International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications
July 2013 Volume: 4 Issue: 3 Article: 17 ISSN 1309-6249

EXAMINATION OF LEARNING APPROACH LEVELS IN PIANO COURSES ACCORDING TO SOME VARIABLES IN INDIVIDUAL INSTRUMENT COURSE

Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehtap AYDINER UYGUN
Niğde University
Niğde, TURKEY

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the learning approach levels of music teacher candidates in piano courses according to some variables in individual instrument course. The sample group of the study is 770 students that are having music education in music departments of universities in Turkey in the 2nd half of the 2011-2012 academic years. The data of the study was collected by "Scale for detrmination of learning approaches in piano course" developed by Aydıner Uygun (2012a) and a form including questions about individual instrument courses. According to the results of the study, the deep learning approach levels of students whose instrument type are *Turkish music instrument* are lower than other students. [x=3.17; $F_{(2,737)}$=10.33; p<0.01]. The deep learning approach levels of students whose instruments are played manually or by plectrum are lower than students whose instruments are played by bow or students who have vocal training. [x=3.24; $F_{(2,737)}$=10.81; p<0.01]. The deep learning approach levels of students whose academic grades are lower than 70 are lower than students whose learning approaches are 70 or higher. [x=3.17; $F_{(2,737)}$=16.30; p<0.01].

Key Words: Piano course, learning approach, individual instrument course.

INTRODUCTION

In musical instrument learning process, 'learning motivation' and 'learning strategy' come out as two essential factors. Learning motivation, which is defined as "the tendency to find the academic activities meaningful and to try to ensure the intended benefits", is significant in finding the learning activities meaningful and ensuring the aimed benefits in those activities (Brophy, 1988; cited in Ün Açıkgöz, 2003:207). Learning strategy, which is stated as "behaviours and thoughts that the learner can perform during the learning process and that are expected to affect the learner's coding process" (Weinstein & Mayer, 1986;315), is significant in the occurrence of easier and more permanent learning and learner's acquisition of independent learning ability. In the related literature, there are studies in which 'motivation' related to musical instrument learning (Ercan, 1999; McPherson and McCormick, 2000; Wristen, 2006; Yıldırım Orhan, 2006; Çalışkan, 2008; Modırı, 2012) and 'learning strategies' used in musical instrument learning (Hallam 2001a, b; Ertem, 2003; Nielsen, 2004; Akın, 2007; Nielsen, 2008; Yokuş, 2009; Aydıner Uygun and Kılınçer, 2012a, b; Kan and Kurtuldu, 2012) are dealt separately. On the other hand, few studies in musical instrument learning area examine 'learning approach', which is a concept that involves both 'learning motivation' and 'learning strategy' (Cantwell and Millard, 1994; Aydıner Uygun, 2012a, b; 2013).

Learning approach term was introduced first after a qualitative study conducted by Marton and Saljö (1976) (Marton and Saljö, 1976; cited in Yılmaz, Orhan, 2011:71). When approached from the student's point of view, learning approach calls a motivation question (Why am I studying this lesson?) and a strategy question (What should I do to learn?) to mind (Tang et al. 2000, cited in Yılmaz, 2009: 66). Learning approach depends on and practically develops as a response to the objectives or the standards of the lesson, teacher's attitude towards the student, teacher's occupational, teacher's teaching methods, student's concern about the subject, student's attitude towards the subject, the style of assessment both in and out of class, and also the level of readiness for the subject (Entwistle and Ramsden, 1983; cited in Ünal Çoban, Ergin, 2008:274). In contrast to individuals' specific and constant learning styles, learning approaches may differ according to the situation. The relation between the learner and the subject (love, interest, need, etc) also determines the learning approach

that the learner prefers (Ramsden, 1991, cited in Yılmaz, Orhan: 2011:72). Therefore, knowing the differences between the individuals' learning approaches may help the teachers find more effective and creative ways (Entwistle, 1997; Biggs, 1999, cited in Yılmaz, 2009:56-57).

Learning approach term is the starting point of this study. The variables that affect the students' learning approach levels in piano lessons are the subjects of this study. Piano lesson makes up one of the two main dimensions of the musical instrument lessons in the undergraduate programs at music education branches. Individual musical instrument lesson is the other dimension of the musical instrument lessons in the programs. During this process, piano lesson and individual musical instrument lesson are like the sides of the same coin. Therefore; while an analysis on one lesson is made, it should be considered to be related to the other lesson as well. In this regard, it is thought to be necessary to examine the relations of the learning approach levels in piano lesson with some variables in individual musical instrument lesson. With the determination of variables that may affect the learning approach levels in piano lesson, it will be possible to provide tangible information for teachers, students and researchers.

