

An Analysis of the Music Education  
Methodology of Dmitry Kabalevsky and a Comparison with  
those of Zoltan Kodaly and Carl Orff

by

Alex Tsisserev

A thesis submitted in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements  
of Master of Education  
University of Manitoba  
1993



National Library  
of Canada

Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et  
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa (Ontario)  
K1A 0N4

*Your file* *Votre référence*

*Our file* *Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-13537-3

Canada

Name

Alex TRISSEREV

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

COMMUNICATIONS & THE ARTS

SUBJECT TERM

0413

U·M·I

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture	0729
Art History	0377
Cinema	0900
Dance	0378
Fine Arts	0357
Information Science	0723
Journalism	0391
Library Science	0399
Mass Communications	0708
Music	0413
Speech Communication	0459
Theater	0465

EDUCATION

General	0515
Administration	0514
Adult and Continuing	0516
Agricultural	0517
Art	0273
Bilingual and Multicultural	0282
Business	0688
Community College	0275
Curriculum and Instruction	0727
Early Childhood	0518
Elementary	0524
Finance	0277
Guidance and Counseling	0519
Health	0680
Higher	0745
History of	0520
Home Economics	0278
Industrial	0521
Language and Literature	0279
Mathematics	0280
Music	0522
Philosophy of	0998
Physical	0523

Psychology	0525
Reading	0535
Religious	0527
Sciences	0714
Secondary	0533
Social Sciences	0534
Sociology of	0340
Special	0529
Teacher Training	0530
Technology	0710
Tests and Measurements	0288
Vocational	0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language	
General	0679
Ancient	0289
Linguistics	0290
Modern	0291
Literature	
General	0401
Classical	0294
Comparative	0295
Medieval	0297
Modern	0298
African	0316
American	0591
Asian	0305
Canadian (English)	0352
Canadian (French)	0355
English	0593
Germanic	0311
Latin American	0312
Middle Eastern	0315
Romance	0313
Slavic and East European	0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy	0422
Religion	
General	0318
Biblical Studies	0321
Clergy	0319
History of	0320
Philosophy of	0322
Theology	0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies	0323
Anthropology	
Archaeology	0324
Cultural	0326
Physical	0327
Business Administration	
General	0310
Accounting	0272
Banking	0770
Management	0454
Marketing	0338
Canadian Studies	0385
Economics	
General	0501
Agricultural	0503
Commerce-Business	0505
Finance	0508
History	0509
Labor	0510
Theory	0511
Folklore	0358
Geography	0366
Gerontology	0351
History	
General	0578

Ancient	0579
Medieval	0581
Modern	0582
Black	0328
African	0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania	0332
Canadian	0334
European	0335
Latin American	0336
Middle Eastern	0333
United States	0337
History of Science	0585
Law	0398
Political Science	
General	0615
International Law and Relations	0616
Public Administration	0617
Recreation	0814
Social Work	0452
Sociology	
General	0626
Criminology and Penology	0627
Demography	0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies	0631
Individual and Family Studies	0628
Industrial and Labor Relations	0629
Public and Social Welfare	0630
Social Structure and Development	0700
Theory and Methods	0344
Transportation	0709
Urban and Regional Planning	0999
Women's Studies	0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture	
General	0473
Agronomy	0285
Animal Culture and Nutrition	0475
Animal Pathology	0476
Food Science and Technology	0359
Forestry and Wildlife	0478
Plant Culture	0479
Plant Pathology	0480
Plant Physiology	0817
Range Management	0777
Wood Technology	0746
Biology	
General	0306
Anatomy	0287
Biostatistics	0308
Botany	0309
Cell	0379
Ecology	0329
Entomology	0353
Genetics	0369
Limnology	0793
Microbiology	0410
Molecular	0307
Neuroscience	0317
Oceanography	0416
Physiology	0433
Radiation	0821
Veterinary Science	0778
Zoology	0472
Biophysics	
General	0786
Medical	0760

Geodesy	0370
Geology	0372
Geophysics	0373
Hydrology	0388
Mineralogy	0411
Paleobotany	0345
Paleoecology	0426
Paleontology	0418
Paleozoology	0985
Palynology	0427
Physical Geography	0368
Physical Oceanography	0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences	0768
Health Sciences	
General	0566
Audiology	0300
Chemotherapy	0992
Dentistry	0567
Education	0350
Hospital Management	0769
Human Development	0758
Immunology	0982
Medicine and Surgery	0564
Mental Health	0347
Nursing	0569
Nutrition	0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology	0380
Occupational Health and Therapy	0354
Ophthalmology	0381
Pathology	0571
Pharmacology	0419
Pharmacy	0572
Physical Therapy	0382
Public Health	0573
Radiology	0574
Recreation	0575

Speech Pathology	0460
Toxicology	0383
Home Economics	0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences	
Chemistry	
General	0485
Agricultural	0749
Analytical	0486
Biochemistry	0487
Inorganic	0488
Nuclear	0738
Organic	0490
Pharmaceutical	0491
Physical	0494
Polymer	0495
Radiation	0754
Mathematics	0405
Physics	
General	0605
Acoustics	0986
Astronomy and Astrophysics	0606
Atmospheric Science	0608
Atomic	0748
Electronics and Electricity	0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy	0798
Fluid and Plasma	0759
Molecular	0609
Nuclear	0610
Optics	0752
Radiation	0756
Solid State	0611
Statistics	0463
Applied Sciences	
Applied Mechanics	0346
Computer Science	0984

Engineering	
General	0537
Aerospace	0538
Agricultural	0539
Automotive	0540
Biomedical	0541
Chemical	0542
Civil	0543
Electronics and Electrical	0544
Heat and Thermodynamics	0348
Hydraulic	0545
Industrial	0546
Marine	0547
Materials Science	0794
Mechanical	0548
Metallurgy	0743
Mining	0551
Nuclear	0552
Packaging	0549
Petroleum	0765
Sanitary and Municipal System Science	0554
System Science	0790
Geotechnology	0428
Operations Research	0796
Plastics Technology	0795
Textile Technology	0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General	0621
Behavioral	0384
Clinical	0622
Developmental	0620
Experimental	0623
Industrial	0624
Personality	0625
Physiological	0989
Psychobiology	0349
Psychometrics	0632
Social	0451



AN ANALYSIS OF THE MUSIC EDUCATION  
METHODOLOGY OF DMITRY KABALEVSKY AND A COMPARISON  
WITH THOSE OF ZOLTAN KODALY AND CARL ORFF

BY

ALEX TSISSEREV

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

© 1993

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publications rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

## ABSTRACT

In an attempt to find alternative strategies for North American music education, this study investigates the music education program devised by Dmitry Kabalevsky, composer and one of Russia's leading twentieth century music educators. The exploration of the Kabalevsky method outlines his emphatic use of song, dance and march. In addition to these three elements, there is an examination of the roles which the material and the teacher play in the Kabalevsky approach.

The Kabalevsky model is measured against the methods of Carl Orff and Zoltan Kodaly in a critical and comparative analysis. The results show that Kabalevsky's music education program is strong in the areas of choral work and music appreciation. The apparent lack of attention given to music theory, polyphony, rhythm, and instrumental play demonstrate that Kabalevsky's approach to music education is not as complete as the two dominant approaches currently implemented in North America.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to my thesis advisor Dr. Larry Patterson. His guidance, support and encouragement will always be appreciated and remembered. I would also like to thank Dr. S. Rosenstock and Professor H. Engbrecht. As committee members they helped to strengthen this study with their knowledge and expertise.

This thesis was further made possible by Orpheus and the dream which granted me the time to pursue this project.

Most importantly, I would like to thank my support system: My parents, Arkady and Isabella, my grandparents, and my best friend, Deborah Dianne Davis for being the most secure safety net any person has ever had. Their patience and inspiration have served as the foundation for this work.

This thesis is dedicated to Evgeny Tsisser, Leonid Freeman, and Maria L. Asovskaya.

## CONTENTS

### Chapter 1

Introduction .....	1
Delimitations .....	9

### Chapter 2

Review of Literature .....	12
North American Philosophies of Music Education .....	12
Russian Philosophies of Music Education .....	17
On Zoltan Kodaly and His Approach to Music Education .....	21
On Carl Orff and His Approach To Music Education .....	27
On Dmitry Kabalevsky and His Approach to Music Education .....	31

### Chapter 3

The Methodology of Dmitry Kabalevsky .....	36
The Three Whales .....	37
The Material .....	42
The Teacher .....	51

### Chapter 4

Comparative Analysis .....	57
Exploring the Differences .....	61
Exploring the Similarities .....	69

### Chapter 5

Critical Analysis of the Kabalevsky Method and its Applicability to North American Music Education .....	76
Observations and Conclusions .....	95
Recommendations for Further Study .....	98
Summary Statement .....	99

Bibliography .....	101
--------------------	-----

## CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

In recent years music education trends in North American elementary schools have relied on the approaches of two great innovators in the field, Zoltan Kodaly (1882-1967) and Carl Orff (1895). Their approaches are readily utilized in many music classrooms across the continent and are very seldom seen as needing improvement. According to research done by Fisher (1982) and Noble (1982) the Orff and Kodaly approaches are well-rounded and educationally sound when synthesized and adapted for North America. This fact leaves music educators quite content with the direction of their music programs. Thus, they have no need to look elsewhere for alternative music education methodologies.

There were three purposes for this thesis. The first was to examine the approaches to music education of renowned Russian composer and music educator, Dmitry Kabalevsky (1904-1987). This examination was intended to explore Kabalevsky's philosophy of music education, the theoretical and practical elements of his approach,



his objectives regarding music education programs, and the pedagogical strategies which he employed in order to reach these objectives. Secondly, this thesis intended to compare and contrast Kabalevsky's strategies with those of Zoltan Kodaly and Carl Orff. When used in combination, the methods of Kodaly and Orff are the prevailing choice of the North American music education movement. This notion is further confirmed in the writings of Wheeler & Raebeck (1977), Landis & Carder (1972), and Nye & Nye (1970). This comparison was based on criteria such as philosophies, strategies, materials, and objectives. Thirdly, the intent of this study was to analyze the educational applicability of the Kabalevsky approach to North American music education trends. Before this thesis continues, three points must be brought to one's attention:

1. Music educators in North America do not use the pure approaches of Carl Orff and Zoltan Kodaly. Orff's method was devised specifically for children in Germany and Austria. Kodaly's techniques were intended for Hungarians. North American practitioners have adapted these programs for North American schools using

translated and transplanted versions of European folk songs in combination with the folk musics of this continent.

2. Orff and Kodaly are two of the principal theorists in the field, and, in combination compliment each other and present an educator with the materials and strategies required for a complete music education program. Such a program leads children toward fluency in melody, harmony, rhythm, movement, form, style, instrumental play, performance, improvisation, and appreciation of music.

3. This thesis does not suggest that there is a unified Orff/Kodaly program. Research does not suggest that there has ever been such a program. Studies by Horton (1976), Landis & Carder (1972), and Waldie (1992) suggest that educators employ elements of the Orff program and the Kodaly program and assimilate same into the design of their music education curriculum. In discussing the Orff/Kodaly synthesized program, this thesis refers not to a program which does not exist. It does, however, refer to the assimilation which Orff and Kodaly methodologies undergo when a music educator structures his/her music curriculum.

The Soviet reservoir of resources for teaching music to children has been virtually untapped by the Western world in the recent past. The Soviets widely consider Kabalevsky's pedagogical methods to be indicative of what music education of children should be like.

The writer of this thesis hypothesized that there were elements of the Kabalevsky approach which made it a unique method and set it apart from the practices of Orff and Kodaly. The hypothesis was broad enough, however, to make the claim that the pedagogy of Dmitry Kabalevsky has many aspects in common with the pedagogy of Orff and Kodaly. It was the belief of this researcher that Kabalevsky's program is unique enough to bring a new, refreshing, and revitalizing breath to North American music education and yet with sufficient similarities to the strategies of Kodaly and Orff to be successfully applied to, and synthesized with North American music education program trends.

