music teachers’ association, and her students participated in one performance opportunity offered through that club each year. To further her expertise in piano teaching, this teacher attended workshops hosted by colleges and universities. Most of her students were beginners.

The female teacher of the 1970s gained most of her students through word of mouth recommendations, and she communicated with students and their parents most often through face-to-face interaction or phone calls to the student’s homes. She taught six to ten students
weekly, most of whom were female. Her average student, male or female, was eight to ten years old.

Her student repertoire consisted of a thorough mixture of pieces from all musical periods (early keyboard music, Baroque, Classical, Romantic, Contemporary, and works by contemporary pedagogical authors). The teacher of the 1970s did not intentionally incorporate music by women composers in her teaching repertoire. She used published method books, specifically those by the Bastiens or those distributed by Alfred Music, and she usually incorporated technique, theory, and sight reading into the lesson. This teacher of the older generation used tape cassettes in her studio, and her teaching aids included a metronome and flashcards. She required her students to practice an established amount of time as follows: beginners, zero to two hours per week; intermediate students, three to five hours per week; advanced students, six to ten hours per week; and beginning adults, three to five hours per week. Most of her students were involved in several other extra curricular activities including sports, religious groups and meetings, and Girl Scouts or Boy Scouts. She established practice requirements in consideration of her students’ extra curricular activities. Parents were kept informed about the student’s musical progress, and she required parents of young students to participate in practice time. She hosted two recitals per year in addition to those provided by clubs or associations.

The typical piano teacher in the 1970s taught lessons six to ten hours per week and averaged one to two hours a week lesson planning. She either had a home studio or averaged a commute of one hour per week to another location to teach lessons. The distance of the commute varied greatly from ten to one hundred miles per week.

This female piano teacher usually taught a thirty-minute private lesson for which the fee was $9.19, a rate that she thought was consistent with other teachers in her area. She billed for lessons on a monthly basis, and she did not include any extra fees for transportation, books, materials used in the lesson, or for recitals. She was not the sole financial provider for herself or her family. She was involved musically in a religious organization for less than an hour a week for which she volunteered her time and services, and she did not participate in community organizations. She had children living with her for whom she was responsible, but she did not teach her own children.
**Older Generation Profile 2000-2009**

The typical forty-eight to seventy year-old piano teacher from 2000 to 2009 did not pursue any other degrees after 1979. She was a member of her state music association, but she usually attended seminars, conventions, workshops held locally by music stores, churches, or the local symphony, and city music festivals.

Most of her students were in either beginners or intermediate pupils. She recruited most of her students through word of mouth recommendations and taught between sixteen and twenty students per week. Her teaching repertoire was a thorough mixture of music from all musical periods, and she did not intentionally incorporate music by women composers. She used method books in her studio, specifically those by the Fabers or methods published by Alfred Music. Music activities that she weaved into the lesson included a balance of sight reading, transposition, ear training, theory, technique, and compositional or other creative exercises. She used compact discs in her studio more than she used her computer. Popular teaching aids were the metronome, flashcards, and pupil awards.

Her students were active in religious groups and attended religious meetings regularly. Most of these students were also actively participating in sports or scouting. She personally provided one to two recital opportunities for her students per year in addition to events hosted by clubs and/or associations where her average student performed twice per year.

She taught in her home and averaged a teaching schedule of twenty-one to thirty hours per week. She taught mostly thirty-minute private lessons at an average fee of $20.72 per lesson, but she also taught one-hour private lessons for $42.91 per lesson. She thought that these rates were average for her location. She volunteered her musical talents to religious groups, and she was paid for her services to community groups. On average, she spent less than an hour of time per week involved in either group.

**Younger Generation Profile 2000-2009**

The typical eighteen to forty year-old piano teacher in the first decade of the twenty-first century had either a high school diploma or a bachelor’s degree in something other than music as her highest degree earned. She did not pursue a higher degree because she lacked the finances to do so. She was involved in her state music teachers’ association, but she did...
not enter her students into club/association performances or competitions. She did not attend workshops or seminars.

She taught mostly beginning level students and she did not have an adjunct or full-time teaching position at an institution of higher learning. She gained most of her students through word of mouth recommendations. Face to face interaction was her most common method of communication with parents and students; however, cell phones and email as the next top two forms of communication. She taught one to five students weekly, and most of her students were female. Her students, male or female, were between eight and ten years old.

She taught a thorough mixture of repertoire from all musical periods, and she did not intentionally incorporate music by women composers in her teaching repertoire. She used published method books in her studio, specifically those published by Alfred. She regularly incorporated theory, sight reading, and technique in her lessons, but less regularly included ear training activities into the lesson time. She used compact discs as the main form of technology in her studio as well as a metronome, flashcards, and pupil awards as her teaching aids.

This younger teacher required her beginner level students to practice zero to two hours per week, and her intermediate and beginning adult students to practice three to five hours per week. Since a majority of her students were involved in religious groups, multiple sports, or Girl Scouts or Boy Scouts, she adjusted practice requirements to fit each student’s individual schedule. She kept parents informed about student musical progress and required parents of young students to participate in practice time. She provided two recital opportunities per year, which she hosted and were not linked to a club or association. Other than these studio recitals she did not provide master classes, theory classes, or other supplementary studio events.

Her weekly teaching schedule ranged from one to ten hours per week, and she spent one to two hours per week lesson planning. She frequently commuted to another location to teach piano lessons and spent either one to six hours per week commuting. Her commute averaged twenty-one to forty miles per week. She primarily taught thirty-minute private lessons for an average fee of $18.29 per lesson, and she billed for lessons on a monthly basis. She thought that her rates were average for her area. Extra fees for transportation, books, or
materials were not included in her lesson fees. She was not the sole provider for herself or for her family.

She volunteered her musical talents to religious groups, and she was paid for her music service for community groups. On average, she spent two hours per week in religious groups and participated less than an hour per week in community musical activities. She did not have children living with her for whom she was responsible. If she had children, she did she not give them piano lessons.
CHAPTER 4

COMPARISON OF DATA

This chapter addresses a primary purpose of this study: to compare two generations of female piano teachers. It concludes with significant similarities and differences between the two generations. The statistics were drawn from an older generation of piano teachers who described their studios in the 1970s as well as their studios from 2000 to 2009, and a younger generation, who characterized their studios in this same decade of the twenty-first century. A comparison of the data from these two generations of female piano teachers and an assessment of if and how one generation of teachers has adapted their studio practices to the twenty-first century follow.

COMPARISON OF DATA IN THIRTEEN AREAS

Thirteen categories of information adapted from the surveys (Appendices B, C, and D) are used to compare similarities and differences of the two generations of female piano teachers: those who (a) taught piano lessons between January 1, 1970, and December 31, 1979, and were between forty-eight and seventy years of age when completing the survey, or (b) taught piano lessons between January 1, 2000, and December 31, 2009, and were between eighteen and forty years of age when completing the survey. Basically, this study is comparing the same age group, eighteen to forty years of age, in different decades: 1970 to 1979, and 2000 to 2009. Because the older generation of teachers was eighteen to forty years of age during the 1970s, the comparisons of piano teachers of similar ages and their studios in two decades are possible. In order for valid comparisons to be made, both generations answered similar questions.

Education

Although the percentage of respondents for both generations who listed a high school diploma as the terminal degree was about the same, the older generation had more college degrees in piano than the younger generation. Approximately one-fifth of the older generation (20.4%) had a bachelor’s degree in piano, and 13.0% had a graduate degree in
piano. Among the younger generation, half as many teachers (10.2%) had bachelor’s degrees in piano, and 11.9% had graduate degrees in piano. The younger generation had higher percentages of Bachelor of Music degrees with an emphasis other than piano (14.4%) and bachelor’s degrees in something other than music (9.3%).

Since 1980, 35.3% of the older generation finished degrees begun in the 1970s, or returned to school to earn other degrees including bachelor’s degrees with emphases in music or education and master’s degrees in music or education. Two respondents completed their doctorates.

**Professional Involvement**

Involvement and/or membership in music clubs and/or associations did not vary greatly between generations. The older generation had a slightly higher percentage of involvement and/or membership (59.3%) than the younger generation, of which 51.7% affirmed their involvement and/or membership in clubs and or associations. State music teachers’ associations were the associations most commonly reported by teachers from both generations. Overall, the older generation (53.7%) entered their students into performances and/or competitions hosted by music clubs and/or associations more often than teachers from the younger generation (39.8%). More than half of the older generation (58.1%) entered their students in an average of three or fewer performance opportunities per year., while only 27.1% of the younger generation had their students participate with the same frequency.

