Exploring the Competencies of Collaborative Pianists in Music Education: A Pilot Study

Linda Mravunac Fabijanić

University of Zagreb Academy of Music, Croatia

lindamravunac@gmail.com

Abstract

Collaborative pianists prepare and perform music pieces with singers, instrumentalists, or ensembles. In educational settings, they are expected to possess artistic, pedagogical, and specific collaborative piano competencies. Given the scarcity of research on collaborative pianists in Croatia, it was important to identify the key competencies required for conducting collaborative piano lessons in Croatian music schools and academies. The aim of this study was to develop an instrument to assess students' perceptions of collaborative pianists' competencies relevant to teaching and conducting collaborative piano lessons in educational contexts. Another aim was to explore differences in students' perceptions by study major, age, gender, and year of study.

The preceding phase of the research involved collecting the opinions of collaborative pianists (N = 9) and fifth-year students (N = 9) at the University of Zagreb Academy of Music regarding essential competencies. Using qualitative content analysis, the responses were categorized into five competency categories: Performance and Artistic, Planning and Organisational, Communication and Pedagogical, Facilitation, and Reflective Practitioner Competencies. In this pilot study, 88 students from the University of Zagreb Academy of Music completed the *Collaborative pianists' competencies* online questionnaire. Participants rated 73 initial items using a 5-point Likert-type scale.

Principal component analysis (PCA, with Varimax rotation and Kaiser-Guttman criterion) was applied and four factors were extracted: Performance and Artistic Competencies (α = .92), Communication and Pedagogical Competencies (α = .89), Facilitation Competencies (α = .88), and Reflective Practitioner Competencies (α = .88). Gender-based differences were observed in overall competency ratings, with female students assigning higher scores. A statistically significant difference emerged within the Facilitation Competencies factor between the 16-19 and 20-22 age groups, with the younger group attributing greater importance to these competencies.

The *Collaborative pianists' competencies* instrument demonstrates strong alignment with a theoretically grounded competency framework, shows high structural validity, and is recommended for application with a larger student sample.

Keywords: collaborative pianist, competencies, music education, pilot study

Introduction

Ever since White (1959) introduced the concept of competency to explain aspects of human behaviour previously unaccounted for by existing motivation theories, research into an individual's ability to efficiently communicate with their environment and engage in gradual learning has become increasingly prominent in the literature. In its broadest sense, competency can be defined as a combination of knowledge, skills, abilities, and ethical awareness applied when working and interacting with others. Competence occupies an important place in all spheres of human activity, particularly in education. Since the role of the teacher is dynamic and constantly evolving, teacher competencies and personal traits directly impact the development of children and youth (Mravunac Fabijanić et al., 2024). Consequently, modern-day teachers are expected to strengthen their role in the students' educational process and effectively respond to the challenges of contemporary society. Lifelong learning, professional training, and continuous development is a right and an obligation for all teachers.

Collaborative piano lessons include individual work by the collaborative pianist with a voice or instrument student in the classroom, where they rehearse a musical piece with the student, as well as a public performance of that piece that showcases what the student has learned. Therefore, in both settings, the collaborative pianists' teaching artistry lies in integrating artistic and pedagogical elements (Wildschütz, 2018; Witt, 2020). A similar duality has

been recognized in vocal and instrumental teachers (Polifonia working group for instrumental and vocal music teacher training, 2010). The broadly designed conceptual framework of competencies, classified into six categories (Performance and Artistic, Planning and Organisational, Communication and Pedagogical, Facilitation, Reflective Practitioner, and Networking and Collaborative Competencies), is based on various roles they play in the classroom, especially taking into account the change in teaching paradigm from teacher-focused to student-focused. This allows teachers and institutions to further develop it in practice and thus adjust to the peculiarities of the profession within a specific educational system (Polifonia working group for instrumental and vocal music teacher training, 2010).