The principles which Kabalevsky uses as a basis for a new musical programme for the general schools and for universal mass music education were discussed at the eleventh gathering of the International Society for

Music Education during the summer of 1974. Kabalevsky found it necessary to find a pedagogical conception which was derived from music and deeply rooted in music. This conception provided a link between music as an art and music as an educational discipline. In addition, this conception made a connection between musical studies in school and life in general. While establishing these conceptions Kabalevsky strived to arouse the children's interest in music, enrich their moral, ideological, and spiritual education, and thereby showing signs of both a totalitarian perspective and an aesthetic dichotomy. Furthermore, Kabalevsky aimed at making youth realize that music was not a mere pastime, or some sort of 'fluffy' entertainment which one can take or leave at will, but an important entity of life itself. Would there be anyone who genuinely cares about, and is in any way involved with the discipline of music education who would not support Kabalevsky's principles?

As an aside, it should be made clear that Kabalevsky did not work in a vacuum. His writings suggest that nationalism and patriotism were considerable forces in his life. It can be stated that

he was affected by the Russian community and the political goings on of his day. This concept must serve as an undercurrent for all that is to be written about Kabalevsky from this point on.

To examine the significance of this study is to, firstly, agree that music educators strive toward the enrichment of their students' musicianship, an extension of music's force in North American existence, and a strengthening of their own profession. With these statements serving as our foundation we may begin the process of justifying our search for new approaches in pedagogy in music programs. When one looks for a new technique he/she does so in order to make his/her pupils' musical experiences more complete and more comprehensive. When one searches for a new methodology, he/she does so with the intention of re-evaluating and, possibly, changing his/her existing professional philosophy. When we begin searching for new approaches in a country, specifically the Soviet Union, which has a significantly different cultural make up than that of Canada, we are faced with some interesting considerations. For example, Leonhard &

House (1972) suggest that music is a symbol. If we look beyond this claim and attempt to understand the entire matter of symbols, it will be quite clear that the most highly developed symbol system of a given culture is that culture's language. This implies that different dialects contain different symbol systems. In examining Kabalevsky's approaches to music pedagogy we need to take into account his and his pupils' mothertongue and that language's innate and unique symbol system which differs from the symbol system inherent in the English language. If this thesis intends to evaluate the applicability of Kabalevsky's methods to the North American approaches to music education such issues can not go by unconsidered.

Dmitry Kabalevsky is Russia's leading music education theorist, practitioner, and pedagogue of the twentieth century. His approach and his professional status, world wide, as a specialist in the area of music education serve as catalysts for this study. Let us take a brief look at this man's career apogees.

Kabalevsky attended the Moscow State Conservatoire, (a.k.a. The P.I.Tchaikovsky

Conservatoire), where he studied composition and piano. He later became a senior lecturer and professor at the Conservatoire. He held a degree of Doctor of Arts, was a member of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the U.S.S.R., and held the award of People's Artist of the U.S.S.R., and Hero of Socialist Labour of the U.S.S.R. He was Secretary of the Union of Soviet Composers, and Editor-in-Chief of the journal *Muzyka v Shkole* (Music in school). Kabalevsky was Honourary President of the International Society for Music Education, an Honourary Corresponding Member of the Academy of Arts of the German Democratic Republic. After his death, aside from his plethora of musical compositions, the first of which was published in 1927, Kabalevsky left behind important creative writings regarding the field of music education. They include "The Beautiful Inspires the Good", "A Story of Three Whales and many other things", "My dear friends", "Educating Mind and Heart", the music syllabus for general schools, and more than 500 articles. It is with these achievements in mind that we look at Kabalevsky's work with great respect and an interest to learn. On a personal level Kabalevsky confessed in his writings to having a great

love for his motherland and her people. His cultural heritage played an important role in his work. Kabalevsky emphasized his interest in contributing to the arts of Russia and the many generations of Russians who will carry on its musical tradition. Nothing has been documented regarding Kabalevsky's romantic life or religious leanings.

#### DELIMITATIONS

This study is descriptive in nature. It is not the intent of this thesis to closely examine Russian educational policies and the politics with which they are intertwined. It is not within the framework of this study to compare Russian school systems to those of North America. Nor is the purpose of this document to discuss Kabalevsky's personal and professional history, and his musical compositions.

Certainly there are approaches other than that of Orff and/or Kodaly implemented by music educators in their classrooms. I have selected the Orff and Kodaly methodologies because they are the most prevalent and widely used in North America. This is confirmed by Vajda (1974) and Warner (1991). It is not my intention



to discuss any of the other commonly used approaches to music pedagogy throughout North America. Furthermore, limited attention is given to contemporary issues in music education and their roles in society, and the subject of interdisciplinary studies.

There is yet another considerable delimitation which needs to be taken into account. One can not evaluate the results of the use of Kabalevsky's methods because his approaches have not been utilized widely across the nation, or even in an experimental, designated area. Furthermore, it should be stated that Kabalevsky's methods have not been officially utilized under his name the way that Orff and Kodaly techniques have been, and are.

The second chapter of this thesis is a review of literature pertaining to five areas of interest in the field of music education; North American philosophies of music education, Soviet philosophies of music education, Zoltan Kodaly's approach to music education, Carl Orff's approach to music education, and Dmitry Kabalevsky's approach to music education. Chapter three examines the main philosophies and components of Kabalevsky's method. The fourth chapter consists of a

critical analysis of the Kabalevsky approach. The applicability of his method to North American music education is discussed through a comparison of his program to the synthesized Orff and Kodaly model. Finally, I proposed to outline the link between Kabalevsky's music education strategies and the state of music education today. This outline is found in chapter five.

## CHAPTER 2

### Review of Literature

The focus of this paper is on Kabalevsky's approach to music education for elementary school students. There is, however, a considerable amount of literature which concerns the philosophies of Western and Soviet theorists and practitioners regarding music education which needs to be reviewed in order to better understand why these cultures arrange and organize their music programs the way that they do.

#### North American Philosophies of Music Education

The mission of music in the public schools has been dealt with by many researchers and educators. The twentieth century has been a time of several very eloquent and powerful statements. Dewey (1934) writes:

Aesthetic experience is a manifestation, a record and celebration of the life of a civilization, a means of promoting its development, and is also the ultimate judgement upon the quality of a civilization (p.326).

Parker, McConathy, Birge, & Meissner (1916) state:

The general aim of education is to train the child

to become a capable, useful and contented member of society. Music, because of its powerful influence upon the very innermost recesses of our subjective life, because of its wonderfully stimulating effect upon our physical, mental, and spiritual natures, and because of its well-nigh universality of appeal, contributes directly to both of these fundamental purposes of education (p.9).

Nohavec Morgan (1947) extends this sentiment by writing:

Throughout the ages, man has found music to be essential in voicing his own innate sense of beauty. Music is not a thing apart from man; it is the spiritualized expression of his finest and best inner self (p.iv).

Winship (1905) says that music's intellectual mission is to make intellectual activity refreshing and graceful (p.632). Leonhard and House (1972) expand on this by noting that music has unique qualities that make it the most desirable medium of organized aesthetic education (p.229). These qualities will be dealt with in detail in the comparative and critical analysis portion of this study. Schwadron (1967) notes

that man's relationship to music becomes educational when succeeding generations are assisted in becoming critically intelligent about musical styles and forms, about the organization and design of sound, and about the social, emotional, and physical phenomena which characterize music as an art form (p.5). Leonhard and House (1972) add that music is not a specialty reserved for the talented but, that it is universally important to every human being and his culture (p.66).

One of the more penetrating views of the aim of music instruction and the justification for music in the curriculum comes from Foster McMurray (1958), who writes:

By translation from the universal aim of general education, the aim of music education may be explained in this way. It is: to help everyone to further awareness of patterns of sound as an aesthetic component in the world of experience; to increase each person's capacity to control the availability of aesthetic richness through music; and to transform the public musical culture into a recognized part of each person's environment... Music education is justified because, when the more refined portions of our musical

culture are communicated, the person to whom they are communicated will find in music what he would not have been able to find otherwise, thereby expanding his environment and increasing his power to find a good life through deliberate guidance of his behaviour and its outcomes (p.146).

Nye and Nye (1970) conclude that the aims of music education and its justification rest on firm ground educationally, culturally, and historically (p,5).

A multitude of statements exists regarding what music is and what it means and contributes to the life of every individual because there is a plethora of concerns with respect to what music should be, where it is going and how music programs in schools can influence that motion. Mursell (1936) claims that a music program should aim at the promotion of active and intelligent musical amateurism (pp. 10-11). Morgan (1953) writes:

Properly taught, music can provide a remarkable example of true democracy wherein both the individual and society have due regard for each other. The dignity and worth of the individual must always be protected, and yet it is necessary that the individual

feel his responsibility to society as a whole (p.2). These concerns reach their climax at the most practical level--the classroom. Tait and Haack (1984) suggest that the basic music education processes of planning, teaching, learning, and evaluating must proceed from principles that relate directly to the essential nature of man, music, and education (p.1). Cundiff and Dykema (1923) suggest that for North America to become truly musical, public schools must do their work during the impressionable days of youth (p.3). Harper (1955) takes this idea one step further by declaring that moral and spiritual values will be found in music education only if they are found in the music educator (p.5). We can not overlook the fact that the music teacher has a job because the public has come to want music for its children, says Mursell (1943). Charles Leonhard (1963) observes that some elementary schools provide no more than a casual contact with music:

In many elementary schools, for example, children dance, play games, and paint to music; they sometimes listen to recordings but with no purpose beyond that of immediate satisfaction and pleasure. Teachers often use music for recreational purposes

and for a kind of emotional catharsis. When children are tired from concentration on reading and arithmetic, bored, overwrought, or obstreperous, it's time for music. This use of music is appropriate, healthy, and consistent with music's great powers, but it does not represent a valid music education program because it leads nowhere and results in no significant musical learning (p.40).

#### Russian Philosophies of Music Education

A review of literature suggests that theorists and practitioners in the Soviet Union approach music and music education from a somewhat different perspective. Mark (1982) writes:

Although music is well loved in the Soviet Union, the reader will readily see that it, and the other arts, are not allowed to exist for the sake of art alone. More important than aesthetic content is the use of the arts to educate and propagandize in order to encourage support for the political system. (p.261)

Mark's words are reinforced by history. Stalin (1939) firmly believed that the rise of this new, socialist intelligentsia of the people was one of the most important results of the cultural revolution in his



country (p.367). In the same address Stalin paraphrased Lenin in stating that music is a means of unifying broad masses of people (364). Shostakovich (1931) said that good music lifts and heartens and lightens people for work and effort. It may be tragic but it must be strong (p.x8). Some more contemporary commentary is provided for us by Bader, Venrova, & Kritskaya (1986) who suggest that one can not forget the considerable aesthetic values of the arts. They comment on music's capacity to transmit aesthetic pleasure to man and to draw in and overwhelm one with its beauty (p.8). With regards to the music program they write:

A music educator can not ignore the fact that children at the upper elementary level are characterized by widening capacities for knowledge, a growth in interest towards life, and an increasing awareness of the society to which they belong (p.8). Abdulin, Kadobnova, & Tarasov (1980) extend this idea by suggesting that music and the study of music grammar faces educators with a wide problem of introducing learners to the world of grand musical art, and teaching them to love and understand music in all its

splendour. In short, to engage the students' musical enculteration in their spiritual culture (p.19). They elaborate:

Musical literacy is the ability to interpret music as a living art form. It is the feelingfulness of music which forces one to personalize it on an emotional level, separating in it the good from the bad, the character of music itself from the character of the performance, and the technical and compositional elements with which one is familiar from those with which one is unfamiliar (p.19).

Further review of literature revitalized the link between music and politics. Hentova (1989) says that creative musical exploits assisted in the struggle of the Russian Communists (p.48). Tretyakova (1987) claims that the revolution, the great builder of socialism, opened to the masses the doors of concert halls and theatres, and by so doing reinforced the public's experience with art (p.5) Kabalevsky (1973) is not as politically concerned as are the above writers. Evidence of this can be seen in statements such as the following:

When dealing with the role and meaning of

aesthetic upbringing of a child, I am convinced that music can not be seen as some sort of secondary luxury of life. Aesthetic education does not imply the pedagogy of a simplified, child-centred art form. It does, however call for a systematic development of feelings and creative abilities which enhance one's appreciation of beauty (p.8)

In another work Kabalevsky (1977) writes:

Art is like a human being. Can you call a human being a real human being if he is not capable of deep thoughts and feelings? No you can not. The same rings true for art. Real art must contain real thoughts and feelings (p.8).

