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One of the issues facing music educators is the way in which they teach students to read rhythms accurately. Using the current educational philosophy of differentiation, or teaching a student by appealing to their preferred learning style, as a backdrop, the researcher proposed that music educators tend to teach rhythms using a limited number of systems, thereby failing to utilize many of the available systems.

The researcher examined the published rhythm systems dating back to the early nineteenth century, surveyed band students in grades 7-12 concerning their preferences in learning rhythms and their learning styles, surveyed music teachers concerning their background in teaching rhythms and their preferences, and surveyed the available method books along with many of their authors.

The results of the study showed that music educators, by a large majority, were taught and teach rhythms to their students using the Harr system. To a lesser degree, the Kodály and mnemonic systems are used. Although there seems to be a relation between how students were taught to read rhythms and which systems they use, there seems to be no relation to their learning styles.

Although an examination of the available literature revealed that some research has been conducted to determine the effectiveness of certain rhythm systems, the survey
indicated that most music educators are unaware of any research in this area. Indeed, when asked if they were presented with research showing another system to be more effective than the one they currently use, most music teachers were unsure if they would switch to the more effective system.

The researcher concluded that more study is needed in the area of rhythm pedagogy to determine different approaches of teaching rhythm in order to appeal to the various learning styles of students.
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Rhythm is a vital part of music (Howard, 1996; Wedge, 1928). The accurate performance of the complex rhythms requires that each musician exercise a high level of physical coordination (Kohut, 1973). Gaston (1968, p. 17) wrote, “Rhythm is the organizer and the energizer. Without rhythm, there would be no music whereas there is much music that has neither melody nor harmony.” Consequently, teaching students to read rhythms would be one of the primary goals of music teachers.

Over the last century, in every generation there has been a consistent call for more and better education in the area of rhythm. For example, Gordon (2000) wrote that discussions concerning the teaching of rhythms were long overdue and that the traditional approach urgently needed a reassessment. In 1991, Lisk wrote that even after many years of having students practice their rhythms from exercise books, “the conditions do not change…. students still have difficulty in reacting to various rhythms.”

Colley (1987) and Bebeau (1982) observed that there was little research conducted to deal with the effectiveness of one rhythm system over another. Boyle and Radocy (1979) expressed a belief that the area of rhythm had been neglected since the Renaissance. In 1974, Winick said that music educators do not take advantage of the materials written about the field of rhythm. Britton (1972) wrote that a large number of
music students did not understand the fundamentals of rhythm. Boyle (1970) wrote that many music educators do not use a systematic system of teaching rhythms. Cooper and Meyer (1960) blamed lack of study in the area of rhythm on the perception that it is too complex and uncertain. In 1944, Lenom wrote that there was a lack of material written specifically on the study of rhythm or directions for helping students to develop a sense of rhythm and training to read rhythms accurately. According to Mursell (1931), “So long as ignorance of this [the subject of rhythm] sort remains, it is hopeless to expect any intelligent approach to the problem of rhythmic training.” Wedge (1927) said that, although many music educators wrote about sound and form, there was very little literature in the area of rhythm. Wedge bemoaned the fact that in America, the birthplace of jazz and syncopation, students had a lack of understanding in the area of rhythm as it pertained to performance. In 1926, Jaques-Dalcroze wrote:

How comes it that, since Beethoven, our musicians have sought progress only in harmony and tone, and have lost the mastery of sound-movements in which the great Flemish composers and John Sebastian Bach excelled?

(p. 163)

It becomes obvious that from the time of Jaques-Dalcroze in 1926 to the present, a span of over 70 years, writers have expressed concern over the apparent lack of study in the field of rhythm. Included in this apparent shortage of study is any work dealing with the various rhythm systems. Many teachers adhere to the “tried and true” systems of teaching rhythm. They often ignore the latest research and revert to teaching the way they were taught. Froseth stated,
“People tend to down on what they’re not up on. One look at a foreign or unknown (as in unskilled) system and the entire program is often rejected. Instrumental teachers love the first system they learned and generally reject systems that are unfamiliar to them. (Personal correspondence, November 12, 2004)

Pape (cited in Ross, 1999) wrote that teachers who learned one particular construct or style of teaching might not be willing to examine the current research and will continue to teach the way they have always taught or the way they were taught. Rischin (2002) stated that when teachers do teach the way they were taught, they find that their method becomes ineffective. Teachers sometimes forget that “our students may not see, hear, think and feel exactly as we do” (p.53). One of the problems with this approach is that what works for one group of students does not necessarily work for another. Sousa (2001, p. 215) cautions that, “whatever we offer children in arts education should be developmentally appropriate, and not represent just an extrapolation of an adult approach.”

**Purpose of the Study**

This study will serve five purposes:

1. It will compile and review information concerning the different systems of teaching rhythms in the United States.
2. It will examine student use of the various systems to which they have been exposed.
3. It will look at the extent to which music teachers use the various systems.
4. It will compare responses from students and teachers, comparing the number or the various systems with the number of the various learning styles.

5. Finally, it will create a knowledge base on the various rhythm systems, teacher preferences, and student preferences for additional research.

Delimitations

This study limited itself to the experiences of the band students (grades 7-12) in the St. Louis Suburban area, music teachers attending the Missouri Music Educators Convention and an examination of as many of the available rhythm systems as possible. In addition, instrumental method books were examined for the rhythm systems they contained as well as opinions from as many composers/authors as the researcher could contact.

Limitations

The researcher considered possible problems arising in the following areas:

1. The number of rhythm systems available to study may be too large in order to do an in depth study. In that case, it may become necessary to limit the number of systems by limiting the study to a more recent period or to categorize the systems into homogeneous groups.

2. Writings that deal with rhythms before the 19th century are abundant, but the information concerning the teaching of rhythms seems to be minimal.
Hypothesis

The researcher asserted a threefold hypothesis. First, instrumental music teachers and students have little or no knowledge of more than one or two rhythm systems and limit their study or use of rhythm to these one or two rhythm systems. This is despite the widespread acknowledgment that different students learn in many ways. Second, a population of instrumental music students perceive themselves as using more than two learning styles. If the first two hypotheses were true, then the third hypothesis would be that the number of rhythm systems being used by teachers and authors of the various method books does not satisfy the student need based on the number of perceived learning styles.

Definitions

Rhythm

Although this study is primarily concerned with the teaching of rhythmic notation, a brief discussion of the various definitions of the word “rhythm” is in order. One of the problems in writing about rhythm is that the concept of rhythm is difficult to define (Wedge, 1927). Gordon (2000) felt that too many people were teaching rhythm without defining what it was they were trying to teach.

Sachs (1953) wrote that the definition of “rhythm” is a complex concept due, in large part, to the number of definitions that it has received through the ages. Boyle and Radocy (1979, p. 67) agree:

Writers have offered innumerable definitions and explanations of rhythm and its various attributes. Theorists have developed elaborate ‘systems’
and analyses of musical rhythm. Philosophers have offered theories of rhythm. Psychologists also have developed rhythmic theories, although their theories purportedly have an empirical base and are concerned primarily with responsiveness to rhythm. In addition, they have studied rhythm as both a stimulus and response (Lundin, 1967) and, in recent years, have become increasingly concerned with rhythmic perception. Other writers have been concerned with exploring developments in rhythm from the time of the ancient Greeks to the present, while still others have sought to examine musical rhythms in relation to rhythms in nature. A smaller group of writers has been concerned with notation systems. . . . Music teachers have examined rhythm from a pedagogical perspective.

Frasse (1982) felt that the study of rhythm was difficult for the simple reason that a precise definition of rhythm does not exist. The explanation for this is based on the concept that rhythm is a complex concept that is composed of several variables.

Even the origin of the word “rhythm” is subject to debate. Gordon (1988) traces the origin of the word to the Greek, rhythmos, which has as its base rheein, meaning “to flow.” Sachs (1953) cites the Roman grammarian, Charisius, saying that, Rhythmus est metrum fluens, metrum rhythmus clausus, or “Rhythm is flowing meter, and meter is bonded rhythm.” However, Sadie (1980) states that the idea that the term rhythmos was derived from rheo (‘flow’) had been changed to the current belief that comes from an older derivation from the root ry (ery) or w’ry (‘to pull’). Obviously, the differences in “flow” and “to pull” imply two different concepts. “Flow” would imply a freely moving
action like the motion of water, whereas “pull” implies a form of work or effort. Fraisse (1982, pp. 149-151) wrote about this problem:

Rhythm comes from the Greek words ruqmoz (rhythm) and rew (to flow).

However, as Benveniste (1951) showed, the semantic connection between rhythm and flow does not occur through the intervention of the regular movement of waves, as was often believed. In Greek one never uses rheo and rhythmos when referring to the sea. Rhythmos appears as one of the key words in Ionian philosophy, generally meaning “form,” but an improvised, momentary, and modifiable form. Rhythmos literally signifies a “particular way of flowing.”

Fraisse refers to the writings of Plato in which the Greek philosopher uses rhythmos when referring to bodily movements, calling it “the order in the movement.” According to Fraisse, some of the first psychologists of the nineteenth century felt that our perceptions of rhythm resulted from human activity. However, Doll & Nelson (1965, p. 2) translate the same Greek word, rhythmos as “measured motion.” They go on to say that rhythm is the “measured release and recovery of energy and consists of repeated units or patterns which take form in line and design, speech, sound, and movement.”

Definitions of rhythm seem to fall into four categories: divisions of time (both written and perceived), patterns of stress, organizer of music and patterns of movement. The following sections examine several such definitions.
Divisions of Time

“Divisions of time” refers to the mathematical breakdown that music creates over any given period. Music books often reflect this concept when they show the relationships between the various note values.

Sadie’s (1980, Vol. 15, p. 804) rhythm article covers over 20 pages. However, the “definition” covers less than two paragraphs. He defined rhythm as, “The subdivision of a span of time into sections perceivable by the senses; the grouping of musical sounds, principally by means of duration and stress.”

Kohut (1973, p. 173) quotes Paul Creston [The importance of being rhythm, The Instrumentalist, June 1960, p. 31] “Rhythm, in music, is the organization of duration in ordered movement.” Kohut continues, “It consists of four basic elements: meter, tempo, pattern and accent.”

Dowling and Harwood (1986, p. 185) write, “Rhythm refers to a temporally extended pattern of durational and accentual relationships. Usually, rhythmic patterns are repeated, creating expectancies about future events. Where the events in a piece are of different durations and the beat is hard to determine unambiguously, we use the term density to refer to an average presentation rate taken across events of different duration (often expressed in notes per second).”

According to Apel, (1944, p. 640 [from Boyle and Radocy, p. 68]) Rhythm “is everything pertaining to the temporal quality (duration) of the musical sound.”

Patterns of Stress

Gordon (2000) developed an entire system of reading rhythms based on the idea of stress. He uses the terms “macro-beats” and “micro-beats” to explain the feeling of
stress or lack thereof on the various beats in any given measure of music. Briefly, “patterns of stress” refers to the feelings of strong and weak beats that naturally accompany the various meters of music.

Mursell (1948, p. 258) defined rhythm as “a pattern of stress, release, duration, and pause organized for an expressive purpose” He defined rhythm again in 1956, but substituted the term “accent” for “stress” and eliminated the word “release” (p. 44).

Hughes (1950, p. 69) felt that rhythm was, “The ‘flow’ and undulation of progression, marked by the rise and fall of stress and duration. . . . the arrangement of accented and unaccented, and of long and short sounds.”

Hoover, W. (1968, p. 59) compared rhythm to the stress of words that is often found in “poetry, oratory, or good prose.”

Organizer of Music

Cooper and Meyer (1960) felt that the study of rhythm enabled the student to understand all music. They wrote that rhythm gave the other elements of music organization but those same elements helped to organize rhythm.

Patterns of Movement

A major proponent of rhythm based on patterns of movement was Jaques-Dalcroze. Jaques-Dalcroze (1921) believed that rhythmic accuracy stemmed from a person’s heartbeat, breathing, respiratory muscles and a steady walking pace. He considered body movement and gymnastics an invaluable tool for the teaching of musical rhythm and felt that communication between the body and the mind was essential since it is that the mind imagines and analyzes, and the body does what the
mind conceives. It was with this philosophy that his system of teaching music (Eurhythmics) came into being.

Gordon (2000, p. 2), although espousing the role of stress in rhythm, wrote, “Rhythm is movement and cannot be understood apart from movement as it interacts with breathing. Thus, rhythm, movement, and breathing are inseparable. Rhythm must be felt—it only begs the question to intellectualize about it.”

Boardman (1996, p. 41) developed the concept of rhythm sound and silence moving through time “in relation to underlying layers of regularly recurring pulsations.” Apel (1972) compared the concept of rhythm to breathing, pulse, and tides. In a similar vein, Flagg (1949) wrote about the concept of rhythm coming from the body.

Study Definition

If we assume that all these definitions are accurate, we can conclude that they simply describe different aspects of the whole concept. Lenom (1944, p. 2) explained the concept of rhythm from an eclectic view. He wrote,

The word rhythm has several significations. It is generally understood to mean proportion, measured motion, movement marked by regular recurrence. In a practical musical sense, it is applied to the regular succession of strong and weak beats. A rhythm contains the elements of a musical thought; it can be formed of beats, parts of beats, or of one or several measures. In performance, to play rhythmically is to punctuate, to phrase, to give the music balance and proportion. The sense of rhythm may be defined as the faculty that enables one to feel, among the mass of tones of a musical composition, the inner accent produced by the motion
of light sounds succeeding to sounds stronger, more accentuated. By sense of time is meant the ability to measure with the greatest exactitude the duration of musical sounds. One may keep time and yet lack the sense of rhythm. On the other hand, one may possess this sense and not keep time.

Since one of the tasks of the music educator is to assist the student in reproducing the written division of time as perceived by the composer, it is important to explore the patterns of stress and patterns of movement. Thus, Lenom’s explanation as it pertains to the written form is the one that will best serve the purpose of this dissertation. His definition synthesizes the others and presents it in a manner that allows a discussion in concrete terms. To summarize his view, rhythm encompasses those parts of music that include the inner feel of the flow, the beat, the measured motion, the mathematical relationships between the notes, beats, parts of beats, accents, phrases and duration of the sound.

*Learning Styles*

Since one of the hypotheses of this study is that music students perceive themselves as using several learning styles, it would be beneficial to define “learning styles.”

For the purpose of this study, “learning style” will be defined as “the way each person begins to concentrate on, process, internalize and retain new and difficult academic information” (Burke & Dunn, 2002, p. 104).

The researcher examined several different theories of learning styles in order to determine which set of styles should be used. Gardner (1983) developed a list of multiple

For the purpose of this study, the researcher does not feel that any one theory of learning styles is important to the outcome, but that students will have a choice of several styles or intelligences with which to identify themselves. For the sake of simplicity and to insure the highest level of student understanding, the researcher will use the terminology of Erlauer and Armstrong when listing the various learning styles on the proposed survey.

Significance of the Study

This study will add to the literature dealing with the teaching of rhythm. It should fill a portion of the void of which other music educators wrote and it will act as a guide for others to study, compare and categorize systems of teaching rhythms according to the appropriate learning styles.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

According to Sadie (1980), any attempt to write a history of musical rhythm would be futile because of the idea that “rhythm resists classification along lines of development.” However, a history describing the various systems of teaching rhythm, although a seemingly large undertaking, should be a task that would allow a scholar to at least see the various relationships and evolution of the different systems. Research and literature on different rhythm systems exist in a scattered manner, with conceptual literature seeming to be more available than empirical research. Histories and treatises about rhythms as a part of music seem to be plentiful. However, little seems to be available prior to the late 18th century. Books that espouse particular systems became increasingly available beginning in the 19th century. The literature reveals information that can be categorized in four ways:

1. Historical background, including explanations and critiques of the various treatises and explanations of rhythm

2. Analyses of rhythm systems, which can be broken into subsets of mathematical or counting systems, language or mnemonic systems, movement systems and miscellaneous systems

3. Research on learning styles as they affect music

4. Research on rhythm
The material presented in the actual dissertation will be more plentiful and more detailed. However, for the purpose of this proposal, the researcher will limit the review to brief overviews of the materials.

Historical Background

Until Aristotle, the ancient Greeks had no experience with any system of independent musical rhythm except for rhythms that occurred naturally in speech patterns. (Sadie, 1980) Treatises, system books and textbooks abound with explanations of rhythms, correct performance practice, rehearsal techniques and in some cases counting and reading systems.

According to Stolba (1994), the rhythms that the ancient Greeks used were based on the meter from their poetry. The combinations of long and short patterns seem to have been of more importance than stress or accent. The Greeks also seem to have used markings to indicate beats and rests. Information about notation, mensuration, etc., seems to be abundant; however, little seems to have been written on systems of teaching these concepts. From the 4th century B.C., Aristoxenus, a student of Aristotle, is recognized as one of the best sources for ancient Greek rhythms and their practice. He was the first person to write that rhythms could be abstracted from their roots in speech, dance movements, and melodies. This allowed Aristoxenus to organize rhythms in one of the first systems that showed rhythms as ratios (Sadie, 1980).

St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430), in De Musica (Knight, 1979) defines music as “scientia bene movendi” or “the science of moving well.” A discussion follows concerning what can be interpreted in today’s language as “rhythm.” Augustine deals with the long and short stresses of syllables of words, the long stresses being equal to
approximately two short stresses (Sadie, 1980). The combinations of these stresses form “feet,” and are divisible into two proportional parts. The “trochee,” or long-short, is a 2:1 ratio, while the “iamb,” short-long, is a 1:2 ratio. When feet of similar proportions are joined, they form musical rhythms and in turn become “phrases” or “verses.” Augustine lists several forms of “feet” in De Musica along with the combinations of their long and short stresses. After reading the explanations that Augustine gives of rhythms, it would seem that a system for teaching rhythms would be unnecessary. This would be because the stresses, feet, and rhythmic phrases would be based on the natural rhythm of speech.