Purpose

In a study on learning approach levels in piano lesson (Aydıner Uygun, 2012b), the relations between learning approach levels of candidate music teachers and the universities at which they studied, their genders, the numbers of students with whom they shared weekly piano lesson hours, places where they studied for piano lesson and weekly hours of piano practice are analyzed. In another study also conducted by the researcher (Aydıner Uygun, 2013), the relation between learning approach levels and academic success levels is studied. The main purpose of this study is to analyze candidate music teachers' levels of learning approach in piano lessons according to some variables in individual musical instrument lesson.
Within this main purpose, the study tries to find answers to the following questions:
Do the candidate music teachers' levels of learning approach in piano lesson show a significant difference,

- According to the types of musical instruments they study in individual musical instrument lesson?
- According to the playing styles of the musical instruments they study in individual musical instrument lesson?
- According to their scores of academic success in individual musical instrument lesson?

METHOD

This study is designed using the descriptive research method and the correlative investigation model.

Population and Sample

The population of the study is composed of students studying in the music education branches in Turkey in the 2nd term of 2011-2012 academic years. The sample group of the study are 770 students chosen among this population. The distribution of sample group students according to the institutions at which they study is like this: Atatürk University (n=82, 10.6 %), Balıkesir University (n=92, 11.9 %), Dokuz Eylül University (n=70, 9.1 %), Gazi Osman Paşa University (n=74, 9.6 %), İnönü University (n=88, 11.4 %), Mehmet Akif Ersoy University (n=77, 10.0 %), Necmettin Erbakan University (n=103, 13.4 %), Niğde University (n=94, 12.2 %), On Dokuz Mayıs University (n=90, 11.7 %). 57.5 % (n=443) of the sample group students are male while 42.5 % (n=327) of them are female. The sample group consists of 23.8 % (n=183) first grade students, 24.4 (n=188) second grade students, 25.2 % (n=194) third grade students and 26.6 % (n=205) fourth grade students.

Procedure

In this study, the data related to sample group students' learning approaches in piano lesson is collected by "Scale for Determining Learning Approaches to Piano Lesson" developed by Aydıner Uygun (2012a). The scale is based on the configuration in "Study Process Questionnaire (R-SPQ-2F)" by Biggs, Kember and Leung (2001). According to this configuration, the scale is composed of two main dimensions such as deep learning approach and superficial learning approach. Both dimensions include motivation and strategy sub-dimensions. The deep learning motivation, deep learning strategy, surface learning motivation and surface learning strategy sub-dimensions of the 25-item scale are composed of 5, 9, 6 and 5 items respectively. Factor loadings relating to

the sub-dimensions are as; deep learning motivation 0.598-0.729, deep learning strategy 0.533-0.761, surface learning motivation 0.611-0.774 and surface learning strategy 0.612-0.779. Reliability coefficients (Cronbach alfa) of the sub-dimensions are calculated as deep learning motivation 0.84, deep learning strategy 0.91, surface learning motivation 0.90 and surface learning strategy 0.84.

Apart from the scale mentioned above, the students are also asked to fill in a form that requires them to state the musical instruments they study in the individual musical instrument lesson and their academic success scores of that lesson. These scores are evaluated under three groups. The academic success scores of the students in the first, second and third groups are between 0-69, 70-84 and 85-100 respectively.

Independent Sample t test is used to compare two groups and One-Way ANOVA is used to make a comparison among more than two groups as the data obtained from the study show normal distribution. If a significant statistical difference among the groups is found after the analysis of variance, Scheffe test- one of the multiple comparisons tests- is used to find out which groups are different from each other (Büyüköztürk, 2008). Scheffe test results are given in the difference column of related tables. The results of the analyses are interpreted at 0.01 significance level. IBM SPSS 20.0 package software is used for the analyses in the study.

FINDINGS

In this section, findings in line with the research data are explained through tables. In the tables, 'motivation' and 'strategy' sub-dimensions are handled separately and then findings about 'learning approach', which is a main dimension, are offered.

Table 1: The Comparison of the Students' Deep Learning Motivation Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with the Type of the Musical Instrument They Study

Type of Musical Instrument	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) Turkish Music Instrument	93	3.06	1.09	11.30*	0.00	(1)-(2) (1)-(3)
(2) Western Music Instrument	607	3.48	.91			
(3) Singing/Vocal Training	70	3.72	.91			

*p<0.01

According to Table 1, it can be said that students' deep learning motivation levels in piano lesson are not at the same level in accordance with individual musical instrument they study [$F_{(2,737)}$=11.30; p<0.01]. Considering the results of average values and multiple comparisons tests, the deep learning motivation levels of students whose individual musical instruments are the Turkish Music instrument are seen to be lower than those of the other students. "Deep motivation is related to internal motivation while surface motivation is related to external motivation" (Aydıner Uygun, 2012b:378). "Internal motivation, without any necessity for external incentives, occurs as a result of effects like reward, punishment, pressure and request" (Ün Açıkgöz, 2003:209). From this point of view, it can be stated that students whose individual musical instruments are singing or Western Music instruments are more internally motivated for piano lesson.