Kabalevsky (1989) states that art influences life. By this we mean that art can move a mortal to do a heroic deed. It can fill one with fear and horror, or uncontrollable joy, sorrow and agony. It has the power to energize or drain a man of energy and strength. Everything depends on what type of art it is and our reaction to it (pp.180-181). With regard to music education in the education system Kabalevsky (1984) writes:

In the last fifty years, Soviet public schools

have gained considerable experience in the areas of theory and practice of musical/aesthetic education of students. Nevertheless, the current situation in this field leaves many educators dissatisfied (p.4).

During my many years as a music educator I have strived to find an educational philosophy which would be born out of music and in music would find its support, a philosophy which would tie music as an art to music as a teachable school subject to life. I strived to perfect strategies which would interest and motivate pupils to learn about music. I have tried to bring them closer to the beautiful art which has the capacity to enrich the human spirit. My main goal was to call upon an understanding and feeling of music by my pupils, the kind of understanding and feeling which makes clear the fact that music is not some type of frivolous entertainment, nor is it an unnecessary auxiliary tool for living a full life (pp.7-8).

#### On Zoltan Kodaly and His Approach to Music Education

A statement made by the president of the Kodaly Institute of Canada, Gordon Kushner (1977) is helpful in appropriately beginning this portion of this thesis.

Zoltan Kodaly was simply committed and singularly dedicated to helping seriously gifted people to find the most sensible pedagogical approach to musical literacy, to the whole panorama of music, and thus to fuller lives (p.7).

Kushner's phrase 'seriously gifted people' does not support the philosophy of educators who employ the Kodaly method in North American schools. They apply Kodaly concepts to a learning environment where all children, and not just the gifted elite, are educated in the area of music. Furthermore, it should be made clear that the musical literacy paradigm consists of one's ability to read, write, think, and to a certain degree understand and appreciate music.

Choksy (1974) claims that Kodaly wished to see a unified system of music education evolve in Hungary, capable of leading children towards love of and knowledge about music from earliest nursery school years to adulthood (p.15).

Russell-Smith (1976) suggests that although Kodaly's principles in music education have only recently had any major international influence, it is fairly safe to predict that it will be no more than a decade before he

is universally recognized as probably the greatest figure in music teaching since John Curwen, on whose work so much of his own was founded (p.78). Choksy (1981) says that what developed in Hungary under Kodaly's guidance, was a life-permeating philosophy of education. Choksy perceives Kodaly's educational philosophy to be the following:

1. True musical literacy--the ability to read, write, and think music--is the right of every human being.
2. To be internalized, musical learning must begin with the child's own natural instrument--the voice.
3. The education of the musical ear can be completely successful only if it is begun early (i.e. kindergarten or earlier, if possible).
4. As a child possesses a mother tongue, he also possesses a musical mother tongue in the folk music of that language. It is through this musical mother tongue that the skills and concepts necessary to musical literacy should be taught.
5. Only music of unquestioned quality--both folk and composed--should be used in the education of children (pp.6-8).

According to Szabo (1948) Kodaly worked with the

following philosophies:

1. The purpose of music is to understand better: to evolve and expand our inner world.
2. Without music life can not be complete, nor is it worth anything.
3. Music is a spiritual food for which there is no substitute.
4. Music reflects the eternal harmony of the universe, and shows people how they can fit in with it.
5. Music is not a recreation for the elite, but a source of spiritual strength which all cultured people should turn into public property.
6. Music must not be the exclusive property of the few, but should be accessible to everyone.
7. Only where it is based on singing does a musical culture develop.
8. Feeding on good art results in spiritual health (p.4).

Kodaly himself said (1974) that he wants to stop teachers' superstitions according to which only some diluted art substitute is suitable for teaching purposes. A child is the most susceptible and the most enthusiastic audience for pure art; for in every great

artist the child is alive-and that is something felt by youth's congenial spirit (p.122). He believed that educators must lead great masses to music with intrinsic value. Such music mainly exists in a culture's folk songs.

Choksy (1974) sees the objectives of the Kodaly approach as being twofold: to aid in the well-balanced social and artistic development of the child, and to produce the musically literate adult (p.15). This, however can not be effectively achieved with a reliance on folk culture alone. She adds that a child developmental sequence, rather than one based on subject logic, was developed to reach these objectives. Choksy explains that the child-developmental approach to sequence within a subject requires the arrangement of the subject matter into patterns that follow normal child abilities at various stages of growth (pp.15-16).

Vajda (1974) elaborates on this type of arrangement following Kodaly practice:

The first stage in musical literacy:

1. rhythm symbols, 2. handsigns, 3. sol-mi melodic motive, 4. two-part games, 5. sight-singing from sol-fa symbols, 6. new melodic notes doh and la, 7. teaching



songs through handsigns, 8. part singing, 9. rhythmic training: bar line, time signature, the two-beat bar, 10. new note-re, 11. four-beat bar, 12. singing with simple rhythm accompaniment, 13. new motives doh-la-doh, doh-la-sol, 14. the three-beat bar, 15. voice production.

The second stage in musical literacy:

1. reading from rhythmic sol-fa symbols, 2. vocal practice from written symbols, 3. practicing intonation from written symbols.

The third stage in musical literacy:

1. staff notation, 2. two+three time in one piece, 3. part singing from staff notation, 4. sight singing of complete tunes from rhythmic sol-fa symbols, 5. playing the xylophone, 6. the top doh', 7. anacrusic start, 8. four+three time in one piece.

The fourth stage in musical literacy:

1. absolute pitch, 2. doh, re, mi on the stave, 3. doh', re', mi' in handsigning, 4. syncopation, 5. dotted rhythms, 6. taking down dictation, 7. the pentatonic scale.

The fifth stage in musical literacy:

1. Diatonic development: new note-fa, 2. new rhythmic

motive-sixteenth notes, 3. improvisation, 4. eighth note as the beat, 5. new note-ti, 6. half note as the beat, 7. composition (pp. v-vi).

On Carl Orff and His Approach  
to Music Education

Unlike Kodaly, Orff's music education program did not stem from his desire to develop a comprehensive and complete program for the musical education of young children. His approach was given birth by the fusion of music and dance for the theatre. Orff's compositions leaned more towards the artistic rather than the educational. He and his colleague, Dorothee Gunther, broke music and dance down into their simplest component parts. Through performance these parts were mastered. They called this process 'elemental style' and based the curriculum of the new school on this process.

Selecting literature for review on Carl Orff was a challenging task. His methods as a music educator are no less important, influential, or plentiful than those of Zoltan Kodaly. There is, however, a much smaller quantity of literature available for review on Carl Orff the music educator than there is on Zoltan Kodaly.

Many of the writings about Orff focus on his compositions rather than his pedagogical strategies.

Horton (1976) suggests that there are several misconceptions, of the Orff approach that need to be mentioned:

First, the idea that the Orff method is based on an instrumental approach to musicianship, with singing thrust into the background, is entirely fallacious; in fact, the Orff system, like the Kodaly system, is built on the interval-relationship of vocal melody, on the rhythms of natural speech, and on traditional rhymes and songs. Secondly, no one who has grasped the principles of the Orff instrumentarium can subscribe to the view that the management of these instruments calls for no technical expertise, rhythmic accuracy, or musical literacy. The picture of an Orff session as a free-for-all orgy of indiscriminate 'bonking' is ludicrously distorted (p.93).

These misconceptions are given birth by misguided teacher application of Orff techniques in the classroom. A community's poor understanding of the advantages of the Orff approach acts as another catalyst for such a misconception.

Landis and Carder (1972) say that the central idea on which Carl Orff based his approach to music education is that music, movement, and speech are inseparable. Furthermore, the most important principle of the Orff approach is that rhythm is the strongest of the elements of music. The most primitive and most natural musical responses of the human personality are rhythmic in nature and that the logical starting point for education in music is rhythm (pp.71, 72).

Wheeler and Raebeck (1977) state the objectives of the Orff program as being the following:

1. To use the speech and movement natural to the child as the springboard for musical experiences.
2. To give an immediacy of enjoyment and meaning to the child through active participation in all experiences.
3. To encourage the feeling that speech, movement, instrumental play, and song are one.
4. To give a completely physical, nonintellectual background in rhythm and melody, thus laying the foundation of experience so necessary to a later understanding of music and musical notation.
5. To give experience in the component parts of the

basic elements of music: in rhythmic experience by beginning with the rhythmic pattern of a word, then two words, gradually building complexity into the phrase and period: in melodic experiences, by beginning with the natural chant of childhood (the falling minor third), gradually adding other tones of the pentatonic scale, tones of other modes, and finally the major and minor scales.

6. To cultivate the musical imagination-both rhythmic and melodic-and thus to develop the ability to improvise.

7. To cultivate individual creativity as well as a feeling for, and the ability to participate in, ensemble activities (pp.xix-xx).

According to Choksy, Abramson, Gillespie, & Woods (1986) the Orff process at every level includes exploration of space through movement, exploration of sound through voice and instruments, and exploration of form through improvisation. At each step of the process the learners move from imitation to creation, from part to whole, from simple to complex and from individual to ensemble.

This sequence supports Carl Orff's ultimate goal of

making music live for children (p.103).

In closing, a statement made by Warner (1991) seems quite appropriate:

Although Orff-Schulwerk is one of the most enjoyable ways to teach music, it is probably one of the most difficult as well. This is so because we constantly learn and create as we teach our children. But creativity in teaching calls for discipline in organization and planning (p.266).

On Dmitry Kabalevsky and his approach  
to Music Education

There seems to be no better way to introduce the work of Dimitry Kabalevsky than by quoting his sentiments regarding aesthetic needs as they pertain to schooling (1973):

The aesthetic enculteration of the people is finding a place as one of the more pressing concerns of our society with greater and greater frequency. Many factors in the past few years suggest that there are reasons for optimism, as we are getting closer and closer to solving the problem of aesthetic upbringing of students in our school systems (p.237).

The International Bureau of Education (1988)

proposes that Kabalevsky was a supporter of a philosophy put forth by Suchomlinsky (1979) who stated that music education is not the education of the musician, but above all the education of the human being (p.19). According to the IBE (1988), it appears that Kabalevsky expanded and personalized this philosophy. This is evidenced in statements such as the following:

I have attempted to arrive at a concept of teaching rising from, and relying on the music itself, a concept which would naturally and organically relate music as an art to music as a school subject, and that would just as naturally relate school music lessons to real life. I have attempted to find the sort of principles, methods and approaches that could help to attract the children, interest them in music, and bring this beautiful art, with its immeasurable potential for spiritual enrichment, close to them (p.21).

Kabalevsky (1984) says that there is a need for methodology which will assist our field in the solution of the fundamental problem found in music education: How do we most effectively interest children, and lure

them musically? He adds that by not solving this problem we are not allowing the music program to be as successful as it potentially can be (p.6).

Kabalevsky (1989) expands on this thought in the following statement:

The interest and involvement in, and the love of music are conditions which are necessary if music is to share and its beauty with children, thereby fulfilling its obligation to raise and enlighten these youngsters. One who is genuinely interested, involved, and in love with music is being controlled by his experiences with music's overwhelming strength (p.7).

To look at the origins of Kabalevsky's approach one must regress in time to a period in Kabalevsky's life when the young composer, who had just completed his studies at the conservatory, (1926), began visiting schools and youth camps in order to assist Soviet children in their music education. Pozhidaev (1970) tells us that Kabalevsky, through these visits, discovered that young people had a very small quantity of their own songs which dealt with their own lives and experiences. A short period of time had passed and



Kabalevsky had emerged with eight original compositions for children. This signified the origins of Kabalevsky's new direction as a composer (p.15). Stretyakova (1987) declares that more than one generation grew up with Kabalevsky's magnificent songs. These songs were heard in youth camps and in civil wars, where they evoked bravery and nationalistic pride, and talked about the Russian people's love for their motherland (p.105).

Kabalevsky (1977) writes about the underlying theory which guides him in his work:

It is imperative that one understands and feels that art penetrates one's entire existence and is, in fact, an integral part of life. This very philosophy should guide everyone in the pursuit of making art accessible to, and available for every individual (p.19).