In 1548, Bathe (Hill, 1979) wrote a short work on music theory. In it, he refers to eight different rhythms with an explanation of the dotted rhythm. This explanation lasts only two sentences, while he spends significantly more time on other musical topics. Bathe defines rhythm or, as he calls it, “quantitie” [quantity] as “the length of the note.”

In the section following, “For the Tyme,” Bathe discusses the problem of stating exactly how long the notes should last. Bathe states:

By time you must learn how long you should hold one of the former quantities, in their due measures, for the just length on the Time itself, there can be no certainty, for it is according to the singer’s pleasure, either to begin with a slow time, or a fast, so that the same time that is begun be observed to the end. The time is a certain thing where we do measure the quantity of notes: for albeit the notes have a certain quantity every one, yet it is not known how long this certainty should be, without the time, wherefore the time is the certainty of each quantity.

Ravenscroft (1614) wrote A Briefe Discourse in which he discussed the relationship of durations between the various notes. However, the Discourse was not
intended as a system of reading rhythms or pitches, but as an explanation of how the notation system worked. Ravenscroft (1614) describes the length of time that notes can last:

But as for the minime, not counting otherwise of it then as of an unite, or a poynt in geometry, he [Franchinus] reckoned it no time, but the beginning of time, and the very beginning of measurable musicke; and lo in these dayes further then the minime the measure tends not, it being the first and shortest note that any measure can begin on; as contrarywise the large is the last and longest note, that the voice of man with one breath can deliver.

Monteclair (1667-1737), a noted French composer, theorist and teacher, taught the daughters of the composer Francois Couperin. According to Sadie (1980), Monteclair was regarded very highly as a teacher. His systems were described as “non-doctrinaire. . . and at times modern.” The treatise Petite Systeme Pour apprendre’ la Musique aux Enfans, written circa 1730, was 82 pages long and dealt primarily with the systems to be used for teaching children the art of music. According to Pincherle (1948), Petite Systeme contains an account of Monteclair’s systems of teaching music, including a section concerning rhythms. However, Pincherle does not go into detail. He leaves the reader with the statement, “I shall not give in detail the rest of this system. . . various rhythms [are] explained with perfect clarity. . .” A comprehensive search of databases suggests that copies of Petite Systeme are only available at Harvard and Stanford Universities and the Library of Congress.

Monteclair (1736) also wrote Principes de musicque, in which he gives a brief description of the mathematical relationships between the various note values. These
relationships are followed with several musical examples in which Monteclair writes the number of the beat under the appropriate note, but does not seem to deal the notes that fall between the beats.

In 1742, Rousseau presented a new system for writing music in order to “notate music and all its complexities in a simpler, more precise manner . . .” (p. 8). Rousseau felt that the number of symbols presented two disadvantages. First, the established system of notation occupied too much space on paper. He felt that his new system would allow music to be more compact. Second, because of the number of symbols, too much time was spent in observing the rules and not enough time in actually performing the music. Rousseau’s Essay on the Origin of Languages goes on to explain his ideas of a new musical notation system. As history has shown, this system was not adopted and the system that he sought to replace has remained in force with few modifications.

**Rhythm Systems**

In 1818, Galin, a scientist by profession, became interested in the music education of children. In his Exposition d’une Nouvelle Methode pour L’Enseignement de la Musique (Account of a New Way of Teaching Music), Galin tested his ideas for teaching sight reading on seven to twelve-year-old children. He felt that since we would not ask a child to learn to read while they learned to talk, then we should not expect a child to learn to perform music and read the music at the same time. Galin illustrated his rhythm system when he showed groups of note names with an arc above them in order to demonstrate the idea of prolongation of the unit note. However, his discussion of rhythms ends shortly after when he says, “I shall not dwell further upon notation and rhythm at this point because I mean to return to them later.” Winick (1974) includes a
table taken from Cheve’s *The Theory of Music*. The table includes syllables under the notes. This system is known as the “French time-names.” The system in this table only demonstrates with notes up to sixteenths and does not address the use of rests. “French times names” is a system originating in the nineteenth century with music educators Galin, Cheve and Paris, and has influenced other educators such as the Englishman, Curwen, the Hungarian, Kodály and the American, Richards. According to Sadie (1980), the system Galin, Cheve and Paris formulated, originally called the *lague des durees*, was published in 1844 in *Systeme elementary de musique vocale* (Elementary System of Vocal Music). This system used sounds that approximated certain rhythms. The sounds that are used divide the quarter note into halves or thirds. If the note is divided in half, the vowel sounds used are “a” and “e.” If the division is in thirds the vowel sounds then become “a,” “e” and “i” (pronounced “ah,” “ay” and “ee”). In “binary” division, notes that are found either half of the beat begin with a “t” sound. Notes that fall on the second and fourth quarter of the beat begin with an “f” sound. Thus, the rhythm ♩♩♩♩ would be pronounced, “ta te ta te.” Whereas the rhythm ♩♩♩♩ would be pronounced, “ta fa te fe.” In addition, Cheve (1900) used the syllable *chut*, the French for *hush* along with the symbol “O.” In order to prolong a note, a dot (•) is placed in the space next to the note to be prolonged.

Lowell Mason, the “father of American music education,” (Abeles, et al., 1994) was an advocate of Pestalozzian philosophy. As such, some of Mason’s writings were based on *Principles of Pestalozzian System of Music*, by Joseph Naef. The principles include:
1. To teach sounds before signs and to make the child learn to sing before he learns the written notes or their names;

2. To lead him to observe by hearing and imitating sounds, their resemblances and differences, their agreeable and disagreeable effect, instead of explaining these things to him—in a word, to make active instead of passive in learning

3. To teach but one thing at a time—rhythm, melody and expression, which are to be taught and practiced separately, before the child is called to the difficult task of attending to all at once;

4. To make him practice each step of these divisions, until he is master of it, before passing to the next;

5. To give the principles and theory after the practice, and as induction from it;

6. To analyze and practice the elements of articulate sound in order to apply them to music, and

7. To have the names of the notes correspond to those used in instrumental music (Abeles et al., p. 11).

In the *Manual of the Boston Academy of Music* (Mason, 1836), Mason makes the point that his system is derived from the “written experience of others.” Beginning in Chapter 4, Mason introduces short rhythm phrases using mnemonic devices. For example, for two half notes or quarter notes, Mason uses the terms, “holy” and “glory.” For three half notes, quarter notes, or eighth notes, he uses, “glorious,” “harmony” and “infinite.” He goes on to use terms like “momentary” and “spirituality” for divisions of four and six respectively. In later chapters, Mason introduces rhythms that are more complex with instructions to the teacher as how to go about teaching those concepts.
Curwen (circa 1845), built on the Galin, Cheve and Paris system, and published the Tonic Sol-Fa system. This system incorporated a combination of letters to signify pitch (D for Do, R for re, etc.) and punctuation marks to signify rhythm and stress of the beats. For example, a colon before a letter would indicate a weak accent. A short vertical line (|) would denote a secondary stress. A period (.) between letters would indicate a rhythm of eighth notes, and periods and commas would show a series of sixteenth notes. For example, D,D,D,D would be the equivalent of pitched on the first step of a major scale. D :R :M would be three quarter notes in triple time on the pitches Do, Re, and Mi. The Curwen Institute still exists today in Canterbury, England, but has changed its system of reading rhythms.

Some system books, as in the case of Whitney (1886), offer very little insight as to the learning of various rhythms with the possible exception of the ratio of one note to another. In the case of Whitney, all the student is told is that, “The whole note is of the longest duration; the half note one half the length of the whole note; quarter note one fourth; eighth note one eighth; sixteenth note one sixteenth of the length of the whole note, etc” (p. 7). In later examples, Whitney places the numbers of the beats (one, two, three, four) under each measure with no provisions made for subdivided beats.

Scott Joplin, in his “School of Ragtime: 6 Exercises for Piano” (Lawrence, 1981), uses no syllable or numeric system for syncopated rhythms other than to show the subdivided beat above the intended rhythm and using dotted lines to indicate the relationship of the syncopated rhythm to the subdivided rhythm. Joplin’s suggestion is, “The perpendicular dotted lines running from the syncopated note below to the two notes above will show exactly its duration. Play slowly until you catch the swing, and never
play ragtime fast at any time” (p. 284). Joplin’s syncopated rhythms, complex for the
day, were explained simply by the subdivision of the beat. He offered no counting
system or mnemonic devices. The student or performer needed to have a sense of the
beat and the ability to understand the relationship of slower rhythms to the faster ones.

Mansfield (1914), while not discussing methodology, gave a brief history of the
use of the dot in music notation. Tracing the history of dotted rhythms beginning in the
fourth century A.D., Mansfield includes the use of the dot for the double and triple dotted
rhythms, in staccato articulations, and their use in repeat signs. In the case of dotted
rhythms, Mansfield writes that “the young student will find but little difficulty in
understanding the value of dotted notes or rests, if he remembers that a single dot
lengthens a note or rest one half; a double dot, three quarters, and a triple dot seven
eighths.” It should be noted that only the mathematical values of the notes are explained.

Mursell (1931, p. 200) refers to Jaques-Dalcroze’s work in eurhythmics as “the
completest realization in terms of educational system of the psychological principles of
rhythmic apprehension.” Jaques-Dalcroze (1921) believed that rhythmic accuracy
stemmed from a person’s heartbeat, breathing, “respiratory muscles” and a “regular gait.”
He considered body movement and gymnastics an invaluable tool for the teaching of
musical rhythm and felt that communication between the body and the mind was
essential since it is that the “mind conceives and analyses, and the body. . .executes.” It
was with this philosophy that his system of teaching music (Eurhythmics) came into
being.

In 1927, Wedge wrote *Rhythm in Music*, whose purpose was to “clear up the
mystery surrounding the subject of rhythm in music.” It advocated a rhythm system that
made use of speech patterns or mnemonics. Wedge first established working definitions of various terms that are pertinent to the study of rhythms. In addition, syllabic stresses are discussed in much the same way as Augustine did. After several examples and exercises were presented, Wedge introduced eighth notes by having the student walk or march to a quarter rhythm and reciting two syllable words such as *walking*, *marching*, *singing*, *playing*, *dancing*. Subdivision of three uses the three syllable words (e.g. *lubricate*, *tenement*, *elegance*, *institute*, etc.). *Improvising, January*, and *February* were words that Wedge uses for subdivisions of four.

Smith, et al. (1937) placed an emphasis on the strength of the beats before continuing with the teaching of rhythms. Each beat is represented by a circle, the size of which is determined by the strength of the beat. Each circle is called “one,” since it represents one beat. Later, vertical lines are added to represent the number of notes per beat, the first note always being called “one.” Eventually, other names are added to aid in the counting of rhythms. For example, the rhythm \( \overline{\text{one}} \) would read “one, one, one, one.” \( \overline{\text{one}} \overline{\text{two}} \) would read, “one-two one-two.” \( \overline{\text{one}} \overline{\text{ta}} \overline{\text{two}} \) would be “one-ta-two-ta one-ta-two-ta.”

McHose and Tibbs (1945), in what was intended to be a college text for sight singing, utilized a system that required the use of numbers and syllables to help the student with rhythms. The authors informed the student, “A brief explanation of the system of reading with rhythmic syllables precedes each section dealing with new rhythmic problems.” The book goes on to use a system similar to Harr’s “1e&a 2e&a” system that is prevalent in the United States today.
Mursell (1948) listed seven “devices” used to teach rhythm: counting, tapping the beat, the metronome, tapping the phrase rhythm, the use of words, ensemble and conducting. In 1931, Mursell made a distinction between “phrase rhythms” and “beat.” “Phrase rhythm” was compared to the pattern of strong and weak syllables in poetry. It was Mursell’s intent to help the student achieve this concept in order to better understand the concept of rhythm. Mursell stressed that the excellence of the educational process used to teach does not depend on the device as much as it does the “intelligence with which the devices are applied.” In addition, Mursell stated that the basis of learning rhythms is “large, free, coordinated, muscular response.” The importance of muscular response is emphasized when he stated, “Unless this is done, it can never be taught properly.”

Kodály held a similar view of rhythm and movement, believing that a child must first develop a feeling for the basic beat by clapping and walking. (Wheeler, 1977) Kodály held that being able to function musically was similar to speech, beginning with the word and progressing to speech patterns, phrases and sentences. Eventually, the Kodály system moves to reading rhythms using a modified version of the French time-names. Kodály used “ta” for quarter notes, “ti” for eighth notes and “ti-ri” for two sixteenth notes. For notes that lasted longer than one beat, Kodály would use combinations of the above notes. For example, half notes are said, “ta-a,” and whole notes would be “ta-a-a-a.” A dotted quarter, since it is a combination of a quarter and an eighth note would be pronounced “ta-i.” Howard (1996) gives several examples of how the Kodály system can be applied to the teaching of instrumental music.
Hindemith (1949) dealt with rhythms in *Elementary Training for Musicians*, a textbook geared toward college music students. In it, the student is expected to tap or clap the beat (physical movement) and sing the rhythms on a neutral syllable (la is suggested). As the book progresses, Hindemith has the student play or sing rhythms while showing the relationship the rhythm has to the beat. Hindemith’s approach includes the admonition that the student should be made to sing and play the rhythms “willingly.” The reason for this approach is because Hindemith believes that the student needs to become a “working musician” and not simply a listener. As the book progress, more difficult rhythms are presented in various meters.

Wheeler and Raebeck (1977) wrote, “Carl Orff’s approach to music education for the child begins with the premise that feeling precedes intellectual understanding.” (p. xix) In *Music for Children* (Orff, 1958), Orff uses combinations of clapping, stamping, finger snapping and knee slapping in conjunction with nursery rhymes and children’s songs.

Reichenthal (1960), a proponent of the “time names” system, divides rhythm systems into four categories: simple definitions, action words, mnemonic words and phrases, and time names. Mnemonic systems use the natural rhythm of words to illustrate the rhythm. For example, using mnemonic words, \( \text{\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet} \) may be rendered as *Mississippi* and \( \text{\textbullet\textbullet} \) could be indicated by the word *Saturday*. Action words are similar to mnemonics, however the words that are used conjure up kinesthetic senses. *Walk, walk, walk, walk* would suggest the rhythm \( \text{\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet} \). \( \text{\textbullet\textbullet} \) uses the words *run-run*. Reichenthal states that the *Definitions* concept simply describes the rhythm and does not give the student any sense of how the rhythm sounds.
The Kodály system led to the creation of the system used by the American, Richards. Richards (1963) introduced the use of charts to teach children in the Portola Valley Public Schools in California. These charts use pictures that the children look at and chant the various words to perform the desired rhythm. Eventually, the pictures are replaced with the stems and beams of the notes and the children are asked to read these, instead. In 1964, Richards wrote, *Threshold to Music*, in which she offers explanations on how to use her charts, which are presented at the back of the book.

Froseth and Weikart (1981) published a method book that incorporated motions and rhythm syllables (du, de, da, di, ba, bi). The concept of their manual is similar to that of Jacques-Dalcroze in that students learn listening, reading, writing and performing music best if first exposed to synchronized movement.

Some band system books offer various ideas of how rhythms should be taught without naming the system or offering to the teacher any word of the effectiveness of the system. Both *Best in Class* (Pearson, 1980) and *Standard of Excellence* (Pearson, 1996) band system books suggest different systems at the back of the teacher’s manual. Both books also show the mathematical relationships between different rhythms much the same way that Joplin used in his “School of Ragtime: 6 Exercises for Piano.”

Gordon (1988) proposes that music aptitude is based on “audiation.” Briefly, audiation is defined as “hearing and comprehending in one’s mind the sound of music that is not or may never have been physically present” (Gordon, 2001, p. 104). In other words, audiation is that quality that allows a person to hear music in their head without hearing it in their ears. Gordon believes that a certain level of audiation must be achieved before rhythms can be read. In addition, Gordon makes a distinction between rhythm
systems and counting systems. Gordon refers to the “1e&a 2e&a” system as a counting system and a time keeping device which does nothing to promote the growth of audition. Instead, he suggests that his own system would be an improvement over the “1e&a 2e&a” system, the Kodály system and others. Gordon’s system emphasizes the difference between macro and micro beats. He applies this concept to the Froseth/Blaser syllables which name notes based on their function in the measure and the meter of the music rather than their duration.

Kohut (1973) seems to disagree with Gordon concerning rhythm systems. Kohut asserts that since pitch reading involves the solfeggio system where syllables are only used for one scale degree, then it would logically follow that rhythm systems should use different syllables for different rhythmic figures. The “1e&a” system is one that would meet Kohut’s criteria.

**Developmental Stages, Learning Styles and Learning Music**

Any discussion concerning the various rhythm systems would require an examination of various developmental stages, learning styles and music learning theories. For the purposes of this study, the researcher feels that it is only necessary to establish that experts in the field of learning find that there are several intelligences, styles and preferences.

There is an abundance of research concerning the use of music as a learning style (Erlauer, 2003; Gardner, 1983; Jensen, 2001; Sousa, 2001; Wolfe, 2001). This research uses the area of music as a means to learning other disciplines. The idea being that if a student has a strength in the area of music, they can utilize that strength to learn concepts
other than music. However, there is less information concerning learning styles as they affect the learning of music.

There is no one theory or explanation for learning music, neither does one theory offer instant explanations as to how music should be taught (Boyle and Radocy, 1979). However, understanding the learning styles of our students would be of great value in determining how they should be taught (Abeles et al., 1994). It would seem logical that, if music teachers had a working knowledge of the students’ stage of development and their individual learning styles, teachers could approach rhythms in a manner that would appeal to each student. In turn, music teachers would be able to adopt a concept of differentiation. According to Tomlinson (1999), teachers should begin teaching where the students are and not apply one specific method to every student. It is this idea that students have commonalities with other students, yet possess various learning styles, that make them unique individuals.

