Education and Science

Vol 41 (2016) No 185 235-250

Effects of Daily Studying Schedule on The Instrument Studying Behavior, Guitar Deciphering and Performance of Students in Classic Guitar Education

Ümit Kubilay Can [1]

Abstract

This study aims to examine the effects of daily studying schedule designed for guitar students of music departments using experimental method design on a pretest-posttest control group model. Guitar students studying at Kocaeli University Faculty of Fine Arts Music Department constitute the example of the paper. Data was collected using a guitar performance rating scale for performance, a deciphering performance scale for guitar deciphering, and attitude towards instrument studying scale for attitude. A significant difference was found between the overall scores of guitar performance rating scale and deciphering performance scale of the experimental group of daily studying schedule and the control group, which was free in designing personal studying schedules, in favor of the experimental group.

Keywords

Daily study program
Guitar training
Deciphering musical instruments
Attitude scale
Performance scale

Article Info

Received: 10.04.2015
Accepted: 08.05.2016
Online Published: 09.06.2016

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2016.4580

Introduction

It is known that human brain has unlimited capacity for learning. Neuroscientific studies offer researchers and instructors detailed data and information. Approaches like brain-based learning have been developed under the light of these studies. Through investigating the mechanisms and reactions of the brain through the learning process, the concept of learning is reconstructed and how the brain learns through natural mechanisms is evaluated. Studies on the brain and learning continue at full speed.

As the concept of "race against time" gains value in our day, it becomes more important how fast problems are solved as well as how. "Time management" is considered to be an important skill individuals need to gain. Güçlü (2001, p. 89) argues that time management is actually self-management and having control over what happens in our lives and that the individual manages himself to manage events. Erdul (2005 as cited in Gözel & Halat, 2010, p. 75) proposes that information about allocation of time should be collected daily, analyzed to determine problems with the use of time, and the detected problems should be solved. Effective management of time is possible when the individual uses several metacognitive skills to plan for purposes and goals. Time management necessities drive all branches of science to design programs of fast and effective education.

[1] Kocaeli University, Faculty of Fine Arts, Department of Music, Turkey, kubican_gitar@hotmail.com

Instrument training involves a long and difficult period in the academic level. Gladwell (2009, p. 41) states that it takes ten thousand hours to become competent at something. However, it may take much longer in musical instrument training to become an expert. Colvin (2011, pp. 14-20) argues that superior performance comes from specific skills developed in a certain way for a long period of time. Even after specializing, musicians must regularly renew their technical and musical skills. Undergraduate instrument programs do not offer a sufficient process for the average music student to specialize in an instrument. However, like in other fields, teachers, methods or individual differences in instrument training may change the training momentum. Moreover, these differences may depend on demographic characteristics.

Sloboda (2000, pp. 397) thinks that specially arranged learning environments are needed in the course of instrument specialization and it is important to have learning environments that require continuity, like practicing, for gaining skills. In another study, Leon-Guerrero (2008, p. 91) argues that individual musical exercise takes an important place in the development of a musician and professional musicians can utilize self-regulation skills, like determining needs, planning and evaluation strategies, during individual periods of training. We can say that stability, discipline and programming behaviors are self-regulation skills that a music student should internalize. It is important that students gain these skills and use them in daily life. In the process of gaining establishing these behaviors, the individual should be encouraged to develop strategic goals and positive plans in order for them to urge themselves towards a specific purpose and goal. It is believed that the individual needs regular and scheduled activities in his daily life to devise positive strategic goals and positive plans. What is expected in this process is for the individual to go through certain changes and gain certain habits. Atılgan (1998, p. 34) thinks that regular and purposeful repetition fortifies the permanence of learning and one and the most important of the skills improving the academic achievements of students is their effective and productive studying behaviors. A music student must gain regular studying skills to render the long training period productive and effective.

Pirgon (2013, p. 41) proposes that regular repetition is very important in consolidation and internalization of learned behavior during the action of 'learning', which is inherent to each discipline. He argues, for continuing development during the instrument training period, newly formed behaviors must be reinforced and learned well. It is only after this phase that a new technical behavior is positioned. Ercan (2006, p. 104) argues that the time spent with an instrument without supervision becomes unnecessary dullness and exhaustion rather than productive and this type of behaviors can be observed in a lot of students if there is no regular studying plan. Students need a daily studying program to develop the desired behaviors. The program is intended to give the students the desired goals and behaviors. Students must first go through a period of adapting to the program. Later, contents of the program and development of accordingly positive behaviors gain importance. Students must develop behaviors like recognizing their deficiencies, studying towards a specific goal, and using time correctly and efficiently during their period.