## CHAPTER 3

The following chapter of this descriptive study explored the methodology of Dmitry Kabalevsky (1904-1987) by dividing his entire approach into compartmentalized and comprehensive sections. In examining Kabalevsky's methods this writer drew from the original writings of several Russian theorists and practitioners, and curriculum guides for grades one through ten. Of greater import to this study, however, are Kabalevsky's own writings, most of which have not been translated. This study proposed to explore the theoretical components of his approach as well as the practical ones. This exploration serves as an introduction to the remainder of this study as it is followed by a comparative analysis whereby Kabalevsky strategies are compared with the synthesized techniques of the Orff/Kodaly methods. The comparative analysis portion of this thesis is linked to a critical analysis of the Kabalevsky approach. This study critiqued the applicability of Kabalevsky's methods to the North American state of music education, thereby, examining

the usefulness of Kabalevsky's contribution to North America's and, more specifically, to Manitoba's music education programs.

#### The Methodology of Dmitry Kabalevsky

Kabalevsky's approach stemmed from a growing dissatisfaction by society with the education which their children were receiving. His intent was to enrich the life of every individual by allowing music to become an integral part of every person's daily existence. His philosophy suggests that art belongs to the people, to all people and must, therefore be made accessible to the lay man. Throughout Kabalevsky's many years of experience in the field of music pedagogy with students of different ages and different backgrounds he has strived to find an educational rationale which would grow out of music and, at the same time, have music as its foundation. The most important aspect of this program is that it would create an essential and undeniable link between music as an art and music as a school subject. Upon the creation of such a link music as a school subject can be connected to every individual's real life. Furthermore, Kabalevsky believed that with the correct

methods, principles, materials, and tools he would be able to entice and interest children to study music, thus, bringing them closer to this wonderful art form which, within itself, conceals an unmeasurable potential to spiritually enrich each human being. This can only be done, however, if educators can fascinate their students with music.

#### The Three Whales

Kabalevsky's main objective was to make students comprehend that music, like all art, is not a form of frivolity or entertainment in which one may or may not choose to engage. Music, rather, is a crucial part of life itself. Those Russian methods, such as ensemble experiences, choral work, memorization activities, and aural development, which have stood the test of time serve only to reinforce this mentality. In structuring his new program Kabalevsky chooses not to reject these older, proven methods of music education for this very reason. Bringing art closer to society, and society closer to art, is a serious and challenging task. Such an act requires the education system to raise the educational and artistic levels of the masses. Kabalevsky suggested that the program with which these

objectives would be most successfully and efficiently reached is the 'three whales' approach. Kabalevsky claimed that this approach successfully fuses the proven music education methods of the past with Kabalevsky's new techniques.

This approach stems from a legend which is a part of Russian folk culture. This legend tells of three huge whales on whose backs rests the entire planet. Kabalevsky puts a twist on this fable and uses it to his advantage when structuring a music education program. The twist is a logical one. He extended the fairy tale by suggesting that these three mammals carry the entire world of music on their backs. This technique, he believed, would bring children closer to the entity of music by enabling them to relate to a concept through a tool with which they are already familiar. Kabalevsky elaborated on this fairy tale by stating that all aspects of music stem from, and are based on three elements. In Kabalevsky's opinion these elements are song, dance, and march. These 'whales' are seen as the simplest and, therefore, most accessible musical forms and genres. More importantly, much like children begin to personalize the world of

music without ever having studied music, thanks to this altered legend, they can personalize song, dance, and march before studying them in a classroom setting.

Kabalevsky believed that there is not one child who has not sung a song or heard one be sung by someone else. Furthermore, there is not one child who has not seen or been involved in a dance or a march/parade. Therefore, children know about song, dance, and march before they step into the classroom. Thus, a foundation for music learning exists before any formal schooling takes place. Best of all, the whales are the most effective tools in the areas of conceptual and theoretical music education, and aesthetic education. Kabalevsky doubts that there would be any teacher who would not employ this method in his/her classroom upon becoming acquainted with it. Song, dance, and march are not only important because they are accessible to children. Their greater value lies in their ability to unite great art with music in the classroom, and music in every day life.

The most powerful aspect of this approach is that it would be nearly impossible to find a person who has never heard or sang a song, has never danced, or been

in some type of procession which contained music. It is very possible, however, that there are people in the world today who have never seen notated music, or who are not aware of music's place in the professional world as a career, who have never seen performances by dance troupes, orchestras, or musical groups. Children have a musical foundation of which they are not aware even before they step into the music classroom and have their first formal, educational experience with music. Most children have sung various songs on various occasions, have seen people dance, or have danced, themselves, have been to a parade, or have seen marching bands in action. Within the first few music lessons these children are pleasantly surprised when they find out just how much musical knowledge they have. Such discoveries result in a greater self-esteem and sense of self-worth. In addition to an increase in their levels of confidence, pupils begin to develop a positive rapport with their teacher and with music as a subject. This rapport is based on feelings such as trust. Such feelings and experiences rapidly instill an atmosphere of motivation and creative interest. Certainly students become excited when they find out

how much they already know about song, dance, and march. The greater excitement comes from the various combinations of wholes. Children's musical horizons expand incredibly when they realize that song and dance, for example, can coexist. Their perception becomes more active and begins to function at a higher level of complexity. Soon they discover that they are not listening to just song, dance, or march, but to music in general.

From this comes the skill of observing, experiencing and analyzing a phenomenon. Pupils engage in listening, actively participating, and thinking about music.

For the three wholes approach to be successful in teaching music to students two very important prerequisites must be met; 1. the material used for classroom instruction must be of high quality, and 2. the instruction by the teacher has to be of a high standard. In the following section, this study will examine Kabalevsky's suggestions on the types and usages of material within the framework of his program, and the qualities which are to be possessed by every educator who will be working within his system.



### The Material

The most significant point which Kabalevsky brings to our attention is that any material employed must be complete in itself. When the material is of high quality it can function as a bridge between the three whales and any other area of musical art. Furthermore, a connection between music and literature may be developed. Good instructional material will provide the pupils and their teacher with potential links between music and life. Here are several examples:

1. A parallel can be drawn between timbres and the colours of an artist's palette. The major mode can be compared with lighter and brighter colours, while the minor mode can be associated with darker, heavier tones.

2. Musical phrasing can be compared to human speech. One can find similarities in the punctuation found in verbal dialogue, and in the punctuation found in a musical composition.

3. Melodic structure and shape may be compared to construction of sentences in speech.

Material and instruction of high quality will motivate students to focus on music outside the music classroom.

Student growth will be evident when they begin to explore music on the radio or on television, and when they begin to examine the multitude of sounds found in the world around them (e.g. cars, birds, the wind, alarm clocks, pet vocalization, and so on). Such exploration will lead to compare-and-contrast exercises in which children will engage. These exercises are very helpful in reinforcing newly learned material. Finding the similarities and differences in any two given entities is something that people, consciously or unconsciously, do until they die.

Choosing works for the music class must be done with great care. The most important considerations are that the composition in question be educationally sound (i.e. it should teach something that is necessary and valuable to a student's reservoir of musical knowledge), it should fulfil a definite educational role such as helping to shape the ideology, morality, and aesthetic taste of the student, it should be appealing to the pupil, thus stimulating within him a sincere desire to participate in the learning, and it needs to have artistic and aesthetic qualities.

In choosing material, Kabalevsky suggests that

educators focus more on those works which will assist the teacher in making the student musically literate than those compositions which have a lot to offer in the areas of theory and the rudiments of music. He sees musical literacy to be far more important than musical grammar. Kabalevsky sees musical literacy as musical culture. Musical enculteration does not depend on one's versatility in the field of musical grammar. Kabalevsky (1988) makes the following observations about musical literacy:

"Music literacy is receptiveness to music as a living, figurative art, born of life and inseparably bound up with it; a special 'feeling' for music, involving its perception through the emotions, and distinguishing of good music from bad; the ability to identify the nature of music on hearing it, to perceive the connection between its nature and the nature of its performance; the ability to hear and unknown piece of music and say who composed it, provided that it is in a style characteristic of the composer, and of those of his works with which the pupils are already acquainted. The introduction of pupils to this delicate sphere of musical culture needs care, a

consistent approach and great precision in the choice of composers and works (p.32).

In Kabalevsky's opinion, listening experiences are the most valuable experiences for a child during the first two years of his musical education. From listening activities pupils will acquire a taste for appreciating and, to some degree, understanding music of high quality. They will be able to internalize the styles of some composers. Furthermore, students will be able to identify a composer by listening to music which they have never heard before.

Kabalevsky sees good material to be folk and classical music. The following is a short list of composers whose music he deems to be a valuable tool in the teaching of music to children. This list was compiled by Kabalevsky and is presented in his 1984 thesis.

Tchaikovsky--his music is filled with Russian folk melodies, incredible melodic lyricism, poetic beauty, and an obvious love for his homeland and its people. Beethoven--his music contains elements of emotional and compositional power, heroic patriotism, and march-like qualities.

Chopin--his music is a celebration of the beauty of Polish folk songs and dances. His compositions are filled with emotion, much of which stems from Chopin's views on his country's struggles, the repressed Polish people, and the longing for freedom.

Prokofiev--his music embraces the world of the child with compositions such as Peter and the Wolf, and Chatter. His work can also be a study in patriotism(e.g. Ivan Susanin). Prokofiev's musical language is interesting to explore for its ability to create vivid imagery.

Dunaevsky--his joyous songs are aimed at children. Dunaevsky employs intricate rhythms in his composition. Such rhythms would be useful in a class discussion. Khachaturyan--his music incorporates many eastern musical elements. For example, an abundance of ornamentation, dance-like qualities, and distinctive melodic inflection.

Kabalevsky places the folk music of the Soviet republics in the same category for their high degree of applicability and usefulness in the music classroom. In studying such music one is inevitably guided to, not only a growth in musical literacy but, also, to an

examination of conceptual musical elements such as rhythm, harmony, melody, form, dynamics, texture, and timbre. The development of this type of knowledge stimulates a growth in one's musical grammar.

Kabalevsky is cautious about introducing theory into the music classroom. He believes that the only way in which we can educate youngsters successfully is to arouse their interest in, and love for music. Theory tends to diminish the captivating essence of music as an art. Rudimentary work calls for drill work, formulaic study, and tedious regurgitation. This is not something that will appeal to most students, nor will it create a desire within the students to proceed with musical study.

In discussing the teaching of material, Kabalevsky makes a stand against instruction by rote. Everything can be learned by rote in any subject. Rote learning, however, is quickly forgotten because it is not really understood. Only that which is really comprehended can be properly remembered. With music there is a greater challenge which exceeds understanding. In our field only what has been both really understood and emotionally felt can be remembered. Music can fulfil

its aesthetic, cognitive, and educational roles only when students begin to really listen to it and think about it. Kabalevsky (1988) states that real, truly felt and thought-out perception of music is one of the most active forms of introduction to music, because it activates the inner, spiritual world of the pupils, in feeling and in thought. Music as an art does not exist apart from perception. It is pointless to talk of the influence of music on the spiritual life of children and adolescents if they have not learned to listen to it as an art with a content, that embodies human feelings and thoughts, vital ideas and images.

In Kabalevsky's program listening is one of the two essential elements. The other element is choral singing. He claims that one can not be a good singer if he is not a good listener. Students should be able to transfer their listening from listening to external sources to listening to an internal source--themselves. In addition to feeling the composer's style and understanding the music which they are performing, children need to hear themselves, listen to other members of the choir and the accompanist. Kabalevsky breaks down choral work into two categories; 1. choral

singing as a compulsory and important part of school music lessons for all children, and 2. choral singing as a non-compulsory form of musical self-expression by children or adolescents. Creative movement grows out of listening and singing. Teacher and students engage in movement analyses and creative movement activities as an educational alternative which doubles as a reinforcement to the learning which has taken place. Kabalevsky does not deal with dance and march in great detail. He does point out that they are beneficial to rhythmic learning and those aspects of music which deal with coordination and physical self-awareness.

All of the materials which are implemented must relate to, and correspond with the general theme of the school term. Each school term has its own theme. The Russian school year consists of four terms. There is an internal continuity between all four terms. More importantly, there is a continuity between all ten school years. A theme is developed from lesson to lesson, gradually increasing in complexity and depth. The success and quality of theme development depend on the type of material used in the music classroom.