Table 2: The Comparison of the Students' Deep Learning Strategy Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with the Type of the Musical Instrument They Study

Type of Musical Instrument	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) Turkish Music Instrument	93	3.23	1.03	9.38*	0.00	(1)-(2) (1)-(3)
(2) Western Music Instrument	607	3.60	.89			
(3) Singing /Vocal Training	70	3.82	.89			

*p<0.01

According to Table 2, it can be said that students' deep learning strategy levels in piano lesson are not at the same level in accordance with individual musical instrument they study [$F_{(2,737)}$=9.38; p<0.01]. When the results of average values and multiple comparisons tests are considered, the deep learning strategy levels of students

whose individual musical instruments are Turkish Music instruments are seen to be lower than those of the other students. "While a student who uses a deep strategy looks for meaning in learning, a student who uses an surface strategy does not look for meaning in learning and studies only enough to meet the minimum requirements" (The Oxford Learning Institute, 2006; cited in Yılmaz, 2009:61). In view of this, it can be deduced that students whose individual musical instruments are singing or Western Music instrument seek more meaning in learning situations in piano lesson than those whose individual musical instruments are Turkish music instruments do.

Table 3: The Comparison of the Students' Deep Learning Approach Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with the Type of the Musical Instrument They Study

Type of Musical Instrument	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) Turkish Music Instrument	93	3.17	1.04	10.33*	0.00	(1)-(2) (1)-(3)
(2) Western Music Instrument	607	3.56	.88			
(3) Singing /Vocal Training	70	3.78	.89			

*p<0.01

According to Table 3, it can be stated that students' deep learning approach levels in piano lesson are not at the same level in accordance with individual musical instrument they study [$F_{(2,737)}$=10.33; p<0.01]. The analysis of the results of average values and multiple comparisons tests shows that the deep learning approach levels of students whose individual musical instruments are Turkish Music instruments are lower than those of the other students. Based on the findings, it can be inferred that students whose individual musical instruments are singing or Western Music instrument have a higher level of deep learning approach in piano lesson.

Table 4: The Comparison of the Students' Surface Learning Motivation Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with the Type of the Musical Instrument They Study

Type of Musical Instrument	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) Turkish Music Instrument	93	2.34	1.16	8.89*	0.00	(1)-(2) (1)-(3)
(2) Western Music Instrument	607	1.94	.93			
(3) Singing /Vocal Training	70	1.77	.80			

*p<0.01

According to Table 4, it can be inferred that students' surface learning motivation levels in piano lesson are not at the same level in accordance with individual musical instrument they study [$F_{(2,737)}$=8.89; p<0.01]. Considering the results of average values and multiple comparisons tests, it can be stated that the surface learning motivation levels of students whose individual musical instruments are Turkish Music instruments are higher than those of the other students. Findings show consistency with the findings explained in Table 1.

Table 5: The Comparison of the Students' Surface Learning Strategy Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with the Type of the Musical Instrument They Study

Type of Musical Instrument	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) Turkish Music Instrument	93	2.52	1.18	10.45*	0.00	(1)-(2) (1)-(3)
(2) Western Music Instrument	607	2.07	.95			
(3) Singing /Vocal Training	70	1.91	.84			

*p<0.01

Table 5 shows that students' surface learning strategy levels in piano lesson are not at the same level in accordance with individual musical instrument they study [$F_{(2,737)}$=10.45; p<0.01]. When the results of average values and multiple comparisons tests are analyzed, it can be stated that the surface learning strategy levels of students whose individual musical instruments are Turkish Music instruments are higher than those of the other students. Findings seem to be consistent with the findings explained in Table 2.

Table 6: The Comparison of the Students' Surface Learning Approach Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with the Type of the Musical Instrument They Study

Type of Musical Instrument	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) Turkish Music Instrument	93	2.42	1.15	9.89*	0.00	(1)-(2) (1)-(3)
(2) Western Music Instrument	607	2.00	.93			
(3) Singing /Vocal Training	70	1.83	.80			

*p<0.01

According to Table 6, the students' surface learning approach levels in piano lesson are not at the same level in accordance with individual musical instrument they study [$F_{(2,737)}$=9.89; p<0.01]. In view of the results of average values and multiple comparisons tests, it can be stated that the surface learning approach levels of students whose individual musical instruments are Turkish Music instruments are higher than those of the other students. Findings are seen to be consistent with the findings explained in Table 3.