The classical guitar has both solo and accompaniment purposes. It is covered in every music school today and academic methods improve each day. Önder and Yıldız (2008, p. 115) think that classical guitar education is period of developing basic, technical and theoretical information, a working discipline, self guidance and management skills in a programmed, disciplined and deliberate way. Yokuş (2009, p. 19) defines classical guitar education, which constitutes a dimension of music training programs as of the 20th century, as an education process of learning and developing knowledge, skills and techniques relevant to the guitar, using the instrument effectively and gaining professional

competence. In the Western music form, classical guitar solo performances require a lot of technical skills. The guitar player must possess a balanced technique and express the works that involve a lot of effort without getting exhausted. It takes a long time for classical guitar students to internalize these skills and it becomes important to use the studying time efficiently. Scattered and unfocused studying and long and unproductive hours spent to that end, incorrect studying, irregular and ill-timed studying are factors that influence the training period of students.

Research studies that evaluate studying methods of students in musical instrument training have found that students are unable to use their individual daily studying sessions efficiently, productively and effectively (Babacan, 2014; Cerit, 2010; Ceman, 2005). Studies that examine deciphering approach in musical instrument training emphasize that it is necessary to allocate deciphering studies a part in instrument training courses (Çimen, 2001; Tufan, 2000).

All aspects of this process must be meticulously designed in order for students trained in four-year music schools at the level of bachelor degree to internalize certain behaviors as they specialize in their instrument. Training period and dynamics depend on the instrument. Classical guitar training involves a difficult process of garnering technical and musical skills. Özdemir (2014, p. 8) argues that classical guitar playing is a top-level psychomotor skill that requires a high level of perception. It is considered that guitar students need to study for 5 hours or more in average every day. It has been observed that guitar students may not achieve desired goals even when they study for a specified period of time. It is believed that one of the most fundamental reasons for this is that students cannot plan their daily work correctly. It has been observed that students cannot use time efficiently, evaluate or criticize their previous and following studies, or create a suitable studying environment. The research study on the instrument training tactics of musical instrument students has shown that students do not study regularly or according to a schedule and do not place much importance on their studying times despite the directions provided by instructors (Özmenteş, 2013, p. 450). Therefore, it is thought that a daily studying schedule is important for students to make certain habits and manage a careful, more efficient and productive instrument training process.

Instrument students, and the subgroup of guitar students, have observed to be inadequate in their deciphering skills. Students generally only do deciphering for the works and etudes provided by instructors. Based the fact that three or four works are played in average each term of the four years of an undergraduate program, a student deciphers twenty four to thirty two works until the end of eight terms. This number is believed to be too little for a student to develop deciphering skills. Generally, great differences are seen between the level of the works students play and the deciphering skills of students. Development of deciphering skills is considered to be of importance in terms of the development of guitar playing performance. The daily study program devised as part of this study includes opportunities for students to regularly decipher works and improve their skills.

The first of the problems investigated in this study is the question whether or not a controlled daily study program makes a significant contribution to the attitude levels of students towards instrument studies.

The second of the problems investigated in this study is the question whether or not a controlled daily study program makes a significant contribution to the deciphering skill levels of students.

The third of the problems investigated in this study is the question whether or not a controlled daily study program makes a significant contribution to the guitar playing performance of students.

The Goal of the Study

This study is intended to evaluate whether or not the daily study program devised by the researcher has an effect on the Guitar Performance, the Guitar Deciphering Performance and the Attitude Towards Instrument Studying of the students. For this purpose, the research hypothesis is as follows.

1. There is a significant difference between overall scores of Experimental and Control Groups in the Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale.

a) There is no significant difference between the pretest scores of the Experimental Group in the Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale and the pretest achievement scores of the Control Group.

b) There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the Control Group in the Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale.

c) There is a significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the Experimental Group in the Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale.

d) There is a significant difference between the posttest scores of the Experimental Group in the Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale and the posttest achievement scores of the Control Group.

2. There is a significant difference between the overall scores of the Experimental and Control Groups in the Deciphering Performance Scale.

a) There is no significant difference between the pretest scores of the Experimental Group in the Deciphering Performance Scale and the pretest achievement scores of the Control Group.

b) There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the Control Group in the Deciphering Performance Scale.

c) There is a significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the Experimental Group in the Deciphering Performance Scale.

d) There is a significant difference between the posttest scores of the Experimental Group in the Deciphering Performance Scale and the posttest achievement scores of the Control Group.