The older generation teachers (53.7%) also attended more workshops and seminars to enhance their expertise in piano teaching, and only 33.1% of the younger generation teachers participated in workshops or seminars. A majority of the younger generation (12.7% of the total one hundred eighteen teachers) attended workshops and seminars hosted by their state associations, while the older generation (26.0%) attended local and regional workshops, including those hosted by music stores, churches, and local symphonies or those hosted by colleges or universities more frequently.

Since 1979, a greater percentage of the older teachers (59.3% to 68.6%) became active in clubs and or associations, particularly state music teacher associations. Since the 1970s, the older generation of teachers has also increased their attendance at workshops and
seminars by 42.4%. It is notable that 4.1% of the older group of respondents mentioned participation in online seminars.

**Teaching Experience**

Both generations primarily taught beginning level students, while intermediate students were the next most common students. More of the teachers from the older generation held adjunct faculty positions (9.3%) than did the younger generation (5.9%). One teacher from the older generation had a full-time faculty position versus zero respondents from the younger generation.

Older generation teachers were still teaching mainly beginning and intermediate students during the first decade of the 2000s. Their responses showed that 8.3% more respondents began teaching at institutions of higher education since the 1970s; 9.8% had adjunct teaching positions; and 7.8% had full-time teaching positions.

**Marketing and Communication**

Both generations of teachers gained most of their students through word of mouth referrals, and both groups obtained a few students by referrals from local schools or churches. Face to face interaction was the most common form of communication among teachers, students, and their parents. Most of the older generation said that they also used calls to home phones and snail mail; whereas, the younger generation indicated that the technological advancements of cell phones and email were their next preferences following face to face interactions.

The older generation of teachers indicated that since the 1970s, word of mouth continued to be the best means for recruiting most of their students. The teachers from the older group also listed other marketing strategies including those identified with the twenty-first century: piano teacher search websites (21.6%) and personal websites (21.6%). Due to length of the survey, no other questions were asked concerning marketing and communication.

**Student Demographics**

The typical eighteen to forty year-old teacher of the older generation taught six to ten students weekly, while the average teacher of the younger generation taught one to five
students weekly. The older generation of teachers increased the size of their studios to sixteen to twenty students weekly in the recent decade of the 2000 to 2009. According to both generations, the majority of students (about 60.0% to 70.0%) were female. The teachers in each generation indicated that the average age of students was eight to ten years of age. For both generations, younger children, three to four years of age, were the least likely to take piano lessons. More older generation teachers (35.2%) than younger teachers (28.8%) taught students of all ages.

**Repertoire**

About half of the younger generation of teachers and 68.5% of older generation teachers indicated that they taught a thorough mixture of literature from all musical periods (early keyboard music, Baroque, Classical, Romantic, Contemporary, and works by contemporary pedagogical authors). Approximately 81.5% of the older generation teachers and 90.7% of younger generation teachers did not intentionally incorporate works by women composers into their teaching repertoire.

The percentage of teachers from the older generation who taught a thorough mixture of piano literature from all musical periods increased in the first decade of the 2000s to 74.0%. Seventy percent of these teachers indicated that they still were not incorporating works by women composers into their teaching repertoires.

**Teaching Methods**

Most of the older generation teachers (90.7%) and a slightly higher percentage of younger generation teachers (95.8%) used published method books. Methods most commonly used by the older generation were materials authored by the Bastiens, and those most commonly used by the younger generation were books published by Alfred. Technique, theory, and sight reading were incorporated into lesson time by both generations of teachers, but the younger generation was more inclined to include ear training as well.

Fewer older generation teachers (89.8%) indicated that they used published method books in the most recent decade (2000 to 2009) than in the 1970s. The most commonly used method books used by the older generation in the first decade of the twenty-first century were those written by the Fabers, particularly Piano Adventures which was mentioned most often. Methods published by Alfred were the next most widely used. More than half of the
older generation of teachers (61.2%) incorporated technique, theory, sight reading, transposition, ear training, and composition and other creative activities into their lessons during the recent decade.

**Technology and Teaching Aids**

Tape cassettes were the most commonly used form of technology in the studios of the older generation teachers during the 1970s. Compact discs were the younger generation’s technological equivalent of the tape cassettes. Metronomes, flashcards, and pupil awards were the top three teaching aids used by both generations of teachers.

Since the 1970s, the older generation teachers began using newer forms of technology in the studio. Compact discs were most commonly reported tools along with computers, keyboards, and MIDI disks. Small percentages of teachers continued to use records (12.2%) and tape cassettes (22.4%), but a significant number of people (22.4%) used video recorders and MP3 recorders (20.4%). Metronomes, flashcards, and pupil awards remained the top three most widely used teaching aids; however, 51.0% of the teachers indicated the use of computer learning programs.

**Student Life**

Most teachers of both generations required similar practice hours per week: beginner, 0-2 hours per week; intermediate, three to five hours per week; and beginning adult, three to five hours per week. The majority of teachers from the younger generation did not teach advanced students, but the majority of those who did required their advanced students to practice six to ten hours per week (a majority of older generation teachers had the same requirements). The majority of teachers from both generations did not teach college students, but the majority of those who did required their college students to practice three to five hours per week.

Students from both generations were involved in many extra curricular activities. Teachers indicated that the majority of their students participated in religious groups and meetings, Girl Scouts or Boy Scouts, and sports. More students of the younger generation teachers than those of the older generation participated in multiple sports, religious groups and meetings, and tutoring; but more of the students of the older generation teachers were members of the Boy Scouts or Girls Scouts. A greater percentage of the younger generation
teachers (78.8%) established practice hours in consideration of extra curricular activities than did older generation teachers (51.9%). More than half of both generations kept parents informed about the student’s musical progress and required parents of young students to participate in practice.

A greater percentage of older generation teachers (90.7%) provided recital opportunities for students (recitals hosted by the teacher and not by clubs or associations) during the 1970s than did younger generation teachers (72.0%) during the most recent decade. Of those who did provide recital opportunities, the average number of recitals for both generations of teachers between ages eighteen and forty was two per year.

Due to the length of the survey, the older generation teachers were not asked about their practice requirements in the recent decade from 2000 to 2009. They were, however, asked to specify their students’ extra-curricular activities, which included religious groups and meetings (87.5%), Girl Scouts or Boy Scouts (60.4%), or sports (over half). The number of older generation teachers who provided recital opportunities for students (those hosted by the teacher and not by clubs or associations) fell by 7.4% in comparison to the 1970s. In fact, 64.6% of the teachers said that their students performed in events provided by music clubs and/or associations during the most recent decade, 2000 to 2009. The average number of recitals hosted by the older generation teachers in the most recent decade was one to two per year, and the average number of club or association performance opportunities that students participated in was two per year.

**Teacher Life**

Most teachers of the older generation taught an average of six to ten hours per week in the 1970s, but the teaching schedule of the younger generation of teachers ranged from one to ten hours per week. The majority of both generations of teachers spent about one to two hours per week lesson planning.

Of the fifty-four respondents from the older generation, the number of teachers who commuted to another location to teach lessons was exactly the same as teachers who taught in their homes (50.0%). Those of the older generation who commuted to teach lessons spent an average of one hour per week and traveled ten to twenty miles per week (14.8% of all older generation respondents reported these distances). Of the one hundred fifteen
respondents from the younger generation, the number of teachers who commuted to another location to teach lessons (72.2%) was much greater than teachers who taught in their homes. The younger teacher’s average commute was one to two hours per week with an equal percentage of teachers traveling four to six hours per week. The majority of teachers of the younger generation (14.0% of the total one hundred fifteen respondents) reported commutes of twenty-one to forty miles per week. This discrepancy in hours versus miles might be explained by the fact that 10.4% listed forty-one to sixty miles for the week in commuting and another 10.4% listed one hundred to two hundred-mile weekly total in commuting.

Since the 1970s, the teaching schedule of a majority of the older generation’s teachers more than doubled in hours to an average of twenty-one to thirty hours per week. An increase of 4.2% of teachers taught in their homes. Of the 45.8% of teachers who continued to commute to teach lessons, most spent an hour commuting per week, which showed that hours commuting had not much changed for these teachers in the past thirty years.

Lessons and Rates

The thirty-minute private lesson was the most popular length of lesson offered by both generations of teachers followed by the private one-hour and the private forty-five-minute lessons. A comparison of the percentages of teachers who taught each length of lesson and the average fees assessed for each are presented in Table 63. Although teachers from both generations taught combination, partner, and group lessons, the percentages were too minimal to be listed (please refer to Chapter Three, Lessons and Rates).