Table 7: The Comparison of the Students' Deep Learning Motivation Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with the Group of the Musical Instrument They Study

Group of Musical Instrument	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) Wind Instrument	113	3.37	.92	10.01*	0.00	(2)-(3) (2)-(4)
(2) Played with a plectrum	189	3.17	1.01			
(3) Stringed Instrument	398	3.56	.89			
(4) Singing/Vocal Training	70	3.72	.91			

*p<0.01

According to Table 7, the students' deep learning motivation levels in piano lesson are not at the same level in accordance with individual musical instrument they study [$F_{(2,737)}$=10.01; p<0.01]. In view of the results of average values and multiple comparisons tests, it can be stated that the deep learning motivation levels of students who study musical instruments that are played with a plectrum are lower than those of the students who study stringed instruments or singing. Findings show that students studying stringed instruments or singing are more internally motivated to the piano lesson than those who study musical instruments played with a plectrum do.

Table 8: The Comparison of the Students' Deep Learning Strategy Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with the Group of the Musical Instrument They Study

Group of Musical Instrument	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) Wind Instrument	113	3.53	.92	10.83*	0.00	(2)-(3) (2)-(4)
(2) Played with a plectrum	189	3.28	.97			
(3) Stringed Instrument	398	3.69	.86			
(4) Singing/Vocal Training	70	3.82	.89			

*p<0.01

According to Table 8, the students' deep learning strategy levels in piano lesson are not at the same level in accordance with individual musical instrument they study [$F_{(2,737)}$=10.83; p<0.01]. Considering the results of average values and multiple comparisons tests, it is seen that the deep learning strategy levels of students who study musical instruments that are played with a plectrum are lower than those of the students who study stringed instruments or singing. Findings show that students studying stringed instruments or singing look for meaning more than the students who study musical instruments played with a plectrum do.

Tablo 9: The Comparison of the Students' Deep Learning Approach Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with the Group of the Musical Instrument They Study

Group of Musical Instrument	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) Wind Instrument	113	3.47	.91	10.81*	0.00	(2)-(3) (2)-(4)
(2) Played with a plectrum	189	3.24	.97			
(3) Stringed Instrument	398	3.64	.85			
(4) Singing/Vocal Training	70	3.78	.89			

*p<0.01

According to Table 9, the students' deep learning approach levels in piano lesson are not at the same level in accordance with individual musical instrument they study [$F_{(2,737)}$=10.81; p<0.01]. When the results of average values and multiple comparisons tests are analyzed, the deep learning approach levels of students who study musical instruments that are played with a plectrum are seen to be lower than those of the students who study stringed instruments or singing. From the findings, it can be inferred that students studying stringed instruments or singing have higher levels of deep learning approach in piano lesson than those of the students who study musical instruments played with a plectrum.

Table 10: The Comparison of the Students' Surface Learning Motivation Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with the Group of the Musical Instrument They Study

Group of Musical Instrument	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) Wind Instrument	113	1.99	.96	5.51*	0.00	(2)-(3) (2)-(4)
(2) Played with a plectrum	189	2.20	1.10			
(3) Stringed Instrument	398	1.90	.90			
(4) Singing/Vocal Training	70	1.77	.80			

*p<0.01

According to Table 10, the students' surface learning motivation levels in piano lesson are not at the same level in accordance with individual musical instrument they study [F(2,737)=5.51; p<0.01]. When the results of average values and multiple comparisons tests are analyzed, it is seen that the surface learning motivation levels of students who study musical instruments that are played with a plectrum are higher than those of the students who study stringed instruments or singing. Findings are seen to be consistent with the findings explained in Table 7.

Table 11: The Comparison of the Students' Surface Learning Strategy Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with the Group of the Musical Instrument They Study

Group of Musical Instrument	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) Wind Instrument	113	2.16	.97	7.23*	0.00	(2)-(3) (2)-(4)
(2) Played with a plectrum	189	2.37	1.09			
(3) Stringed Instrument	398	2.01	.94			
(4) Singing/Vocal Training	70	1.91	.84			

*p<0.01

According to Table 11, it can be stated that the students' surface learning strategy levels in piano lesson are not at the same level in accordance with individual musical instrument they study [$F_{(2,737)}$=7.23; p<0.01]. The results of average values and multiple comparisons tests show that the surface learning strategy levels of students who study musical instruments that are played with a plectrum are higher than those of the students who study stringed instruments or singing. Findings are seen to be consistent with the findings explained in Table 8.