3. There is a significant difference between the overall scores of the Experimental and Control Groups in the Guitar Performance Scale.

a) There is no significant difference between the pretest scores of the Experimental Group in the Guitar Performance Scale and the pretest achievement scores of the Control Group.

b) There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the Control Group in the Guitar Performance Scale.

c) There is a significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the Experimental Group in the Guitar Performance Scale.

d) There is a significant difference between the posttest scores of the Experimental Group in the Deciphering Performance Scale and the posttest achievement scores of the Control Group.

Significance of the Research

During the research, the daily studying schedule was intended to produce goals for guitar students to improve their instrument skills and create a level of metacognitive awareness among the students. Accordingly, the daily studying schedule provided several studying strategies to prevent students from studying a uniform schedule, and included critical practices for students to evaluate themselves. Özmenteş (2013, p. 442) states metacognitive tactics include planning, monitoring and evaluation and stresses that students must use tactics like concentration, objectives and self-assessment in order to gain independence in during learning. He argues that professional musicians display a wide range of metacognitive skills in concentration, planning, monitoring and assessment, and technique and

interpretation, while playing musical instruments. According to Özmenteş, it is important for studying plans that students have clear and certain goals during instrument training. Additionally, he says designation of specific goals in an appropriate difficulty level for individuals is important in deliberate practice, which has come into prominence in instrument training in recent years.

This research study is significant as it scientifically exhibits the implementation of regular and controlled studying in music and guitar training.

Musical instructors and educational institutions generally offer verbal encouragement for students to urge them to follow a daily schedule. It is important for students' improvement that musical instructors prepare and inspect the implementation of a daily schedule. The research is expected to help instructors gain awareness of the importance of daily studying schedules, which add value to instrument training.

Another significant aspect of the research is the applicability of the daily studying schedule designed for guitar training to other instrument groups. This allows new educational opportunities to be applied to other instruments and gain currency.

Limitations of the Study

1st-, 2nd-, 3rd- and 4th-year guitar students studying at Kocaeli University Faculty of Fine Arts Music Department in the academic year of 2014-2015 constitute the example of the study group.

Experimental phase of the study was planned to be four weeks. Guitar students of all classes that regularly attend classes were included in the study due to the number of guitar students in the school the study was conducted in. To that end, the musical works used in the study were selected among those not particularly difficult to decipher but requiring good performance so that guitar students in various levels could be measured in terms of performance. Four weeks was considered to be enough time for students to display their performance from deciphering of the musical works to the final performance. Therefore, the experimental phase of the study was limited to four weeks.

Method

An experimental method design on a pretest-posttest control group model was used as the research model of the study.

Study Group

The guitar class of 2014-2015 of Kocaeli University Faculty of Fine Arts Music Department constitutes the study group of the study. Control (n=5) and experimental groups (n=5) consist of 10 students in total.

Data Collection

Data was collected using a guitar performance rating scale for performance, a deciphering performance scale for guitar deciphering, and attitude towards instrument studying scale for attitude.

Guitar Performance Rating Scale

Akçay (2011) Guitar Performance Rating Scale was used in the study. The scale includes 15 items under 3 headings: Basic Behaviors, Technical Behaviors and Musical Effect and Interpretation. Reliability coefficient Cronbach's Alfa was estimated at 0.84 for the study.

Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale

Özmenteş (2007) Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale was used in the study. The test consists of 28 proposals and its reliability coefficient Cronbach's Alfa was estimated at 0.95. The scale was applied to groups before and after the experiment.

Deciphering Performance Scale:

Deciphering Performance Scale was used in the study. Developed by Uyan (2012), the scale was adapted to Kaynak (2011) "Piano Rubric" and turned into a deciphering performance scale for the guitar. The scale includes 9 criteria, 4-point likert scale and its reliability coefficient Cronbach's Alfa was estimated at 0.9.5.