Table 63. Types of Lessons Offered 1970-1979 vs. 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private: 30. Min.</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>$9.19</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>$20.72</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>$18.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private: 45 min.</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>$13.40</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>$30.24</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>$32.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private: 1 hr.</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>$18.39</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>$42.91</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>$46.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked how their rates compared to other teachers in their area, 74.1% of the older generation respondents thought their rates were average, 9.3% thought they were low, and 16.7% thought they were high. When asked the same question, 55.7% of the younger generation respondents thought their rates were average, 35.7% thought they were low, and 8.7% thought they were high. A majority of teachers from both generations billed for lessons on a monthly basis. Most respondents from the older generation offered studio recitals, master classes, and theory classes as supplementary activities, but most of the younger generation teachers only offered studio recitals.

It is apparent in Table 63 that from 2000 to 2009, older generation teachers charged more than younger generation teachers for thirty-minute private lessons, but less for forty-five-minute and one-hour private lessons. When asked how their current rates compared to other teachers in their area, 68.8% of the respondents thought their rates were average, 14.6% thought they were low (5.3% more than in the 1970s), and 16.7% thought they were high. Older generation teachers continued to offer the same three supplementary activities besides lessons: studio recitals, master classes, and theory classes.

**Income**

A majority of the older generation of teachers (64.8%) indicated they were not the sole provider for themselves or their families during the decades of focus. Just under half of the younger generation indicated that they were not the sole financial providers for themselves or their families, but many said that they were the sole financial provider for themselves for a portion of the decade. Eleven percent of the older generation and 19.1% of the younger generation provided financially for themselves. About 13.0% percent of teachers from both generations indicated that they had combined incomes.

Of both generations of respondents who completed this portion of the survey, a smaller percentage of respondents were paid than those who volunteered for religious groups. Between 40% and 50% of all respondents from both generations were not involved in community music groups. The older generation spent less than an hour per week in religious or community groups. The younger generation offered their musical talents to religious groups for an average of two hours per week, and spent less than an hour a week of musical involvement in the community.
The older generation of teachers was not questioned about any other income except for income from religious or community groups. Similar to their situations in the 1970s, more teachers volunteered for religious groups than were paid, and 37.8% were not involved musically in the community. For both religious and community opportunities, the majority of the older respondents were involved in less than an hour of service weekly; however, an equal number of respondents were also involved in two hours of religious service per week, which was more than in the 1970s.

**Child-Care**

A majority of the older teachers (61.1%) but only 30.0% of the younger generation had children living with them for whom they were responsible. The older teachers, who taught their own children, started lessons when the child was five years old and continued lessons with that child for an average of more than two and a half years. The younger generation teachers started teaching their children a year later, six years of age, than the mothers of the older generation and the average child studied with them for about one year.

**Significant Comparisons**

Significant similarities between generations were in the areas of student demographics, repertoire, and teaching methods. According to both generations, the majority of students (about 60.0% to 70.0%) were female, and teachers in each generation indicated that the average student was eight to ten years of age. At least half of both generations of teachers taught a thorough mixture of literature from all musical periods, and most of the teachers did not intentionally incorporate works by women composers. Most teachers, who were eighteen to forty years of age during their respective decades, used theory, technique, and sight reading, but did not incorporate transposition, composition, or creative activities in lessons.

Significant differences between generations were in the areas of education, professional involvement, teacher life, and lessons and rates. Half as many of the younger teachers (10.2%) had bachelor’s degrees in piano than the older teachers (20.4%). Over half of the older teachers attended workshops and seminars to enhance their expertise in piano teaching during the 1970s, and only 33.1% of the younger generation participated in workshops or seminars in the 2000s. The typical eighteen to forty year-old teacher of the
older generation taught six to ten students weekly, while the average teacher of the younger generation taught one to five students weekly. Of the fifty-four respondents from the older generation, the number of teachers who commuted to another location to teach lessons was exactly the same as teachers who taught in their homes (50.0%). Those of the older generation who commuted to teach lessons spent an average of one hour per week commuting. About three-fourths of the younger generation commuted to teaching locations and spent anywhere from one to six hours commuting. A very significant difference between generations was in the area of lessons and rates. The older generation charged over $2.00 more for private thirty-minute lessons than the younger generation, but the younger generation charged about $2.50 more for forty-five-minute lessons and about $4.00 more for hour lessons.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter begins with a summary, which restates the twofold purpose of this thesis and reviews the procedures of the study. Following the summary, the author’s personal conclusions drawn from the results of the study are made. Following the conclusions are recommendations for further research. The chapter ends with a brief closing message.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was twofold: first, to compare generational similarities and differences of female piano teachers; and second, to discover if and how a former generation of teachers adapted their studio practices to the twenty-first century. This comparative study focused on female teachers between the ages of eighteen and forty and their piano studios during the specified decades: 1970 to 1979 and 2000 to 2009. It was not limited to teachers who were members of music clubs or associations, but was advertised through venues available to all types of piano teachers from around the country. The study revealed how piano teachers, studios, and students changed over time due to social, economic, and technological factors. The study also identified how the former generation of piano teachers adapted to the twenty-first century, and presented possible reasons for the changes or the lack of changes.

In January 2010, three questionnaires (see Appendices B, C, and D) were developed for an online survey and data collection system called SurveyMonkey. An online link was created for the collection of surveys. This link was sent to respondents via email and posted on various websites allowing respondents to select the link and to enter the survey. A letter on the first page of the survey explained the purpose of the thesis and stated respondent eligibility (see Appendix E for the Survey Letter). The female respondents were screened for eligibility in a group of teachers who either (a) taught piano lessons between January 1, 1970, and December 31, 1979, and were between forty-eight and seventy years of age when they...
completed the survey, or (b) taught piano lessons between January 1, 2000, and December 31, 2009, and were between eighteen and forty years of age when they completed the survey.

The majority of survey responses consisted of non-probability (or convenience) interviews obtained through Facebook.com. A small list of respondents was obtained through a variety of other sources including local school districts, advertisements on two websites for music teachers (MTNA.org and PracticalPedagogy.com), email announcements from music stores, and telephone recruitments obtained through online directories.

The survey included two hundred and eight online respondents among a nationwide sample of female piano teachers, and one hundred fifty-nine teachers (76.4%) completed the questionnaire. Only surveys that were completed, or those with responses to 50% or more of the questions, were included in the study. Results of this thesis represent fifty-four teachers from the older generation and one hundred eighteen teachers from the younger generation.

CONCLUSIONS

When the two generations were compared, the younger generation possessed half as many bachelor’s degrees in piano as the older generation did when they were eighteen to forty years of age in the 1970s. Between 1980 and 1999, only 35.3% of the older generation piano teachers returned to school for bachelor’s or master’s degrees, and only two completed doctorates.

Although more than half of each generation of teachers were involved in clubs and/or associations during the first decade of the 2000s, the younger generation had a far lower percentage of teachers who took advantage of performance/competition opportunities that the clubs/associations offered for their students. Younger teachers also attended fewer workshops/seminars than the older generation from 2000 to 2009. It is notable that the older generation of teachers began to attend more workshops and seminars later in life. Because the younger generation had fewer degrees with specialization in piano and piano teaching, attended fewer workshops and seminars, and had lower membership in clubs and/or associations, this study highlighted the ongoing need for proper certification in piano teaching.

When comparing the eighteen to forty year-old age groups from both generations, more older generation teachers offered yearly recitals (hosted by the teacher, not by a club or
association) than did the younger generation of teachers. Fewer of the older generation of teachers offered recitals in the 2000s than they did in the 1970s, perhaps due to their increased involvement in clubs and/or associations.

As technology developed throughout the past few decades, cell phones replaced landline phones, and email replaced snail mail as the means for communication with parents and students. Approximately one-fifth of the older generation (21.6%) adapted to the twenty-first century through the use of searchable piano teacher websites and personal websites; this was, however, a small percentage.

A majority of the teachers surveyed in this study were teaching a thorough mixture of repertoire from all musical periods in their respective decades. Most of the teachers in both groups were not intentionally incorporating works by women composers into their students’ repertoires; however, as their careers continued, more of the older generation teachers (11.5%) began introducing women composers. It is interesting to note that each generation favored a different published teaching method: the older generation used materials authored by the Bastiens during the 1970s, the younger used methods published by Alfred, and the older generation’s preference switched to method books written by the Fabers in the 2000s. Lesson activities used by the older generation in the 1970s were limited to technique, theory, and sight reading, but the younger generation used those as well as ear training. During the first decade of the 2000s, the older generation of teachers began using a greater variety of activities such as transposition, ear training, composition, and creative exercises to provide a well-rounded learning environment. Because the younger generation had not yet incorporated transposition, composition, and creative exercises into their lessons, the older generation reflected a more comprehensive approach to teaching than the younger generation of teachers.