Table 12: The Comparison of the Students' Surface Learning Approach Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with the Group of the Musical Instrument They Study

Group of Musical Instrument	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) Wind Instrument	113	2.07	.95	6.45*	0.00	(2)-(3) (2)-(4)
(2) Played with a plectrum	189	2.28	1.08			
(3) Stringed Instrument	398	1.95	.90			
(4) Singing/Vocal Training	70	1.83	.80			

*p<0.01

According to Table 12, it can be stated that the students' surface learning approach levels in piano lesson are not at the same level in accordance with individual musical instrument they study [F(2,737)=6.45; p<0.01]. Considering the results of average values and multiple comparisons tests, it can be seen that the surface learning approach levels of students studying musical instruments that are played with a plectrum are higher than those of the students who study stringed instruments or singing. Findings show consistency with the findings explained in Table 9.

Table 13: The Comparison of the Students' Deep Learning Motivation Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with Their Academic Success Scores in Individual Musical Instrument

Academic Success Score	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) 0-69	147	3.12	1.02	13.02*	0.00	(1)-(2) (1)-(3)
(2) 70-84	260	3.46	.85			
(3) 85-100	363	3.58	.94			

*p<0.01

According to Table 13, the students' deep learning motivation levels in piano lesson are seen to be at the different levels in accordance with their academic success scores in individual musical instrument lesson [$F_{(2,737)}$=13.02; p<0.01]. When the results of average values and multiple comparisons tests are analyzed, it is seen that the deep learning motivation levels of students whose academic success scores are below 70 are lower than those of the students with academic success scores 70 and above. From the findings, it can be inferred that students whose individual musical instrument lesson scores are 70 and above are more internally motivated for the piano lesson.

Table 14: The Comparison of the Students' Deep Learning Strategy Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with Their Academic Success Scores in Individual Musical Instrument

Academic Success Score	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) 0-69	147	3.20	1.00	17.60*	0.00	(1)-(2) (1)-(3)
(2) 70-84	260	3.58	.84			
(3) 85-100	363	3.72	.90			

*p<0.01

According to Table 14, the students' deep learning strategy levels in piano lesson are not the same levels in accordance with their academic success scores in individual musical instrument lesson [$F_{(2,737)}$=17.60; p<0.05]. In view of the results of average values and multiple comparisons tests, it is seen that students whose academic success scores are below 70 have lower deep learning motivation levels than the students with academic success scores of 70 and above do. Findings reveal that students whose academic success scores in individual musical instrument lesson are 70 and above look for more meaning in learning situations.

Table 15: The Comparison of the Students' Deep Learning Approach Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with Their Academic Success Scores in Individual Musical Instrument

Academic Success Score	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) 0-69	147	3.17	.99	16.30*	0.00	(1)-(2) (1)-(3)
(2) 70-84	260	3.54	.83			
(3) 85-100	363	3.67	.90			

*p<0.01

According to Table 15, the students' deep learning approach levels in piano lesson are not the same levels in accordance with their academic success scores in individual musical instrument lesson [$F_{(2,737)}$=16.30; p<0.01]. The results of average values and multiple comparisons tests show that students whose academic success scores are below 70 have lower deep learning approach levels than the students with academic success scores of 70 and above do. Considering the findings, it can be concluded that students whose academic success scores in individual musical instrument lesson are 70 and above have higher levels of deep learning approach.

Table 16: The Comparison of the Students' Surface Learning Motivation Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with Their Academic Success Scores in Individual Musical Instrument

Academic Success Score	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) 0-69	147	2.34	1.08	14.39*	0.00	(1)-(2) (1)-(3)
(2) 70-84	260	1.96	.89			
(3) 85-100	363	1.84	.93			

*p<0.01

According to Table 16, the students' surface learning motivation levels in piano lesson are not the same levels in accordance with their academic success scores in individual musical instrument lesson [$F_{(2,737)}$=14.39; p<0.01]. When the results of average values and multiple comparisons tests are analyzed, it is seen that the surface learning motivation levels of the students whose academic success scores are below 70 are higher than the surface learning motivation levels of the students with academic success scores of 70 and above. Findings show consistency with the findings explained in Table 13.

Table 17: The Comparison of the Students' Surface Learning Strategy Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with Their Academic Success Scores in Individual Musical Instrument

Academic Success Score	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) 0-69	147	2.49	1.10	15.05*	0.00	(1)-(2) (1)-(3)
(2) 70-84	260	2.08	.91			
(3) 85-100	363	1.97	.95			

*p<0.01

Table 17 shows that the students' surface learning strategy levels in piano lesson are not the same levels in accordance with their academic success scores in individual musical instrument lesson [$F_{(2,737)}$=15.05; p<0.01]. When the results of average values and multiple comparisons tests are analyzed, the surface learning strategy levels of the students whose academic success scores are below 70 seem to be higher than the surface learning strategy levels of the students with academic success scores of 70 and above. Findings are consistent with the findings explained in Table 14.