In addition to artistic competencies, such as interpretation, highly advanced musical and technical piano skills (Katz, 2009; Moore, 1956) and pedagogical competencies, collaborative pianists should also have specific collaborative piano skills in order to work effectivelly with singers and instrumentalists (Roussou, 2017; Yang, 2023). Academic research on collaborative piano and pianists, that began with American doctoral theses (Lippmann, 1979; Mann–Polk, 1984; Rose, 1981), continues to develop today. This body of research has explored educational systems from the perspective of collaborative piano lessons (Lee, 2009; Yang, 2023), as well as competencies required for working with singers (Rich, 2002) and choirs (Lee, 2016), professional and musical competencies (Lee, 2009; Yang, 2023), and practical skills and roles (Roussou, 2017). Other studies have examined non-musical competencies (Wildschütz, 2018; Witt, 2020), partner relationships (Lee, 2009; Kiik-Salupere & Ross, 2011), interpersonal relationships and empathy (Cota, 2019), and performance cues established during rehearsals and applied in public performances (Lisboa et al., 2013). However, research in this field in Croatia remains extremely limited (Mravunac Fabijanić, 2021).

Aims

The aim of this study was to design an instrument for assessing the key competencies that collaborative pianists should possess when conducting collaborative piano lessons in Croatian music schools, as well as music and art academies. Another aim was to examine differences in students' perceptions of these competencies based on their study major (voice, string, or wind/brass instrument), age, gender, and year of study.

Based on the assumption that collaborative pianists require specific skills when working with singers, with string and wind/brass instrumentalists (Roussou, 2017; Yang, 2023) and that both collaborative pianists and students have particular expectations of one another (Roussou, 2017), it was expected that significant differences in students' estimation of collaborative pianists' competencies would be found depending on their study major (H_1). It was further assumed that there would be no significant differences in students' opinions regarding the required competencies based on age (H_2), gender (H_3) or year of study (H_4).

Method

Sample

The convenience sample included all students from the voice, string, and wind/brass departments of the University of Zagreb Academy of Music, as well as percussion, harp, and tamboura students who work with collaborative pianists (N = 283). The questionnaire was completed by 114 students; however, not all met the criteria for inclusion in the research sample. As a result, 77% of the submitted responses were included in the analysis. The final sample consisted of 88 students (age range: 16–32; M = 21.28, SD = 2.77; 52 female, 36 male; 19 vocal, 21 string, 35 wind/brass department, 13 other).

Measure

A Questionnaire for assessing collaborative pianists' competencies was developed specifically for the purposes of this study (see Appendix).

Phase 1: Defining competence categories and preparing the *Collaborative pianists' competencies* questionnaire. In a previous study (Mravunac Fabijanić, 2021), a total of 181 statements were collected from fifth-year students of the voice and instrumental departments at the University of Zagreb Academy of Music (N = 9), as well as from collaborative pianists (N = 9). These statements reflected what respondents considered to be desirable competencies in collaborative pianists. Responses with similar meanings, such as "being very patient and having strong nerves" and "no productive work can be done with distressed and nervous pianist", were replaced with a single item: "A collaborative pianist must be very patient and have strong nerves". This process resulted in a refined list of 73 items, which were then categorized

into five competence categories (Performance and Artistic, Planning and Organisational, Communication and Pedagogical, Facilitation, and Reflective Practitioner Competencies), in line with the Polifonia framework (Polifonia working group for instrumental and vocal music teacher training, 2010). Content and substantial validity were evaluated in this phase by nine collaborative pianists, two experts in psychology and music pedagogy, and one person from the student population. All agreed that the items adequately represented the relevant aspects of collaborative pianists' competencies. Thus, the *Collaborative Pianists' competencies* questionnaire was prepared.

Phase 2: Pilot study. Items 1–4 of the questionnaire collected socio-demographic data (age, gender, study major and year of study), and the subsequent 30 questions pertained to competencies required for conducting collaborative piano lessons. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with each statement using a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 – *strongly disagree*, 5 – *strongly agree*). The questionnaire took approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Procedure

Following the approval from the dean of the University of Zagreb Academy of Music, students completed the *Collaborative pianists' competencies* questionnaire via an online Google Forms survey between February and May 2021. A statement preceding the survey explained the purpose of the study, the nature of the questions, and participants' rights. Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and the research was conducted in accordance with ethical guidelines. By submitting the completed questionnaire, participants consented to the use of their data for academic purposes. It was clearly stated that individual responses would not be analysed, in order to encourage honest and thoughtful participation.

Data analysis

The quantitative method of data analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics, Version 26. The main statistical methods applied included principal component analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation and the Kaiser-Guttman criterion, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and independent samples t-test. These methods were used to examine the factor structure of the questionnaire and to assess differences in students' responses based on demographic variables.