Study Period

Experimental period of the study covers four weeks. 1 musical work (Esim Can - Miniature 5) and 1 etude (Tarrega - Etude A) were selected for the study, taking into consideration works subjects never played before, covering different periods and guitar techniques, and easily decipherable in all levels but challenging in the final performance. Experimental and control groups studied with the researcher in one-on-one sessions one day a week for four weeks. Only two musical works were studied in this process. The researcher provided instructions according to the individual needs of the subjects. During this period, the experimental group, unlike the control group, was given a daily studying program form and guitar deciphering examples for daily deciphering. The experimental group studied in their own time according to the daily studying program and filled and submitted a weekly schedule to the researcher. Control subjects were guided by the researcher on how to design their daily studies throughout the program, without filling a daily studying schedule or supervision. The researcher arranged guitar deciphering studies of the experimental group starting from easy studies to more difficult ones and planned two deciphering examples a day on the daily schedule. The 2nd example deciphering of the 5th Level of Level 1-8 deciphering examples of Thorlaksson (2001, p. 9) were used for the pretest and posttest deciphering performances of the groups.

After four weeks of studying, the posttest was performed to analyze the differences between the groups.

Daily Classic Guitar Studying Program

The daily studying program evaluated in the study was designed by the researcher. The researcher took his own experience in guitar training into consideration in designing the program, which proposes qualities a guitar student should have or develop. The program covers performance preparation, selected techniques in the right and left hands, deciphering, etude and musical work, with a critique of each item. Accordingly, each of the items was inserted into the weekly schedule as separate goals and objectives. Also, students were asked to mark their daily studies towards each objective on the daily schedule, rate themselves from 1 to 5 in their achievements and rate their daily studying program in general at the end of the program. The goal was to have the students observe their daily improvements towards each goal and develop the same behavior for other works.

Group Design

A scale of attitude towards instrument studying and a guitar performance test were used to equalize the groups prior to the study period. Mann Whitney U Test was used to equalize the groups.

Descriptive Values and Test Results

Table 1. Descriptive Values of the Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale for the Study Group

Group	Pretest			Posttest		
	N	$\bar{x}$	S.S.	N	$\bar{x}$	S.S.
Experimental Group	5	122.60	10.64	5	124.40	10.06
Control Group	4	121.25	2.99	4	113.75	18.63
Overall	9	122.00	7.78	9	119.67	14.57

Descriptive values of the Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale for the study group shows that the lowest average is 113.75 for the posttest scores of the Control Group, and the highest average is 134.40 for the Experimental Group posttest scores. The overall averages are 119.67 and 122.00.

Table 2. Results of the Mann Whitney U Test between Pretest Scores in the Experimental and Control Groups in the Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale of the Students

Group	*N*	*Rank Average*	*Sum of Ranks*	*u*	*Z*	*P*
Experiment	5	5.40	27.00	8.00	0.49	0.62
Control	4	4.50	18.00			

A significant difference was not found between the pretest scores of the Experimental and Control Group students in the Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale (z=0.49, p>0.05).

Table 3. Descriptive Values of the Deciphering Performance Scale for the Study Group

Group	Pretest			Posttest		
	N	$\bar{x}$	S.S.	N	$\bar{x}$	S.S.
Experimental Group	5	11.50	3.47	5	19.10	8.32
Control Group	5	10.80	3.49	5	14.60	5.14
Overall	10	11.15	3.63	10	16.85	8.29

Descriptive values of the Deciphering Performance Scale for the study group shows that the lowest average is 10.80 for the pretest scores of the Control Group, and the highest average is 19.10 for the Experimental Group posttest scores. The overall averages for pretest and posttest are 11.15 and 16.85, respectively.

Table 4. Results of the Mann Whitney U Test between Pretest Scores in the Experimental and Control Groups in the Deciphering Performance Scale of the Students

Group	*N*	*Rank Average*	*Sum of Ranks*	*u*	*Z*	*P*
Experiment	5	6.20	31.00	9.00	0.78	0.44
Control	5	4.80	24.00			

A significant difference was not found between the pretest scores of the Experimental and Control Group students in the Deciphering Performance Scale (z=0.78, p>0.05).

Table 5. Descriptive Values of the Guitar Performance Scale for the Study Group

Group	Pretest			Posttest		
	N	$\bar{x}$	S.S.	N	$\bar{x}$	S.S.
Experimental Group	5	33.70	2.11	5	88.00	8.12
Control Group	5	33.00	2.00	5	56.00	25.46
Overall	10	33.35	1.97	10	72.00	24.53

Descriptive values of the Guitar Performance Scale for the study group shows that the lowest average is 33.00 for the pretest scores of the Control Group, and the highest average is 88.10 for the Experimental Group posttest scores. The overall averages for pretest and posttest are 33.35 and 72.00, respectively.