*Piaget and Developmental Stages*

Jean Piaget developed a four-stage structure for understanding the development of children: sensorimotor stage (pre-language), pre-operational (ages two to seven), concrete operational thought (ages seven to eleven), and formal operational thought (ages eleven to sixteen). For our purposes, we will confine our discussion to the concrete operational and formal operational thought stages.

Children in the concrete operations stage “are able to perform internal manipulations of data, but the data must be perceptible or concrete, not purely verbal or abstract.” (Gorman, 1974, pp. 44-45) This stage usually begins around second grade and reaches its maturity in the middle grades.
“Formal operational thinking usually begins about age twelve—give or take a year or two—and reaches a level of relative maturity about fifteen or sixteen. . . .” (Gorman, 1974, p. 49) Consequently, some students would begin this stage of development at age ten, while others would not start until age fourteen. Translate that into grade levels, and we find that it could span anywhere from fifth grade to ninth grade. It is in this stage that students are able to deal with abstract concepts. Rather than using images and bodily movements, teachers find that their students can understand the working of music notation without the use of these other tools (Abeles et al., 1974). It becomes easier to discuss music in a more theoretical sense.

**Gardner’s Multiple Intelligences**

Fogarty (2002) believes that the study of Gardner’s multiple intelligences creates an atmosphere whereby experimentation can occur in the areas of instruction, curriculum, and assessment. Gardner (1983) theorized that people were endowed with different types of intelligences which allow them to excel in certain areas: linguistic, musical, logical-mathematical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic and personal intelligences. Gardner notes that a variety of forms of transmission need to take place in order to appeal to the different forms of intelligence. Consequently, we may surmise that music students may learn rhythms best with the system that appeals to their own intelligences.

**Bruner’s Theories on Learning**

Bruner maintained that the emphasis of education changed in the early 1900’s from studying the “nature of learning as it occurs in schools” to the study of “aptitude and achievement” (Bruner, 1960, p.4). Bruner felt that learning structures was more
beneficial than the mastery of facts because it fulfilled his first objective of learning, which was to “serve us in the future” (1960, p. 17).

Bruner maintained that there were four claims for teaching structures:

1. Understanding fundamentals makes a subject more comprehensible,
2. Unless detail is placed into a structured pattern, it is rapidly forgotten,
3. An understanding of fundamental principles and ideas...appears to be the main road to adequate “transfer of training,” and
4. By constantly reexamining material taught in elementary and secondary schools for its fundamental character, one is able to narrow the gap between “advanced” knowledge and “elementary” knowledge (1960, pp. 23-26).

Bruner’s “Spiral Curriculum” was adapted by the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project in 1965. The “spiral curriculum” concept was based on Bruner’s philosophy that students could be taught any subject “in some honest form” and that a curriculum could be built around the important concepts of that subject in ever increasing depth. The music version of this model emphasized the concepts of timbre, rhythm, melody, dynamics form and harmony. These areas were to be taught in stages, becoming more in depth as the student mastered the lower levels.

Theories on Learning Music

1. In the nineteenth century, several music educators, including Lowell Mason, adapted the Pestalozzian philosophy for music. Mason even published the books A Glance at Pestalozzianism (1863) and The Pestalozzian Music Teacher (1871). This philosophy can be thought of as an early child development concept for music.
In 1949, Flagg compared reading music to reading words. She stressed that the research done in the area of reading was a sign of the direction that reading music should be going. Music education researchers have determined that children develop the ability to form concepts of music in the following order: volume, timbre, tempo, duration [rhythm], pitch, and harmony (Zimmerman, 1981).

**Boardman**

Boardman (1996) advocates a generative approach to education. She defines generative as “holding within itself the potential for more learning” (p. 63). This approach is based on the writings of Bruner.

This approach can be broken into six components:

1. Content-Concept-Schema
2. Context-Focus
3. Behavior
4. Mode of knowledge representation
5. Cognitive process
6. Attitudinal Climate-disposition

According to Boardman, since learning is holistic, these components work together simultaneously. She maintains that the role of the teacher is to provide “an environment where meaningful learning can take place” (p.10). She states further, “Learning moves from the known through the unknown to a new known” [Underline is Boardman’s] (p. 12). Boardman also wrote that Piaget’s stages of development were correct, but she agrees with Bruner that these stages change with experience and not, as Piaget suggests, with the chronological age of the students.
Musically, Boardman again agrees with Bruner that students move through various stages of learning. These stages are referred to as enactive, iconic, and symbolic (1996, p. 39). The enactive stage occurs when the student can act out their understanding of a concept. In music, that may occur by students dancing or moving to the music. The iconic stage occurs when the student can recreate a concept using images. The next step, symbolic, takes place when the student’s grasp of the concept allows them to relate conventional notation to the sound that it represents. She states that, although everyone must begin in the enactive stage, not everyone will progress to the symbolic stage. Consequently, teachers need to have knowledge of the different ways that appeal to each student’s level of understanding. Teachers need to:

1. Understand the desired musical schema,
2. Analyze the schema to determine the desired concepts, actions and musical context and
3. Establish the appropriate music environment for the learning to take place.

Boardman suggested that, in the area of rhythm, students begin with movement—the enactive stage. In the iconic stage, students should be encouraged to develop their own visuals that show long and short values. Finally, in the symbolic stage, students move to standard music notation.

*Gordon*

In the 1960’s, Gordon developed his Music Learning Theory. He coined the term *audiation* in order to describe his learning theory. The concept of audiation can be broken into eight types and six stages (Grunow, et al., 2001, p. 32). The eight types are:

1. Listening to familiar and unfamiliar music
2. Reading the notation of familiar and unfamiliar tonal patterns
3. Writing from dictation the notation of familiar and unfamiliar tonal patterns.
4. Recalling without the aid of notation familiar and unfamiliar music, and
   performing them silently, vocally, or on an instrument.
5. Writing familiar tonal patterns and rhythm patterns that we are recalling.
6. Creating and improvising unfamiliar music, using both familiar and unfamiliar
   tonal patterns and rhythm patterns, and performing the music silently, vocally,
   or on an instrument.
7. Reading (such as chord symbols), using both familiar and unfamiliar tonal
   patterns and rhythm patterns.
8. Writing unfamiliar music that we have created or improvised (Grunow, et al.,
   2001, p. 32).

The six stages of audiation are “hierarchical and cumulative” (Grunow, et al.,
2001, p. 33). Stage 1 concerns a person who can “retain short series of pitches and
durations that were heard just a moment earlier in the familiar or unfamiliar music to
which we are listening. We do not audiate what we hear at the exact moment we hear it.”
At the other end of the hierarchy is Stage 6 where the person can “anticipate and predict
the tonal patterns and rhythm patterns that we will hear next in the music to which we are
listening. The more accurate our predictions, the better we understand the music to
which we are listening” (Grunow, et al., 2001, p. 33).

Gordon maintains that music learning theory can be broken into two general
ways: discrimination and inference. Each of these can be broken into smaller subsets
(Table 1). He defines discrimination learning as, “The lower of two generic types of
skill learning. In discrimination learning, students are taught skills content and patterns by rote” (2001, p. 106). Inference learning is defined as, “The higher of two generic types of skill learning. In inference learning students are guided by the teacher to learn skills, content, and patterns by teaching themselves” (2001, p. 110).

Research on Rhythm

Some of the research in the area of rhythm deals with comparisons of the various systems. Other research examines how the ability to read and/or perform rhythms can be affected by external variables. Boyle (1970) studied the relationship between rhythmical movements and the ability to sight-read music. Boyle felt that students’ ability to read music was inhibited by their lack of skill to sight-read. He wrote, “Many music educators fail to undertake the systematic teaching of it [rhythm].” In this study, Boyle studied twenty-four bands from twenty-two schools in eight school districts. A pretest-treatment-posttest system was used. Boyle established criteria for choosing the schools, including proximity to the University of Kansas, socio-economic status and school size. Bands were split equally in order to create experimental bands and control bands. The experimental groups included the following activities in their ten-minute training periods:

1. Listening to recordings of music to recognize the beat.
2. Marking time to the underlying beat.
3. Clapping rhythm patterns while tapping the beat with the foot.
4. Playing rhythm patterns on a single note while marking the beat with the foot.
At the conclusion of the semester, the posttest revealed that the experimental groups that incorporated foot tapping with their training period scored significantly higher than the control groups with a correlation coefficient of .81.

Palmer (1976) conducted a five-month experiment with fourth grade students in order to compare the effectiveness of the Mary Helen Richards system (based on the Kodály) and the Gordon system. Palmer found that the Gordon approach’s statistical results fared significantly better than the Richards approach. However, based on other factors, Palmer concluded that there was not enough evidence to show that the Gordon approach was, indeed, more effective than the Richards approach.

Bebeau (1982) conducted a similar experiment, comparing the traditional rhythm system to the simplified speech cue system. The traditional system in Bebeau study was explaining rhythm based on mathematical relationships. The simplified speech cue system combined the Orff and Kodály methods, using words, syllables and physical gestures. Using a pretest-treatment-posttest design, Bebeau’s study found that the speech cue students scored higher than the students using the traditional rhythm system did. In a follow-up study, Bebeau again compared the traditional and the speech cue system. The results of the follow-up were similar to the original study.

Willman (1983) investigated the relationship between the Kodály system and the instructional theory of Bruner. She codified the writings of various authorities of the Kodály system, finding that these writings could be categorized into three major areas of tools and materials used in teaching relationships of musical sounds, means of active music making, and sequencing in the methodology. Comparing these areas to the four
major areas in Bruner’s instructional theory, Willman concluded that the Kodály system did correlate positively to Bruner’s instructional theory.

Colley (1987) compared the effectiveness of several syllabic systems in order to determine which would prove to be the most effective. The study was done with 160 second and third grade students in southern Maine. After the students were given a pretest in recognition, dictation and performance to determine their level of proficiency, they were taught to read rhythms using one of three systems: Kodály, Gordon, or the Word system. At the conclusion of the experiment period, 11 weeks later, the children were given a post-test. The word system scored highest in dictation and performance, while the Gordon system scored highest in the recognition test. It was noted that the interest level of the students diminished with the Kodály system after the third and fourth weeks of lessons and after Lessons 6 and 7 with the Gordon system. However, the word system seems to have kept the interest of the students throughout the course of the experiment. While the results of this study present quantitative information in the comparison of three systems, it contains added value for the purpose of this paper because of the list of eleven different names of rhythm systems.

Shehan (1987) examined “the effects of aural and visual approaches to rhythm reading and short-term retention.” The study sought to determine which method of exposing students to rhythms would result in the students’ accurate performance of those rhythms. Second- and sixth-grade students were exposed to rhythms through audio-rhythm, audio-mnemonics, (audio) visual-rhythm and (audio) visual-mnemonics. Shehan found that the simultaneous use of auditory and visual methods were more effective. In
addition, Shehan found that the sixth-grade students were able to learn rhythm patterns twice as fast as the second-grade students.

Love (1988) studied the relationships between tempo, length of patterns and grade level on the ability of students to recognize rhythm patterns. Love tested 2,146 music students and 114 non-music students in grades 6-12. She had the students listen to 48 pairs of rhythm patterns. She concluded that all of the above variables affected memory of rhythm patterns. More specifically, she found that the tempo might influence how students learn rhythm. However, the abstract does not say which tempo, slow or fast, was the most beneficial to students.

Gage (1994) compared the rhythm systems of four beginning instrumental music method books. As a result of this study, Gage developed a method of analyzing and comparing method books. He found that there were no similarities in the presentation sequence of rhythm concepts but that they did have similar instruction content. Gage does have an extensive literature review dealing with rhythm. He divides it into three sections: maturation factors affecting rhythm cognition, learning theories dealing with students’ acquisition of rhythm cognition, and instructional processes for teaching rhythm.

In 1996, Rogers asked if instruction using colored rhythmic notation would affect first- and second-grade students’ rhythm-reading skills. After 23 weeks, Rogers found mixed results. The experimental group was able to read colored notation better than the control group. However, when he asked the experimental group to read the colored notation and the control group to read the uncolored notation, the results did not differ significantly.
Kelly (1997) conducted a study examining the question of whether beginning band students who were taught to conduct would perform their music more accurately than students who were not taught to conduct. Beginning bands were picked randomly from schools within a set proximity. Kelly used pretest-treatment-posttest model for this study. After pretesting, the groups using excerpts from the Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale, the researcher and a trained replicator went to the schools on a regular basis and taught the experimental groups to conduct for ten minutes at a time. The control groups received no treatment. After a period of 10 weeks, the groups were tested again using the Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale. Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) showed a significant difference between the two groups in the areas of rhythm reading, and phrasing ability. However, there was no difference found in the stylistic performances (legato, staccato, dynamic changes and overall performance.)

Brittin (2001) studied middle school band students’ perception of counting systems. Area band directors had nominated 131 middle school students to be members of an area honor band. Brittin surveyed these students, asking them about the types of rhythm systems they learned and who it was that taught them (middle school band director, elementary band director and elementary classroom music teacher). She then administered a short test to evaluate their rhythmic accuracy. The results showed that the systems their band directors used had little or no effect on the accuracy of the test. Instead, the system that the elementary classroom music teacher taught had a more significant effect on the results. In fact, if the classroom teacher used the Kodály system, the student was more likely to answer correctly than if a number counting system had been used. In addition, Brittin found that band directors in the study asked students to
count rhythms in “some rehearsals” 61% of the time. Whereas asking students to count rhythms in “every rehearsal” occurred 21% of the time. 10% of the students claimed that their band directors “hardly ever” asked them to count rhythms.

Gauthier and Dunn (2004) compared Boardman’s Additive Approach and the “traditional” Subdivision Approach with first grade students. A pre-test was given to two groups of students, followed by instruction using either the Additive or Subdivision approach four times a week for eight weeks. At the end of that period, a post-test was given to each group. The results showed that, although both groups improved in their rhythm reading ability, the group that was taught the Additive Approach fared better than the Subdivision group.
Chapter 3

Method

In order to answer the questions posed above (i.e. what are the various systems of teaching rhythms, to what extent have these systems have been analyzed and compared to each other, how do these systems fit into the current learning style theory and how many of these systems are in use today), this study utilized the grounded theory approach. According to Schwandt (2001), grounded theory begins with collection of data and, using that data, arrives at a “formal, substantive theory of social phenomena” (p. 110). Denzin and Lincoln (2000) write that the grounded theory method is more concerned with the analytic strategies rather than the data collection methods (p. 514). The analysis of data is accomplished through the following method:

1. Simultaneous collection of data
2. A two-step data coding process
3. Comparative methods
4. Memo writing aimed at the construction of conceptual analyses
5. Sampling to refine the researcher’s emerging theoretical ideas

Data for this study was collected in three phases:

1. An examination of the development and workings of various rhythm systems and various learning styles,
2. An overview of the available method books and the rhythm systems they employ and

3. Surveys of students, teachers and composers/authors to determine the extent to which the various systems are being utilized and their perceived learning styles.

Phase One

The goal of phase one was to accumulate the needed information to construct a list of the several systems which are currently being used or have been used in the past. The list was necessary for the surveys in the third phase. The scope of such a list was limited to the late nineteenth through the twenty-first century. This list was supported by the research that deals with the effectiveness of the various rhythm systems.

The information for this phase was found in numerous journals, method books, and texts. Some of the information was only available by examining original documents (for example the writings of Lowell Mason, whose papers are on file in the Yale Music Library or the journals of Haskell Harr at the Vandercook School of Music in Chicago). In those cases, the researcher determined that those resource were not essential to the study. Based on preliminary work, the researcher determined that enough information existed, both in primary and secondary sources, which allowed sufficient research to create an extensive list of rhythm systems.

The researcher categorized the systems into the following areas: language or mnemonic systems, counting or mathematical systems, movement systems, and miscellaneous systems. Subsets of those categories included examples and explanations
of each system, any evolutionary data related to that system, and available research concerning those systems.

The researcher also examined the various theories of learning and how they relate to the area of rhythm pedagogy. This involved a review of the various theories that seem to be prevalent in the literature and comparing those styles with the list of rhythm systems. The researcher then examined relationships between learning theories and the rhythms systems as reported by the surveyed students.

*Phase Two*

To get a better idea for the possible reasons music educators choose the systems they do, the researcher examined the instrumental method books that were available. This examination identified which system, if any, was advocated by the author of that book. The researcher contacted several authors of the method books in order to obtain the rationale for the rhythm systems that they advocated, the reason for advocating just one system or for the absence of any particular system.

*Phase Three*

On October 25 and November 1 2004, the researcher surveyed students who were auditioning for the St. Louis Suburban Music Educators All-Suburban Bands (Appendix A). Two auditions took place, grades seven to eight and grades nine to twelve, with a yield of 275 respondents. The students came from 29 school districts, consisting of 109 middle schools and high schools across a three county area in the metro-St. Louis. The students come from different cultural, racial, ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds.

The survey’s purpose was to gather information concerning the types of rhythm
systems to which the student had been exposed. Also included were the system(s) the
students chose to use and their perception of their personal learning style.

The students were asked to supply their audition number. After the audition
process was over, a comparison was made with the students who were selected to the All-
Suburban Bands and their preferred rhythm system. This did not jeopardize the
anonymity of the survey since the names of the students were not revealed.

The researcher administered another survey to music teachers attending the
Missouri Music Educators Convention (Appendix B). The questions were similar to
those of the students, with emphasis placed on the systems they used to teach students
and the possible reasons for their choices. The music teacher survey examined the
knowledge of systems and practices these teachers used with their students
The researcher implemented three phases in order to address the hypotheses. These phases were:

1. An examination of the development and workings of various rhythm systems and learning styles,
2. An overview of the available method books, the rhythm systems they employ, the rationale some authors of the method books use for the rhythm systems that they advocate, and
3. Surveys of students and teachers to determine the extent to which the various systems are being utilized. In addition, the researcher asked the respondents what they perceived their learning styles to be.