Aside from developing musical literacy and



learning music grammar from song, dance, and march, Kabalevsky feels that it is very important to encourage and nurture pupils' creativity. This can be done through composition and improvisation. When children become creators of music they also become active music makers. Without composition and improvisation students tend to be passive music consumers who can not fully appreciate music as a craft. One can notice a child's creative capabilities an early age. A student's creative potential should not go unexplored.

Improvisation serves as a catalyst in the development of creative fantasy. Secondly, it helps to bring out the feeling for intonation and harmony. An educator can begin an improvisatory exercise with students by asking them to complete a melody which the teacher had begun. The students may be asked to finish the melody in a certain key. At more advanced levels of improvisation pupils may have to take the melody into keys which have distant harmonic relationships with the tonic key. This may be done with the use of applied dominant or diminished chords. Such an exercise requires the students to be fairly well versed in the areas of music theory and music harmony. With such

accomplishments, however, comes an incredible musical freedom and creative potential. We can expand creative horizons by improvising with mode mixture, tempi, dynamics, styles, and execution. For this type of activity to be productive and beneficial, the teacher needs to be quite comfortable with the subject area of improvisation. Because there is no formal training for teachers in the field of improvisation, however, improvisation can not be considered a compulsory part of the music program.

#### The Teacher

Let us now examine the teacher's role in Kabalevsky's approach. An educator must be his/her students' guide through the world of music. He/she must be a good facilitator who, through his/her love and understanding of music, can help his/her pupils to love and understand music, also. After all, how can youngsters be expected to appreciate music if their teacher does not. A teacher has the power to be an incredible influence on his students. He must comprehend that the art of teaching is the art of speaking to the human heart. Kabalevsky (1984) sees the educators in his program as people who meet the

following list of qualifications:

1. must be able to play the piano or the accordion,
2. must be able to direct a choir and to sing,
3. must have training in the areas of music theory and music history,
4. must have adequate accompanying skills,
5. must be able to play by ear to some degree,
6. must have transposition skills,
7. must be able to play the role of facilitator rather than answer-giver.
8. must be able to bring together all the elements of the lesson and subordinate them to the main theme of the lesson, the term, the entire school year, and the syllabus, without losing the specific logic in the development of each separately considered element.
9. must be able to bring the lesson to life, to display music's profound thoughts and feelings, and to go beyond the shallow view point that music is just entertainment.
10. must be able to convey to pupils the atmosphere in which it was written.
11. must look at long term objectives (i.e. study of song leads to study of opera, study of dance leads to

study of ballet).

In Kabalevsky's opinion, the educators working in his program must be musically trained teachers.

Furthermore, it is crucial that children notice how important it is to be able to make music. This will not be sufficiently demonstrated if the teacher can not play an instrument and sing. To meet these qualifications an educator must be strong enough to acknowledge and overcome his own musical shortcomings, and be committed enough to rise to such challenges. Kabalevsky depicts his ideal teacher as being the perfect educator. To become such a pedagogue is quite an undertaking. Kabalevsky challenges universities, colleges, and conservatories to upgrade their standards in order to produce perfect teachers. Only then will there be a hope of raising the quality of music education in his country. Only then will there be a hope of producing a generation that appreciates and understands music, and makes music an integral part of its daily life.

In addition to the above teacher requirements, the educator must consider several curricular issues:

1. choir is a compulsory part of the music program in

schools,

2. most classes will centre on listening, discussing, vocalizing, and performing,

3. an educator can expect to see a class once per week (one must consider that it takes three music classes to learn and perfect a song - pacing is crucial).

In analyzing Kabalevsky's philosophy regarding music education we notice that he relied on the view of B.V. Asafiev (1965) who suggested that when we consider music as a subject to be taught in school, the first thing that we must do is categorically to reject questions of musicology in this context and say to ourselves that music is an art, is a man-made phenomenon, and not a scientific discipline to be taught and studied (p.52). Kabalevsky strongly supported the definition of the role of aesthetic education put forth by N.K. Krupskaya (1959) who said that through art we must help the child to think more clearly and feel more deeply (p.317). The principles and methods of Kabalevsky's approach are aimed at the musical upbringing of all school children in his homeland. They are general enough to be applicable to all fifteen republics (most of which are no longer

members of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). Furthermore, this approach is flexible enough to undergo any creative modifications which educators or curriculum makers wish to insert. This program is based on the fundamental thought that musical education is not the education of the musician, but the education of the human being. Firstly, in Kabalevsky's opinion this program is successful because it reflects the important characteristics of the Russian culture, and considers its past and present. Secondly, the program's success lies in its dependency on folk and classical music. For Kabalevsky, the main aim of music education is not so much the teaching of music for its own sake as influencing through music the children's inner world and their moral character. Music is not simply an art. It teaches mutual understanding, inculcates humanitarian ideas, and helps mankind to safeguard peace. Kabalevsky (1988) writes:

"Art does not disappear among the complex contradictions of our life but, on the contrary, it becomes more and more responsible in the education of the new generations. A privileged place must be reserved for music, an emotional art above all others,

which exerts an irresistible influence on man" (p.137).

## CHAPTER 4

## Comparative Analysis

The intent of this chapter is to compare and contrast the Kabalevsky program with the synthesized Orff/Kodaly model, as it is adapted for music education in North America. The reader is reminded of the observation made in chapter one which states that there is no documented evidence which would suggest that a unified Orff/Kodaly program exists. When this thesis speaks of a synthesized Orff/Kodaly design it refers to the fusion of elements which Orff and Kodaly methodologies undergo when a music educator constructs his/her music education program.

Having briefly examined Kabalevsky's ideology and rationale in chapter three, certain issues clearly require our attention. His approach has both similarities and differences in areas of philosophy, pedagogy, and technique when compared to the synthesized approach of Orff and Kodaly. In attempting to determine the probable effectiveness of the Kabalevsky approach in the North American music education setting we must outline and discuss the particular points of contrast and similarity. Such an



outline, containing general observations only, is presented in the following chart. A more detailed analysis will follow.

The synthesized approach of  
Carl Orff and Zoltan Kodaly

Dmitry  
Kabalevsky

---

1. The aesthetic experience is important because it is a reflection and a celebration of man, his development, his quality of life, and the society of which he is a part.

The aesthetic experience is important because it has the power to educate and unify the masses, and to allow the individual to have a clearer understanding of the society of which he is a part. Furthermore, such experience has the ability to propagandize to support the country's political system.

---

2. Music education is valuable because it assists in making an individual a more capable, useful, contributing, and well-rounded member of society. It enables one to express those emotions and

Music education is of great value because it is a medium which enhances one's appreciation of beauty. Such appreciation is not a luxury of life reserved only for the elite.

feelings which cannot be transmitted through linguistic means.

3. Music stimulate's one's mental, physical, and spiritual nature. Through music an individual can voice his own, unique sense of beauty. Music and man are two separate entities which fuse together. For such a fusion to be of high quality, music education must commence in early childhood and must have clear objectives. A Focused setting of goals will help any educator to strengthen his/her music program, the state of music education in his her community, and the state of his/her own profession. These objectives must correlate with broad educational aims of the education system, and with each educator's personal set of beliefs, standards, and values

Music is a part of every person's daily existence. It is a tool which can help one communicate in a non-verbal manner. It exists in parallel, and contributes to other elements of one's life. The teaching of music must begin in early childhood. It must be accompanied by clearly outlined objectives and philosophies. Such an outline will contribute focus and direction to the music program. Furthermore, it will assist an instructor in the selection of appropriate materials and their

sequencing. These objectives and philosophies must move must move parallel to the expectations of the society, the administration, and the party.

- 
4. The important elements of a music education program are as follows: the use of good quality music (i.e. folk, classical), a well qualified teacher, vocal and ear work, instrumental play and performance, creative movement, ensemble activities, improvisation/composition, musical literacy, and musical grammar.
- The important elements of a music education program are as follows: the use of good quality material (i.e. folk, classical), a well qualified teacher, extended vocal work, listening activities, class discussion, creative movement, improvisation and composition, performance, and music literacy.
-

To adequately compare the approaches used in North America to those proposed by Kabalevsky, one's exploration must reach far deeper than the points which are set out in this chart.

#### Exploring the Differences

The Orff method, as does that of Zoltan Kodaly, has its roots in Europe. According to the Kodaly Institute of Canada (1977), and Choksy, Abramson, Gillespie, & Woods (1986) the Orff/Kodaly synthesized approach is adapted for, and employed in North America. This, of course is the geographic area with which North American theorists and practitioners are primarily concerned. North America is a vast, multicultural, and democratic community where people have the right to exercise freedom of speech. With this freedom each individual lives with the knowledge that he may base his lifestyle on his personal philosophies, morals, beliefs, and value systems, as long as they are in accordance with the law. Thus, each person is free to live the type of life which he or she chooses within the limits of our legal system. Such is not the case in Russia. Russia is, also, a vast, populated land which, as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

consisted of fifteen republics and, therefore, can be considered a multicultural area, too. During the time of Dmitry Kabalevsky, Russia, unlike North America, however, did not exercise democracy. In many ways it displayed totalitarian and dictatorial tendencies within its political structure. Kabalevsky designed his approach in a pre-glasnost country where freedom of speech was not every person's obvious right. Certainly, in many ways Russian attitudes have altered. The freedom of expression has broadly expanded its horizons for hundreds of thousands of Russian citizens. Nevertheless, the hierarchical mentality of the industrial community and the socioeconomic classes has not changed. The country is in a state of virtual economical and political collapse and those at the top of the hierarchical order are afraid that any further change will inevitably bring only more damage to their system.

The education system is one of Russia's few real hopes for an optimistic future. It is of utmost importance to the government that school systems follow rules which politicians feel are appropriate and necessary in order to make children into the types of citizens which, in the past, made Russia strong and

powerful morally, economically, and politically.

Another very obvious difference between the two methods is that Orff and Kodaly use instrumental play considerably more than Kabalevsky does. In fact, in Kabalevsky's method there is no instrumentarium for children. He does not suggest the implementation of pitched or non-pitched instruments within the framework of his approach. A program which lacks instrumental play by a child is a program which neglects to focus on that child's manual dexterity and coordination skills, experiences with performing in an instrumental ensemble, encounters with a vast variety of textures, timbres, and sound-making capabilities of different instruments in various combinations. Furthermore, an instrument such as a xylophone or a glockenspiel acts as effective visual reinforcements for the locations of, and spacing between notes. Instrumental play can turn a dry and monotonous music learning experience into one filled with learning that is refreshing and enjoyable. It is a teaching tool for the teacher and a learning tool for the student. Instruments can make the venture into the area of improvisation and basic composition quite accessible. Kabalevsky relies on the voice and the piano to be the main catalysts in

improvisatory skill acquisition. While the voice and the piano can be employed effectively in this area of music education they prove to be more time-consuming and less educationally sound than pitched and non-pitched percussion instruments.

Upon a closer look one begins to notice another major difference between Kabalevsky's music education model and the Orff/Kodaly design. Kabalevsky bases his method on the Three Whales strategy. As stated in chapter three, these "whales" are song, dance and march. Kabalevsky emphasizes 'song' a great deal. It is a vital and unavoidable part of his program. He talks far less about dance and march. Kabalevsky believes that dance and march are of considerable value to his approach because everyone has an idea of what a dance and march are. Through dance his students will be guided to the exploration of creative movement at very basic levels. March seems to be used as nothing more than a way to learn about beat and basic rhythm patterns.

Orff and Kodaly followers see creative movement as being a crucial part of the overall program. The writer of this thesis must state that because Orff and Kodaly are adapted for North American schooling one can

not examine the methodologies of Orff and Kodaly in their pure forms. Instead, we work with the methodologies which are derived by Orff and Kodaly followers. Orff and Kodaly suggest advanced exploratory activities which involve creative movement and the choreography thereof. Exploration is followed by improvisation. Such activities can not be considered basic. Kabalevsky, however, discusses using creative movement in more basic ways than those found in the Orff/Kodaly model. For example, Kabalevsky often talks about circle, chain, and other symmetrical dances which stem from the march. Furthermore, Orff and Kodaly successfully progress from eighth and quarter note rhythmic motion to distinguishing between beat and rhythm, to the exploration of dotted, tied, and syncopated figures without relying on an entity such as a march, an entity which Kabalevsky deemed to be so important that he dubbed it one of the three whales.