Results

Factor analysis

Multiple factor analyses were conducted using principal component analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation and the Kaiser-Guttman criterion, based on the initial set of 73 items defined in Phase 1 of the research. In the first step, 16 factors were extracted. Items with non-significant loadings (< .50) and those with multiple loadings were excluded. A second iteration yielded 8 factors, followed by another exclusion of items with non-significant/multiple loadings. Prior to the final analysis, the necessary assumptions for factor analysis were checked and confirmed: the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure was .882, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was significant at 1% level (χ = 1929,01, df = 435), indicating that the data were suitable for factor analysis. Based on the Kaiser-Guttman criterion (eigenvalues > 1), four factors were retained, explaining 64.675% of the variance. The factors were as follows: Performance and Artistic Competencies (eigenvalue = 12.879) accounted for 22% of the variance, Communication and Pedagogical Competencies (eigenvalue = 2.795) explained 15.83% of the variance, Facilitation Competencies (eigenvalue = 2.040) accounted for 13.81% of the variance, Reflective Practitioner Competencies (eigenvalue = 1.671) explained 12.99% of the variance. This factor structure was supported by the Scree plot test.

Following the determination of the final factor structure, basic descriptive statistics were calculated for each item. The questionnaire demonstrated excellent internal reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha of .95 for the entire scale. The final version of *Collaborative pianists' competencies* questionnaire consists of 30 items grouped into four factors: Performance and Artistic Competencies (11 items; M = 4.54, SD = 0.56, α = .92), Communication and Pedagogical Competencies (7 items; M = 4.56, SD = 0.62, α = .89), Facilitation Competencies (7 items; M = 4.17, SD = 0.70, α = .88) and Reflective Practitioner Competencies (5 items; M = 4.15, SD = 0.72, α = .88). The final version of the questionnaire is provided in the Appendix.

The importance of competencies

Students rated Performance and Artistic Competencies as the most important. Of those, the highest-rated items were item 1.5 "It is important for a collaborative pianist to be able to adjust tempo", (M = 4.85, SD = 0.54), item 1.2 "A collaborative

pianist should perform melody and phrase nicely." (M = 4.80, SD = 0.57), and item 1.1 "A collaborative pianist must be musical and musically engaged" (M = 4.76, SD = 0.63). Following this, Communication and Pedagogical Competencies were rated highly, with item 2.3 "The signals, glances and synchronized breathing developed between a student and a collaborative pianist are important" receiving a mean score (M = 4.76, SD = 0.66) comparable to item 1.1 from the previous factor. Facilitation Competencies ranked third in importance. The highest-rated items in this factor were item 3.2. "A collaborative pianist should be psychologically stable and know how to act and what to say in the moments preceding the performance" (M = 4.51, SD = 0.80), and item 3.6. "Prior to a performance, a collaborative pianist should know how to deal with different people; the personal, human, and friendly moment is extremely important before going on stage" (M = 4.42, SD = 0.83). Within this factor, the item with the lowest overall agreement was 3.1 „A collaborative pianist is like a conductor; using breath, head or other signs to signal to a soloist when to step in" (M = 3.73, SD = 1.17). Reflective Practitioner Competencies received the least importance overall. This factor includes two items that ranked as the 2nd and 3rd least agreed with statements in the entire study: item 4.2 "A collaborative pianist should always meet the expectations of their colleagues teaching the study major" (M = 3.77, SD = 1.00), and item 4.1 "A collaborative pianist should always be well-practiced, well-prepared, accurate and precise, and must not be sloppy" (M = 3.81, SD = 0.98).

Overall differences in respondents' perceptions

This study examined whether students' assessments of collaborative pianists' competencies differed based on their study major, age, gender, and year of study, in order to test the proposed hypotheses.

Study major. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore whether students from different study majors rated collaborative pianists' competencies differently. The mean scores were relatively close across groups: singing (n = 19, M = 4.36, SD = 0.45), wind/brass (n = 35, M = 4.38, SD = 0.66), and string instruments (n = 21, M = 4.52, SD = 0.39). Tests for normality and homogeneity of variance supported the use of ANOVA. The analysis showed no statistically significant differences between study majors, $F(2, 85) = 0.60$, $p > .05$. The effect size was very small (partial $\eta_p^2 = .016$), indicating that study major explained only 1.6% of the variance in competency ratings. Thus, the first hypothesis, which predicted differences based on study major, was not confirmed.