An Examination of Rhythm Systems

In order to examine the various rhythm systems, it was necessary to first develop a list of systems. The researcher found numerous rhythm systems dating from the early nineteenth century through the late twentieth century (Tables 2-5). These systems were divided into five categories: ratio, number/counting, syllable, mnemonic, and kinesthetic. This section of the study will examine these categories in general and the more widely used systems in particular.
Ratio

The ratio system simply compares the various note values to other note values. This system seems to be popular in earlier books. For example, Whitney (1886) incorporated a chart (Figure 1) into his method book that demonstrates this concept. This chart serves no purpose other than to show the mathematical proportions of one note value to another. The remainder of Whitney’s book gives no other system for performing rhythms with the exception of writing the beat numbers under sample rhythms on page eight.

In 1907, Scott Joplin published a booklet entitled *School of Ragtime*. In it, he addresses the problem of accurately playing syncopated rhythms.

It is evident that, by giving each note its proper time and by scrupulously observing the ties, you will get the effect. . . . strike the first note and hold it through the time belonging to the second note. The upper staff is not
syncopated, and is not to be played. The perpendicular dotted lines running from the syncopated note below to the two notes above will show exactly its duration (Lawrence, 1981) (Figure 2).

Again, no system for learning the rhythms was given. However, for the purposes of this publication, Joplin may have believed that the student was already acquainted with reading rhythms accurately.

Other books include similar charts and explanations of rhythm without using any other system for teaching rhythms.

**Number/Counting**

Counting systems or systems using numbers and subdivisions of the beat have been in existence since the early nineteenth century. The concept behind counting systems is that numbers are assigned to the notes that fall on the beats and other syllables are assigned to the various subdivisions of the beat. Its prime purpose is to show where the note is placed in a particular measure. One of the earlier systems that the researcher was able to find was in the method books of Hohmann (1842). His counting system assigned numbers to the notes that fell on the beat and then the symbol + to signify the second half of the beat (Figure 3).
Harr (1937) may have developed the system that seems to be the most widely used. The system that Harr used assigned numbers to notes that occur on the beat and syllables for notes that fall on subdivisions of the beat (Figure 4). The syllables remain consistent for all subdivisions with only the number for the beat changing. For example, the rhythm in Figure 4 would be read, “1 e & a 2 e & a.”

Other authors published systems similar to that of Harr. Smith et al. (1937) and McHose and Tibbs (1944) developed systems that applied the same premise of using numbers to identify notes that fall on the beat with syllables to denote those notes that occur on subdivisions of the beat. The system developed by McHose and Tibbs came to be known as the “Eastman” system, presumably because both were on the faculty at the Eastman School of Music. Based on copyright dates, Hovey (1934, 1958) seems to have pre-dated Harr, but his system was not used to the extent that Harr’s has been. Hovey devised a similar system to the above systems (Figure 5). The authors in Figure 5 differ from Harr in that Harr gives a different syllable to every fourth of the beat. The other systems give the same name to the second and fourth quarter of the beat.
Although the system that Gordon currently advocates uses no numbers, his original system in 1971 did (Grunow, 1992) (Figure 6).

*Syllable*

Syllable systems assign a particular syllable to a note value, or, as in the case of Froseth/Blaser, a syllable is assigned to particular divisions of the beat or the function of the note in the measure.

The French times-names system was developed by Pierre Galin, Aimé Paris, Paris’ sister, Nanine and her husband Emile Chevé in the early nineteenth century. Also known as the Galin-Paris-Chevé Method, the system uses different vowel sounds based on the subdivision of the beat (a, e for rhythms in a duple meter and a, e and i for rhythms in a triple meter). Cheve explained the system:
As all the subdivisions of the unit result from the binary and ternary roots, Aime Paris adopts the two vowels A and E to express halves, and the three vowels E, E, I, to express thirds, and in such a manner that, in a binary group, A always denotes the first half and E the second, while a ternary group, A always denotes the first third, E the second, and I the third third. The sound I is, therefore, peculiar to the ternary root, while A and E are common to both (Winick, 1974, pp. 149-150).

The French times-names became the basis for Curwen’s system later that century and Kodály’s in the twentieth century. The American music educator, Richards, adapted Kodály’s system for American children. Although Richards was a proponent of Kodály, her syllables differ slightly because of instructions he gave her concerning the use of the child’s natural tongue (R. McChesney, personal correspondence, March 16, 2001). Sueta modified Kodály’s syllables in order to approximate the shape of wind player’s embouchure (E. Sueta, personal correspondence, July, 2003) (Figure 7).

![Figure 7 A Comparison of Syllable Systems.](image-url)
In 2000, Gordon wrote that counting systems were “little more than a time
keeping device and was designed for use with only the most simple rhythm patterns
found in usual duple meter” (p. 94).

The system that Gordon now advocates comes from the research of Froseth and
Blaser (Grunow, 1992, Gordon, 1980). This system (Froseth refers to it as the
Froseth/Blaser phonetic rhythmic syllables) seems to be a mix of syllable and counting
systems. The system evolved because of Froseth’s experience teaching jazz. Froseth
chose the syllable Du because it is “common to most styles of scat singing” (J. Froseth,
personal correspondence, November 12, 2004). Other scat syllables were modified by
making the initial sounds using a D or a T (de, di, da, ta) because they lent themselves
easily to articulation patterns for wind players (see Appendix I for a discussion of the
attribution of the Froseth/Blaser system).

Gordon advocates the use of the Froseth/Blaser phonetic rhythmic syllables and
incorporates it with what he refers to as macrobeats and microbeats. He defined
macrobeats as:

The fundamental beat in a rhythm pattern. In usual duple meter with the
measure with the measure signature 2/4, quarter notes are the performed
or underlying macrobeats. In usual triple meter with the measure
signature 6/8, dotted-quarter notes are the performed or underlying
macrobeats. In usual triple meter with the measure signature 3/4, dotted-
half notes are the performed or underlying macrobeats. . . (2000, p. 163)

Microbeats are defined as:
The equal division of a macrobeat. The following are examples. In usual duple meter with the measure signature 2/4, groups of two eighth-notes are the performed or underlying microbeats. In usual triple meter with the measure signature 6/8, groups of three eighth-notes are the performed or underlying microbeats. In usual triple meter with the measure signature 3/4, groups of three quarter-notes are the performed or underlying microbeat (2000, p. 165).

An example of the Froseth/Blaser phonetic rhythmic syllables in duple meter appears below (Figure 8).

![Figure 8 Froseth/Blaser Duple Meter.](image)

The notes that fall on the *macrobeats*, in this case beats one and two, are labeled *Du*. The second half of each beat is labeled *De* (pronounced *day*), the name for the *microbeat*. However, in triple meter the syllable *Du* is only used on the first beat. Beats two and three become *Da* and *Di* since they are, by definition, *microbeats*. This is done in order to give the feeling of triple meter. *De* is still used on the second half of each beat (Figure 9).

![Figure 9 Froseth/Blaser Triple Meter.](image)
Mnemonics

Mnemonics, or the use of words, is a system where the rhythms of words are used to teach rhythms in “chunks.” Sometimes the natural rhythms of words match the written rhythms. Other times the words are contrived or forced into the rhythm. An early example of the use of mnemonics is Lowell Mason, the father of music education in America. Mason (1836) categorized rhythms into groups of two, four and six syllables (Figure 10). The system that Mason used made no differentiation between quarters, eighths, sixteenths, etc. Words were strictly used for groupings of like note values.

In *The Individualized Instructor* (1973) and *Do It* (1997), Froseth utilizes children’s songs and folk songs, including the lyrics underneath the music. A more in depth discussion follows below.

Kinesthetic

Kinesthetic systems employ the use of various body movements to reinforce rhythm. Recalling part of this study’s definition of rhythm, it consists of an inner feeling or a measured movement. The kinesthetic approach to teaching rhythms capitalizes on that feeling or movement. As stated above, Jacques-Dalcroze believed that rhythm was
influenced by a person’s heartbeat, breathing, respiratory muscles and a steady walking pace. Similarly, Orff’s approach to rhythm began with the concept that “feeling precedes intellectual understanding” (Wheeler and Raebeck, 1977, p. xix). Consequently, the music education of many elementary school children involves clapping, dancing, and other forms of movement.

Boyle’s studies in the area of rhythm found that kinesthetics increased the accuracy of students’ performance of rhythms. More specifically, students who tapped their feet were more likely to perform rhythms accurately than students who do not tap their feet. Some instrumental method books advocate the concept of foot tapping (e.g. *Division of Beat, The Rhythm Bible*).

The BRIM system was developed by Middleton and Robinson in the 1950’s. The system uses a pulsation of air in groups of two, three, four or six per beat. These pulsations of air act as a physical reference in order to help students subdivide the beat. Haines and McEntyre (*Division of Beat, 1981*) advocate this system and incorporate it in their book. The authors maintain that the system also aids in the development of vibrato.

*Box Notation Method*

The Box Notation Method, while technically not a rhythm system, is included in this discussion because of its unique approach. This system was developed by Phillip Harland in 1962 at the University of California in Los Angeles (Toussaint, 2004). Harland developed the system (also known as the Time Unit Box Systems or TUBS) in order to help percussion students perform African drum patterns. The system works by subdividing the beat into the smallest used value and then representing each subdivision with a box. Boxes are marked based on which division of the beat the note occurs
Varley, Paul, 2005, UMSL, p. 53

(Figure 11). In the case of multiple percussion, notation in each box can indicate which instrument is to be used and may even specify how that instrument is to be played. It should also be noted that TUBS seems to utilize the Harr system as an integral part of its workings. The researcher was unable to find examples of this system in any band or orchestra beginning method books. However, he did see this system used in general music method books and percussion books that specialized in music from cultures other than western. (e.g., Jessup, 1975)

![Figure 11 Box Notation Example (Eduardo & Kumor, 2001, p. 15)]

Method Books and Rhythm Systems

The researcher examined 37 books (Table 6). The books came from local music stores and free samples sent to the researcher by publishing companies. The books included orchestra and band methods, as well as books designed specifically for developing rhythm reading skills. None of the books were written for vocal or general music classes. Most of the books were similar in the areas of rhythm systems, the sequential order in which rhythms are taught, and even the melodies used for exercises. This section will be limited to discussions dealing with rhythms.

Rhythm Systems
Of the 37, eight books used no rhythm system (Tables 7 and 8). Two such books are *Standard of Excellence*, and *Best in Class* (Pearson, 1996 and 1982). Pearson explained that he omitted any specific system from the student book (he suggests three systems in the teacher’s manual) because, “counting systems are very personal and reflect one's philosophy. I wanted my method books to be able to be used with any and all counting systems” (Personal email, April 27, 2004).

Twenty-two books use some form of a number counting system. Some of these books vary slightly as to the naming of the subdivision of the beat. The name of the second half of the beat varies between *and*, &, and + (Table 9). Of the books using a counting system, ten used an additional system in conjunction with counting. These books most often used some form of kinesthetics to supplement the counting.

Three books used a system to the exclusion of counting. Froseth (1984) used a combination of the Froseth/Glaser system in the beginning of the book and lyrics with many of the remaining exercises.


The singing voice provides the elementary and middle school general music teacher with perhaps the best means for developing improved aural acuity. This is true because, generally speaking, there is a direct relationship between the ability to hear musically and the ability to sing. More simply stated, one does not hear musically any better than one can sing. . . .Folk song literature is, of course, the best available material with which to coordinate a singing and playing approach to teaching general
music. . . For example, almost every folk song has musical content for teaching form, phrasing, tonality, melody, **rhythm**, harmony, and many aesthetic-expressive aspects of musical performance [emphasis added].

*The Individualized Instructor* uses lyrics and two different counting systems. A CD supplements *Do It*, but is strictly an accompaniment CD.

Gordon et al. (*Jump Right In*, 2002) uses the Froseth/Glaser system, but only on the accompanying CD. The book itself does not use any particular system. According to Grunow, most music teachers would be unable to use these materials without first attending workshops on how to use the materials (Grunow interview, July 30, 2004).

Ten books incorporate some form of kinesthetics. Of those, eight books advocate the use of foot tapping. Froseth (1984) uses lap-pats reminiscent of the patschen used by Orff. Additionally, six of the books using kinesthetics use it with some form of a counting system. The exception is *Listen, Move, Play and Sing for Band* (Froseth book).

Three books use more than two systems. *The Rhythm Bible* (Fox, 2002) utilizes three types of systems: counting, mnemonics and kinesthetics (foot-tapping). *The Rhythm Bible* is not intended as a beginning instrumental method book. Its contents are simply rhythms arranged in order of complexity. According to the author, “Most instruction books do not adequately prepare musicians to play complex rhythms. . . . *The Rhythm Bible* was written to help remedy this deficiency” (p. 2). *Thirty Days to Rhythm* (Henderson, 2002) is another book that is not intended as a beginning instrumental book. However, the book is written on an elementary level, using worksheets, flashcards, and several rhythm systems. The third book, *The Individualized Instructor*, was discussed on the previous page.
An examination of Table 8 shows that the counting system is used most often in method books (12 books or 32.4%). The use of no system is the second most frequently used (7 or 21.6%). These two categories account for 54% of the books examined by the researcher. Two of the books (5.4%) used one other exclusive system (1 syllable, 1 mnemonic). Fifteen books (40.5%) used two or more systems. Eleven of those books used only two systems. Of those eleven books, ten included a counting system. Only three books used more than two systems. Two of those books were written for the express purpose of teaching rhythms.

Order of rhythms

The order in which authors introduce rhythms to students vary among the instrumental method books. The majority of beginning band method books begins by introducing whole notes. According to some of the composers that were surveyed, the reason for beginning with the whole note for beginning band students is that it allows the student to develop air support, a good embouchure and an acceptable tone quality.

However, not all authors share this philosophy. Froseth (Listen, Move, Sing and Play; Do It), Grunow and Gordon (Jump Right In), and Sueta begin with quarter notes and half notes regardless of the instrument. Grunow explains,

The child is going to give meaning to rhythm or give meaning to the tonal. You have to start with a context, and a context is a feeling of meter. . . . What’s happening in all the other method books is they have that counting and holding a whole note which is the hardest rhythm there is to perform because the kids cannot maintain a consistent tempo underneath it

(Interview, July 30, 2004).
New notes are introduced as whole notes in the method books of Froseth, Grunow and Gordon. However, whole notes in the exercises are never introduced in either level one book.

Method books for strings begin with quarter notes and eighth notes. This approach is based on the idea that bow movement for smaller note values is more conducive to young beginners than longer bow strokes.

Most band method books start with whole notes and then proceed with half notes and quarter notes. The reason for this seems to be based on the belief that students should begin playing long tones in order to develop a good embouchure and consequently a good characteristic tone.

**Communications with Composers/Authors**

Part of phase two was to contact authors of the various method books and ask for the rationale they used to include certain rhythm systems or lack thereof. Through email and telephone interviews, the researcher was able to contact eleven authors and submit questions to which they responded, also via email or telephone interviews (Table 10). The authors who responded were:

1. Bruce Pearson, *Standard of Excellence* and *Best in Class*

2. Sandy Feldstein, *Yamaha Band Student*, *Alfred’s Drum Method Book*, and *Yamaha Advantage*

3. John O’Reilly, *Accent on Achievement*, *Yamaha Band Student*, and *Strictly Strings*

4. Wendy Barden, *Artistry in Strings*

6. Andrew Dabczynski, *String Explorer*

7. Dan Fox, *The Rhythm Bible*

8. Ann Witt, *A Rhythm a Week*


10. Richard Grunow, *Jump Right In*

11. James Froseth, *Do It!, Listen, Move, Play and Sing, and The Individualized Instructor for Band*

These people accounted for 18 or 48.6% of the method books that the researcher analyzed.

Some of the questions that the researcher asked were dependent on the type of book being analyzed. For example, the researcher found that the order of rhythms being introduced in the method books varied, for the most part, depending on whether the book was written for orchestra or band. Some of the books were written as rhythm supplements to other method books. The researcher structured the questions as uniformly as possible, but allowed for flexibility depending on the circumstances. Therefore, not all of the authors answered all of the questions.

1. *What was your rationale for the choice of rhythm system in your book?*

Bruce Pearson (BP): I did not advocate any particular rhythm (counting) system because counting systems are very personal and reflect one's philosophy. I wanted my method books to be able to be used with any and all counting systems. I will provide further explanation in my answer to question #4.
Sandy Feldstein (SF): Over my years of teaching, this system [1 e & a] has worked best for my students and me. In talking to other teachers throughout the world, I have gotten the same feedback. I always tell teachers to use the system that works best for them. For example, if one taught in a school system that had a strong Orff program, you might want to use that system of counting to make the transition to instrumental music as smooth as possible.

John O’Reilly (JO): I think it's the most logical system [1 e & a] and the one that makes most sense to kids because of the mathematical connections. In AOA [Accent on Achievement] we always think 1 & 2 &, etc., unless sixteenths are involved.

Wendy Barden (WB): I wasn't involved in the initial decision about choice of counting systems, but it has been my experience that "1 e & a" is a most widely used system. Unlike the band world, rhythms in Suzuki string pedagogy have been introduced with word phrases, with great success. (I think this is due to the fact that, in Suzuki, very young students listen and play rather than read counting, plus rhythm is more of a physical, bow moving task than it is for wind players.) Both systems are used together in Artistry in Strings as new rhythms are introduced - the best of both worlds. After the introduction of rhythms, the teacher is free to use our counting labels, or there is plenty of space for the student to write in other variations. That's why we don't write counting under more lines, but rather provide the direction "Write in the counts" so the student will use whichever system their teacher prefers. We continue to focus on rhythm/counting with WriteRight rhythm lines, and also through various WriteRight worksheets included in the Artistry in Strings score. I
know in writing a method book, it is important to provide "systems" that don't get in the way of the teacher's personal preference.