Orff and Kodaly emphasize the importance of a program which progresses in parallel with the developmental stages of a child. At no point in their writings, however, do they identify or acknowledge Piaget's developmental stages. Their program begins by



exploring sounds found in the surrounding world and moves on to observe the abilities of every person's most natural and accessible instrument, the voice, through speech and song. A study of rhythms, melodic and harmonic motion, form, dynamics, style, expression, and improvisation follow in a logical and strategic manner within the framework of spiral pedagogical techniques. Instruments, handsigns, and rote exercises are used as teaching tools. Shortly thereafter improvisation, movement, song, speech and instrumental play become inseparable elements of the overall musical experience. Such an experience makes music an appreciated and extremely valuable part of every individual's environment, thereby allowing every person to be a more complete human being.

Kabalevsky speaks out against rote learning. In his opinion nothing that does not proceed beyond short term memory is of any use. In addition, he believes that children do not understand a lot of what they learn by rote, thus, their learning experiences do not exceed basic levels of comprehension. Kabalevsky's opinion is well worth noting if one considers that Kabalevsky's intention is to create music creators rather than music consumers. Although Kabalevsky

provides a considerably strong argument, he fails to provide the reader with an alternative to rote techniques. One of the reasons why North American educators use rote so readily is because they work within considerable time constraints. Teaching by rote is very time efficient. This is one of its great short-term advantages. A music teacher in North America sees a class two or three times per week or cycle. In Russia a music teacher sees a class no more than once a week. If North American teachers find their teaching time to be too limited it would be logical, by transitive property, to suggest that Russian teachers find their teaching time to be twice as constraining. Yet, Kabalevsky rejects one of the most time efficient instructional techniques that we as teachers possess. He makes an admirable stand for quality teaching rather than quantity.

The next important issue falls under the category of musical literacy. In the Orff and Kodaly approaches musical literacy is seen as the ability to read, write and, to some extent, duplicate and create music. This definition of musical literacy suggests that a child will understand the basic structure and style of a composition. In this model a child's inner world is

expanded and one's appreciation for music is developed. Kabalevsky's model of musical literacy differs in several important respects. He makes a distinction between music literacy and music theory. He compartmentalizes the reading and writing of music as being elements of music theory. Kabalevsky suggests that musical literacy is achieved when a person distinguishes good music from bad music by analyzing composition, various aspects of technique, and the character of the composer's style as well as the composition's performance. In short, the ability to listen to, think about, and discuss a work, is musical literacy. Such a skill would enable an individual to interpret music as a living and concrete art form. He wants to educate the human being rather than educate the student. Kabalevsky philosophizes that, like any other program, to run a successful music education program you must maintain children's interest in music at a high level. When they become disinterested in what is taking place in the music classroom they will, simultaneously, lose interest in learning about music. This situation perpetuates an unproductive learning environment, and, in the long run, an unhealthy state of music and a generation of musically disinterested

and unappreciative individuals. Kabalevsky states that the learning of music theory tends to be a tedious, regurgitative, and drill-like activity which greatly decreases one's interest in the studying of music. He warns educators to approach music theory with great caution and incorporate it with the music education program in moderation. After all, one who is poorly versed in music theory and music history is not one who is musically illiterate. Musical literacy is not comprised of theory and history alone.

#### Exploring the Similarities

Many elements of Kabalevsky's approach and philosophy can be found in the Orff/Kodaly model. All three educators believe that musical training must begin in early childhood in order to produce quality results. All three composers state that a good program will implement folk and classical music of high standard. A child can personalize a musical experience more successfully if the folk music of that child's homeland is used. Such folk music has served the test of time, thus proving its worth. Also, folk music brings with it an element of familiarity. Orff, Kodaly and Kabalevsky designed their programs for four reasons. Firstly, they were a part of a society which

wanted to make the world of music available to their children. Secondly, all three believed that music was every individual's right. This art form is public property. It is not for the elite only. Kabalevsky, Orff and Kodaly desired to make music accessible to every person. Thirdly, they wanted to make one's education as complete and well-rounded as possible. Without music and the arts no individual can be complete. Fourthly, all three educators suspected that they could, through their contributions, improve the state of music education.

Both models expect to have top notch educators in music classrooms. Teachers need to be good musicians, good pedagogues, and sensitive and rational human beings. The values of an educator are easily transferred to his/her students. If an educator falls short of these expectations, the children's encounters with music do not reach their full potential.

Both approaches suggest that a music education program must be singing and rhythm based. Only through a program which includes the study and performance of folk songs will a musical culture develop. Kabalevsky includes the political arena in cultural development.

In both models the voice is considered to be the

primary instrument of each student. Vocal exploration and ear training are the first stepping stones to the entire world of music. Kabalevsky, Orff and Kodaly place greater emphasis on practice than on theory, but do not discount the importance of theoretical knowledge. The most obvious goal that all three educators want to reach is to arouse in their students, a clear, fundamental understanding of music and its value in our lives. This type of understanding will reinforce music's place in society as being a necessity rather than a luxury or mere entertainment.

In the music classroom Orff, Kodaly and Kabalevsky encourage active student participation. They expect music educators to be facilitators without playing the role of answer givers. In the later stages of the program, these three theorists expect students to experiment with improvisation and become independent music makers.

This chapter compares the Kabalevsky model to the synthesized approach of Orff and Kodaly. Before this comparison is concluded, certain distinctions between Orff and Kodaly. Kodaly's philosophy lies closer to Kabalevsky's thinking than does that of Orff. Szonyi (1973) suggests that Kodaly was very nationalistic in

his methods. He constantly comments on the need to improve Hungarian music education and make Hungarian children into more complete human beings. Kodaly very rarely talks about children in general. Like Kabalevsky, Kodaly believes that the strongest unifying musical force of a nation is that nation's folk songs. Kodaly, like Kabalevsky, suggests that folk music is the strongest element in musical literacy. As stated earlier in this thesis Kodaly's definition of musical literacy is slightly different from Kabalevsky's definition of the same term. Nevertheless, Kabalevsky and, especially, Kodaly do not seem to give a lot of thought to music that transcends cultural barriers. Kabalevsky does talk about classical music, but he examines the ways in which classical music pertains to the Russian culture. He does not deal with classical music's cross-cultural influence and usefulness. Kabalevsky gives nothing more than a passing thought to children who are not being raised in Russia. Choksy (1981) observes that Kodaly places a great deal of emphasis on folk music and almost no reinforcement is made in the area of classical music. Folk music does not cross cultural barriers. Such music is of incredible value to any given culture within that

particular culture. However, children in Brazil, for example, will not find the same meaning or familiarity in Russian songs that Russians find in those same songs. The example when reversed holds true, also. Classical music does transcend cultures. One cannot make such a statement, however, without consenting to the nationalistic nature of a large quantity of classical music. Although every individual may personalize such music in his/her own unique manner, the appreciation and timelessness of classical music is not limited to remaining within one particular culture. This argument shows that Kodaly's heavy reliance on folk music is insufficient for overall musical literacy. In other words, musical literacy can not be achieved through the study and use of folk music alone. Kodaly's approach works extremely well with that of Carl Orff. Kodaly's strengths lie in singing and instrumental play while Orff's are found in areas of rhythm and movement. Both are equally strong in the field of improvisation and ensemble work. Initially, the Orff method was intended for the world of elemental dance while Kodaly's model was designed with children in mind. Today Orff's approach is widely used all over the world. Kodaly's program has not met the same



amount of wide spread implementation or acceptance,<sup>74</sup>  
though. This may be the case because of his dependency  
on nationalistic and folk themes. This type of  
dependency is not as evident in Orff's program design.  
Furthermore, it is this writer's suspicion that  
Kodaly's methods are more elitist than Kodaly himself  
would have wanted. This may be largely due to the  
direction taken by his followers. Kodaly spoke of  
music being the property of the masses and not an  
availability for the elite only. In today's music  
education environment we see that Kodaly followers have  
an affection for selected choral and instrumental  
ensembles. Selected groups, obviously, do not  
incorporate all of the students who take music in a  
school and want to participate. Such a mentality on  
the part of these educators is elitist in nature. The  
same is very seldom seen in the Orff method. It is not  
the purpose of this study to explore the rhetoric and  
hypocrisy which may be present within the Kodaly model.  
In addition, this writer has no concrete proof on which  
to base his allegations. These suspicions may be more  
successfully explored in a separate thesis, and will be  
dealt with in chapter five to a greater extent.  
Nevertheless, with a great deal of confidence this

writer is able to state that together, the Orff and Kodaly approaches have no weak links in the unified model. They complement each other very successfully.

## CHAPTER 5

Critical Analysis of the  
Kabalevsky Method and its Applicability  
to North American Music Education

The objective of this chapter is to take a critical look at Kabalevsky's music education program with respect to its degree of applicability to North American music education. Furthermore, this chapter will contain a summary statement regarding this study, and recommendations for further study. Prior to such an examination this thesis is obligated to explore the writings of several North American music educators. Fletcher (1987) defines the state of North American music education by taking a look at what music educators of this continent attempt to impart on their students:

An awareness of the basic elements of music (i.e. melody, rhythm, harmony, counterpoint, motor speed, dynamics, timbre, voice production, instrumental performance, musical notation, musical styles and histories, and their diversity). Furthermore,

individuals need to understand the links between art forms, and have an awareness of the relationships between musical history and social history. North American music education aspires to fill each student's musical schooling with all of the points listed above. Of great import to this study is the current state of public school music education in the province of Manitoba. A study conducted in 1991 by Waldie showed that general music, band, and choir programs were alive and well in Manitoba schools. Furthermore, there was a noticeable growth in the number of guitar and keyboard programs in the province. String programs, however, were on the decline. From this evidence alone, one is able to observe a link between the state of North American music education and the state of music education in Manitoba. Waldie states that music educators in Manitoba must be much more assertive in their advocacy for music education if they want to see progress in their chosen field. Taylor (1979) suggests the same to her colleagues in the United States. North American educators and theorists such as Frazee and Choksy are answering the call for assertive action by adapting European programs of high quality,

specifically Orff and Kodaly, for use in North American schools. These methodologies have been examined in this thesis.

North American music education programs function with several purposes in mind. These purposes, or objectives, provide music education with a sense of direction and focus. Without purpose and direction there can be a minimal amount of learning and no true progress. Leonhard and House (1972) state that music educators' main objectives are to enrich the musicianship of their pupils, to extend music's force in North American life, and to strengthen their own profession (p.177). Such objectives are quite broad and will not be met if they are not subdivided into smaller, more specific goals.

Objectives stem from two areas. The first is the investigation of what the pupils need, the community expects, and the state of the arts calls for. The second is each educator's personal beliefs, convictions, and ideals regarding music education. When faced with a list of goals such as the ones summarized by Fletcher (1987) and listed at the beginning of this chapter, a teacher will have a

clearer and stronger link between musical instruction and the broader aims of the school. Furthermore, such a list will better equip an educator in planning educative experiences, using the necessary methods and materials, and conducting suitable evaluation.

North American music education programs should function with objectives as their foundation. This point is emphasized by Sunderman (1972). In assessing the applicability of the Kabalevsky approach to such a system of music education it is imperative that we examine how well Kabalevsky's model will or will not coincide with and compliment the adapted Orff and Kodaly approaches.

Kabalevsky is quite thorough in stating his objectives. He, like many Western theorists, organizes his objectives into two categories - the general, and the specific. The general objectives have been explored in greater detail in chapters two and three. Kabalevsky anticipates that through music education an individual will become a more complete, appreciative, receptive, and contributing human being who will have a better understanding of him/herself, his/her universe

and extrinsic and intrinsic value of life and art, and its aesthetic beauty on a variety of levels. Wheeler and Raebeck (1977) confirm that Orff and Kodaly created music education programs with the same philosophy as their foundation. Kabalevsky's specific goals deal with the elements of melody, song, rhythm, dynamics, style, form, movement, and improvisation. The Orff/Kodaly model is more complete. In addition to all of the elements stated in the Kabalevsky program, Orff and Kodaly methodologies also include speech, harmony, and instrumental play. These three areas are too valuable to a music program to be excluded the way in which Kabalevsky does.