Table 18: The Comparison of the Students' Surface Learning Approach Levels in Piano Lesson in accordance with Their Academic Success Scores in Individual Musical Instrument

Academic Success Score	n	Mean	SS	F	p	Discrepancy
(1) 0-69	147	2.41	1.07	15.17*	0.00	(1)-(2) (1)-(3)
(2) 70-84	260	2.02	.88			
(3) 85-100	363	1.90	.92			

*p<0.01

In Table 18, it is seen that the students' surface learning approach levels in piano lesson are not the same levels in accordance with their academic success scores in individual musical instrument lesson [F(2,737)=15.17; p<0.01]. In view of the results of average values and multiple comparisons tests, the surface learning approach levels of the students whose academic success scores are below 70 are seen to be higher than the surface learning strategy levels of the students with academic success scores of 70 and above. Findings are consistent with the findings explained in Table 15.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

According to the results of this study, the deep learning approach levels [x=3.17; $F_{(2,737)}$=10.33; p<0.01] in piano lesson of the students whose type of individual musical instrument is Turkish music are found lower than those of the other students. On the other hand, the surface learning approach levels of the same group of students are seen to be higher than those of the other students.

According to the literature, learning approach is not a constant qualification of a student. It should be accepted as a student's response to the learning situation (Entwistle and Ramsden, 1983, cited in Ünal Çoban and Ergin, 2008:274). Thus; seeing that the deep learning approach levels of the students whose individual musical instruments are Turkish music type are low while their surface learning approach levels are high, it can be claimed that these students show negative responses to the learning situations in piano lesson. This may result from the idea that the students' relations with piano cannot strengthen because of the differences between the sound systems of piano and the musical instruments that the students whose individual musical instrument types are Turkish music play. To contribute to the argumentation of the results, interview were made with 8 students who studied in the Department of Music Education at Niğde University during the 2nd term of 2011-2012 academic years and whose types of individual musical instruments are Turkish music. In the interviews, students have mentioned that they haven't been able to establish a connection with piano which they think is essential to be able to practice the instrument and be successful in musical instrument lessons. The disability to have a connection with the instrument may cause the students not to be able to get motivated to the piano lesson and not to use deep learning strategies. Considering that learning approach is not a constant qualification of a student, with some arrangements in the learning-teaching environment, the learning approaches of the students whose type of individual musical instruments is Turkish music may change from surface learning approach towards deep learning approach. In this respect, including more frequently the works of Turkish composers or works that can be described in terms of mode is thought to be an effective way to strengthen the emotional bonds of students with piano.

The results of Şen's (2011) are in fact a verification of the ideas explained above. Şen (2011) aimed at analyzing the attitudes of the students in the departments of music education towards traditional Turkish music in terms of various variables. According to the results of the study, the attitudes of students whose individual musical instrument is bağlama (x=4.20) towards traditional Turkish Folk Music lessons are higher than those of the students whose individual musical instruments are violin (x=3.61), cello (x=3.55), guitar (x=3.53 and flute (x=3.31). As for traditional Turkish Classical Music, students whose individual musical instrument is bağlama (x=4.00) are seen to have higher attitude values than those of the students whose individual musical instrument is flute (x=3.42). Similarly, the attitude values about traditional Turkish music lessons of the students who play Western music instruments in individual musical instrument lessons are found lower than those of the students who play Turkish music instruments in individual musical instrument lessons.

According to another result of the study, the deep learning approach levels [x=3.24; $F_{(2,737)}$=10.81; p<0.01] of students who study musical instruments that are played with a plectrum are found lower in comparison with the levels of the students who study stringed instrument or singing. On the other hand, the surface learning approach levels [x=2.28; $F_{(2,737)}$=6.45; p<0.01] of students who study musical instruments that are played with a plectrum are found higher than those of the students who study stringed instrument or singing. In Music Education branches, training for musical instruments such as bağlama, ud (lute), guitar is given to the students within the scope of musical instruments played with a plectrum. Therefore, it can be said that most of the musical instruments played with a plectrum are Turkish Music instruments. In this respect, the result of the study supports the abovementioned result related to the types of individual musical instrument. The result that the deep learning approach levels of the students who receive education on singing are high may be considered as a positive effect of instructing the singing lessons accompanied by piano. Singing lesson students make use of piano more effectively in both doing tune-up practices and singing the songs they have learned within singing lessons than the students in the other musical instrument groups. It can be said that a similar situation is true for the students who study stringed instruments as well. As a result, the deep learning approach levels in piano lesson of the students who receive education in both musical instrument groups are thought to be higher in comparison with those of the students studying musical instruments played with a plectrum.