Ed Sueta (ES): It is a combination of Harr and a modified Kodály. The vowel sounds used for Kodály are changed to make it more conducive for an embouchure (Telephone conversation July, 2004). Sueta says he developed his system by “experimentation over 10 years.”

Andrew Dabczynski (AD): 1. It [1 e & a] is one standard approach, in our experience a widely used way of counting. 2. Also very easy to reproduce on paper (as opposed to Doo-day-doo-day). 3. Includes the actual beat number (i.e., 1e&a, 2e&a), which is makes sense visually, on paper.

Dan Fox (DF): I’m not sure I can give you a rationale. Just comes from years of teaching people and seeing what works [1 e & a].

Ann Witt (AW): I do not advocate a particular system because I feel that it is a personal choice.

Dave Black (DB): [1 e & a] There are a couple of reasons. First of all, with publishing or anything else, you’re going by history, because you’re not trying to reinvent the wheel. When we look at books like that, you try to look at what’s been successful, what’s sold well, because you’re trying match that, and then improve upon it. Then in this case, Haskell Harr was the book to beat. That was one reason why we kept it similar in terms of the pacing, notation, and stuff like that. One of the main reasons is that we’re following correlating material like Band Method. That’s one method, for instance, which is used as a supplement to Yamaha Band Student, Accent on Achievement or any other band method for a teacher that wants to go into more
detail with their percussion student. And since most band methods, at least up to that point...that book was published 17 years ago, use that system of counting. And so a lot of it was to correlate with existing methods that were out there. With le&a, going by history, that’s the way I was taught as a player, that’s what I kind of understand. With le&a, there’s a syllable for every note. It makes it very logical. But there are a lot of other things that are tied in, like I said. Just to be brief, existing correlating material like Band Methods, etc., or existing publications that have been tried, proved successful or have long histories that teachers are familiar with and they like and you don’t want to rock the boat too much because you don’t want to scare them off.

Richard Grunow (RG): I actually used those rhythm syllables [Froseth/Blaser] when I was working with Jim Froseth and you’ll see in that rhythm article that I wrote (Grunow, 1992), it will talk in there about the origin of those syllables. Gordon uses them a little bit differently than Froseth in various ways. When I started writing the series with Ed Gordon, we started writing lesson plans in about 1983 and obviously the rhythm syllables were something that both of us were comfortable with. So, it was just a natural thing to do. But the unique aspect of the rhythm syllables is the following: there is nothing sacred about the actual syllable itself other than the fact that they’re associated with function and not associated with note values. Many times, I’ll have students that come here from another country, and it’s difficult for them to pronounce those syllables. I say to them at the time, “You need to find syllables in your own language that work for you.” Because there’s nothing sacred about the syllables. It’s just the fact that their associated with a feeling—a large
paired macrobeat. When you break the macrobeats down into twos, you get another syllable. When you break them down into threes, you get another syllable. However, the unique aspect of those syllables is how you break down macrobeats. [This is] because, based on Gordon’s research, it’s the smaller beat, in other words what he calls the microbeat, [that] really what gives rise to a feeling of meter-- a feeling of duple or triple. It is paired macrobeats, and then you break it into the du de du de or the du da de du da de. Then if you go to unusual meters, it has a different feel because the macrobeat now is not temporally equal. One of the things that was most influential is that, and I think we’re unique in this, all the rhythms that we teach do not to start with rhythm syllables. They start with neutral syllables so that we’re not trying to teach two things at once. In other words, we want the kid to establish in his body a feeling of large beats and small beats and then he chants over top of that just a “Buh, buh, buh--- Buh Buh Buh.” When they can perform that independently, then we start to add the Du De Du. It’s all done without notation. Technically speaking, the child is never to say written down Du De Du De. Never to see it. The teacher may find it in the teacher’s guide, but he would never see that. It’s only to be heard and not to be seen.

James Froseth (JF): [Dr. Froseth’s response to this question came from an article he emailed the researcher (Froseth, 1970)]. The singing voice provides the elementary instrumental music teacher with perhaps the best means for developing improved aural acuity. This is true because, generally speaking, there is a direct relationship between the ability to musically “hear” and the ability to sing. . . .No doubt, songs children sing provide a reliable source of musical material which lends itself to the
development of basic musical concepts which can be generalized to instrumental performance. For example, almost every folk song has musical content for teaching form, phrasing, tonality, melody, rhythm, harmony, style and various aspects of musical expression. Most important, folk songs have meaning for children. [Dr. Froseth added the following information when explaining the absence of any rhythm system in the *Do It!* Series] I learned from inclusion of solfege syllables and phonetic rhythmic syllables in the *Comprehensive Music Instructor* series that “people tend to down on what they’re not up on.” One look at a foreign or unknown (as in unskilled) system and the entire program is often rejected. Instrumental teachers love the first system they learned and generally reject systems that are unfamiliar to them.

2. *How do you personally approach rhythms? Do you use any system when you are reading music or do you just read?*

**JO:** I always use the system we teach. I'm a percussionist and pride myself in being an excellent sight reader on percussion and piano. I really do believe it's because of the early instruction I received using this system. Subdivision is always there when I conduct and perform. When I was 20, I had the honor of performing under Nadia Boulanger for a week and she frequently insisted on all the performers subdividing using sixteenths all the time (especially at slow tempos).

**WB:** Personally, my greatest experience comes from the "band world." Right from the beginning, I learned to tap my foot and count the rhythms. I used my foot to subdivide (tap down on the numbers, up on the ":") but rarely counted a half note.
as "1 & 2 &." As I got into sixteenth notes, I was taught to use the "1 e & a" system. As I play now, I tend to think in this system - especially when sightreading.

ES: Too Ta Ta TTTT, 1 1 & 1 e & a (Both systems)

AD: I like the Gordon/Froseth ideas for beat internalization and rhythm reading rhythmic movement, synchronization with beat syllables, then with flash cards, then applied to performance. I use the same approach when teaching anything new: isolation of new rhythms, then movement to them, synchronize with syllables, flash cards, then application in the exercise or piece. This is how it’s approached in String Explorer.

DF: Since I've been a professional musician for over 50 years, I just read. But I give credit for developing my inner hearing to Pasquale Bona's Rhythmical Articulation. Since the book was written about 200 years ago, it's very strong in the area of sight singing pitch, but of course has little if anything about syncopation and nothing at all about the swing feel or anything else derived from the African-American rhythmic tradition. My object in writing "The Rhythm Bible" was to remedy this shortcoming.

AW: Usually I “just read.” But when necessary I do tap my foot and/or say rhythm syllables.

DB: Being a jazz drum set player, everything is subdivided (Gives triplet example: Ding-a-de Ding-a-de Ding). I’m always thinking triplet subdivision, or eighth note if it’s rock or Latin, or sixteenth note divisions if it’s funk. And there’s always that (Gives sixteenth note example: Ya-ta-ta ta-ta-ta-ta) pulse going. If it’s a complicated rhythm or a passage, I break it down. I think most people tend to, and Frank Zappa used to say this with some of his stuff, everybody just tries to get
overwhelmed and read four bars at a time, or whatever. I take half of a measure and I work that out. Then I work on the second half of the measure. Then I put the two together. Then I move on to the second measure and do half. Then I add the first measure and half of that. And that’s the way I’ve always approached it. It makes it very logical and easy to do. If you try and read a long passage or four bars of a difficult rhythm, or two bars, or even a bar without first dissecting it, it becomes frustrating and chances are you become panicked. I just start with one beat, second beat, third beat, whatever, and then I piece it all together.

RG: It depends how familiar I am with the piece of music. It’s just like reading a book. If you look at the book and say, “Yeah, I know every word that’s on that page! I don’t have to figure out anything…just read!” That’s the myth. I know this is a simple statement, but if you’re going to ask kids to sight read stuff that is not familiar, it just makes sense that they first should have first been taught to read things that are familiar. That’s not what we’re doing. We have never taught kids to read things that are familiar. And we’re only asking them to read things that are unfamiliar. The kid’s going to struggle. If you put something in front of me, I just look at it and say, “There’s nothing on there that isn’t familiar! So, I’m just going to read it. You want it with syllables, you don’t want it with syllables? I’ll give it to you anyway you want it!” If you give me something that’s got some patterns in there that are not as familiar to me, I might have to figure out where the large beats and where the small beats are. I’ll get my body moving to where I feel large beats and small beats and I can use the syllables or not use the syllables. Ultimately, the goal is to get rid of syllables. We don’t want kids singing songs with syllables—
tonal syllables or rhythm syllables. We should transcend the syllables. We start without them. We use them to build our vocabulary. Then we get rid of them.

3. How do you determine the order of rhythms that are introduced in your books?

BP: The order of rhythms reflects my personal philosophy that the first note should be conducive to the development of good tone quality. Consequently, I start with long tones (whole notes) for it has been my experience that starting with quarter notes is detrimental to the development of good tone quality. Advocates of starting with quarter notes say that it helps with rhythmic development. That is simply inaccurate for research indicates that there must be the use of large motor-skill activity to foster the internalization of rhythms (Dalcroze). The tongue is simply too small of a muscle to make any significant difference. As soon as the tone has been developed, I then begin the process of dividing the tone into smaller subdivisions, i.e. half notes, quarter notes, eighth notes, etc. Another reason for not starting with quarter notes is that to reinforce quarter notes requires much movement between notes. This is often too complex for young students. My Best In Class Recorder Method starts with quarter notes. The reason is two fold:

1. It is difficult for young students to hold a note on recorder and feel the rhythmic pulse of a whole note, and

2. Recorders are most often taught in general music classes that employ more singing and bodily movement activities. In my opinion, singing and bodily movement activity should be employed in our band classes. I have written on the teaching of music reading and audiation in the Standard of Excellence score, The Instrumentalist, and the Kjos Band News.
SF: I like to use a “take away” method as much as possible. By that, I mean introducing 8 eighth notes in a measure and then quarter 6 eighth etc. I find that that helps students keep a steady beat without rushing. I also like to show the new rhythm related to a known one whenever possible. For example, a dotted quarter note shown related to a quarter tied to an eighth, etc.

JO: We decided to start with whole notes to get a decent tone started but then went right to quarters in order to have more interesting tunes and reinforce rhythmic concepts. After quarters we do halves. We recommend counting 1&2&, etc., right from the start. I always taught my beginners that way and made them tap their foot with a distinct down-up-down-up motion. When I play drum-set, my high hat foot uses a similar approach of heel-toe-heel-toe. Eighth notes are introduced pretty early in both AOA [Accent on Achievement] and Yamaha [Band Student]. Of course, in AOA we very carefully limit eighth note patterns to repeated pitches for several pages. That way the kids can become solid on the rhythms without having to worry about technique. We also teach the dotted quarter and eighth pattern plus the reverse, which a lot of books skip. In addition, we include simple syncopation in book one. Book two very methodically goes through the various sixteenth patterns beginning with four to the beat counted 1e&a etc. Many books throw all the sixteenth patterns together all at once. 3/8 and 6/8 are taught in book two using 123456 for fast and slow 6/8. We also include cut time in book two. Book three picks up many rhythms not taught in book one & two of all band methods. We teach quarter note triplets, 5/8, changing meter etc. If kids can accurately play our book three they're going to be excellent readers.
WB: The order of rhythms is generally different in band and orchestra. In band, it is typical (but not universal) to start with a whole note to produce a long tone with uninterrupted air. Then add tongue to use quarter notes, then half notes, then pairs of eights, etc. In strings, it is a more advanced skill to be able to pull the bow slowly enough to play a whole note. Quarter notes are easy, followed by pairs of eighth notes - both of these rhythms can be played in the middle part of the bow, which is easiest to control in the early stages of playing. The bowing movement and rhythms go hand-in-hand. As each rhythmic value is introduced it appears in "Bow Stroke Rhythm" Families. In the mnemonics, the half note becomes "Slow Bow," the dotted half note is "Slower Bow," and the whole note is "Slowest Bow." Initial quarter notes are labeled "Down Up."

ES: Half, half—quarter, dotted half, eighth, dotted quarter—eighth, four sixteenths, two sixteenths—eighth, eighth—two sixteenths, eighth—quarter—eighth.

AD: We reverted to the four basic Suzuki rhythms, which have become the default rhythms for teaching strings in the past 40 years (and that’s a good thing). Suzuki demonstrated that short rhythms are easier to play, more approachable by young students, and thus breed more success than the notion of long notes (wholes and halves, a la String Builder, Tune a Day, etc.) that method books had been based upon prior to around 1965. Starting with whole/half notes is a carry-over from wind methodology, and historically it likely stems from the fact that strings and band instruments were taught simultaneously throughout most of the US as a full orchestra prior to the 60’s. In band teaching, starting with long notes makes sense, but is antithetical to the string playing and string repertoire; as an illustration, try to
name one fiddle tune (arguably the most “instinctive” part of the string literature) that is based upon long notes! Further, starting with long notes is contrary to best knowledge about child development because it necessitates that the child subsequently be able to divide (mathematically); most math curricula recognize that the division concept is a late one, usually not introduced until 3rd or 4th grade. Therefore, recognition of beat structure (aurally AND visually) must be additive (1+1+1+1=4), thoroughly understandable by that grade level.

In *String Explorer*, we start with the steady beat (four quarters), followed by the “motorcycle stop-stop” rhythm, followed by straight eighths (“motorcycle-motorcycle”), and finally the shuffle bowing (“run-pony, run-pony”). These are the four basic Suzuki “Twinkle Variation” rhythms. We left out the syncopated Suzuki rhythm, as we felt it is counter-intuitive as a beginner rhythm, very difficult to read (and reading IS, after all, a central goal of the book), and thus is better left until after further development (see Unit 14).

It’s critical to note that the foremost feature of SE is the separation of right- and left-hand skills. Students focus on new right hand, rhythmic, and sound production concepts while using only old left hand material. They then turn to new left-hand concepts while using only old right-hand material. Thus, there’s no psychological overload, and old concepts are consistently reviewed. After learning the new concepts separately, the new right- and left-hand skills are then applied in combination in the “putting it together” section.

**DF:** The book has an opening section on simple (that is, unsyncopated) rhythms, starting with the usual whole, half, & quarter and gradually introducing 8ths, 16ths, triplets,
and dotted rhythms with an emphasis on things that many of my students have found troublesome, especially beginning measures with a rest, tied notes over the bar lines, quarter note and half note triplets etc. Syncopations are introduced in the next section with a (I think) unique explanation as to the role of anticipation. The first group of syncopations deal with one per measure, depending on which beat is anticipated. Then these are combined in yone exercise, but never in the same measure. Then two syncopations per measure are introduced, then three, and then four. The final sections deal with double time, 3/4, 6/8, 3/8, 9/8, 12/8, cut time, with some material on odd meters and syncopated accents.

AW: I sequenced them to correspond with the beginning method books. My thinking was that teachers would be more likely to use A Rhythm a Week as a supplement if it presented the rhythms in the same order they would already be teaching. Unison playing is the best way to learn rhythms, not harmony. Teachers should have students play in unison a lot more than we do. Precision – or lack of it – is more clearly heard, and of course unison playing is most helpful for intonation. This book not only provides unison experiences, but also reinforces the scale patterns. Another thing I like about A Rhythm a Week is that each measure moves to the next note of the scale. There are at least two advantages to this: 1) it is a musical entity with a shape and a melody, not just something that could just as easily be played on a practice pad or clapped, and 2) students who try to “coast” can easily hide when all the notes are on one pitch, but the changing pitches reveal the students who are unsure. (This is not to embarrass the student of course, but to give the teacher a true picture of each person’s success.)
DB: Part of it is personal teaching preference. Part of it is, Haskell Harr, Roy Burns or whatever. You had 40,000 people using those books. So, you wanted to put your own stamp on it and we introduce some things differently like the seven-stroke roll. Basically again, it’s what is in the history of what’s out there, what do the majority of teachers teach? Again, you have the correlation between major band methods and such. How do they introduce? So, that’s kind of the logic behind that.

RG: First of all, we start with macrobeats and microbeats. We are dealing with probably executive skill issues a bit here in the sense that the kids start to articulate with simple connected and separated styles. At the same time they’re learning those simple macrobeats and microbeats, we have them play lots of tunes. We’ll have kids in the first year of instruction that can play 50, 100 or more tunes by ear and have not read any notation. Then we introduce the next function, because it’s going to involve a little bit more executive skill.

JF: My entire rationale for rhythm is based on the notion that rhythm, as a musical phenomenon, derives from the melody and text of music repertoire, and in particular, folk music repertoire. The repertoire may be printed or passed along in the aural tradition. *The Individualized Instructor*, (1970) GIA Publications, Inc, was my first implementation of this notion. The page format reveals the strategy of starting with a song appropriate to beginning instrumental students in terms of range and rhythmic content. The song is taught through singing to establish a rhythmic, tonal, and expressive vocabulary that can be used to teach instrumental performance and music literacy. (See Froseth, Delzell, Grunow. *Teaching Skills Workbook*, pages 2 and 3 for procedures for teaching a rote song). Once the melody,
rhythm, and phrasing are competently expressed through singing, performance objectives can readily be established and easily understood. The first objective is to generalize what has been sung to instrumental performance with particular attention given to tempo, rhythm, melody, and phrasing. The second objective is to generalize the sound of the melodic rhythm patterns to 1) rhythmic movement, 2) rhythmic syllables, and 3) rhythmic notation. The sequence can be outlined with the following descriptive sequence.