Kabalevsky's work is consistent with the broad educational aims of his country. His methods, however take into consideration the political aims as well as the musical goals. This point is made clear in his writings of 1973 and 1977. The selection of materials and subject matter is influenced by political philosophies of the government. Granted, it would be difficult to find an education system, in our country which would not be subject to political influence. In Russia, however, according to Hentova (1989), the

influence of the government is very evident. The Russian education system serves as propaganda for the Russian political structure. This is something that no theorist or practitioner can escape when constructing and/or executing any education program. Kabalevsky designed his program with Soviet political viewpoints in mind, making it difficult to consider application to North American music education.

Kabalevsky provides very clear plans for educative experiences and their presentation to the students by the teacher. The presentation of material to students is of such importance to Kabalevsky that he has written a book titled; 'How to Tell Children About Music'. One of Kabalevsky's strengths is that he is a skilled presenter, organizer, and sequencer of material. Unfortunately, his scope of material provides incomplete musical experiences. Kabalevsky finds a handful of selected activities to be necessary and appropriate for the music classroom. These activities are: listening, discussing, singing, improvising, and exploring creative movement. Only singing and creative movement are developed to be suitable for performance. The Orff/Kodaly model is much more complete by



comparison, with one exception. In the Orff/Kodaly approach, as it is generally implemented, listening and discussing play a lesser role than they do in the Kabalevsky model. In two separate articles Levi (1982) and Shehan (1981) anticipate that listening activities will be emphasized to a greater extent in North American music education programs than they are at the present time. Listening experiences are highly encouraged in the writings of Orff and Kodaly. Due to a lack of confidence and expertise in the area of listening, many music educators shy away from such activities. This is a weakness which must be strengthened. It needs to be made clear, however, that this weakness comes not from the methodology of Orff and Kodaly, but from many teachers who bring their own shortcomings into the music classroom. Kabalevsky's expectations of his teachers must be praised. He would not allow an educator with such shortcomings to teach within his program. Regretably, neither Kabalevsky, Orff, nor Kodaly can personally evaluate every teacher who joins the profession. The problem of inadequately prepared teachers will not be easily or quickly solved. All three music education models are very concerned

with successful music teaching. Instruction of high quality results in broad and lasting musical learning which leads a person to musical independence and the attainment of musical understanding, musical skills, appreciation, and other musical learnings which are associated with a musically educated person. In this respect, the philosophies of Kodaly, Kabalevsky and Orff compliment each other quite well. All three approaches are rooted in strong philosophical beliefs. Reimer (1990) states that a philosophy of music education should be a systematic statement of music education's nature and value. Such a statement must come from an investigation of the nature and value of music. If it is possible to present a convincing explanation of the fundamental nature and value of the art of music in the lives of people, it becomes possible at the same time to present a convincing case for music education's fundamental nature and its value in human life (p.1).

Evaluation is a very serious issue for North American educators. Practitioners and theorists read books, write articles, hold seminars, and conduct debates in order to make the subject of evaluation more

clear and comprehensive. Kabalevsky, Orff, and Kodaly rarely discuss formal evaluation. They do, however, recommend evaluating an individual's progress on a daily basis. All three individuals appear to believe that if the teaching is of a high calibre, the learning will inevitably display positive results. According to Landis & Carder (1972), evaluation is quite important in the Orff and Kodaly programs. The same is evidenced in Kabalevsky's 1977 book which deals with his music education design. All three innovators suggest that student progress should be evaluated on a daily basis. A teacher can clearly see how a child is progressing with note name learning, rhythmic learning, coordination skills, ear training, and so on from one lesson to another without having formal testing every second week. Children are evaluated in a normal classroom setting as they work on daily tasks. There are, of course more concrete testing procedures such as rhythmic dictations, recorder playing, and concept identification. As a student, a student-teacher, and a teacher within the Orff/Kodaly framework the writer of this thesis knows that both types of evaluation take place even though they are not talked about in great

detail by Orff and Kodaly. The same cannot be said of the Kabalevsky method with which this writer has no personal experience and has not talked with anyone who does. Therefore, discussing evaluation within the Kabalevsky paradigm would be futile. The writer of this thesis hypothesizes that in the evaluation administered by all three educators there has existed a common problem. When students must be tested, the objectives are commonly forgotten and the pupils are simply tested on their recall of what the teacher has said and done. Monroe (1937) makes this issue quite clear:

"There has been much discussion of the importance of teachers formulating their objectives, and, in response to the pressure of authority, they have spent many hours in formulating lists of immediate objectives, that is, the goals toward which the students are expected to direct their efforts. Many of these lists merit commendation, but their influence upon students is minimal in comparison with the influence of tests administered. Students direct their efforts toward becoming able to respond to the tests they anticipate" (p.32).

Chapter three outlined Kabalevsky's philosophies of music education. This thesis needs to address three issues which were introduced in the third chapter. In the paragraphs that follow, this writer will firstly deal with Kabalevsky's notion of maintaining student interest. Secondly, the topic of music literacy/music grammar will be investigated. Thirdly, this thesis will analyze Kabalevsky's reliance on the piano in the music classroom.

One of Kabalevsky's main recurring statements advises educators to create and maintain within the students a certain level of interest in the study of music. He believes that students who are not interested in the subject matter are less motivated, less attentive, and learn at a lower level of quality than those pupils who are interested in the subject matter. It is this writer's observation that while that may be true it should not suggest that teachers concentrate more on maintaining student interests than on reaching educational goals and achieving pedagogical tasks. It may be argued that with a high level of pupil interest a teacher is able to reach objectives and finish tasks more efficiently, but an educator need

not be in a position of constant self evaluation regarding the entertainment value of his/her class presentation. Any teacher who extensively focuses on the interest level of his/her pupils is bound to overlook the pedagogical standard of his/her instruction. In other words, one should consider students' best interest. Should they be educated by an entertainer or a pedagogue? Interested students are willing and receptive students. An entertaining teacher, however, is not always an educationally sound pedagogue. A teacher's job is to teach, not to entertain. Educators should be good facilitators motivators, and innovators. Yet, they must be able to distinguish frivolity from serious work. Kabalevsky does not elaborate on his philosophy regarding this matter. As a result, his opinions are not clearly established and supported.

Next is the point of musical literacy and music theory. This point has a direct link to Kabalevsky's suggestion to keep student levels of interest high. Kabalevsky cautions educators about the instruction of music theory, saying that it tends to be a tedious activity. Tedious activities, of course cause a drop

in the level of student interest in the subject matter. The topic of musical literacy and music theory has been discussed in greater detail in chapters three and four. What has not been discussed is an apparent flaw in Kabalevsky's logic. Kabalevsky sees the appreciation of a composition, its style, and its structure to be one element which is an important part of a student's overall musical literacy. An obvious question comes to mind, though. How can a student truly appreciate a composition and its structure without substantial knowledge of music theory. Either the student will have a very shallow understanding of the structural elements of a composition, or he/she will have to come in contact with advanced theory training and face the risk of losing interest in the study of music. Which option is Kabalevsky referring to? What does he suggest? Maybe his followers misunderstand his approach on this matter? He does not devote attention to elaborating on this issue.

When we look deeper into the Kabalevsky music class we observe that his method has several other serious shortcomings. The main musical instrument in his classroom is the piano. There are many advantages

to having a piano in the music room. An educator and his students, however, should not be forced to rely on the piano alone. Many schools in the northern and eastern parts of Russia do not have pianos. The writer of this thesis has experienced music education in Russia as a student. Living in a middle class, suburban area of a major industrial city and attending two different schools within a three year period, this writer remembers one out of the two schools having a piano in the music room. If middle class suburbia is not guaranteed a piano in every school, then there is even less hope for low income area and inner city schools. If a school does have a piano, there is no guarantee that it will have a teacher who specializes in music education, much less a teacher who knows how to play piano. Without a piano a substantial part of the Kabalevsky method cannot be implemented.

Kabalevsky (1984) contends that choral and aural elements of the music program are irreplaceable in his methodology. One can still engage in listening and creative movement activities in the music class, but the choral element of the music program will fall very short of Kabalevsky's expectations. A group of



students will be able to sing without instrumental accompaniment, but ear training is made so much easier and more effective with the use of a musical instrument. This is substantiated in the 1986 writings of Russian curriculum specialists Bader, Venrova, and Kritskaya. It is this writer's opinion that Kabalevsky relies too heavily on the piano. In the Orff/Kodaly system children have recorders and an entire instrumentarium of pitched and non-pitched percussion instruments from the use of which students reap great educational and music-making rewards. Kabalevsky does not discuss such instruments in his program.

The Orff/Kodaly approach employs many proven techniques with children in their daily learning of music. Here are several examples. Teachers are constantly working with rhythmic and vocal canons, ostinati and bordun patterns, body percussion, handsigns, mirroring and imitations skills. These elements of the North American music education model are invaluable to a student. Canons prepare a child for ensemble work and raise the students' attention and concentration levels. Ostinati and bordun patterns open the door to the study of texture, harmony,

polyphony, coordination, and improvisation. This is most successfully done through the use of instrumental play. Instrumental play is not a part of the Kabalevsky model. This writer observes that body percussion alone displays more vitality than one of the three whales in the Kabalevsky approach - the march. Body percussion exercises do more in the area of rhythmic study than any other tool possessed by a teacher. When instruments such as finger symbols, rhythm sticks, a guiro, a cabasa, maracas, a hand drum, a triangle, and a tic-toc block, just to name a few, one has many options when working with timbre, texture, dynamics, polyphony, and rhythmic structure. Kabalevsky does not talk about these instruments within his program, either. Handsigns are very useful in the study of pitches, tones, semitones, structures of scales, and intervallic relationships. Kabalevsky does not employ handsigns in his approach. Clearly, when comparing the Kabalevsky method to that of Orff and Kodaly, Kabalevsky's model seems to lack many important tools which can only enhance music pedagogy and invigorate the musical learning experience.

While in university, it is common for teachers in

North America to gain some knowledge of the developmental stages of a child as outlined by Piaget. Another area of concern in the structure of Kabalevsky's approach is that he seldom discusses these developmental stages. With his sequencing of concepts and materials it is obvious that he is aware of a child's various developmental stages. The problem is that Kabalevsky does not advise the educators in his model to familiarize themselves with these stages. It appears that Kabalevsky, through his many years of experience as a theorist and a practitioner knows what to take into consideration when developing a program for children. Once Kabalevsky institutes such a program, however, teachers are expected to execute it with nothing more than a basic understanding of what Kabalevsky intended and why. In his writings Kabalevsky talks at great length about how to teach. To a much lesser extent, however, does he explain the need to teach that way and what pedagogical options are available with regards to a certain topic in the curriculum.

The Manitoba Department of Education (1978) States the following:

"Music and the arts have been justified in school programs in terms of their contributions towards social development, creative use of leisure time, personal talent development, language experience and the appreciation of the finer things in life. The arts are also, and perhaps more significantly, another way of knowing about the world, and offer a unique way of getting into and expressing human feelings. They deal with a major aspect of the human condition-- subjective responsiveness, and music is uniquely the art that deals in sound" (p.7).

In analyzing the Orff/Kodaly approach and the Kabalevsky method it is clear that both models function with this basic philosophy as their foundation. This study can quickly point to the area in which the two methods differ by looking at a statement made by LeCroy (1992):

"Because of the role of arts in civilization and their unique ability to exalt human spirit, it is crucial that each child receives a balanced, comprehensive, sequential, substantive and rigorous program of instruction in the arts" (p.21).  
LeCroy speaks of a balanced program of instruction.