Age. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to examine differences in respondents' opinions based on age. Students were divided into three age groups: 16-19 years (n = 29, M = 4.46, SD = 0.38), 20-22 years (n = 34, M = 4.33, SD = 0.67), and 23-28 years (n = 24, M = 4.42, SD = 0.43). Despite minor deviations from normality, the data met the assumptions for ANOVA. The test showed no significant difference in competency evaluations by age group, $F(2, 84) = 0.54$, $p > .05$. The partial eta squared value (.012) indicated that age accounted for only 1.2% of variance. The Pearson correlation, $r(87) = -.19$, $p > .05$, also showed a weak and non-significant relationship, confirming the second hypothesis that age does not influence students' opinions on competencies.

Gender. An independent samples t-test was used to compare male (n = 36) and female (n = 52) respondents. The Levene's test confirmed homogeneity of variances (F = 2.31, p = .132). Results revealed a statistically significant difference, t (86) = -2.13, $p < .05$, with females rating the competencies higher (M_{female} = 4.5) than males (M_{male} = 4.3). The effect size was moderate (partial $\eta_p^2 = .05$), indicating that gender explained 5% of the variance in responses. This finding contradicts the third hypothesis, indicating that gender does influence perceptions of collaborative pianists' competencies.

Year of study. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to examine differences in competency evaluation based on respondents' year of study. Students were grouped into first year (n = 40, M = 4.46, SD = 0.35), second and third year (n = 29, M = 4.31, SD = 0.71), and fourth and fifth year (n = 19, M = 4.91, SD = 0.48). Although minor deviations from normality were observed, the assumptions of homogeneity and symmetry were met. The ANOVA showed no significant differences based on year of study, $F(2, 85) = 0.64$, $p > .05$. Partial eta squared was .015, indicating a minimal relationship, with the year of study explaining only 1.5% of variance. These results support the fourth hypothesis that the year of study does not significantly affect students' competency evaluations.

Since the results turned out to be quite homogeneous across respondent groups, no statistically significant differences of opinions were found based on study major, age, or year of study. The only statistically significant difference was

observed between male and female respondents, with female students rating competencies slightly higher overall. To gain deeper insight, further analysis was conducted to determine whether differences existed within each of the four identified competency factors.

Differences per factor

Gender. To explore whether gender differences existed across the four factors, a series of independent samples *t*-tests was conducted. The analysis revealed that the differences between male and female respondents were not statistically significant for any individual factor. Although female students rated overall competencies slightly higher than male students, gender was not a significant variable when the factors were examined separately.

Age, study major and year of study. Several multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were performed to determine whether students' responses differed significantly across the four competency factors based on age, study major, and year of study. A significant difference was detected by year of study. To explore this further, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with age as the independent variable, specifically examining its relationship with the Facilitation Competence factor. The results indicated a statistically significant difference among age groups, $F(2, 85) = 2.66$, $p < .05$. Post hoc comparisons (Tukey HSD and Scheffé tests) revealed a significant difference between the 16-19 ($M = 4.43$, $SD = 0.45$) and the 20-22 ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.85$) age groups, with the younger group assigning higher ratings to Facilitation Competencies.

Discussion

This research was conducted with the aim of creating a new instrument for assessing collaborative pianists' competencies important for maintaining collaborative piano lessons in Croatian music schools and music/art academies and examining the differences in students' opinions depending on their study major (voice, string or wind/brass instrument), age, gender, and year of study. Results show that the questionnaire containing four factors and 30 items adequately represents the required competencies. The instrument has a high structural validity and reliability and can be a useful research tool in the future.