- Feels like*
- Sounds like*
- Looks like*

*(Refer to pages 19-24 of the Teaching Skills Workbook for an illustration of procedures. Also refer to the Teacher’s Guide to the Individualized Instructor, pages 15-35 and 38, 39, and 48 for rationale and procedures). You will note in all my published works for beginning instrumental music students that the first repertoire in the sequence emphasizes the need to develop the ability to maintain a steady beat. (The term “beat” is best defined as the musical ictus of the conductor’s baton). In order to accommodate the need to emphasize musical phrasing from the start, simple two beat elongations are also included. Second in the hierarchy of rhythmic pattern presentation is repertoire that serves to develop students’ ability to subdivide a steady beat into even 2s (2/4 eight-notes), and subsequently, into even 3s (6/8 eighth notes). Subsequent to the critical need to maintain a steady beat and evenly subdivide the beat into 2s and 3s, the presentation of repertoire expands rhythmic pattern vocabulary to include patterns of sound and silence; patterns that include a variety of elongations; subdivisions of subdivisions; and combinations of beats, elongations, sounds and silence, and subdivisions of subdivisions. (The
specific order of rhythmic pattern presentation for *Do It! Play In Band* is illustrated in *Rhythmic Flashcard Set One* [Appendix B], GIA Publication, Inc., MLR-421 and *Rhythmic Flashcard Set Two* [Appendix C], GIA Publication, Inc., MLR-423. You may also review the sequence of rhythmic pattern presentation and associated repertoire in the “Rhythmic Pattern Dictionaries” found in *Do It! Play In Band*, Books 1 and 2. These listings, however, take some sequential liberties in order to make it easier for students to locate specific patterns in the dictionaries. The first series ever to include a sound sheet with the book was *Introducing the Instruments* (James O. Froseth, GIA 1976). The first long tones introduced were unarticulated sound models with specific pitches presented in a call and response format on the brass mouthpiece, mouthpiece barrel assembly, or double reed. (For purposes of this discussion, my definition of a long tone for a beginner is one sustained for 4 beats at a mm=100). Immediately the long tone was transformed into an articulated long breath line (connected style and separated style). If done properly the long tone and the articulated long breath line are fundamentally the same thing. Subsequently, long tone exercises on the assembled instrument are immediately followed by articulated single tones and changing tones. The primary objective was to get the student prepared to play a tune as soon as possible.

We have all observed the hapless beginner who cannot sustain a long tone with any sense of the beat. We have also observed page after page of whole notes and whole rests designed to “set the embouchure.” Sometimes this approach is called the “blat-rest” method. It is entirely unrelated to anything musical (such as musical repertoire) and does not encourage a sense of the basic beat. (For purposes of this
discussion, the “basic beat” is defined as the ictus of the conductor). A long tone approach, if carried on for a prolonged period of time, sometimes results in the notion that music is a series of single notes (tu__ tu__ tu__tu__ or, sometimes, hu__ hu__ hu__ hu__). I believe this happens because too little attention is given to articulation with long tone exercises. Too much time spent on long tones, and the absence of real music repertoire, also can lead to tedium, boredom and drop-outs. It is unnecessary to delay the introduction of the rhythmic pattern (that is, the articulated long breath line). When the articulated breath line is established early on, the performance of music repertoire can become the focus of the curriculum. In all my publications for young players, music repertoire is what drives the program. When I started to write my first series, *The Individualized Instructor*, the major problem was to find children’s songs that had appropriate rhythmic content and range for the beginner. An analysis will reveal that first three or four tunes are all composed of rhythmic patterns that express the basic beat with long tones of no more than two beats.

The “Rhythmic Building Blocks Hierarchy” handout is the basis for my rhythmic presentation (Appendix A). The best view of my presentation of rhythmic patterns can be found in the Rhythmic Flashcard Set One (Appendix B), and Set Two (Appendix C) summary sheets. You should note that the flashcards represent rhythm as patterns. The key to understanding my thinking about rhythmic presentation is the term pattern. Music repertoire is composed of patterns. Rhythmic/melodic patterns are the “building blocks” of the musical phrase and form in music repertoire.
4. Do you have a personal preference for a system to teach rhythms? Why or why not?

BP: The teaching of rhythms and the utilization of counting systems are not the same. One of our goals, as teachers, is to help students to audiate. That is, to hear the musical line (both pitch and rhythmically) before they play it. Research indicates that every counting system has drawbacks and no one counting system has advantages over another. A counting system must be consistent within itself and accompanied by physical activity to assist in the rhythmic development. Students must have mastery of both pitch and rhythmic "sets". Please see my SOE [Standard of Excellence] conductors' score for articles and activities. The instrument should become the extension of what the child hears in their head before they play. Too many young musicians use their instruments as "tonal crutches". I have used with much success the Down-Up System illustrated in the back of the Conductor's Score.

SF: I have always been most successful with 1 e & a.

JO: Obviously 1e&a

WB: The majority of my teaching experience, 20+ years, is in band. Teaching counting to band students I have had great success using the "1 e & a" system. I couple this with foot tapping and the physical feeling of the down beat on the number and up beat on the &. I also use the visual association of each beat as a circle - slice it in half vertically to get the two halves of the beat, the number (left half) and the & (right half). It is very easy to use this visual to explain a dotted quarter note - why your foot needs to go "down, up, down" before moving on to the accompanying eighth note. From there, it's lots of repetition through a variety of activities:

Count/clap/tap, writing in the counting and drawing in the bar lines, creating new
measures, etc. I have taught string orchestra for 2 years. I have had good success using numbers for quarter notes, and introducing all other rhythm patterns with a word phrase. Once students have developed the bow stroke/feeling of various rhythms along with saying the word phrase, it has been a smooth transition to move to the "1 e & a" system.

ES: Yes. As stated above.

AD: As I described, I do like Gordon/Froseth, especially because of its initial aural presentation, movement, etc. But it’s very easy to learn visually, it’s very clunky to put in print and books are printed! One drawback of Gordon is that it never identifies the beat number (purposefully) so the kids never truly identify, say, beat 1 as “1.” They feel it, to be sure, but it never is titled. Here at BYU the students are taught both Gordon and the McHose system, which is kind of a combination of Gordon and the default; i.e., students chant “1-tay, 2-tay, 3-tay, 4-tay” for straight eighths. I like that a lot, and I’ve become a believer over the past 3 years, because the beat is identified. The problem, frankly, is that McHose has been dead for a generation or more, and very few people are out there espousing the system, and thus, it’s difficult to train and/or put in print. The standard default (1e&a) still works, and in many respects is like McHose only with less consistent syllablization.

DF: I think it essential that a player be able to sing every rhythm. In this way he develops his inner hearing, the basis for good musicianship.

AW: Yes, I always teach students to count each beat of the measure as a number – 1, 2, 3, 4 – and the subdivisions as &s. This system is used by professionals, so I didn’t have to “upgrade” the students from one to another. The advantages of using the
numbers, instead of something like “ta, ta, ta, ta” is that you always know where you are located within the measure, as well as how long the note lasts. More information is always good.

DB: For me, if it was just a straight book like that, I would still do 1e&a. There’s just no simpler mathematical way to equate two eighths equal a quarter note and four sixteenths equal this. Subdivision for me is everything. As a jazz musician, subdivision of the beat and where it falls is very important. But that’s changing a little bit.

JF: My preference is expressed in a rhythmic learning sequence titled “The Comprehensive Rhythmic Learning Sequence.” It was developed and published in association with The Comprehensive Music Instructor.

5. Do you approach rhythms from different perspectives depending on if you are writing for percussion or winds? Why or why not? (Asked of authors of band method books.)

SF: If only for snare drum, I am influenced by the fact that they cannot sustain a note in the beginning.

JO: No. I use interesting rhythms in both wind and percussion parts.

ES: No.

DF: No. Here again, the basis is inner hearing.

RG: Basically, we didn’t. We do have another percussion book that’s coming out…it’s in the works…where we’re going to do some auxiliary things for percussion. We have the kids playing all those different rhythms on practice pads and also playing them on a keyed instrument. But we are developing some other things where they’ll be learning some more rudiments and things like that because we want to augment
that percussion book. I think it needs augmentation. But the unique thing about how we treat percussion is that everybody learns to play a melodic instrument—they’re just not banging on a drum... We bring everybody down the same road because I want everyone to have that rhythm proficiency.

6. *Since the book is for strings, what role does the bowing movement play in learning rhythms? Did that influence the way you approached teaching the rhythms?* (Asked of authors of string method books.)

AD: Bow movement has much to do with our decisions as demonstrated by Suzuki and Rolland. Hence the presentation order as discussed above (question 3). Short steady detaché strokes are followed by physically similar subpatterns of the same basic detaché bowings. Note that we always start with clapping (movement) and chanting (aural), then airbow, then finally the bow is placed on the string. Movement is central here.

AW: Yes! Bowing is what makes rhythm a challenge for string players. Awkward bowings make rhythm patterns much more difficult. The right bowing makes all the difference. So I spent a great deal of time making the bowings the most natural and effective. Also I made each of the four lines begin with a down bow, so that they could easily be isolated for drill, or be used in creative ways. Sometimes I even changed a rhythm so that the bowing would work out.

7. *What system(s) were you taught as a child?*
BP: As a child I was taught the traditional 1 &, 2 &, 3 & etc. system. The problem with that system is that one can't differentiate between eighth notes in simple meter and eighth notes in complex meters.

SF: 1e&a

JO: 1e&a

WB: As a beginning flute student, I was taught solely using the "1 e & a" system.

ES: 1e&a

AD: 1e&a, also MUCH rhythmic movement and singing (my parents were music teachers).

DF: See my previous answer regarding Pasquale Bona.

AW: 1, 2, 3, 4 – and the subdivisions as &s. (I would imagine that most of us teach as we were taught!)

DB: 1e&a, without question.

RG: What I recall about it was numbers. But it really had very little to do with what I am talking about now. I could count…figure out where 1 went and 2 went. But the big issue was not figuring out where the syllables were, but could you keep a consistent tempo while you were doing it? That’s really what we stress. So, I’m sure I used numbers when I was a kid. I never used Ta Ti Ti because I never went through a general music program. But I used numbers. And then I went through the earlier system which I talk about in that article of…1 na ne 2 na ne 1 na ne 2 na ne. I went through that system for a short amount of time. And in that article I also indicate that in the late seventies we switched over to Du Da De Du Da De Du ta Da ta De ta Du. And Du De Du De…it’s much simpler.
JF: I was taught the duple 1-and-2 and, 1-e-an-da 2-e-an-da and triple 1-an-da 2-an-da.

No one ever taught me a subdivision of the triple syllables, probably because 1-e-an-e-da-e 2-e-an-e-da-e is difficult to articulate and not at all musical or rhythmic.

7. What system(s) did you use as a teacher?

BP: In the early years of my teaching I used the traditional 1 &, 2 &, 3 & system but during the later years of my teaching I used the down up system.

SF: A variety. But this [1 e & a] one works best for me.

JO: 1e&a. I was a "fanatic" when it came to making sure kids could read well. If they understand rhythm well everything else falls into place. I get very frustrated when I conduct honor bands that really don't read very well. A few years back I was commissioned to write a piece for an Allstate high school band. I included lots of 5/8, 7/8, etc., and it was like pulling teeth to get the kids through the piece.

WB: I have used both the "1 e & a" system, and various word phrase associations. My choice of counting systems has depended on the age/experience of the students, students' previous experience in vocal/classroom music, using what works and making applications/transfer to future music.

ES: Above plus foot tap.

AD: All of those mentioned in #5, with a bit of Kodály and Orff thrown in.

AW: Only this one [1 & 2 & 3 & 4 &]. I consider myself so fortunate that I have had the freedom to make this choice. I know teachers who are bound to use a counting system that they would never choose – or use themselves - and it is most difficult.

DF: Since my degree is in composition, not pedagogy, I never used any particular system but sort of worked it out as I went along.
RG: When I taught in the public schools, for seven years I was still using just numbers. But when I taught in a laboratory school at the University of Michigan, I started with 1 ne 2 ne and all that and gradually switched to Du Da De, whatever it happened to be. And then, at the Eastman School of Music, I mean I’ve been here for 25 years and I’ve using the syllable system that’s in the book.


- The absence of numbers allows the syllables to be generalized to any common measure signature.
- The syllables are easily sung. Numbered systems are not.
- The syllables can be taught with a simple teacher call-student response.
- Syllable articulations can be applied directly to wind instrument articulations. Syllable articulations sung are virtually the same as syllable articulations played.
- The syllables can be used to teach the connected style of articulation, the separated style of articulation, crescendo, decrescendo, accent, and sforzando.
in addition to the full range of musical dynamics through the teacher call-student response.

- With the addition of the syllables “dit” (light and short), “doo-dle-di” (accent on di), “dot” (soft and sharp accent) “DOT!” (forte with hard accent), “dop” (soft and light accent) and “DOP!” (forte with light accent), they are an ideal means to develop jazz style articulations.

- They are, above all else, eminently musical.

As children, all but one of the authors in the study were taught to read rhythms using Harr’s counting system. At some point in their teaching careers, all of the authors that taught also used this same counting system. Presently, three of the five prefer the Harr system. Barden stated that she used a combination of Harr, foot tapping and word phrases.

**Student Surveys**

On October 25 and November 1, 2004, the researcher surveyed middle school and high school band students respectively who were auditioning for the St. Louis Suburban Music Educators All-Suburban bands. The surveys yielded 276 respondents. Students came from 31 middle schools and 21 high schools, representing at least 20 school districts in the St. Louis metropolitan area. The majority of the respondents (235) came from the middle school auditions. The researcher attributes the difference in participation numbers to the fact that the middle school students had the assent form included on their audition form. On the other hand, the high school students were given their assent form separately. In many cases, the high school students did not have their assent form with them when they arrived at the audition. In these cases, the researcher provided them with
another assent form only if their parents were present or if the student was over the age of 18. In addition, the high school auditions presented a problem in that there was more than one entrance, unlike that of the middle school auditions. In the case of the middle school auditions, all students entered through one door and were easily accessible.

The students were asked to complete a survey while they were waiting to register for their audition. The survey asked questions concerning which systems they had been taught, which systems they currently use, and their perception of how they learn (Appendix D). The purpose of the student surveys was to determine the number of rhythm systems to which the students had been exposed. The rhythm systems were then compared to the intelligences at which the students believed they were best. This was done as per the first two hypotheses that most students knew or used up to two rhythm systems as compared to more than two perceived intelligences.

In order make comparisons, the researcher sorted the different combinations of rhythms and learning styles the students and teachers cited, and assigned numbers to each combination. The frequency of use for each system was arrived at by determining the number of times that each combination that included that particular system was used and then adding the number of all the combinations that included that system.

*Rhythm Systems Taught and Used*

There seemed to be a strong relationship between the systems taught and systems used (Table 11). For example, of the 255 students taught the Harr system, 250 claimed to use it.
Of the 8 rhythm systems listed on the survey, all 8 were chosen at least once when asked which systems they were taught and which ones they use. The frequency that each system was taught or used varied widely (Tables 11 and 12).

There was a large disparity in students’ answers when asked which rhythm systems they had been taught. Students responded overwhelmingly that they had been taught the Harr system (94.20%). In fact, all students from 13 of the middle schools and 15 of the high schools indicated that they were taught the Harr system exclusively. The system with the next highest response was the Kodály system (7.60%). The least frequently taught system was Gordon’s (.72%). 29 or 48.97% of the schools were cited as teaching only one system. Of those schools, 28 or 96.55% use the Harr system. 10 schools or 20.40% taught more than two systems.

When asked which systems they used, students gave similar responses. The Harr system was the most frequently cited (94.20%). Again, the least used system was Gordon’s (1.08%).

_Students’ Learning Styles_

Students’ responses concerning learning styles indicated that all styles were accounted for to some extent (Tables 13 and 14). Word-smart was cited most often (44.20%) followed by Music-smart and Number-smart. The least cited learning style was Nature-smart (4.71%).

An analysis of the scatter plots in Tables 15 and 16 reveal that a large majority of students were taught and use the Harr system. However Table 18 shows that there is no trend towards the students’ perceived learning styles. There was no correlation between either the systems taught or used and their perceived learning styles (0.0525 and -0.0158...
respectively). These correlations and an examination of scatter plots in Tables 15-17 suggest that students use the systems they were taught but not necessarily the system the best appealed to their learning style. The wide variety of learning styles cited by students is in sharp contrast to the concentration of students identifying Harr system as their only exposure to rhythm systems. The fact that most schools do not teach more than two systems (79.60%) would support this idea also.

After reviewing the results, the researcher felt that the statistics might be somewhat skewed in two ways. First, the researcher’s bias may have played a part in the variety of results in the survey since his students had all been taught multiple rhythm systems including Harr, Sueta, Kodály, and mnemonics. Although these students accounted for 9.78% of the respondents, they completely accounted for 7 of the 26 system combinations in the area of systems taught (26.92%), and a majority of 2 other combinations. In the area of systems used, these same students accounted for 5 of the 17 system combinations (29.41%). The second possible source of skewing may be found in the similarities between the McHose/Eastman and the Harr systems. Sueta and Kodály are also similar. If students chose one system mistaking it for the other system, then it would be possible for a small statistical error.

Teacher Surveys

On January 26-27, 2005, the researcher surveyed music educators attending the Missouri Music Educators Association convention. In addition to the questions that were asked of the middle school and high students, teachers and college students were asked to answer several other questions. These questions concerned their background with rhythm systems, which systems they use in their teaching, their perception of their
personal intelligences, questions about their choice of method books, their knowledge of research concerning their system of choice and their willingness to change systems if presented with research showing another system to be superior (Appendix E1 and E2).

While the music educators were standing in line waiting to register for the convention, the researcher gave surveys to those teachers and college students who agreed to complete it. 450 surveys were distributed with a return rate of 393 or 87.3%. Teachers simply not choosing to return their survey can account for the difference between the surveys distributed and returned. Not all teachers completed second page of the survey. Of the 393 people that returned the survey, 16 (4%) did not complete the second page. These 16 surveys were eliminated from the study.