Although technology in the twenty-first century allows for MP3 digital recordings and the viewing of performances online, a majority of teachers from the younger and older generations used compact discs during the first decade of the 2000s. The older generation’s use of computer learning programs, keyboards, and MIDI disks in the studio exhibited elements of modernization. A small portion of the older generation of teachers also used video recorders and MP3 recorders.
Half of the teachers, ages eighteen to forty in the 1970s, taught in their homes; whereas, only about a third of the younger generation of teachers taught in their homes. Of those from both generations who commuted to teach lessons, the younger generation spent as much as five more hours in commute per week. The locations of the older generation’s studios did not change much from 1970 to 2009; however, since the 1970s, a majority of the older generation’s teaching schedules more than doubled in size to an average of twenty-one to thirty hours per week. Although the reasons were not explored in the survey, the older generation taught many more students per week from 2000 to 2009. Although the reasons were not determined by this study, the average eighteen to forty year-old teacher of the 1970s taught more students on a weekly basis than did the younger generation of teachers.

Very few teachers from either generation taught group, partner, or combination lessons. Although over half of all respondents thought that their lesson rates were comparable to other teachers in their area, a greater percentage of younger generation teachers thought their rates were low (see Table 64 for lesson rates for each generation). Also, the younger generation charged more for forty-five minute and one-hour lessons than did the older generation of teachers between 2000 and 2009. Considering that the older generation of teachers had more music degrees and greater experience, surprisingly, the younger generation apparently felt that they should be able to charge comparable rates.

Table 64. Types of Lessons Offered and Fees 1970-1979 vs. 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response Percent (%)</td>
<td>Average Fee ($       )</td>
<td>Response Percent (%)</td>
<td>Average Fee ($       )</td>
<td>Response Percent (%)</td>
<td>Average Fee ($       )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private: 30. Min.</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>18.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private: 45 min.</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>30.24</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>32.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private: 1 hr.</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>18.39</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>42.91</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>46.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A majority of the older generation of teachers (64.8%) indicated they were not the sole provider for themselves or their families during the decades of focus. Less than half of the younger generation (47.3%) indicated that they were not the sole financial providers for themselves or their families either, but many (16.4%) said that they were the sole financial provider for themselves for a portion of the decade. All teachers volunteered for religious groups but were paid for community musical involvement. The older generation of teachers spent less than an hour per week contributing their musical talents to either religious or civic music organizations during the 1970s, but in the 2000s teachers from both generations volunteered an average of two hours each week to religious organizations.

More than twice the number of older generation teachers had children when they were between ages eighteen and forty in the 1970s than did younger generation teachers of the same age group from 2000 to 2009. Perhaps this is due to the fact that women in the younger generation were starting to have children later in life than was socially common in the 1970s. When compared to the younger generation, the older generation of teachers started teaching piano to their own children when the children were younger; they also taught their own children longer than the younger generation teachers.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Although this study has produced data, the reasons behind the statistics are often undetermined. Ideas for further research include a study that would compare piano teachers who are members of MTNA to piano teachers who are not. It would be interesting to know why younger piano teachers are or have been less likely to pursue degrees in piano than the older generation of teachers. Although this study asked teachers to list their highest degrees earned or their reasons for not pursuing degrees, it did not specifically inquire about original career choices. In a future study, teachers with original career choices other than independent piano teaching could be asked why they chose their original careers and why they eventually became piano teachers.

Surveys targeting students and parents might be useful in discovering more about how society values piano lessons. Familial expectations for piano study and a teacher’s qualifications could be explored in a future study. Perhaps expectations fluctuate by ethnic backgrounds or other factors. Students could also be asked how many years they studied
piano, how often they changed teachers, and the reasons for changes. Another study might explore the reasons why female teachers teach more students per week in their later years. Perhaps this is due to the fact that they are no longer pursuing higher degrees and have more time to teach, or because they no longer have children of their own living at home for whom they are responsible. Younger teachers may teach fewer students per week due to the fact that piano teaching is not their primary vocation. It would be interesting to know what percentage of piano teachers nationwide view piano teaching as their primary vocation and how many teach piano as a hobby or as a means of earning supplementary income.

Clubs and associations might benefit from a study that shows why female piano teachers, ages eighteen to forty, are less likely to participate in club/association events. Perhaps teachers between eighteen and forty years of age are not as involved in clubs and/or associations due to the financial obligations of such groups. Another reason for younger teachers’ lack of involvement may be due to the fact that they still have children at home. A future study could also determine why teachers spend relatively few hours participating musically in the community, and why they spend more time participating musically in religious organizations that in community groups. The reason for not participating in community musical events may be due to the fact that teachers are teaching during the evening hours when community organizations are most likely to meet. Religious group meetings are usually held on Sundays when teachers are less likely to be teaching.

It would be interesting to know how teachers plan lessons to address repertoire, technique, theory, sight reading, transposition, ear training, composition, creative exercises, and other activities. A study that discovers the reasons for teachers’ hesitations in utilizing group, partner, or combination lessons would be useful. Understanding these reasons could facilitate the development of workshops/seminars to educate teachers about the effectiveness of these types of lessons. This training might encourage teachers to offer these types of lessons and better enable them to teach a wider variety of activities in the lessons.

Musical organizations might also benefit from a study that shows why a large percentage of older generation teachers do not use searchable teacher websites or personal websites to market themselves as piano teachers. It might be discovered that older teachers are already established and do not need the aid of a website to enroll students in their studios. It is also possible that the older generation of teachers are not likely to learn how to use a
website or how to create their own websites.

Other topics for further study could discover why piano teachers do not intentionally incorporate repertoire by women composers, why the younger generation of teachers is more likely to commute to teaching locations than to teach from their homes, and why younger generation piano teachers are less likely to have children.

**CLOSING**

This studied fulfilled its twofold purpose: first, to compare generational similarities and differences of female piano teachers; and second, to discover if and how a former generation of teachers has adapted their studio practices to the twenty-first century through careful analysis of thirteen different aspects of the piano teaching profession and the piano studios. Piano teachers may benefit from this study by comparing who the younger private teacher of the past was and how she maintained her studio to a newer generation of eighteen to forty year old piano teachers and how they manage their own private studios. Using this study, teachers who are not affiliated with a music club or association are able to compare themselves and their independent studios to teachers who are active in local, state, and national music associations. This study allows the former generation to clearly observe the changes that have occurred, to learn about the next generation of piano teachers, and to evaluate their own practices. This study also gives the newer generation an opportunity to learn about earlier traditions in managing a piano studio and to benefit from those who have gone before them. The author hopes that this study enhances and improves piano instruction in the private studio of the average female piano teacher in some small way and, more importantly, provides a better musical education for piano students.
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APPENDIX A

SDSU HUMAN SUBJECTS TUTORIAL
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION
SDSU Human Subjects Tutorial
Certificate of Completion

This certifies that Katie Kinnaman M.A.
has demonstrated compliance with
SDSU training in the ethical and regulatory
issues associated with the protection
of human subjects in research.

Date of Certification: Saturday, July 11, 2009
Expires: Monday, July 11, 2011

Please keep this certificate in your records so that you may verify completion of training.
You may print this certificate by right clicking anywhere on the page and selecting print from the menu that appears. You
will probably find it best to print the certificate as landscape.
APPENDIX B

1970-1979 QUESTIONNAIRE
1. Respondent Information

Dear Piano Teacher,

My name is Katie Kinneman and I am a graduate student from the School of Music and Dance at San Diego State University where I study with Dr. J. Metz Kalmar. To fulfill the requirements for the M.A. in Piano Pedagogy degree I have selected a thesis topic that requires survey responses from female piano teachers located throughout the United States. The study will compare generational similarities and differences in teachers and students, and will discover if and how a former generation of teachers has adapted their studio practices to the twenty-first century.

You are eligible to take this survey if you are a female who A) taught piano lessons between the time period of January 01, 1970 and December 31, 1979 and are currently between 48 and 70 years of age, or B) taught piano lessons between the time period of January 01, 2000 and December 31, 2009 and are currently between 18 and 48 years of age.

Please feel free to email me directly for details and queries about my study at kfkpianostudio@gmail.com. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration, which is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Katie Kinneman

*1. Please provide me with your current demographic information. Your name is optional. Any email address you provide will be used only for the purposes of this survey and will not be shared with any other party.