Respondents think that Performance and Artistic Competencies are the most important, which is in line with earlier research. Setting and maintaining tempo is important when playing music together (Roussou, 2017), but equally important are occasional deviations from tempo (Katz, 2009; Moore, 1956; Morgenroth, 2015) and flexibility (Lippmann, 1979). Furthermore, it is also important that collaborative pianists are able to play melody beautifully, in a "singing tone" (Lippmann, 1979, p. 13) or "singing, sustained, tone" (Rose, 1981, p. 77). Musical engagement also involves making analytical considerations related to issues of harmony, phrasing and voicing (Pow, 2016; Savella, 2023). In this context, breathing together refers to non-verbal communication needed for the two performers playing together in an ensemble (Katz, 2009; Wildschütz, 2018). Similarly, performing in public calls for a combination of auditory, visual and social communication (Roussou, 2017). Giving clear non-verbal messages is an important strategy in overcoming communication obstacles (Lee, 2016). It is therefore no wonder that in this research students found Communication and Pedagogical Competencies the second most important set of competencies. Collaborative pianists as facilitators respond to the different needs of their students and create a supportive and collaborative learning environment (Polifonia working group for instrumental and vocal music teacher training, 2010; Witt, 2020). Surprisingly, this Facilitation Competencies factor contains an item that respondents least agreed with in the whole research (3.1 "A collaborative pianist is like a conductor, using breath, head or other signs to signal to a soloist when to step in"). On the one hand, perhaps students do not expect one-way cues and communication from a collaborative pianist but consider these to be a jointly shared responsibility (Lisboa et al., 2013; Wildschütz, 2018). On the other hand, it is also possible that students, soon to be professionals, do not need assistance to the extent that primary and secondary music schools' pupils do. Results would probably be different if the opinions of pupils were also taken into account, which is a recommendation for a future piece of research. As for Reflective Practitioner Competencies, it seems as if Croatian students care least about them. The finding that they should not always meet the expectations of their colleagues teaching the study major will bring particular joy to collaborative pianists. Previous research has also shown that students value other characteristics in collaborative pianists: experience, musicality, listening, adaptability (Haddon, 2016, as cited in Roussou, 2017, p. 46) and expect

partnership in the teaching/learning process between collaborative pianist, vocal teacher, and student (Kiik-Salupere & Ross, 2011).

In addition to the four types of collaborative pianists' competencies confirmed in this research (Performance and Artistic, Communication and Pedagogical, Facilitation, Reflective Practitioner Competencies), the conceptual framework developed by Polifonia working group for instrumental and vocal music teacher training (2010) suggests two additional competency areas (Networking and Collaborative Competencies, Planning and Organisational Competencies). Although collaborative pianists regularly perform in concerts at institutions for which they work or elsewhere, participate in the music life of the school/academy, community and society, and promote music, respondents seem to have focused only on the artistic and pedagogical context of collaborative piano classes in the classroom and in the qualitative phase of the research (Mravunac Fabijanić, 2021) not a single statement they made was included in the Networking and Collaborative Competencies. Similarly, the results of this pilot study did not show the existence of Planning and Organisational Competencies, which refer to teachers using their knowledge and skills to plan, monitor, and evaluate different learning and teaching situations in ways that facilitate students' musical development (Polifonia working group for instrumental and vocal music teacher training, 2010). Upon further review, competencies that had previously been listed here belong to some other category. For example, statements 1.8 "A collaborative pianist should be knowledgeable enough to be able to advise students in their personal development", 1.9 "A collaborative pianist is very important in the musical education of students" and 1.10 "A collaborative pianist should always readily help students" have now been classified as Performance and Artistic competencies. On the one hand, results show that in practice, teacher roles and competencies are intertwined (Mravunac Fabijanić, 2021, p. 35), which is also highlighted within the competence framework (Polifonia working group for instrumental and vocal music teacher training, 2010). On the other hand, such results are not in line with previous research. In fact, Witt (2020) finds that the development and application of skills of collaborative pianists as art advocates can enrich the entire collaborative piano work process as well as collaboration with the audience and community.

Another aim of this research was to examine the differences in respondents' opinions about desirable collaborative pianists' competencies, depending on study major, age, gender, and year of study. The assumption that pianists working with singers, string, or wind/brass instrument players need different skills has not been confirmed, contrary to previous research (Roussou, 2017; Yang, 2023). This may be due to the small size of the sub-sample of singers and instrumentalists, which was insufficient to encompass the differences. It is therefore recommended that this be analysed on a larger sample of students. As expected, no differences were found in students' opinions on collaborative pianists' competencies that depended on their age or study major. However, contrary to the expectations, gender differences have been found. Furthermore, the observation that female respondents assigned higher ratings in all dimensions of the scale should be carefully interpreted, as subsequent analyses have shown that the differences in male and female responses were statistically non-significant in all of the factors. Looking at other results within each factor, the only statistically significant difference was found in Facilitation Competencies, between the 16-19 and the 20-22 age groups, where the younger group assigned higher ratings. Within this factor, students placed the greatest importance on items concerning collaborative pianists' psychological stability, appropriate behaviour, and personal and individualised approach prior to public performances. This indicates that students primarily expect their needs to be taken into account, followed by an adaptation of acts and behaviour of collaborative pianists in line with those needs, particularly when performing. Extensive research has confirmed the importance of interpersonal relations (Cota, 2019; Rose, 1981; Roussou, 2017). In line with earlier literature (Witt, 2020), Croatian students too seem to appreciate supportive relations and environments that make them feel safe and empowered. It is unclear, however, why students aged 16-19 find it more important. This finding suggests that younger students may place greater value on the psychological support and interpersonal sensitivity provided by collaborative pianists, possibly due to less experience and greater performance-related anxiety in earlier stages of their education. A possible reason could also lie in the fact that at the beginning of study (approximately that age), they usually have more psychological and pedagogical subjects. These explanations are, however, a mere assumption that would need to be empirically verified.