There was a somewhat equal distribution of teaching experience (Table 18). Likewise, the distribution of grade level was similar with the exception of college teachers and college students in grade level responsibilities (Table 19).

In the category of area specialty, orchestra teachers seem under represented when compared to the other areas of band, vocal and general music (Table 20). This is possibly because orchestra programs are not as prevalent in Missouri schools as the other three.

After examining the demographics of the respondents, the researcher felt that the sample was appropriate for this study.

*Teachers’ Experience with Rhythm Systems*

Teachers were asked four questions to determine their experience with various rhythm systems. These questions asked what rhythm systems were taught to them as children, what systems were taught to them in college, which systems they teach their students and which systems they personally use (Tables 21-28).
Teachers overwhelmingly cited the Harr system as the one they were taught and the one they use. The Kodály system was the second most system cited in all four categories. The least cited was the Froseth/Blaser system, with Gordon and Sueta next.

It should be noted that, of the four questions asking the teachers’ experiences with rhythms, the most varied responses came from the one concerning the rhythms systems they were taught in college (Table 26). All of the systems were cited as being taught to some degree.

When asked why they use their preferred rhythm system(s) (Table 29), most teachers answered that they based their decision on their personal experience (259 or 65.9%). The next most cited reason was, “It’s the way I was taught” (189 or 48%). “Research support reasons” was cited the least (44 or 11.2%).

The lack of teachers using research as a reason to choose a rhythm system may be explained by examining the answers to questions 12 and 13 (Tables 30 and 31). Question 12 asked if the respondent was familiar with any research dealing with the rhythm system they used. 280 (75%) of the teachers stated that they did not know of research that dealt with their system. When asked, “If presented with research that showed another rhythm system to be more effective, would you switch,” most teachers indicated that they were unsure if they would (209 or 55.7%). 119 people said that they would switch and 46 people said that if presented with research that showed another system to be more effective they would not change the system they use.

The researcher examined these numbers further by dividing them into categories of knowing and not knowing the research (Table 32). Teachers that did not know of any research concerning their preferred rhythm system were more likely to adopt a new
system than those who did know of research. An examination of the same questions sorted according to teaching experience (Tables 33-37) showed that teachers with 11-20 years of teaching experience were more likely to know of research concerning rhythm than the other experience groups, and teachers with 0-5 years of experience to be the least likely. However, teachers with 0-5 years of experience claimed to be more willing to adopt a new rhythm system if presented with research than any of the other groups (Tables 38-42).

Teachers were asked to identify which systems they knew and could teach, knew but did not feel qualified to teach and those that did not know (Table 43). 360 of the teachers (99%) indicated that they knew the Harr system and felt comfortable teaching it, making it the best known system. Froseth, Gordon, and Sueta were the least known systems. The reason for these data can be understood when comparing these figures to those dealing with the systems that music educators were taught as children and in college.

Teachers with more experience did not seem to feel more qualified to teach the various rhythm systems than those with less experience (Tables 45-49). The exception was the McHose/Eastman system. Teachers with 16 or more years tended to feel more qualified to teach rhythms using the McHose/Eastman than did teachers with less than 16 years of experience.

*Teachers’ Choice of Rhythm Systems*

In their own teaching experience, music teachers seem to revert to the use of a smaller number of systems even though they may have been taught more than one rhythm system in college, with the Harr and Kodály systems being used most (Tables 26 and 27).
Teachers also indicated that they prefer to use the Harr system in their own personal practice (Table 28).

A number of teachers indicated that they teach certain rhythm systems to the exclusion of others (Table 49). 168 teachers said that they only use the Harr system. Of those teachers, 225 teachers teach on the middle or high school level. Elementary teachers preferred the Harr system, but were more likely than any other level to use the Kodály system (37) (Table 50). Analyzing the choice of rhythm systems from the aspect of specialty areas (Table 51) reveals that band, orchestra and vocal teachers are more apt to use the Harr system. General music teachers were evenly split between Harr and Kodály rhythm systems.

*Teachers’ Choice of Method Books*

250 teachers indicated that they used a method book. These teachers were asked to select the possible reasons for their choice (Table 52). The most popular reason teachers selected was the way that the book progressed (52.4%). 11.6% of the teachers chose method books based on the rhythm system it advocated. The two least cited reasons for choosing a method book were research support reasons (10 teachers, or about 4%) and the reputation of the publisher (4 teachers, or about 1.6%). Most people named method books that use some form of number counting system (Table 53). 70 people use the two books by Pearson, which do not use any particular system. 50 people indicated that they used some other method book.

*Teachers’ Perception of Personal Intelligences*

Teachers were asked to indicate which personal intelligences they felt applied to them. The researcher determined that teachers listed 141 different combinations of
learning styles. As was the case with the middle and high school students, there was a wide variety of combinations, with no discernable pattern (Table 54). There is no correlation between learning styles and the rhythm systems used by teachers.

Teachers identified music-smart and word-smart more frequently as their learning styles than any other (237 and 229 respectively). Number-smart was the sixth most cited learning style (Table 55).

Comparing Students and Teachers

Since the number of teachers responding to the survey was 38.7% larger than the student sample, the researcher converted raw data to percentages in order to compare the responses of the two groups more accurately. The three areas that the researcher was able to compare were systems taught, systems used and perceived learning styles (Tables 57-59).

The comparison of rhythm systems revealed a higher correlation between the students and the teachers than does the comparison of learning styles. The largest difference seems to be the Kodály system. In both comparisons of systems taught and systems used, the researcher found the Kodály system utilized at a higher percentage by teachers than by students.
Chapter 5

Discussion

This study examined the various systems of teaching students to read rhythms. First, a study was made of rhythm systems available in various publications. The researcher examined most of the instrumental method books that are available to music educators to determine which rhythm systems were being utilized. Finally, the researcher surveyed band students and music teachers in order to learn what their experiences were with the various rhythm systems and indicate their perception of their individual learning styles.

The reader should understand that the results to the question concerning learning styles might not reflect the same results that an in-depth study in this area would have yielded. However, the researcher believes that the wide variety of answers do merit consideration when discussing the possibility of using different approaches to teaching rhythm.

Rhythm Systems

The researcher was unable to find any rhythm system that was without some drawback. Most of the issues seem to center around consistency. For example, the Harr system would have students count three quarter notes and three triplets exactly the same (Figure 12). It would be understandable for students to become confused when presented with this aspect of Harr’s system.
Likewise, the Froseth/Blaser system seems to have issues with dotted eighth-sixteenth rhythms (Figure 13). In this case, it could be argued that the purpose of the syllables is to represent the function of the note in the measure rather than the count or the value.

A review of the available literature does not provide any conclusive evidence that one system is superior to another for all students. However, an examination of all the systems shows obvious differences. The researcher feels that these differences provide an opportunity for music students to choose the system that best appeals to their personal learning styles.

Method Books

Many method books advocated no particular rhythm system. The most common reason given for this was that rhythm systems were the personal choice of the teacher. Counting systems were used most often in books that advocated a particular system. Only small variations between the books exist in the order in which rhythms are
introduced. The orchestra method books seem to begin with quarter and eighth notes. Whereas most band method books begin with whole and half notes, presumably to establish a good embouchure and tone. However, a few authors of band method books disagree with this approach. These authors favored the introduction of the quarter notes first and were more likely to cite some form of research in the area of child development and learning theory to support their position.

Of the books that were examined, the researcher found only one that approached rhythms using a plurality of systems. However, that book, *The Individualized Instructor* (Froseth, 1973), does not seem to be widely used.

If students learn in variety of ways, the researcher then feels that it might be better for method books to refrain from advocating any rhythm system rather than a single system. In this way, music teachers would have the option of using any and all systems they chose. However, if the purpose of including systems in the method book is to assist the teacher to teach and the student to learn, then using a plurality of systems in the manner of Froseth’s *Individualized Instructor* may be in the best interest of the student.

*Author Input*

The researcher contacted authors of some of the method books in order to ascertain reasons for their choice of rhythm systems, the sequential order that the rhythms are introduced, and their background in the area of rhythm.

Based on the results of the teacher survey, it was not surprising to find that all but one of the authors had learned to read rhythms with some form of the Harr system. It was surprising to find the extent to which some of the authors based their content decisions on marketability. With few exceptions, authors did not cite any research for
their choices. In fact, some went by their personal observations or impressions of what they thought were the best systems. Phrases like “I believe,” “I feel,” and “it has been my experience,” arose often in their explanation of their decision to use a particular rhythm system. The researcher wonders if such an approach perpetuates the status quo. On the other hand, it may be that any innovations in rhythm pedagogy will be ignored by music teachers, supporting Froseth’s earlier statement that music teachers “tend to down on what they’re not up on.” Indeed, 88% of all surveyed teachers indicated that they either would not or were unsure as to whether they would change their approach to teaching rhythms, even if presented with research showing another system to be superior. This would seem to reinforce Pape’s (1992) position that teachers tend to ignore research and teach as they were taught.

Student Surveys

The student surveys did not reveal anything unexpected as far as the use of the Harr system was concerned. However, the lack of other systems, specifically the Kodály system was surprising. Even though the Kodály system was the second most cited system taught, the numbers reveal 14 of 21, or 66%, of those students were the students of the researcher.

With the move toward differentiation in education, it becomes evident that music educators, in general, are not addressing the learning differences between students. An examination of Tables 16 and 18, clearly shows that, although students claim to learn in a wide variety of styles, music educators almost exclusively use one method to teach rhythms.
Additionally, the most frequently chosen learning style was Word-smart, followed by Music-smart and then Number smart. We may safely assert that the Harr and other counting systems deal with mathematical relationships since they require knowledge of addition and division. Tables 14 and 15 show that about 44% of the students claim to be Word-smart, while only about 36% claim to be number-smart. Moreover, 78 students chose word-smart that did not choose number-smart. Conversely, only 55 students selected number-smart and did not select word-smart. Therefore, it would seem that a system of reading rhythms other than counting systems would be preferable to most students. If music educators adhere to the belief, as Duvall (1960, p. 144) insisted, that “unless the director standardizes a system of counting for his band, and insists that every member learn and use that system, he will be forever plagued with problems of rhythm,” then we may be ignoring the learning strengths of our students.

Teacher Surveys

The teacher surveys helped to confirm the researcher’s hypotheses with the exception of part of the first: “…instrumental music teachers and students have little or no knowledge of more than one or two rhythm systems and limit their study or use of rhythm to these one or two rhythm systems.” The surveys did reveal that many teachers did have some knowledge of more than two rhythm systems. However, based on questions 14-21, that knowledge seems to be somewhat limited.

The researcher had previously believed that the Harr and Kodály systems would be the only systems that teachers would cite. It was surprising that many of the teachers revealed that they had been exposed to more systems in college. Nevertheless, most teachers did not utilize the systems they had learned in college once they began teaching.
The responses for the question concerning why teachers use their preferred system showed some inconsistencies. Only 44 teachers (12.1%) base their choice of rhythm systems on research. 259 teachers (66.2%) indicated that personal experience was their reason for using their preferred system. Yet, since most teachers stated that they knew only a few systems, their personal experience would not seem to be complete enough on which to base their choice. Additionally, 68.2% of the teachers indicated that, even if they were presented with research, they either were not sure or would not switch from the rhythm system they are currently using. Another 12% indicated that they would not change their approach to teaching rhythms, even if presented with research showing another system to be superior. This would seem to reinforce Pape’s (1992) position that teachers who learned one particular system of teaching might not be willing to examine the current research and may teach the way they have always taught or the way they were taught.

According to teacher surveys, colleges seem to be teaching various systems to some extent. However, the Harr system seems to be taught on the college level more than any other system (327). Kodály is taught to a lesser extent (121), followed by McHose/Eastman (69). Keeping in mind that Harr and McHose are very similar counting systems, it would be safe to say that the majority of teachers are learning number counting systems in college more frequently than other systems. Since half of the people that identified themselves as college teachers (22) indicated that they teach the Harr system exclusively it seems evident that college students are receiving limited exposure to other systems. In fact, of the 10 college students that participated in the survey, 4 stated that the only system they had been taught on the college level was the Harr system.
When the researcher examined the learning styles that teachers identified as theirs, he found that, although most teachers preferred number/counting systems, they did not list number-smart as frequently as five other learning styles. Instead, teachers listed music-smart and word-smart most frequently with number-smart being only the sixth most cited learning style.

Significance of the study

The primary significance of the study is the finding that music educators utilize two systems a vast majority of the time. This may be attributed to the findings that teachers tend to teach in the manner they were taught. Additionally, there seems to be little in the way of curricular materials for instrumental music that would change this approach. The majority of available method books use Harr, systems similar to Harr, or no system at all. Teachers using books that advocate no particular system must rely on the system(s) they know, which tends to be minimal. This is in stark contrast to the way that students believe they learn best. Consequently, it can be concluded that, as a profession, music educators do not teach to the students’ strengths. Instead, they tend to use a single approach, possibly overlooking other systems that may appeal to a wider variety of students.

Recommendations for further study

The researcher believes that further study is warranted in several areas. Based on the examination of method books and responses from authors, it becomes obvious that the overwhelming majority of materials available use some form of number counting system. Coupled with the findings dealing with student perception of their learning styles, it would be advantageous to the profession to study the various systems, determine
which styles of learning each system appeals to, and then develop training for teachers to use the various systems in a way that would appeal to their students. Based on an analysis of the scatter plots in Tables 16, 17, and 18, and the correlations in Table 11, it seems that there is no relationship between how students believe they learn and how they are being taught to read rhythms.

Further, the researcher believes that it may not be in the best interest of the profession to study which systems “work best.” There seems to be a wide variety of systems differing in structure enough so that different ones may appeal to a number of students. Considering the research available where different systems were compared to each other, it seems that there was no clear-cut favorite. In instances where one system seemed to work better than another, no study examined the learning preferences of the students. In addition, no study explained why the results were not unanimous. Consequently, it may be better for studies to examine which systems “work” for different students.

If it is found that different approaches to teaching rhythm appeal to the various student-learning styles, the researcher feels that study would be warranted in the area of methodology.

Experimenting with new designs of method books using a plurality of rhythm systems could be another area for research. What would method books look like that teach students to read rhythms using systems that appeal to their particular learning styles? Is such a book practical and marketable? These questions could be answered in another study.
An inquiry into the methods taught at the various music education programs throughout the United States would seem to be an appropriate study. Researchers could investigate questions regarding the number of systems that future music teachers are trained in and the reason for their curriculum. Follow-up studies could explore the extent to which teachers coming from such programs use a plurality of systems once they enter the workplace.

A study showing the effects of programs that teach a multiplicity of rhythm systems versus a program that teaches only one would be an invaluable resource. Such studies could examine multiple areas of music education.

An investigation into the relationship between a student’s success in music and their ability to read and play rhythms accurately would be one possible study. This area could evolve into an investigation of the causes of student dropout rates. If it was found that student frustration with rhythms played a role in their decision to quit an instrumental program, it may prove beneficial to determine the cause of their inability to comprehend rhythms.

A study could address a comparison between the student’s learning style, the teacher’s learning style and the method being used to teach rhythms. For example, an investigation could be conducted concerning whether teachers teach systems based on their own learning style.

The rhythm comprehension of the group might be useful study. In other words, when groups read music, do they actually read the rhythms or do they learn how the piece goes through rote from the teacher or by imitation of the students who are able to read
rhythms more accurately? If it is found that the students are having difficulty reading rhythms, questions can be asked concerning the reasons.

Sight-reading effectiveness could be a related study. Is the ability to sight-read primarily a function of being able to read rhythms? If so, can students be taught to become better sight readers by teaching them according to their learning styles?
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Appendix A
Building Blocks to Rhythmic Competency (Froseth)

ABILITY TO PERFORM
PATTERNS OF TEMPORALLY CONSISTENT
"SOUND AND SILENCE"
"ELONGATIONS"
"SUBDIVISIONS"
AND
" PATTERNS"
THAT REPRESENT THE RHYTHM
OF THE MELODY OR THE RHYTHM OF THE TEXT

ABILITY TO SUBDIVIDE THE BEAT INTO
2's (DUPLE) and 3's (TRIPLE)

ABILITY TO MAINTAIN
CONSISTENT TEMPO

BUILDING BLOCKS TO RHYTHMIC COMPETENCY
Appendix B
Rhythmic Flashcard Patterns Set One (Froseth)
Appendix C
Rhythmic Flashcard Patterns Set Two (Froseth)
Appendix D
Music Student Survey

Rhythm Reading Survey

How were you taught to read rhythms by your band director? (Mark all that apply)

- 1 & 3 e & a 4
- Du Du de Du ta da ta Da
- 1 Te 3 Ta Nee Te 4
- Too Ta Ta TTTT Too
- 1 Te Te Ta Te Ta 4
- Ta Ti Ti Ti Ri Ti Ri Ta
- Car Airplane Mississippi Car (or other words)
- Other (Please Specify)
- I don't remember

How do you read rhythms now? (Mark all that apply)

- 1 & 3 e & a 4
- Du Du de Du ta da ta Da
- 1 Te 3 Ta Nee Te 4
- Too Ta Ta TTTT Too
- 1 Te Te Ta Te Ta 4
- Ta Ti Ti Ti Ri Ti Ri Ta
- Car Airplane Mississippi Car (or other words)
- Other (Please Specify)
- I don't remember

How would you describe your type of intelligence(s)? (You may choose more than one.)

- Word-smart. I work best if I can read the information.
- Number-smart. I work best using numbers/maths.
- Picture-smart. I work best when I can look at pictures.
- Music-smart. I work best when I can use music or rhythmic tool.
- Body-smart. I work best when I can move my body.
- People-smart. I work best when I can interact with other people.
- Self-smart. I work best when I can think about how I would handle the situation.
- Nature-smart. I work best when I can relate to things found in nature.