Name: 
City/Town: 
State: 
Email Address: 

*2. I found out about this survey through/from...

☐ My local school district
☐ My local music store/studio
☐ My local university
☐ Facebook
☐ NTHA website
☐ Practical Pedagogy website
☐ A friend/colleague
☐ I received a phone call from Katie Kinneman asking me to take the survey.
☐ Other (please specify)
3. Which of the following makes you eligible to take this survey? If you do not meet either of the required categories then please exit the survey at the top right corner of this page. Thank you for your willingness to assist me in this study.

- [ ] I taught piano lessons between the time period of Jan 01, 1970 and December 31, 1979 and am currently between 48 and 70 years of age.
- [ ] I taught piano lessons between the time period of Jan 01, 2000 and December 31, 2009 and am currently between 18 and 40 years of age.

2. Education

Please answer the following questions pertaining to only the decade 1970-1979.

1. Please check your highest level of continuing education completed and degrees earned before or during the decade of focus:

- [ ] High School Diploma
- [ ] Associates Degree
- [ ] Bachelor Degree in Piano
- [ ] Bachelor Degree in Music, not piano
- [ ] Bachelor Degree in something other than music
- [ ] Graduate Degree in Piano
- [ ] Graduate Degree in Music, not piano
- [ ] Graduate Degree in something other than music
- [ ] Doctoral Degree in Piano
- [ ] Doctoral Degree in Music, not piano
- [ ] Doctoral Degree in something other than music
2. If you did not complete a piano degree of any sort in the undergraduate or graduate levels, what was your reasoning for not continuing in higher education? Please check the appropriate answer(s):

- [ ] I had financial hardships
- [ ] I had other interests at the time
- [ ] I didn’t think it was necessary
- [ ] N/A. I was still in college during this decade. I plan to graduate with a degree in piano sometime between 2010 and 2020.
- [ ] N/A. I completed a degree in piano.
- [ ] Other (please specify)

3. Professional Involvement

Please answer the following questions pertaining to only the decade 1970-1979.

* 1. In which state(s) did you reside during the decade of focus (1970-1979)?

* 2. Were you involved in or a member of any music associations or clubs during the decade of focus?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

3. If yes, please list the clubs/associations and your years of involvement. (Skip this question if not applicable.)

* 4. Did you work at a music studio/arts academy/school of music that paid you to teach their students?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
5. If you were involved in a music club, association, or studio that offered performance/competition opportunities, how many times a year did your average student perform in such events? (Skip this question if not applicable.)

6. Please list any workshops or seminars you attended during the decade focus that furthered your expertise in piano pedagogy (please include dates when possible). (Skip this question if not applicable.)

### 4. Teaching Experience

For the following questions please refer to typical years during the decade 1970-1979.

**1. During the decade of focus were you ever unable to teach piano for an extended period of time (a year or more) due to family obligations?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**2. If you were to characterize the busiest time in your studio during this decade, what was the level of students you taught during this time? (Please check all that apply)**

- [ ] Beginners
- [ ] Intermediate
- [ ] Advanced
- [ ] College
- [ ] Beginning Adult
- [ ] All of the Above
- [ ] Other (please specify) ____________________________

**3. If you taught in higher education during the decade of focus, were you adjunct faculty, full-time faculty?**

- [ ] Adjunct Faculty
- [ ] Full-time Faculty
- [ ] both
- [ ] Neither

### 5. Marketing and Communication
5. If you were involved in a music club, association, or studio that offered performance/competition opportunities, how many times a year did your average student perform in such events? (Skip this question if not applicable.)

6. Please list any workshops or seminars you attended during the decade focus that furthered your expertise in piano pedagogy (please include dates when possible). (Skip this question if not applicable.)

4. Teaching Experience

For the following questions please refer to typical years during the decade 1970-1979.

* 1. During the decade of focus were you ever unable to teach piano for an extended period of time (a year or more) due to family obligations?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

* 2. If you were to characterize the busiest time in your studio during this decade, what was the level of students you taught during this time? (Please check all that apply)
   - [ ] Beginners
   - [ ] Intermediate
   - [ ] Advanced
   - [ ] College
   - [ ] Beginning Adult
   - [ ] All of the Above
   - [ ] Other (please specify): ________________________________

* 3. If you taught in higher education during the decade of focus, were you adjunct faculty, full-time faculty?
   - [ ] Adjunct Faculty
   - [ ] Full-Time Faculty
   - [ ] Both
   - [ ] Neither

5. Marketing and Communication
1. On average, how many students did you teach weekly?

- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 21-30
- 30-40
- None or more than 40

2. What percentage of your students were female?

- None of my students were female
- About 10%
- About 20%
- About 30%
- About 40%
- About 50%
- About 60%
- About 70%
- About 80%
- About 90%
- All of my students were female

3. What ages of students did you teach during the decade that you began teaching piano lessons (1970-1979)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>3-4 Yrs Old</th>
<th>5-7 Yrs Old</th>
<th>8-10 Yrs Old</th>
<th>11-13 Yrs Old</th>
<th>14-18 Yrs Old</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>All of the Above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Repertoire

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the decade 1970-1979.
1. What period(s) of music did you primarily teach during the decade of focus?

- [ ] Early Keyboard Music
- [ ] Baroque
- [ ] Classical
- [ ] Romantic
- [ ] Contemporary
- [ ] Contemporary pedagogical authors
- [ ] I taught a thorough mix of all the above-mentioned musical periods
- [ ] Other (please specify)

2. Did you intentionally try to incorporate works by women composers into your students’ repertoires?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

3. Were other teachers you knew in the decade of focus teaching music by women composers?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] I don’t know

8. Teaching Methods

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the decade 1970-1979.

1. Did you use published method books in your studio during the decade of focus (1970-1979)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

2. If you answered yes to the above question, please list the method books you used. (Skip this question if not applicable.)
3. If you did not use a published method book in your piano studio, please explain what you did instead. (Skip this question if you used published method books.)

4. Which of the following learning activities did you incorporate into the lesson time?

- Sightreading
- Transposition
- Ear Training
- Theory
- Technique
- Composition and Creative Exercises
- All of the Above
- None of the Above
- Other (please specify)

9. Technology and Teaching Aids

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the decade 1970-1979.

1. Did you use technology in your studio during the decade of focus? If so, please check all that apply:

- Records
- Tape Cassette
- Keyboards
- Headsets
- Typewriters
- Other (please specify)
2. Please indicate any teaching aids (besides the technological aids listed above) that you used in your studio during the decade of focus:

- Flashcards
- Metronome
- Bulletin boards, charts
- Blackboards
- Pupil Awards
- Other (please specify)

10. Student Life

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the decade 1970-1979.

1. How many hours a week did you require your students to practice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours/week</th>
<th>0-2</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>14-20</th>
<th>20+</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Adult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What other types of extra-curricular activities were your students involved in besides piano lessons? Please check all that apply:

- One sport at a time
- More than one sport at a time
- Girl Scouts or Boys Scouts
- Tutoring
- Religious groups/meetings
- Other (please specify)

3. Did you establish your practice requirement in consideration of the student’s extra-curricular activities?

- Yes
- No
4. Did you keep your student’s parents informed about the student’s musical progress?

☐ Yes
☐ No

5. Were the parents of young students required to participate in the student’s practice time?

☐ Yes
☐ No

6. Did you personally provide performance opportunities (recitals) for your students?

☐ Yes
☐ No

7. If you answered yes to the previous question, how many recitals/performance opportunities did you host a year for your students?


8. Did you maintain relationships with all, most, some, or none your students once they were no longer your students?

☐ All
☐ Most
☐ Some
☐ None

11. Teacher Life

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the decade 1970-1979.

1. How many hours a week on average did you spend teaching piano lessons (include any and all lessons) during the busiest year or set of years of the decade of focus?

☐ 1-5 Hours/week
☐ 6-10 Hours/week
☐ 11-15 Hours/week
☐ 16-20 Hours/week
☐ 21-30 Hours/week
☐ 31-40 Hours/week
4. Did you keep your student’s parents informed about the student’s musical progress?
   - Yes
   - No

5. Were the parents of young students required to participate in the student’s practice time?
   - Yes
   - No

6. Did you personally provide performance opportunities (recitals) for your students?
   - Yes
   - No

7. If you answered yes to the previous question, how many recitals/performance opportunities did you host a year for your students?

8. Did you maintain relationships with all, most, some, or none your students once they were no longer your students?
   - All
   - Most
   - Some
   - None

11. Teacher Life

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the decade 1970-1979.