Table 6. Results of the Mann Whitney U Test between Pretest Scores in the Experimental and Control Groups in the Guitar Performance Scale of the Students

Group	*N*	*Rank Average*	*Sum of Ranks*	*u*	*Z*	*P*
Experiment	5	6.20	31.00	9.00	0.74	0.46
Control	5	4.80	24.00			

A significant difference was not found between the pretest scores of the Experimental and Control Group students in the Guitar Performance Scale ($z=0.74$, $p>0.05$).

Data Analysis

A studying attitude scale, a guitar deciphering performance scale and a guitar performance scale were used in the study. The Mann Whitney U test was used for intergroup analysis of the pretest and posttest data. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test was used to compare in-group pretest and posttest scores. The scales were assessed by two instructors specialized in the guitar, including the researcher. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation performed on ratings of the raters demonstrates interrater reliability ($r=0,99$, $p<0.001$).

Findings

Table 7. Results of the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test between the Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Control Group Students in the Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale

Posttest-Pretest	*N*	*Rank Average*	*Sum of Ranks*	*Z*	*P*
Negative Rank	1	2.00	2.00	0.45	0.66
Positive Rank	1	1.00	1.00		
Equal	2				
Total	4				

The Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test did not reveal a significant difference between the Pretest-Posttest Scores of the Control Group students in the Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale (z=0.45, p>0.05).

Table 8. Results of the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test between the Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Experimental Group Students in the Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale

Posttest-Pretest	*N*	*Rank Average*	*Sum of Ranks*	*Z*	*P*
Negative Rank	1	3.50	3.50	1.09	0.28
Positive Rank	4	2.88	11.50		
Equal	0				
Total	5				

The Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test did not reveal a significant difference between the Pretest-Posttest Scores of the Experimental Group students in the Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale (z=1.09, p>0.05).

Table 9. Results of the Mann Whitney U Test between the Posttest Scores of the Experimental and Control Group Students in the Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale

Group	*N*	*Rank Average*	*Sum of Ranks*	*u*	*Z*	*P*
Experiment	5	5.90	29.50	5.50	1.10	0.27
Control	4	3.88	15.50			

A significant difference was not found between the posttest results of the Experimental and Control Group students in the Attitude Towards Instrument Studying Scale (z=1.10, p>0.05).

Table 10. Results of the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test between the Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Control Group Students in the Deciphering Performance Scale

Posttest-Pretest	*N*	*Rank Average*	*Sum of Ranks*	*Z*	*P*
Negative Rank	0	0.00	0.00	1.83	0.07
Positive Rank	4	2.50	10.00		
Equal	1				
Total	5				

The Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test did not reveal a significant difference between the Pretest-Posttest Scores of the Control Group students in the Guitar Deciphering Scale (z=1.83, p>0.05).

Table 11. Results of the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test between the Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Experimental Group Students in the Deciphering Performance Scale

Posttest-Pretest	*N*	*Rank Average*	*Sum of Ranks*	*Z*	*P*
Negative Rank	0	0.00	0.00	2.02	0.04
Positive Rank	5	3.00	15.00		
Equal	0				
Total	5				

The Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test revealed a significant difference between the Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Experimental Group students in the Deciphering Scale in favor of the Posttest scores (z=2.02, p>0.05).

Table 12. Results of the Mann Whitney U Test between the Posttest Scores of the Experimental and Control Group Students in the Deciphering Performance Scale

Group	*N*	*Rank Average*	*Sum of Ranks*	*u*	*Z*	*P*
Experiment	5	7.50	37.50	2.50	2.10	0.03
Control	5	3.50	17.50			

A significant difference was found between the Posttest scores of the Experimental and Control Group students in the Deciphering Performance Scale in favor of the Experimental Group (z=2.50, p<0.05).

Table 13. Results of the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test between the Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Control Group Students in the Guitar Performance Scale

Posttest-Pretest	*N*	*Rank Average*	*Sum of Ranks*	*Z*	*P*
Negative Rank	1	2.00	2.00	1.48	0.14
Positive Rank	4	3.25	13.00		
Equal	0				
Total	5				

The Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test did not reveal a significant difference between the Pretest-Posttest Scores of the Control Group students in the Guitar Performance Scale (z=1.48, p>0.05).

Table 14. Results of the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test between the Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Experimental Group Students in the Guitar Performance Scale

Posttest-Pretest	*N*	*Rank Average*	*Sum of Ranks*	*Z*	*P*
Negative Rank	0	0.00	0.00	2.02	0.04
Positive Rank	5	3.00	15.00		
Equal	0				
Total	5				

The Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test revealed a significant difference between the Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Experimental Group students in the Guitar Performance Scale in favor of the Posttest scores (z=2.02, p>0.05).