Conclusion

The contribution of this research lies in identifying the key competencies of collaborative pianists that students consider important. The results obtained through this research have both practical and theoretical implications. They may inspire changes in practice, paving the way for future collaborative pianists to develop their competencies during their studies, such as through the design of new study programs and professional training programs within existing piano studies, as well as the establishment of collaborative piano studies, which currently do not exist in Croatia. Additionally, this could encourage the organization of a system of traineeships for collaborative piano, the induction of collaborative pianists into the profession, the introduction of state examinations in collaborative piano, and the adaptation of career advancement systems to better accommodate this profession.

The study had several limitations, including a relatively small sample size, a large number of items, and the selection of respondents from a single music academy, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Nevertheless, the newly developed instrument *Collaborative pianists' competencies*, is a valid representation of the theoretically defined competencies. It demonstrates high structural validity and is recommended for application with a larger sample of students from various music and art academies. Furthermore, it would be valuable to extend these findings by examining the perspectives of pupils as well as vocal and instrumental teachers regarding the importance of specific competencies required of collaborative piano teachers. This research will hopefully stimulate further investigation into this important area, which significantly influences students' learning and performance outcomes.

Finally, although the herein stated competencies do not in their own right make an expert collaborative pianist, they most certainly can help become one, which seems particularly important for the process of collaborative piano classes in an educational setting.

References

Cota, M. (2019). *Interpersonal aspects of musical collaboration for collaborative pianists* (Publication No. 27663397) [Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Katz, M. (2009). *The complete collaborator: The pianist as partner.* Oxford University Press.

Kiik-Salupere V., & Ross, J. (2011). Tripartite unity: What students expect from their teacher and accompanist during individual singing lessons. *Trames Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences, 15*(65/60) (4), 404–421. http://dx.doi.org/10.3176/tr.2011.4.05

Lee, K. (2016). *Developing the skills necessary to become an effective collaborative choral pianist* [Doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University]. Texas Tech University Electronic Theses and Dissertations.

Lee, P. S. (2009). *The collaborative pianist: Balancing roles in partnership* (Publication No. 3415684) [Doctoral dissertation, New England Conservatory of Music]. ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis Global.

Lippmann, J. C. (1979). *A program in piano accompanying at the Ohio state university: A feasibility study* (Publication No. 7915999) [Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Lisboa, T., Chaffin, R., Demos, A., & Gerling, C. (2013). Flexibility in the use of shared and individual performance cues in duo performance. In A. Williamon & W. Goebl (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Performance Science* (pp. 465-470). Association Européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen.

Mann-Polk, S. (1984). *The D.M. / D.M.A. Degree in piano accompanying and ensemble performance* (Publication No. 8518569) [Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Moore, G. (1956). *The unashamed accompanist.* MacMillan.

Morgenroth, D. J. (2015). *Collaborative crossover: Identifying classical vocal collaborative piano practices in jazz vocal accompanying.* [Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas]. UNT Digital Library.

Mravunac Fabijanić, L. (2021). Qualitative content analysis – Piano accompanists' and collaborative pianists' competencies. *Glasbenopedagoški zbornik Akademije za glasbo v Ljubljani, 17*(34), 29-46. https://doi.org/10.26493/2712-3987.17(34)29-46

Mravunac Fabijanić, L., Cvrtila, T., & Jambrošić, N. S. (2024). Poželjne osobine učitelja Glazbene kulture [Desirable Characteristics of Elementary School Music Teacher]. In B. Filipan-Žignić, M. Sabo Junger, G. Lapat, I. Nikolić, H. Šlezak, & A. Višnjić-Jevtić (Eds.) *Jezik, književnost i obrazovanje - stanje i perspektive, Međunarodni znanstveni skup 5. Međimurski filološki i pedagoški dani* (pp. 362-378). Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Učiteljski fakultet, Čakovec.