1. How many hours a week on average did you spend teaching piano lessons (include any and all lessons) during the busiest year or set of years of the decade of focus?
   - 1-5 Hours/week
   - 6-10 Hours/week
   - 11-15 Hours/week
   - 16-20 Hours/week
   - 21-30 Hours/week
   - 31-40 Hours/week
1. Please also list your weekly rates for those types of lessons that you offered during the decade of focus (Ex. $20.00). Leave the box blank for lesson types that you did not offer.

- Private: 15 min.
- Private: 30 min.
- Private: 45 min.
- Private: 1 hr.
- Group: 
- Partner: 
- Combination (Please specify): 
- Other (Please specify): 

Please specify if you worked at a studio that charged their own rates by writing "Studio". Please enter the rates if you know what the studio charged.

2. Please indicate if you offered any of the following events on a periodic basis.

- Masterclasses
- Studio Recitals
- Theory Classes
- I did not offer any of the above
- Other (please specify)

3. Were your rates high, average, or low for your area?

- High
- Average
- Low
4. Did you require lessons to be paid weekly, monthly, quarterly, or yearly?

☐ Weekly
☐ Monthly
☐ Quarterly
☐ Yearly
☐ I do not know because I worked for a studio/community music school.
☐ Other (please specify) __________________________

5. Please indicate if you included the cost of any of the following into lesson fees:

☐ Transportation fees (only applicable if you were commuting to lessons)
☐ Books
☐ "Materials used in the lesson" not including the student’s own books
☐ Recital Fees
☐ I did not include any of the above things into lesson fees.
☐ Other (please specify) __________________________

13. Income

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the decade 1970-1979.

1. How did you report your earnings for tax documents between 1970 and 1979?

☐ Hobby
☐ Small business
☐ I do not wish to answer this question
☐ I do not know/remember
☐ Other (please specify) __________________________
2. During the decade of focus, were you the sole financial provider for yourself and/or your family?
- Yes, for myself
- Yes, for my family
- No, I was not the sole provider for myself or for a family
- No, I had a combined income
- Yes, for myself, but only for a portion of the decade
- Yes, for my family, but only for a portion of the decade
- Other (please specify) [ ]

3. If you were the sole provider, did you depend on your piano teaching as your primary income?
- Yes
- No
- N/A

4. If applicable, what other jobs filled the financial gaps in your piano teacher's income. If not applicable, write "N/A".

5. Please describe your musical involvement in the community by checking the appropriate boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Paid, Volunteer, N/A</th>
<th>Weekly Hours of Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Child Care

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the decade 1970-1979.

1. Did you have children for whom you were responsible for living with you during the decade of focus?
- Yes
- No
2. Did you ask another person to watch your children while you were teaching lessons?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] N/A

3. Did you have to pay this person to watch your children?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] We exchanged services
   - [ ] N/A

4. (This question is only for teachers with dependent children.)
   If you had dependent children and were their primary piano teacher during the decade of focus, what ages did you start lessons with your children, and how many years did you instruct them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Age of Beginning Student</th>
<th># of Years Studying with Mom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. The End!

You have completed the survey! I assure you that your answers and identity will remain strictly confidential. Thank you very much for your time and efforts in helping me to complete my research. I am looking forward to analyzing the data and letting you know the results of the study as soon as possible!
APPENDIX C

1970-1979 QUESTIONNAIRE ON CURRENT STUDIO
1. Respondent Information

Dear Piano Teacher,

My name is Katie Kinnamon and I am a graduate student from the School of Music and Dance at San Diego State University where I study with Dr. J. Mitzi Kolar. To fulfill the requirements for the M.A. in Piano Pedagogy degree I have selected a thesis topic that requires survey responses from female piano teachers located throughout the United States. The study will compare generational similarities and differences in teachers and students, and will discover if and how a former generation of teachers has adapted their studio practices to the twenty-first century. You are eligible to take this survey if you are a female who A) taught piano lessons between the time period of January 01, 1970 and December 31, 1979 and are currently between 48 and 70 years of age, or B) taught piano lessons between the time period of January 01, 1960 and December 31, 2009 and are currently between 18 and 48 years of age.

Please feel free to email me directly for details and queries about my study at KKpianostudio@gmail.com. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration, which is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Katie Kinnamon

1. Please provide me with your current demographic information. Your name is optional. Any email address you provide will be used only for the purposes of this survey and will not be shared with any other party.

Name: 
City/Town: 
State: 
Email Address: 

2. I found out about this survey through/from...

- My local school district
- My local music store/studio
- My local university
- Facebook
- MTNA website
- Practical Pedagogy website
- A friend/colleague
- I received a phone call from Katie Kinnamon asking me to take the survey.
- Other (please specify) 


3. Which of the following makes you eligible to take this survey? If you do not meet either of the required categories then please exit the survey at the top right corner of this page. Thank you for your willingness to assist me in this study.

☐ I taught piano lessons between the time period of Jan 01, 1976 and December 31, 1979 and am currently between 40 and 70 years of age.

☐ I taught piano lessons between the time period of Jan 01, 2006 and December 31, 2009 and am currently between 18 and 40 years of age.

15. Current Teaching Status

* 1. Did you teach piano lessons at any time during the most recent decade, 2000-2009?

☐ Yes

☐ No

16. Current Education & Professional Involvement

The previous questions of this survey concerned your independent piano studio in the 1970s. The remaining questions of the survey concern the current status of your piano studio (2000-2009). For the following questions please refer to typical years during the decade 2000-2009.
1. Please list any degrees that you have earned since the year 1980 (please include year achieved or N/A):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree 1</th>
<th>Degree 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Have you been involved in or a member of any music associations or clubs during the most recent decade, 2000-2009?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

3. If yes, please list the association or club name and all years of involvement. Please write "N/A" if not applicable to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association/Club</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. If applicable, please briefly list any workshops or seminars that you attended in the most recent decade, 2000-2009. Please write "N/A" if not applicable to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop/Seminar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. Current Teaching Experience

These questions are in regards to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.

**1. What is the level of students that you taught during the most recent decade? (Please check all that apply.)**

- [ ] Beginners
- [ ] Intermediate
- [ ] Advanced
- [ ] College
- [ ] Beginning Adult
- [ ] All of the Above
- [ ] Other (please specify):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. If you taught in higher education during the most recent decade, were you adjunct faculty or full-time faculty?

- [ ] Adjunct
- [ ] Full-time
- [ ] N/A

Other (please specify): [ ]

18. Current Marketing and Communications

The following questions refer to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.

1. If applicable, how did you market yourself as a piano teacher during the most recent decade, 2000-2009? (Check all that apply.)

- [ ] N/A
- [ ] Word of Mouth
- [ ] Local Schools
- [ ] Local Churches
- [ ] Music Clubs
- [ ] Community Newsletters
- [ ] Yellow Pages
- [ ] Piano Teacher Search Websites
- [ ] Personal Website

Other (please specify): [ ]
**2. What form of communication did you use most often to communicate with your students and their parents between 2000 and 2009? (Check all that apply.)**

- [ ] Face to face interaction
- [ ] Phone
- [ ] Snail mail
- [ ] Pager
- [ ] Fax
- [ ] Email
- [ ] Other (please specify) ____________

**19. Current Student Demographics**

The following questions are in reference to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.

**1. How many students did you average weekly between 2000 and 2009?**

- [ ] 1-5
- [ ] 6-10
- [ ] 11-15
- [ ] 16-20
- [ ] 21-30
- [ ] 30+40
- [ ] More than 40

**20. Current Repertoire**

The following questions are in reference to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.
1. What period(s) of music did you primarily teach during the most recent decade, 2000-2009?
   - [ ] Early Keyboard Music
   - [ ] Baroque
   - [ ] Classical
   - [ ] Romantic
   - [ ] Contemporary
   - [ ] Contemporary pedagogical authors
   - [ ] I taught a thorough mix of all the above-mentioned musical periods
   - [ ] Other (please specify)

2. Did you intentionally try to incorporate works by women composers into your students’ repertoires during the most recent decade?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

### 21. Current Teaching Methods

The following questions refer to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.

1. Did you use published method books in your studio during the most recent decade, 2000-2009?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

2. If you used published method books, please briefly list them below. If not, please explain your teaching method in as short an explanation as possible.

[Blank]
**3. Which of the following learning activities did you incorporate into the lesson time during the most recent decade, 2000-2009?**

- Sightreading
- Transposition
- Ear Training
- Theory
- Technique
- Composition and Creative Exercises
- All of the Above
- None of the Above
- Other (please specify)

**22. Current Technology and Teaching Aids**

The following questions refer to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.