Table 15. Results of the Mann Whitney U Test between the Posttest Scores of the Experimental and Control Group Students in the Guitar Performance Scale

Group	*N*	*Rank Average*	*Sum of Ranks*	*u*	*Z*	*P*
Experiment	5	7.90	39.50	0.50	2.51	0.01
Control	5	3.10	15.50			

A significant difference was found between the Posttest scores of the Experimental and Control Group students in the Guitar Performance Scale in favor of the Experimental Group (z=2.51, p<0.05).

Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

An experiment was conducted as part of the study to evaluate whether or not a daily studying schedule affects classical guitar training. Three data collection tools, a "attitude towards instrument studying scale," a "deciphering performance scale," and a "guitar performance scale," were used in the study.

The data revealed by the attitude towards instrument studying scale did not reveal a significant difference between the posttest scores of the groups. The pretest scores of the groups in instrument studying determined high scores in average. Among prior studies, Hewitt (2000) conducted a controlled experimental study on the effects of self evaluation and self listening on the performance and instrument studying attitude of 82 students that play wind instruments and, in parallel with this study, did not find a difference created by self listening skills on instrument studying behaviors. Can (2009) conducted a controlled experimental study to evaluate peer teaching programs developed for guitar students in music departments and did not find a significant difference between groups in terms of their attitude towards guitar courses. It would be wrong to propose that music students have weak attitudes towards studying instruments or instrument courses; it is known that instrument students are generally willing to and like to study their individual instruments. Although this study reveals a difference between the instrument performance measurements of the daily studying program because students had high scores of attitude towards instrument studying prior to the experiment, it can be said that there was no difference between the groups in their posttest scores.

Deciphering performance scale revealed a significant difference in the posttest scores of groups in favor of the experimental group. Moreover, the significant difference between the posttest results of the experimental and control groups shows the experiment yielded significant results. It can be said that the experimental group, which performed two deciphering works a day according to the daily studying program, improved more significantly than the control group, which did not perform regular deciphering studies. In a controlled experimental study conducted on the effects of regular deciphering studies, Özer and Yiğit (2011) evaluated 12 students in the first year of the Music Department of Konya Çimento High School of Fine Arts and Sports for 13 weeks and found a significant difference between experimental and control groups in favor of the experimental group, which performed regular deciphering studies. Study results are in parallel with the results of this study. Survey studies on the effects of deciphering found that deciphering studies are not placed the importance they require in instrument training (Türkmen, 2008; Coşkun, 2001).

Possessing fast deciphering skills ensures more effective and productive instrument training and training transforms from a difficult time into enjoyable time. Deciphering training is regarded as a dimension that should be given importance in instrument training programs and in the daily studying schedules of students.

The data obtained from the guitar performance scale revealed a significant difference between the posttest results of groups in favor of the experimental group. After applying the daily studying program, the experimental group, which utilized the program, showed a significant difference. Among other studies on the subject, Sloboda, Davidson, Howe, and Moore (1996) analyzed 257 music students between the ages of 8 and 18. 94 students studied daily and other students studied as they wished without intervention. The study revealed a significant relationship between daily studying and musical performance. Williamon and Valentine (2000) evaluated 22 piano students in different levels and found a significant relationship between the rate of daily practicing and performance. Pirgon (2013) conducted a controlled experimental study on 8 piano students in Süleyman Demirel University Faculty of Fine Arts Music Department and found that students that worked daily and regularly were more successful than studies that did not through the course of achieving objectives.

Instrument training is a difficult process that requires patience and requires daily studying. Following proposals are intended to achieve a more effective and productive process and help students internalize a regular daily studying schedule in their daily lives. Instrument instructors and families have important roles as well.

It is proposed that instrument instructors prepare daily-weekly-monthly studying programs for their students, encourage and motivate their students to use these programs, regularly revise and keep tallies of their programs, make sure their regular functionality, and encourage the establishments they are affiliated with and their colleagues to use programs and try and cultivate and institutional perspective.

The research study was designed on university students and the study results were obtained from this age group. Due to their age, university students are generally independent from their family in their study program decisions. However, families of younger students that practice for a long time at home can have an active role in the schedules of these students. It is recommended that families should create a suitable environment, and monitor and motivate their children until they gain a regular studying habit. In his research study titled "The Role of Family Influences in the Development of Musical Performance," Davidson, Howe, Moore, and Sloboda (1996) found that the best students in instrument performance have the most involved parents. In the study, the families did not intervene in the practices of students and only listened and gave positive messages. According to the study, families play an active role in the achievements of students. It is recommended that awareness should be raised of the importance of family support on regular studying, especially on the part of instructors.