Upon examining Kabalevsky's approach it appears that his methods and techniques are somewhat incomplete. The justification for this statement appears in the previous paragraphs of this chapter. Kabalevsky's program design is not as well planned or as well justified as the design of the synthesized Orff/Kodaly approach. In talking with several music specialists, and through personal experience, this writer observes that transplanting the Kabalevsky method to Manitoba may not be as fruitful for the state of this province's music education as it would be to keep the existing programs. The adapted and assimilated elements of the Orff and Kodaly programs receive support from many Winnipeg educators and administrators. Furthermore, the contributions of the existing music programs in Manitoba have been observed and noted. To the best of this writer's knowledge, no attempt to adapt the Kabalevsky model to North American music education has been made. To compare adapted Orff and Kodaly methods to unadapted Kabalevsky methods is to do a disservice to this study and to Kabalevsky's model. It is more reasonable to deal with the Orff, Kodaly, and Kabalevsky philosophies in their purest form, as was

done in chapter two. The approaches of Orff and Kodaly, when synthesized and adapted for North American music education, provide the music curriculum with a complete and well-balanced structure. Are there any deficiencies in a program which offers experiences with speech, song, instrumental play, movement, dynamics, style, form, performance, ensemble work, composition, improvisation, creativity, melody, harmony, and texture? The writer of this thesis contends that in chapters four and five of this study it has been made clear that the Kabalevsky approach is less educationally sound than the combined methods of Carl Orff and Zoltan Kodaly.

#### Observations and Conclusions

The objective of this study was to examine Dmitry Kabalevsky's model of music education and compare it to the readily used, adapted and assimilated models of Carl Orff and Zoltan Kodaly. This thesis hypothesized that it would find elements of merit in the Kabalevsky approach which are not present in the Orff and Kodaly approaches. By applying such elements to Orff and Kodaly, as they are implemented in North America, one would enhance the existing state of music education on

this continent. It was expected that a celebrated theorist and practitioner from a country which has a vast musical heritage and history, a country which has not been widely studied for its school music education methods, would offer new approaches, techniques, methods, or philosophies to those involved in music education in North America.

Kabalevsky discusses his philosophies, strategies, techniques, and tools as they pertain to music students in his country. Kabalevsky places importance on introducing music to children in early childhood. He suggests that elementary music education is the key to the success of all of the programs it feeds.

Kabalevsky places emphasis on choral and listening programs, also. Yet, are the students in his model being short changed by not having a string/orchestra program, a band program, a guitar program, and a musical theatre program? Instrumental programs stem from elementary instrumental experiences. Kabalevsky, when designing his approach, offered no instrumental components other than rudimentary keyboard techniques.

When discussing Orff, Kodaly, and Kabalevsky one must examine all three programs on the same level.

This simply means that it is inappropriate to study Orff and Kodaly as they have been adapted for, assimilated, and integrated with North American music education while, at the same time observing Kabalevsky's approach in its pure and unaltered form. Furthermore, the Kabalevsky model has not been utilized in North America. It was designed with certain government policies and philosophies in mind. To this day, Kabalevsky's program exists in the same country for which it was intended, and in which many of the same policies and philosophies have survived the test of time. Initially, Kodaly designed his program with Hungarian children in mind. Orff's program originated in the field of dance. When we look at these programs today, we examine geographically transplanted and time-altered music education models that have, inevitably, lost the purity which they contained at their inception. North Americans such as Choksy and Frazee adapted Orff and Kodaly to the perceived musical needs of North American children without concentrating on two facts: a. These programs were created in the early part of the century and are being used many decades later when social and educational needs may have changed.



b. These programs took into considerations government policies and expectations of the European countries for in which they were created and not North America. Kabalevsky developed his program in a country which differs politically from North America, Austria, and Hungary. Furthermore, his methodology was given life during the sixties, several decades after that of Orff and Kodaly.

#### Recommendations for Further Study

A study of the effectiveness of the Kabalevsky method in various Russian republics or Eastern block countries would satisfy the need to observe the Kabalevsky program at work in multi-cultural and multi-political settings. Perhaps the Kabalevsky design would be somewhat adapted for, for example, Poland. It would be interesting to see how Kabalevsky's program would react to change and adaptation.

A study whereby the Orff or Kodaly program can be observed at work in Russia would lead to greater understanding of Orff and Kodaly music education designs and their capacity to contribute cross-culturally to the field of music education.

An examination of governmental influence on

curriculum in general, and, specifically the music curriculum in various countries would be a useful undertaking.

#### Summary Statement

It is evident from the findings of this study that Dmitry Kabalevsky's music education program has many merits. Its greatest strengths lie in its choral and music appreciation areas. His focus on listening to, and analyzing music opens the door for students to become active musical thinkers who gain knowledge about style, genre, improvisation, form, and history. These elements of Kabalevsky's methodology would be an asset to any music education program which does not contain those elements. Yet, when compared with the adapted and assimilated Orff and Kodaly models, which are in use in Manitoba, and throughout North America, one notices that Kabalevsky's program is lacking in other important areas. These areas include music theory, polyphony, rhythm, and instrumental play. The intent of this thesis was twofold. The first was to examine Kabalevsky's music education program. The second was to note the contributions which his method could make to the approaches of Orff and Kodaly. Upon studying

Kabalevsky's model one observes that he has very little to offer to the approaches of Orff and Kodaly. The elements of the Kabalevsky program which would be an asset to any music program which does not contain these elements are not assets to Orff and Kodaly methods because the approaches of Orff and Kodaly contain and utilize these elements already. A program which is more educationally sound than that of Dmitry Kabalevsky has very little to gain from his approach to music education.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abduln, E.B., Kadobnova, I.V., & Tarasov, G.S. (1980). "The Music Program in Grades 1-3". Enlightenment Edition. Moscow.
- Abeles, H.F., Hoffer, C.R., & Klotman, R.H. (1984). "Foundations of Music Education". New York: Schirmer Books.
- Asafiev, B.V. (1965). "Selected Articles on Musical Education". Leningrad Music, Moscow.
- Bader, T.A., Venrova, T.E., & Kritskaya, E.A. (1986). "Music in Grades 4-7". Enlightenment Edition, Moscow.
- Choksy, L. (1974). "The Kodaly Method". New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Choksy, L. (1981). "The Kodaly Context". New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Choksy, L., Abramson, R.M., Gillespie, A.E., & Woods, D. (1986). "Teaching Music in the Twentieth Century". New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- "Cross - Section of Research in Music Education". (1982). Edited by S.H. Barnes. University Press of America, Inc. Washington.
- Cundiff, H., & Dykema, P.W. (1923). "School Music Handbook: A Guide for Teaching School Music". Boston: Birchard and Company.

- Dewey, J. (1934). "Art and Civilization". New York: Minton, Balch and Company.
- Eosze, L. (1962). "Zoltan Kodaly. His Life and Work". Boston: Crescendo Publishing Company.
- Fifty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. (1958). "Basic Concepts in Music Education". Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Fletcher, P. "Education and Music". (1987). New York: Oxford University Press
- Harper, E.E. (1955). "Music in American Schools". Chicago: Music Educators National Conference.
- Hentova, S. (1989). "Favourite Music". Musical Ukraine Publishing, Kiev
- Horton, J. (1976). "Carl Orff". Some Great Music Educators. Kenneth Simpson General Editor. Great Britain: Novello and Company Limited.
- International Bureau of Education (1988)
- Kabalevsky, D. (1973). "The Beautiful Awakens the Well-Natured". Pedagogy Publications, Moscow.
- Kabalevsky, D. (1977). "My Dear Friends". Young Batallion Publishing, Moscow.
- Kabalevsky, D. (1984). "Development of the Mind and Heart". Enlightenment Edition. Moscow.
- Kabalevsky, D. (1988). "Music and Education". London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

- Kabalevsky, D. (1989), "How to Tell Children About Music".  
Enlightenment Publishing, Moscow.
- Kodaly Institute of Canada (1977). "Kodaly and Education I".  
Ontario: The Avondale Press.
- Kodaly Musical Training Institute, Inc. (1973). "Teaching Music  
at the Beginning Levels Through the Kodaly Concept". Ma:  
Kodaly Musical Training Institute, Inc.
- Kodaly, Z. (1971). "Folk Music of Hungary". London: Barrie and  
Jenkins.
- Kodaly, Z. (1974). "The Selected Writings of Zoltan Kodaly".  
New York: Boosey & Hawkes Music Publishers Ltd.
- Krupskaja, N.K. (1959). "The Task of Education in the Arts".  
Academy of Education, Moscow.
- Landis, B. & Carder, P. (1972). "The Eclectic Curriculum in  
American Music Education: Contributions of Dalcroze, Kodaly  
and Orff". Virginia: Music Educators National Conference.
- LeCroy, H.F. (1992). "Imparting Values: A Challenge for  
Educators". Music Educators Journal, September, 1992.
- Lee, R. (1931). "Dmitri Szostakovitch". The New York Times.  
Interviewed in Moscow, December 5, 1931.
- Leonhard, C. (1963). "The Place of Music in Our Elementary and  
Secondary Schools". NEA Journal, April.
- Leonhard, C. & House, R.W. (1972). "Foundations and Principles  
of Music Education". New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Manitoba Department of Education. (1978). "K-6 Music".

- Mark, M.L. (1982). "Source Readings in Music Education History". London: Collier MacMillan Publishers.
- Monroe, W.S. (1937). "Some Trends in Educational Measurement," Twenty-fourth Annual Conference on Educational Measurements, Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, 13(4). Bureau of Cooperative Research, Bloomington, Ind.
- Morgan, R.V. (1953). "Music: A Living Power in Education". New York: Silver Burdett Company.
- Mursell, J.L. (1936). "Principles of Music Education". The Thirty-fifth Yearbook, Part II: Music Education, National Society for the Study of Education. Bloomington: Public School Publishing Company".
- Mursell, J.L. (1943). "Music In American Schools". New York: Silver Burdett Company.
- "Musical Education in Hungary". (1969). Edited by F. Sandor. Budapest: Boosey and Hewkes and Corvina Press.
- Nohavec Morgan, H. (1947). "Music Education Sourcebook". Chicago: Music Educators National Conference.
- Nye, R.E., & Nye V.T. (1970). "Music in the Elementary School". Third ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Parker, H., McConathy. O., Birge, E.B., & Meissner, W.O. (1916). "The Progressive Music Series". Teachers Manual, Vol.II. Boston: Silver Burdett and Company.
- Plummeridge, C., Swanwick, K., Taylor, D., & Moutrie, J. "Issues in Music Education". (1981). University of London Institute of Education

- Reimer, B. (1989). "A Philosophy of Music Education". New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Russell-Smith, G. (1976). "Zoltan Kodaly. Composer, Musicologist, and Educational Revolutionary". Some Great Music Educators. Kenneth Simpson General Editor. Great Britain: Novello and Company Limited.
- Schwadron, A.A. (1967). "Aesthetics: Dimensions for Music Education". Washington: Music Educators National Conference.
- Stalin, J. (1939). "Report to the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik) on the Work of the Central Committee". Bruce Franklin ed., 'The Essential Stalin': Major Theoretical Writings, 1905-1952. New York: Anchor Books.
- Sunderman, L.F. "New Dimensions in Music Education" (1972). The Scarecrow Press. New Jersey.
- Swanson, B. (1969). "Music in the Education of Children". Third ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.
- Swanwick, K. (1979). "A Basis for Music Education". Great Britain: NFER Publishing Company, Ltd.
- Swanwick, K. (1988). "Music, Mind and Education". New York: Routledge, Chapman, and Hall.
- Szabo, H. (1948). "The Kodaly Concept of Music Education". New York: Boosey and Hawkes Music Publishers Limited.
- Szonyi, E. (1973). "Kodaly's Principles in Practice". London: Boosey and Hawkes Music Publishers.



- Tait, M., & Haack, P. (1984). "Principles and Processes of Music Education: New Perspectives". Columbia University: Teachers College Press..
- Taylor, D. "Music Now". (1979). England: The Open University Press.
- Tretyakova, A.s. (1987). "Soviet Music". Enlightenment Publishing, Moscow.
- Vajda, C. (1974). "The Kodaly Way to Music". London: Boosey and Hawkes Music Publishers Limited.
- Waldie, B.M. "The Study of School Music Education in the Province of Manitoba". (1992). University of Manitoba.
- Warner, B. (1991). "Orff-Schulwerk. Applications for the Classroom". New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Winship, A.E. (1905). "The Mission of Music in the Public Schools". Wisconsin: National Education Association.
- Wheeler, L. & Raebeck, L. (1977). "Orff and Kodaly Adapted for the Elementary School". Second ed. Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Young, P.M. (1964). "Zoltan Kodaly. A Hungarian Musician". Connecticut: Greenwood Press Publishers.