**1. Which of the following technologies have you been using in your piano studio in the most recent decade?**

- Records
- Tape cassettes
- Keyboards
- Typewriters
- Computers
- MIDI disks
- CD's
- Video Recorders
- MP3 recorders
- I do not use any of the above

Other (please specify)
2. Please indicate any teaching aids (besides the technological aids listed above) that you used in your studio between 2000 and 2009.

- [ ] Flashcards
- [ ] Metronome
- [ ] Computer learning programs
- [ ] Bulletin boards; charts
- [ ] Pupil awards
- [ ] Blackboards

Other (please specify)

23. Current Student Life

The following questions refer to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.

1. What other types of extra-curricular activities was your average current student involved in (during the most recent decade) besides piano lessons?

Please check all that apply:

- [ ] One Sport
- [ ] Two Sports
- [ ] Three Sports
- [ ] Girl Scouts or Boys Scouts
- [ ] Tutoring
- [ ] Religious groups/ meetings
- [ ] Other (please specify)
2. If you personally provided performance opportunities for your students during the most recent decade, in how many (on average) do you require your students to participate?

- [ ] N/A
- [ ] 1
- [ ] 2
- [ ] 3
- [ ] 4
- [ ] 5
- [ ] More than 5

3. If you were involved in a music club, association, or studio that offered performance/competition opportunities between 2000 and 2009, how many times a year did your average student perform in such events?

- [ ] N/A
- [ ] 1
- [ ] 2
- [ ] 3
- [ ] 4
- [ ] 5
- [ ] More Than 5
- [ ] Other (please specify)

24. Current Teacher Life

The following questions refer to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.
1. How many hours a week on average did you spend teaching piano lessons (include any and all lessons) between the years 2000 and 2009?
   - 1-5 Hours/week
   - 6-10 Hours/week
   - 11-15 Hours/week
   - 16-20 Hours/week
   - 21-30 Hours/week
   - 31-40 Hours/week

2. Did you commute to another location other than your home to teach lessons between the years 2000 and 2009?
   - Yes
   - No

3. If yes, how many hours and miles a week did you spend traveling to teaching locations (studios, community music schools, student's homes, etc)? (Skip question if not applicable.)
   - Hours/week
   - Miles/week
   - My circumstances changed during the decade of focus. (Please explain.)

25. Current Lessons and Rates

The following questions refer to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.
1. Please list your weekly rates for the types of lessons that you offered during the most recent decade (Ex. $20.00). Leave the box blank for lesson types that you did not offer.

   Private: 15 min.
   Private: 30 min.
   Private: 45 min.
   Private: 1 hr.
   Group:
   Partner:
   Combination (Please specify):
   Other (Please specify):

   Please specify if you worked at a studio that changed their own rates by writing "Studio". Please enter the rates if you know what the studio charged.

2. Please indicate if you offered any of the following events on a periodic basis.

   □ Masterclasses
   □ Studio Recitals
   □ Theory Classes
   □ I did not offer any of the above
   □ Other (please specify)

3. Were your rates high, average, or low for your area?

   □ High
   □ Average
   □ Low

26. Current Income

The following questions refer to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.
1. How did you report your earnings for tax documents between 2000 and 2009?

- Hobby
- Small business
- I do not wish to answer this question
- I do not know/remember
- Other (please specify)

2. Please describe your musical involvement in the community by checking the appropriate boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paid, Volunteer, N/A</th>
<th>Weekly Hours of Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. The End!

You have completed the survey! I assure you that your answers and identity will remain strictly confidential. Thank you very much for your time and efforts in helping me to complete my research. I am looking forward to analyzing the data and letting you know the results of the study as soon as possible!
APPENDIX D

2000-2009 QUESTIONNAIRE
1. Respondent Information

Dear Piano Teacher,

My name is Katie Kinneman and I am a graduate student from the School of Music and Dance at San Diego State University where I study with Dr. J. Mitzi Kolmar. To fulfill the requirements for the M.A. in Piano Pedagogy degree I have selected a thesis topic that requires survey responses from female piano teachers located throughout the United States. The study will compare generational similarities and differences in teachers and students, and will discover if and how a former generation of teachers has adapted their studio practices to the twenty-first century. You are eligible to take this survey if you are a female who A) taught piano lessons between the time period of January 01, 1970 and December 31, 1979 and are currently between 48 and 70 years of age, or B) taught piano lessons between the time period of January 01, 2000 and December 31, 2009 and are currently between 18 and 45 years of age.

Please feel free to email me directly for details and queries about my study at KKpianostudio@gmail.com. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration, which is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Katie Kinneman

*1. Please provide me with your current demographic information. Your name is optional. Any email address you provide will be used only for the purposes of this survey and will not be shared with any other party.

Name: 
City/Town: 
State: 
Email Address: 

*2. I found out about this survey through/from...

☐ My local school district
☐ My local music store/studio
☐ My local university
☐ Facebook
☐ NTHA website
☐ Practical Pedagogy website
☐ A friend/colleague
☐ I received a phone call from Katie Kinneman asking me to take the survey.

☐ Other (please specify)
3. Which of the following makes you eligible to take this survey? If you do not meet either of the required categories then please exit the survey at the top right corner of this page. Thank you for your willingness to assist me in this study.

☐ I taught piano lessons between the time period of Jan 01, 1978 and December 31, 1979 and am currently between 48 and 70 years of age.

☐ I taught piano lessons between the time period of Jan 01, 2006 and December 31, 2009 and am currently between 18 and 40 years of age.

27. 2000-2009: Education

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.
* 1. Please check your highest level of continuing education completed and
degrees earned before or during the decade of focus:

- High School Diploma
- Associate's Degree
- Bachelor of Science in Piano
- Bachelor of Music, not piano
- Bachelor of Music in something other than music
- Graduate Degree in Piano
- Graduate Degree in Music, not piano
- Graduate Degree in something other than music
- Doctoral Degree in Piano
- Doctoral Degree in Music, not piano
- Doctoral Degree in something other than music

* 2. If you did not complete a piano degree of any sort in the undergraduate
or graduate levels, what was your reasoning for not continuing in higher
education? Please check the appropriate answer(s):

- I had financial hardships
- I had other interests at the time
- I didn’t think it was necessary
- N/A. I was still in college during this decade. I plan to graduate with a degree in piano sometime between 2010
  and 2020.
- N/A. I completed a degree in piano.
- Other (please specify)

28. 2000-2009: Professional Involvement

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.

* 1. In which state(s) did you reside between 2000 and 2009?

* 2. Were you involved in or a member of any music associations or clubs
during the decade of focus?

- Yes
- No
3. If yes, please list the clubs/associations and your years of involvement. (Skip this question if not applicable.)

4. Did you work at a music studio/arts academy/school of music that paid you to teach their students?
   - Yes
   - No

5. If you were involved in a music club or association that offered performance/competition opportunities, how many times a year did your average student perform in such events? (Skip this question if not applicable.)

6. Please list any workshops or seminars you attended during the decade of focus that furthered your expertise in piano pedagogy (please include dates when possible). (Skip this question if not applicable.)

29. 2000-2009: Teaching Experience

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the most recent decade, 2000-2009. For the following questions please refer to typical years during this decade.

* 1. During the decade of focus were you unable to teach piano for an extended period of time (a year or more) due to family obligations?
   - Yes
   - No
2. If you were to characterize the busiest time in your studio during this decade, what was the level of students you taught during this time? (Please check all that apply)

- Beginners
- Intermediate
- Advanced
- College
- Beginning Adult
- All of the Above
- Other (please specify)

3. If you taught in higher education during the decade of focus, were you adjunct faculty, full-time faculty or both?

- Adjunct Faculty
- Full-time Faculty
- Both
- Neither

30. 2000-2009: Marketing and Communication

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.

1. How did you market yourself as a piano teacher during the decade of focus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I didn't gain any students</th>
<th>I gained a few students</th>
<th>I gained many of my students this way</th>
<th>I gained most of my students this way</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Churches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Newsletters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Teacher Search Webites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worked at a studio/community music school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify the strategy and its effectiveness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. What form of communication did you use most often to communicate with your students and their parents during the decade of focus? (Check all that apply.)

- Face to face interaction
- Home Phone
- Snail mail
- Fax
- Cell Phone
- Pager
- Email
- Other (please specify) ______________

31. 2000-2009: Student Demographics

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.