This study has shown that a daily study program designed for guitar students is effective on deciphering and guitar performances of students. The means currently available for the research impose a weakness, which is the limitation of the experimental process to four weeks. However, effectiveness of the daily studying schedule on the realization of desired goals and behaviors is considered the strong point of the research. It is proposed for further studies on the subject to study other groups, different numbers and levels of musical works and use research models with extended experimental phases.

References

Akçay, Ş. Ö. (2011). *Gitar eğitiminde performans ölçeği geliştirme çalışması* (Unpublished master's thesis). Atatürk University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Erzurum.

Atılgan, M. (1998). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin ders çalışma alışkanlıkları ile akademik başarılarının karşılaştırılması (Gaziantep üniversitesi öğrencileri üzerine bir araştırma)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gaziantep University, Institute of Social Science, Gaziantep.

Babacan, E. (2014). Aday müzik öğretmenlerinin piyano eğitimi sürecindeki bireysel çalışma yöntemlerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Sanat Egitimi Dergisi*, *2*(1), 1-16.

Can, Ü. K. (2009). *Müzik öğretmenliği gitar öğrencileri için geliştirilen akran öğretimi programının etkililiğinin sınanması* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Marmara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, İstanbul.

Ceman, S. (2005). *Müzik öğretmeni adaylarının piyano çalışma alışkanlıkları ve piyano çalmalarını etkileyen faktörler* (Unpublished master's thesis). Karadeniz Technical University, Institute of Social Science, Trabzon.

Cerit, E. (2010). *Gazi eğitim fakültesi güzel sanatlar eğitimi bölümü müzik eğitimi anabilim dalı öğrencilerinin bireysel piyano çalışma yöntemleri ile bazı değişkenler arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

Colvin, G. (2011). *Yetenek dediğin nedir ki?* (K. Atakay, Trans.) (2nd ed.). Ankara: Elma Yayınevi.

Coşkun, M. (2001). *Müzik öğretmenliği programı anabilim dalında uygulanmakta olan piyano eğitiminde deşifrenin yeri ve önemi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Graduate School of Natural and Applied, Ankara.

Çimen, G. (2001). Piyanoda deşifre öğretimine yaklaşımlar. *Gazi Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi, 14*(2), 445-452

Davidson, J. W., Howe D. G., Moore D. G., & Sloboda J. A. (1996). The role of parental influences in the development of musical performance. *British Journal of Psychology, 14*, 399-412.

Ercan, N. (2006). Piyano eğitiminde alıştırma yapmanın önemi ve bazı öneriler. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 7*(12), 104-108.

Gladwell, M. (2009). *Outliers* [Çizginin dışındakiler] (A. Özer, Trans.) (9th ed.). Ankara: MediaCat.

Gözel, E., & Halat, E (2010). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenleri ve zaman yönetimi. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 6*, 73-89.

Güçlü, N. (2001). Zaman yönetimi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, *25*(25), 87-106.

Hewitt, M. P. (2000). *The effects of modeling, self-evaluation, and self-listening on junior high ınstrumentalists music performance and practice attitude* (Doctoral dissertation). Arizona University, USA.

Kaynak, T. (2011). *Piyano eğitimi yarıyıl sonu sınavlarında öğrenci performansının rubrik ile ölçülmesi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

Leon-Guerrero, A. (2008). Self-regulation strategies used by student musicians during music practice. *Music Education Research*, *10*(1), 91-106.

Önder, Ş. Ö., & Yıldız G. (2008). Klasik gitar eğitiminin boyutları. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *8*(15), 115-133.

Özer, B., & Yiğit, N. (2011). Piyano öğretiminde deşifre becerisinin kazandırılması. Eskişehir *Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *12*(1), 39-49.

Özdemir, M. (2014). *Müzik öğretmenliği klasik gitar eğitimi dersi için eklektik bir model önerisi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Marmara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, İstanbul.

Özmenteş, S. (2007). *Çalgı çalışma sürecinde özdüzenlemeli öğrenme ile duyuşsal özellikler ve performans düzeyi ilişkileri* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Educational Sciences, İzmir.

Özmenteş, S. (2013). Çalgı eğitimi alan lisans öğrencilerinin kullandıkları çalışma taktikleri. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *26*(2), 439-453.