Polifonia working group for instrumental and vocal music teacher training. (2010). *Instrumental and vocal teacher education: European perspectives*. Association

Européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen (AEC). https://rb.gy/q1pdv9

Pow, L. B. (2016). *"More than the mere notes": Incorporating analytical skills into the collaborative pianist's process in learning, rehearsing, and performing repertoire* (Publication No. 10154841) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Rich, C. (2002). *A manual for the vocal accompanist* (Publication No. 3053548) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Rose, E. L. (1981). *Competencies in piano accompanying* (Publication No. 8128290) [Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Roussou, E. N. (2017). *Exploring the piano accompanist in western duo music ensembles: Towards a conceptual framework of professional piano accompaniment practice* (Publication No. 13911080) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Hull]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Savella, T. (2023). *Cello-piano duos: Analytical, practical and rehearsal strategies for the collaborative pianist* (Publication No. 30247146) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto (Canada)]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological Review, 66*(5), 297-333.

Wildschütz, F. (2018). Into the hanging gardens - A pianist's exploration of Arnold Schönberg's Opus 15. *Research Cathalogue*. Retrieved April 18, 2024, Retrieved from https://rb.gy/frc816

Witt, J. (2020). *Process-Driven Collaboration: Capacities from Teaching Artistry That Enrich the Work of Collaborative Pianists* (Publication No. 27960316) [Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Yang, L. (2023). *Developing collaborative skills in piano students* (Publication No. 30561040) [Doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

https://doi.org/10.17234/9789533793085.09

Appendix

The *Collaborative pianists' competencies* questionnaire

Performance and artistic competencies
1.1. A collaborative pianist must be musical and musically engaged.
1.2. A collaborative pianist should perform melody and phrase nicely.
1.3. A collaborative pianist should play a clear harmony.
1.4. A collaborative pianist should be technically adept.
1.5. It is important for a collaborative pianist to be able to adjust tempo.
1.6. A collaborative pianist should have a broad education, considerable knowledge and good familiarity of repertoire.
1.7. A collaborative pianist must be well acquainted with musical styles and the compositions that they are working on.
1.8. A collaborative pianist should be knowledgeable enough to be able to advise students in their personal development.
1.9. A collaborative pianist is very important in the musical education of students.
1.10. A collaborative pianist should always readily help students.
1.11. A collaborative pianist should be able to organize their own practice time.
Communication and pedagogical competencies
2.1. A collaborative pianist should be communicative and know how to properly speak with students and teachers of the study major.
2.2. A conversation between a collaborative pianist and a student is of utmost importance.
2.3. The signals, glances and synchronized breathing developed between a student and a collaborative pianist are important.
2.4. A collaborative pianist must love their job.
2.5. It does matter who is at the piano.
2.6. Collaborative pianists should always work on perfecting themselves.
2.7. A collaborative pianist should know when to lead and when to follow.
Facilitation competencies
3.1. A collaborative pianist is like a conductor, using breath, head or other signs to signal to a soloist when to step in.
3.2. A collaborative pianist should be psychologically stable and know how to act and what to say in the moments preceding the performance.
3.3. A collaborative pianist must be very patient and have strong nerves.
3.4. A personal, individualized approach and good interpersonal relations are just as important as collaborative pianists' piano skills.
3.5. A collaborative pianist should provide students with emotional support in classes and when performing.
3.6. Prior to a performance, a collaborative pianist should know how to deal with different people; the personal, human, friendly moment is extremely important before going on stage.
3.7. A collaborative pianist should be attentive to the needs of others and their feelings.
Reflective practitioner competencies
4.1. A collaborative pianist should always be well-practiced, well-prepared, accurate and precise, and must not be sloppy.
4.2. A collaborative pianist should always meet the expectations of their colleagues teaching the study major.
4.3. Public performance is a prominent dimension of collaborative piano, and a collaborative pianist should be psychologically prepared to perform publicly on a daily basis.
4.4. A collaborative pianist should be easy to adapt and constantly ready to learn.
4.5. A collaborative pianist should be skilled, quick, flexible, resourceful, and prompt in reacting to new situations and new literature.