1. On average, how many students did you teach weekly?

- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 21-30
- 31-40
- More than 40
**2. What percentage of your students were female?**

- [ ] None of my students were female
- [ ] About 10%
- [ ] About 20%
- [ ] About 30%
- [ ] About 40%
- [ ] About 50%
- [ ] About 60%
- [ ] About 70%
- [ ] About 80%
- [ ] About 90%
- [ ] All of my students were female

**3. What ages of students did you teach between the years 2000 and 2009?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3-4 Yrs Old</th>
<th>5-7 Yrs Old</th>
<th>8-10 Yrs Old</th>
<th>11-13 Yrs Old</th>
<th>14-18 Yrs Old</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>All of the Above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**32. 2000-2009: Repertoire**

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.

**1. What period(s) of music did you primarily teach during decade of focus?**

(Check all that apply.)

- [ ] Early Keyboard Music
- [ ] Baroque
- [ ] Classical
- [ ] Romantic
- [ ] Contemporary
- [ ] Contemporary pedagogical authors
- [ ] I taught a thorough mix of all the above-mentioned musical periods
- [ ] Other (please specify)
2. Did you intentionally try to incorporate works by women composers into your students' repertoires?
   - Yes
   - No

3. Were other teachers you knew in the decade of focus teaching music by women composers?
   - Yes
   - No
   - I don't know

33. 2000-2009: Teaching Methods

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.

1. Did you use published method books in your studio from 2000-2009?
   - Yes
   - No

2. If you answered yes to the above question, what method books did you use? (Skip this question if not applicable.)

3. If you did not use a published method book in your piano studio, please explain what you did instead. (Skip this question if you used published method books.)
4. Which of the following learning activities did you incorporate into the lesson time?

- Sightreading
- Transposition
- Ear Training
- Theory
- Technique
- Composition and Creative Exercises
- All of the Above
- Other (please specify) ________

34. 2000-2009: Technology and Teaching Aids

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.

1. Did you use technology in your studio during the decade of focus? If so, please check all that apply:

- Records
- Tape Cassettes
- Keyboards
- Headsets
- Typewriters
- Computer Learning Programs
- MIDI
- CD’s
- Other (please specify) ________
2. Please indicate any teaching aids (besides the technological aids listed above) that you used in your studio during the decade of focus:

- Flashcards
- Metronome
- Bulletin boards; charts
- Blackboards
- Pupil Awards
- Other (please specify) [___]

35. 2000-2009: Student Life

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.

1. How many hours a week did you require your students to practice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours/week</th>
<th>0-2</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>20+</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginners</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Adult</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What other types of extra-curricular activities were your students involved in besides piano lessons? Please check all that apply:

- One sport at a time
- More than one sport at a time
- Girl Scouts or Boys Scouts
- Tutoring
- Religious groups/meetings
- Other (please specify) [___]

3. Did you establish your practice requirement in consideration of the student’s extra curricular activities?

- Yes
- No
4. Did you keep your student’s parents informed about the student’s musical progress?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

5. Were the parents of young students required to participate in the student’s practice time?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

6. Did you personally provide performance opportunities (recitals) for your students?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

7. If you answered yes to the previous question, how many recitals/performance opportunities did you host a year for your students? Please write “N/A” if not applicable.

8. Did you maintain relationships with all, most, some, or none your students once they were no longer your students?
   ○ All
   ○ Most
   ○ Some
   ○ None

36. 2000-2009: Teacher Life

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.

1. How many hours a week on average did you spend teaching piano lessons (include any and all lessons) during the busiest year or set of years of the decade of focus?
   ○ 1-5 Hours/week
   ○ 6-10 Hours/week
   ○ 11-15 Hours/week
   ○ 16-20 Hours/week
   ○ 21-30 Hours/week
   ○ 31-40 Hours/week
**2. How many hours a week on average did you spend lesson planning?**

- 0
- 1 Hour/week
- 2 Hours/week
- 3 Hours/week
- 4 Hours/week
- 5 Hours/week
- More than 5 hours a week

**3. Did you commute to another location other than your home to teach lessons?**

- Yes
- No

**4. If yes, how many hours and miles a week did you spend traveling to teaching locations (studios, community music schools, student’s homes, etc)? Please skip this question if it does not apply to you.**

- Hours/week
- Miles/week
- My circumstances changed during the decade of focus. (Please explain.)

**5. If you taught in your home, were you subject to zoning restrictions?**

- Yes
- No
- N/A

---

**37. 2000-2009: Lessons and Rates**

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.
1. Please also list your weekly rates for those types of lessons that you offered during the decade of focus (Ex. $20.00). Leave the box blank for lesson types that you did not offer.

   Private: 15 min.  
   Private: 30 min.  
   Private: 45 min.  
   Private: 1 hr.  
   Group:  
   Partner:  
   Combination (Please specify):  
   Other (Please specify):  

   Please specify if you worked at a studio that charged their own rates by writing "Studio". Please enter the rates if you know what the studio charged.

2. Please indicate if you offered any of the following events on a periodic basis.

   - Masterclasses  
   - Studio Recitals  
   - Theory Classes  
   - I did not offer any of the above  

   Other (please specify):  

3. Were your rates high, average, or low for your area?

   - High  
   - Average  
   - Low
4. Did you require lessons to be paid weekly, monthly, quarterly, or yearly?

☐ Weekly
☐ Monthly
☐ Quarterly
☐ Yearly
I do not know because I worked for a studio/community music school.
☐ Other (please specify)

5. Please indicate if you included the cost of any of the following into lesson fees:

☐ Transportation fees (only applicable if you were commuting to lessons)
☐ Books
☐ "Materials used in the lesson" not including the student's own books
☐ Recital Fees
☐ I did not include any of the above things into lesson fees.
☐ Other (please specify)

38. 2000-2009: Income

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.

1. How did you report your earnings for tax documents: as a hobby or as a small business (or other)?

☐ Hobby
☐ Small business
☐ Other (please specify)
2. During the decade of focus, were you the sole financial provider for yourself and/or your family?

☐ Yes, for myself
☐ Yes, for my family
☐ No, I was not the sole provider for myself or for a family
☐ No, I had a combined income
☐ Yes, for myself, but only for a portion of the decade
☐ Yes, for my family, but only for a portion of the decade

3. If you were the sole provider, did you depend on your piano teaching as your primary income?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ N/A

4. If applicable, what other jobs filled the financial gaps in your piano teacher's income. Please write "N/A" if not applicable.


5. Please describe your musical involvement in the community by checking the appropriate boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Paid, Volunteer, N/A</th>
<th>Weekly Hours of Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. 2000-2009: Child Care

Please answer the following questions pertaining only to the most recent decade, 2000-2009.

1. Did you have children, for whom you were responsible, living with you between the years 2000 and 2009?

☐ Yes
☐ No
2. Did you ask another person to watch your children while you were teaching lessons?
   - Yes
   - No
   - N/A

3. Did you have to pay this person to watch your children?
   - Yes
   - No
   - We exchanged services
   - N/A

4. (Skip this question if you did not have dependent children between 2000 and 2009.)
   If you had dependent children and were their primary piano teacher during the decade of focus, what ages did you start lessons with your children, and how many years did you instruct them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Beginning Student</th>
<th># of Years Studying with Mom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. The End!

You have completed the survey! I assure you that your answers and identity will remain strictly confidential. Thank you very much for your time and efforts in helping me to complete my research. I am looking forward to analyzing the data and letting you know the results of the study as soon as possible!
APPENDIX E

SURVEY LETTER
Dear Piano Teacher,

My name is Katie Kinnaman and I am a graduate student from the School of Music and Dance at San Diego State University where I study with Dr. J. Mitzi Kolar. To fulfill the requirements for the M.A. in Piano Pedagogy degree I have selected a thesis topic that requires survey responses from female piano teachers located throughout the United States. The study will compare generational similarities and differences in teachers and students, and will discover if and how a former generation of teachers has adapted their studio practices to the twenty-first century. It will be specific to female piano teachers who (a) taught piano lessons between January 1, 1970, and December 31, 1979, and are currently between forty-eight and seventy years of age, or (b) taught piano lessons between January 1, 2000, and December 31, 2009, and are currently between eighteen and forty years of age.

I have been doing a nationwide search for piano teachers, and I am wondering if you might be able to help me by taking my confidential, online survey, which will give you the opportunity to represent other female piano teachers from your area. Your participation is crucial to the effectiveness of this study.

The survey is entitled “A Comparative Study: Two Generations of Female Piano Teachers.” Clicking on the link will take you directly to the survey.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/GSDYJHV

Please feel free to email me directly for details and queries about my study at KKpianostudio@gmail.com. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration, which is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Katie Kinnaman