Pirgon, Y. (2013). Piyano eğitiminde günlük çalışma yapmanın öğrenci başarısı üzerine etkisi. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *2*(3), 41-49.

Sloboda, J. A. (2000). Individual differences in music performance. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 4*(10), 397-403.

Sloboda, J. A., Davidson J. W., Howe D. G., & Moore D. G. (1996). The role of practice in the development of performing musicians. *British Journal of Psychology, 87*(2), 287-309.

Thorlaksson, E. (2001). *Sight reading samples for guitar 1st and 8th grade*. Retrieved from http://www.classicalguitarschool.net/music/1110.pdf

Tufan, S. (2000). Piyano eğitiminde deşifre çalışmaları. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *20*(3), 101-104.

Türkmen, N. (2008). *Müzik öğretmeni adaylarının piyanoda deşifre çalabilme düzeyleri üzerine bir çalışma* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

Uyan, M. O. (2012). *Lisans düzeyindeki gitar öğrencilerinde ön dinlemenin deşifre performansına etkisi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

Williamon, A., & Valentine, E. (2000). Quantity and quality of musical practice as predictors of performance quality. *British Journal of Psychology, 91*(3), 353-376.

Yokuş, T. (2009). *Gitar eğitiminde üstbilişsel becerilerin gerçekleştirlmesine yönelik etkinliklerin performans başarısına etkisi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Marmara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, İstanbul.

Appendix 1. Daily Study Program

Student Name: **Class:** **Between Dates: ...../.....** **Prepared by: Asst. Prof. Dr. Ümit Kubilay CAN**

CLASSICAL GUITAR DAILY STUDY PROGRAM				Scoring (1-5)													
				Monday		Monday		Monday		Monday		Monday		Monday		Monday	
RIGHT HAND	Preparation to Performance (Points to Consider)		How Appropriate **Fingernails** are for Performance														
			Positioning of **Stance and Handling**														
			Positioning of **Right Hand and Fingers**														
	Performance (Points to Consider)		**Deliberate (Controlled)** Playing														
			Comfortable Playing														
			Clear Tones														
			Sound Strength														
	Criticism		**Observation of the Entire Study Process**														
			Detecting and Recording Positive or Negative Behavior														
LEFT HAND	Scales	Monophonic	Parmaklandırma "**i,m**"														
			Parmaklandırma "**m,a**"														
			Parmaklandırma "**i,m,a,m**"														
		Diphonic	Parmaklandırma "**i,m**"														
			Parmaklandırma "**m,a**"														
	Bare (Points to Consider)		**Correct Positioning** of Fingers														
			Balance and Comfort in Left Hand														
			Ease and Fluency in Chord Changes														
	Legato (Points to Consider)		**Correct Positioning** of Fingers														
			Clear Tones														
			Sound Strength														
			Balance and Comfort														
	Finger Stretching (Points to Consider)		**Correct Positioning** of Fingers														
			Balance and Comfort														
	Criticism		**Observation of the Entire Study Process**														
			Detecting and Recording Positive or Negative Behavior														
DECIPHERING/ 2 pieces	Analysis of the Piece		**Review of Tone, Rhythmic Structure, Positions of the Piece**														
	Performance (Points to Consider)		**Correct Finger Positioning**														
			Correct Positioning														
			Rhythmic Integrity														
			Melodic Integrity														
			Separating Accompaniment and Melodic Partition														
			Playing the Entire Piece Nonstop in Slow Tempo														
ETUDE and PIECE	Study Methods (at least two of the pre-specified methods)		**Separating Sentences and Partitions**	**Etude**	**Piece**	**Etude**	**Piece**	**Etude**	**Piece**	**Etude**	**Piece**	**Etude**	**Piece**	**Etude**	**Piece**	**Etude**	**Piece**
			Studying Difficult Passages Separately														
			Adding Meter														
			Using Metronome														
			Playing Sentences in Different Rhythms														
			Playing the Entire Piece from Start to Finish														
	Performance (Points to Consider)		**Correct Positioning of Right and Left Fingers**														
			Rhythmic Integrity														
			Melodic Integrity														
			Correct and Comfortable Use of Technique														
			Implementation and Expression of Strength, Speed and Expression Terms														
	Criticism		**Observation of the Entire Study Process**														
			Detecting and Recording Positive or Negative Behavior														
Self-Scoring in Daily Study (1-5)																	

Instructor Signature