According to another result of the study, the deep learning approach levels of the students [x=3.17; $F_{(2,737)}$=16.30; p<0.01] whose academic success scores in individual musical instrument lessons are below 70 are found lower than those of the students whose academic success scores in individual musical instrument lessons are 70 or above. On the other hand, the surface learning approach levels of the students [x=2.41; $F_{(2,737)}$=15.17; p<0.01] are found higher than those of the students whose academic success scores in individual musical instrument lessons are 70 or above. This result makes us think that students with higher academic success are more internally motivated for learning and that they use deep learning strategies more frequently. As a matter of fact, it is discovered that students who are internally motivated (who have deep learning motivation) for learning situations make use of deep learning strategies much more than the students who are not internally motivated (who do not have deep learning motivation) do (Pintrich, Garcia, 1991; cited in Stefanou, Salisbury-Glennon, 2002:276). This result also matches up with the results obtained from related studies. In a study by Entwistle (1988, cited in Stefanou, Salisbury- Glennon, 2002:276), beneficial effects of deep cognitive processing period on academic success and learning are identified. It is also found out in other empirical researches that successful university students use deep learning strategies (Van Zile- Tamsen ve Livingston, 1999; cited in Stefanou, Salisbury- Glennon, 2002:276). According to related studies, successful students make use of learning strategies more and better than unsuccessful students do. Based on the results of related studies, the discovery that the deep learning approach levels of students whose academic success scores in individual musical instrument lesson are 70 or above are high is considered as an expected result.

IJONTE's Note: This article was presented at 4th International Conference on New Trends in Education and Their Implications - ICONTE, 25-27 April, 2013, Antalya-Turkey and was selected for publication for Volume 4 Number 3 of IJONTE 2013 by IJONTE Scientific Committee.

BIODATA AND CONTACT ADDRESS OF AUTHOR

Mehtap AYDINER UYGUN is an assistant professor at Faculty of Education, Nigde University, Nigde, Turkey. She received master in 2004 and Ph.D. in 2009 from University of Gazi, Ankara, Turkey. Her research interests are music education, piano education, learning strategies and learning approaches.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehtap AYDINER UYGUN
Nigde University Faculty of Education, Nigde, TURKEY
E. Mail: maydiner@nigde.edu.tr

REFERENCES

Akın, Ö. (2007). *Anadolu güzel sanatlar liseleri müzik bölümleri keman dersinde anlamlandırma stratejisinin kullanımı ve etkililik düzeyi* [The use of elaboration strategy and its efficiency level in violin lessons given in music departments of Anatolian fine arts high schools]. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Gazi University Institute of Education Sciences, Ankara.

Aydıner Uygun, M. (2012a). Scale for determining learning approaches to piano lesson: development, validity and reliability. *World Congrees on Design, Arts and Education*, *The Journal of Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences,* Vol. 51, (pp.916-927).

Aydıner Uygun, M. (2012b). Müzik öğretmeni adaylarının öğrenme yaklaşımlarının bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi [An analysis of music teacher candidates' learning approaches levels in piano lesson according to some variables]. e- *Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 7(4), 375-404.

Aydıner Uygun, M. and Kılınçer, Ö. (2012a). Piyano repertuvarının öğrenilmesinde öğrenme stratejilerinin kullanılma düzeyleri ile başarı düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi: güzel sanatlar ve spor liseleri örneği. [Evaluation of the relationship between the levels of achievement and the levels of learning strategy utilisation: the fine arts and sports colleges case]. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy,* 7(2), 199-213.

Aydıner Uygun, M. and Kılınçer, Ö. (2012b). Piyano repertuvarının öğrenilmesinde öğrenme stratejilerinin kullanılma düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi: güzel sanatlar ve spor liseleri örneği [An analysis of using levels of learning strategies according to some variables in learning piano repertoire: example of fine arts and sports schools]**.** *International Journal of Human Sciences,* 9(1), 965-992.

Aydıner Uygun, M. (2013). Piyano dersindeki öğrenme yaklaşımı düzeyleri ile akademik başarı düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi [Analysis of relation between level of learning approaches in piano lessons and level of academic success]. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies,* 6(2), 1087-1110.

Biggs, J., Kember, D. and Leung, D.Y.P. (2001). The revised two- factor study process questionnaire: R-SPQ-2F, *British Journal of Educational Psycology,* 71(1), 133-149.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2008). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı* [Handbook of data analysis for social sciences]. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Cantwell, R.H. and Millard, Y. (1994). The relationship between approach to learning and learning strategies in learning music. *The Journal of Educational Psychology,* 64(1), 45-63.

Çalışkan, T. (2008). *Müzik öğretmeni adaylarının bireysel çalgı eğitiminde güdülenme düzeyleri ve başarı durumları arasındaki ilişki*. Unpublished master dissertation, Marmara University Institute of Education Sciences, İstanbul.

Ercan, N. (1999). Çalgı eğitiminde motivasyon [Motivation in instrument education]. *Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi,* 252.

Ertem, Ş. (2003). *Ankara Anadolu güzel sanatlar lisesi müzik bölümü temel piyano eğitiminde öğrenme stratejilerinin kullanılma durumları ve örgütleme stratejisinin etkililik düzeyi.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Gazi University Institute of Education Sciences, Ankara.

Hallam S. (2001a). The development of expertise in young musicians: strategy use, knowledge acquisition and ındividual diversity. *Music Education Research,* 3(1), 1-42.

Hallam S. (2001b). The development of metacognition in musicians: ımplications for education. *British Journal of Music Education,* 18(1), 1-29.

Kan, K.; Kurtuldu, M. K. (2012). Piyano eğitiminde planlı örgütleme stratejisinin öğrenci başarısına etkisi. *Niğde University X. National Science Music Education Congress,* (ss.458-464).

McPherson, G. E. And McCormick, J. (2000). The contribution of motivational factors to instrumental performance in a music examination. *Research Studies in Music Education,* 15, 31-39.

Modırı, I. G. (2012). Müzik öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin piyano dersi motivasyonları ile kişilik özellikleri arasındaki ilişki. *YYÜ, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* IX (I), 74-98.

Nielsen, S. G. (2004). Strategies and self- efficacy beliefs in ınstrumental and vocal ındividual practice: study of students in higher music education. *Psychology of Music,* 32 (4), 418-431.

Nielsen, S. G. (2008). Achievement goals, learning strategies and ınstrumental performance. *Music Education Research,* 10 (2), 235- 247.

Stefanou, R. C. and Salisbury- Glennon, J. D. (2002). Developing motivation and cognitive learning strategies through an undergraduate learning community. *Learning Environments Research,* 5(1), 77-97.

Şen, Y. (2011). *Müzik öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin geleneksel Türk müziği derslerine ilişkin tutumlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Gazi University Institute of Education Sciences, Ankara.

Şimşek, A. and Balaban, J. (2010). Learning strategies of successful and unsuccessful university students. *Contemporary Educational Technology,* 1(1), 36-45.

Ün Açıkgöz, K. (2003). *Etkili öğrenme ve öğretme.* İzmir: Eğitim Dünyası Yayınları.

Ünal Çoban, G. and Ergin, Ö. (2008). İlköğretim öğrencilerinin Fen'i öğrenme yaklaşımları. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* XXI(2), 271-293.

Weinstein, E. C. and Mayer, E. R. (1986). The teaching of learning strategies. (Ed. M. C. Wittock). *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp.315-327). New York: Macmillian Company.

Wristen, B. (2006). Demographics and motivation of adult group piano students. *Music Education Research,* 8(3), 387-406.

Yıldırım Orhan, Ş. (2006). Anadolu güzel sanatlar liseleri çalgı eğitiminde motivasyon [Motivation in instrument education of the Anatolian fine arts high schools]. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* 20, 130-136.

Yılmaz, B. M. (2009). *Karma öğrenme ortamındaki üniversite öğrencilerinin öğrenme yaklaşımlarına göre ders başarılarının, derse devamlarının, web materyalini kullanma davranışlarının ve ortama yönelik memnuniyetlerinin değerlendirilmesi.* [Evaluation of university students' academic achievements, attendances, web material using behaviors, and satisfactions with the learning environment according to their learning approaches in a blended learning environment]. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yıldız Technical University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.

Yılmaz, B. M & Orhan, F. (2011b). Karma öğrenme ortamındaki üniversite öğrencilerinin akademik başarılarının, web materyalini kullanma davranışlarının ve devamlarının öğrenme yaklaşımlarına göre değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of university students' academic achievements, web material using behaviors and attendances in respect to their learning approaches in a blended learning environment]. International Journal of Human Sciences, 8, 2, ISSN: 1303-5134, pp. 1027- 1048.

Yokuş, H. (2009). *Piyano eğitiminde öğrenme stratejilerinin kullanılmasına yönelik etkinliklerin performans başarısına ve üstbilişsel farkındalığa etkisi.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Marmara University, Institute of Education Sciences, İstanbul.