How many years have you been playing an instrument?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
Appendix E
Music Teacher Survey Page 1

Please circle the letters that correspond with your answer.

1. What is your specialty area(s)? (Mark all that apply.)
   A. Instrumental-Band
   B. Instrumental-Orchestra
   C. Vocal
   D. General

2. What grade level do you teach? (Mark all that apply.)
   A. Elementary school
   B. Middle school
   C. High school
   D. College
   E. College Student
   F. Other

3. Do you use a method book?
   A. Yes
   B. No

4. If you use a beginning method book, which one do you use? (Mark all that apply.)
   A. Accent on Achievement
   B. Artistry in Strings
   C. Best in Class
   D. Do It!
   E. Essential Elements
   F. Essential Elements 2000
   G. Jump Right In
   H. Sounds Spectacular
   I. Standard of Excellence
   J. String Explorer
   K. Yamaha Band Student
   L. Other

For questions 5-8, please choose the letters from the options listed below:

- A
- B
- C
- D
- E
- F
- G
- H
- I

5. What rhythm system(s) were you taught as a child? (Mark all that apply.)
   A B C D E F G H I

6. What rhythm system(s) were you exposed to in college? (Mark all that apply.)
   A B C D E F G H I

7. Which rhythm system(s) do you teach to your students? (Mark all that apply.)
   A B C D E F G H I

8. Which rhythm system(s) do you personally use when you are performing? (Mark all that apply.)
   A B C D E F G H I

9. Why do you use your preferred rhythm system? (Mark all that apply.)
   A. It’s the way I was taught.
   B. It’s the only rhythm system I feel comfortable with.
   C. Research supported reasons.
   D. Personal experience says it’s the best one.
   E. Other

10. How many years teaching experience do you have?
    A. 0-5 years
    B. 6-10 years
    C. 11-15 years
    D. 16-20 years
    E. More than 20 years

11. Why do you use your current method book? (Mark all that apply)
    A. I like the way it progresses.
    B. I picked it based on the reputation of the author.
    C. It was recommended to me.
    D. My school district uses it.
    E. It is a popular method.
    F. I like the rhythm system it uses.
    G. I picked it based on the publisher.
    H. Research supported reasons.
    I. Other

*Note: The text contains musical notation and symbols, which cannot be accurately represented in text format.*
12. Are you aware of any research that deals with the effectiveness of the rhythm system(s) you use?  
A. Yes  
B. No

13. If presented with research that showed another rhythm system to be more effective, would you switch?  
A. Yes  
B. No  
C. I don’t know

For questions 14-21, please rate the following rhythm systems using the scale below:  

A. I understand this rhythm system and feel qualified to teach it.  
B. I know this rhythm system but do not feel qualified to teach it.  
C. I do not know this rhythm system.

14. 1 2 & 3 e & a 4 (Harr)  
A B C
15. Ta Ti Ti Ti Ri Ti Ri Ta (Kodaly)  
A B C
16. Car Air-plane Mississippi Car (or other words) (Mnemonic)  
A B C
17. Du Du De Du ta de ta Du (Froseth/Blaser)  
A B C
18. 1 2 te 3 ta Ne ta 4 (Gordon)  
A B C
19. Too Ta Ta TTTT Too (Sueta)  
A B C
20. 1 2 te 3 ta te ta 4 (McHose/Eastman)  
A B C
21. BRIM (Breath Impulse) (Middleton & Robinson)  
A B C

22. Which types of personal intelligences best apply to you?  
(Mark all that apply)  
A. Word-smart—I work best if I can read the information.  
B. Number-smart—I work best using numbers/math.  
C. Picture-smart—I work best when I can look at pictures.  
D. Music-smart—I work best when I can use music or a rhythmic tool.  
E. Body-smart—I work best when I can move my body.  
F. People-smart—I work best when I can interact with other people.  
G. Self-smart—I work best when I can think about how I would handle the situation.  
H. Nature-smart—I work best when I can relate to things found in nature.

23. Please circle your major performance area.  
A. Flute  
B. Oboe  
C. Bassoon  
D. Clarinet  
E. Saxophone  
F. Trumpet  
G. Horn  
H. Trombone  
I. Euphonium  
J. Tuba  
K. Percussion  
L. Keyboard  
M. Violin  
N. Viola  
O. Cello  
P. Bass  
Q. Voice  
R. Other
Appendix F
Dabczynski Correspondence

The researcher contacted Dr. Andrew H. Dabczynski at Brigham Young University, asking permission to send him questions. In his return email, before receiving the standard questions, Dr. Dabczynski wrote the following:

In essence, I agree with you. Generally, teachers default to a few standard ways to learning how to READ rhythm essentially in one or two different ways. The operative word here is READ. And I’m not sure that is necessarily a bad thing? But I think teachers use a myriad of different methods to teach rhythmic perception and beat internalization, which necessarily precedes (or should precede) the reading of rhythm, of course. One thing that has bothered me for years and may influence your study is that I believe teachers do not consider their students development level enough when teaching reading. Most method books start with a whole note and divide down to a half, then quarter, then eighth, etc. Well, that may be OK for a 5th or 6th or JHS student, but a third grader doesn’t even now what mathematical division is yet, never mind musical division. Thus, for younger students (and even for older kids), I think an additive approach is essential (1+1+1+1=whole note, etc.). I think you’ll see that reflected in our series. But all of that is moot if the child cannot feel or maintain a steady beat, which of course is an aural/physical process. Assuming the teacher recognizes this, then your notion of multiple learning styles comes to the fore. Then the notion of making the connection between aural/physical understanding and the written symbology is the domain where the teacher should also be creative in
approaching a variety of learning styles. And I think most experienced teachers attempt to do this, to the extent possible in their individual circumstance. There’s one thing that I would emphasize here, and have you keep in mind? Like most teachers, I developed my own way of doing things (rather successfully, I think) during my years in the classroom, and was often critical of the myopic view of most method books. Until I was asked to write one! Then I realized how difficult it is to basically take everything I do, and everything I believe, and all my successful teaching strategies and fit them into 48 pages! Why 48 pages? Because that, unfortunately, is the size of a book that can and will be bought on average by most students. Extensive market research has supported that for years, and many people have tried otherwise. So, the result is major generalization and short-cutting. And in the end, I think that is the reason why the “default” has occurred. Authors must (and do) assume that the teachers to whom they are appealing will use the method as a departure point, and will use their own successful strategies in addition to the published materials. The very nature and underlying philosophy of public schooling (especially in a large, group process teaching such as we normally find in string teaching) I think assumes this generalization. It is the skill of the teacher, then, that brings students from the generalized, mediocre level to a point of excellence. No book can do that.

Dr. Dabczynski later sent an email with answers to the standard questions. In addition, he included the following comments:

One thing I want to emphasize re. String Explorer that is the recognition that NO method book can, or ought to be considered as the complete method. SE
[String Explorer] is intended to be a system of well-constructed, researched, and thoroughly field-tested materials to aid THE TEACHER. While we used the default “1e&a” approach, our Teachers Manual is quite clear that the counting is there primarily as a prompt for the teacher/student to force the issue, as it were. We are consistent in the Manual and in our presentations to say that the important thing is NOT the actual system used, but rather that the teacher uses SOME counting system on a regular basis in his/her teaching. We honestly do not care which one is used, just that the teacher chooses a system and uses it daily. For this reason, you’ll notice that the visual identification of beats (1e&a) is minimally presented in the student books. It is suggested as part of the right hand, rhythm-learning preparatory sequence. The concept is that the students get in the habit of counting whatever system is championed by the teacher whenever reading rhythms. Further, counting is ALWAYS presented as a “right hand” skill, coordinated with bowing movement the two should not be separated in string teaching.

We offer lots of other prompts with the same thought intended. Note that there’s a singing/solfege example and a history highlight in each unit; there’s an Arco’s Activity Page every 4 units with theory, ear training, composition, improvisation, and world music; integrated arts activities in the teacher’s manual; listening activities in the teacher’s resource kit; lots of supplementary exercises in the teacher materials -- all to prompt and suggest that the teachers instruct comprehensively, approaching these elements on a regular basis. Hopefully that
“regular basis” will be far more often than we can possibly provide for in a 48-page book.

Ultimately, good teaching is the responsibility of the teacher. We can provide excellent materials and all our feedback confirms that we do but ultimately, it comes down to how the teacher USES the materials.

(Incidentally, and for what it’s worth, we’ve had various independent teachers do double blind studies, quite unbeknownst to us, and have reported that SE gets the students reading faster and more accurately than the other currently-popular method books. I’m confident that this is due to the separation of right- and left-hand skills before “putting it together.” This means that rhythm reading and performance is taught separately and more thoroughly, allowing students to master those skills before they gets confused by concentrating on the left hand.)
Appendix G
Grunow Interview

An interview with Dr. Richard Grunow, head of the music education department at The Eastman School of Music, July 30, 2004, 9:00 A.M. CST

Grunow (G): The most recent letter you sent to me or an email said [that] you went to Penn State and why have you never heard about Gordon and all of the above. Gordon has been out there for a long time. He started teaching at the University of Iowa back in the late fifties. The truth of it is there wasn’t a lot of practical application for his work. So you’ll certainly hear about Gordon on all of the above if you look in aptitudes and [things] like that. The practical application of his works really didn’t start to come about, with the exception of Froseth’s *IndividualizedInstructor*, which was an earlier series, until eighties. Gordon has always been a kind of controversial individual mainly because he was doing something that was so different than anyone else was doing. There’s a whole body of research to back it up but he’s also just been rather confrontational with a lot of people, and I think that also caused part of the problem.

Varley (V): Part of my research involves looking at a lot of different method books and examining what type of systems they used to teach rhythms. So there are just a couple of them that I was able to find with his. And even the ones that had his didn’t… I didn’t think did a real good job of explaining how his system works. So, you’re kind of left out in the cold.

G: Well, are you looking at the method book or are you looking at the teacher’s guide?
V: When I first started doing the research, I sent [Gordon] some email because I had some questions. And so he sent me back an e-mail and said, “Well, here’s the book I just have out. Buy it, and read it.” And then, you know…

G: His rhythm book?

V: Yes.

G: You will probably find it a little difficult to get through, and that has been a problem. Gordon’s writing has become much better in recent years. But, a lot of times it’s kind of heady and hard to get through. Writing about rhythm is difficult because you need to experience it. If you want to understand what’s in those books, you need to have a teacher’s guide. [That’s] because there’s a teacher’s guide that gives lesson plans for teaching all of those books. It’s a substantial teacher’s guide on the above. The teacher’s guide for strings is several hundred pages, probably three or 400 pages. And there’s a teacher’s guide for recorder and a teacher’s guide for winds and one for strings. But I’m looking at the teacher’s guide for recorder or strings right here and it’s 520 some pages. It does explain in there to some degree about the rhythm syllables. But you can probably find out more about it through sources as well. But the teacher’s guide is really necessary in order to teach this series.

V: There’s a problem if the series and his method isn’t all that well known. I went down to our local music stores and I never saw [the] teacher’s method book for those.

G: Keep this in mind, Paul, this is, by design, very different than other method books. For the most part, you don’t have to take a workshop. In fact it would
help if you didn’t in order to do the most with the method books that are out there. In all honesty, there isn’t much difference among all the method books that are out there. They all start with whole notes, they all start with music theory, and they start with fingering charts. In order to use *Jump Right In*, you really need to take a workshop. Now that’s by design, not just so we can make tons of money (which we don’t), but to attract good musicians to the profession. But, unlike any other profession, you need to have specific knowledge in order to teach it. Now it is used Eastman School of Music, the University of Michigan, Michigan State…lots of schools around the country. So there will be more people that are coming out of undergraduate school who are prepared to use it. But there are a lot of people that cannot use this series because they don’t have the musicianship to use it. It’s not very well known for that reason but also because it requires some skills.

V: What I’m finding [in my research] is that there’s not a lot of systems out there that people really know--that they feel confident in teaching.

G: Have you ever been to a workshop that anybody’s ever done on Gordon music clinic series?

V: No, I never have.

G: If you go to the GIML website, it’s for the Gordon Institute of Music Learning…it’ll also tell you where workshops are being held and where people are all over the country doing these. There might be something close to you and it will be much simpler to understand if you’ve experienced it.

V: I’ll check that out.
G: Froseth is a student of Gordon’s. I never was a student of Gordon’s. I’ve been working with him for 25 years but I was never a student of his. I was a student of Jim Froseth. When I was a student at the University of Michigan, I did work with Jim with *The Individualized Instructor*. But Jim was a student of Ed Gordon back in the sixties and music learning theory as it is today didn’t really take shape until the seventies when Ed was teaching at the University of Buffalo. So a lot of what your getting with Froseth, while it’s probably ahead of most, is still steeped in very early music learning theory but just in programs that Jim has developed.

V: He doesn’t approach it quite the same way.

G: There’s a big difference between what we do in *Jump Right In* and what he does in his work.

V: And I notice that he uses a lot of lyrics and I wonder how much of that he does because he thinks that it’s easier for kids to latch onto words.

G: Sometimes we do tunes with words and sometimes we don’t. In reality, if a young child’s language development is more advanced than their musical development, and if you start teaching tunes to kids with words, they will latch onto the words and they will not tend to the tonality and meter and chord changes and consistent tempo and all that kind of thing. [They] end up singing with words like (sings monotone) “Mary had a little lamb, little lamb, little lamb,” and they think they’re singing. So we have a tendency to sing songs without words but, instead, using various styles of articulation. So that when he learns the tune, we can easily teach the words. It’s a piece of cake.
V: Let me go back and asking the questions that I’m asking everybody. The first question was that you approach the rhythms using the Gordon’s system. What was your rationale for the choice the systems?

G: Well, I actually used those rhythms syllables when I was working with Jim Froseth and you’ll see in that rhythm article that I wrote, it will talk in there about the origin of those syllables. Gordon uses them a little bit differently than Froseth in various ways. When I started writing the series with Ed Gordon, we started writing lesson plans in about 1983 and obviously the rhythm syllables were something that both of us were comfortable with. So, it was just a natural thing to do. But the unique aspect of the rhythm syllables is the following, Paul: there is nothing sacred about the actual syllable itself other than the fact that they’re associated with function and not associated with note values. Many times I’ll have students that come here from another country, and it’s difficult for them to pronounce those syllables. I say to them at the time, “You need to find syllables in your own language that work for you.” Because there’s nothing sacred about the syllables. It’s just the fact that their associated with a feeling—a large paired macrobeat. When you break the macrobeats down into twos, you get another syllable. When you break them down into threes, you get another syllable. However, the unique aspect of those syllables is how you break down macrobeats. [This is] because, based on Gordon’s research, it’s the smaller beat, in other words what he calls the microbeat, [that] really what gives rise to a feeling of meter-- a feeling of duple or triple. It is paired macrobeats, and then you break it into the du de du
de or the du da di du da di. Then if you go to unusual meters, it has a different feel because the macrobeat now is not temporally equal. One of the things that was most influential is that, and I think we’re unique in this, all the rhythms that we teach do not to start with a rhythm syllables. They start with neutral syllables so that we’re not trying to teach two things at once. In other words, we want the kid to establish in his body a feeling of large beats and small beats and then he chants over top of that just a “Buh, buh, buh--- Buh Buh Buh.” When they can perform that independently, then we start to add the du de du. It’s all done without notation. Technically speaking, the child is never to see written down du de du de. Never to see it. The teacher may find it in the teacher’s guide, but he would never see that. It’s only to be heard and not to be seen.

V: I guess the problem is that a lot of teachers want to be able to have the kids look at the rhythm and say the rhythm. But they want to be able to do it on the spot. It’s got to be a sight-reading kind of a deal.

G: Well, sight reading is a bit of a myth. If I gave you a book to read in the English language, Paul, What would I say to you? Would I say, “Sight-read this book for me?”

V: No, you would say, “Read it.”

G: Exactly. What kids must be taught to do is to read and not sight-read. For example, if you go to page ten-where they first introduced the tone patterns and then maybe page eleven is the rhythm patterns? When those kids are first introduced to those rhythm patterns, for example, in their vocabulary they
already know those patterns. They have performed them. They’ve probably improvise to them. So they simply put their finger on that pattern. The teachers says, “du du de, du du de.” The student now reads what he has been performing for weeks and months. The same thing happens tonally, by the way. It’s very similar. We teach tonal patterns without syllables and then with syllables. The whole purpose of rhythm syllables is probably different for us that it is for others. Obviously it helps in reading, but rhythm syllables are just a naming process and it enables you to store more patterns in your vocabulary. And so that’s the reason for the logic—that they’re based on function. They’re not based on note values. So ultimately, when a child wants to read music, he looks at music just as you look at a book and you see words that are familiar to you. If the teacher is savvy, he’s going to get the kids notation that he’s familiar with. Now and then there will be some unfamiliar words in there. That’s similar to what happens in language. When you come to a word you don’t know, essentially you have three choices. You can blow by it (which is not a bad idea) or you can look it up in your dictionary. Or you can figure it out based on the context. Now if the kid is “sight-reading” and he comes to a rhythm he doesn’t know, many times we’ve suggested that he blow by it or they try to figure it out based on what’s around it or they dig into their dictionary. And in their dictionary are all those tonal patterns and rhythm patterns they’ve been taught with solfege.
V: Then if I were to ask a kid to perform a certain rhythm just so I could make
sure that they have that knowledge or comprehension—using this system,
then, I wouldn’t ask them to say the rhythm per se, would I?

G: You mean with syllables?

V: Yes.

G: Oh, you could. Or you could ask them to do it without it. It’s also unique to
our system in that we start without syllables. Bah Bah Bah Bah Bah. Then we
give them syllables. Then we do a lot of improvisation. Improvisation is
where the action is. It’s like conversation is in language. In other words kids
carry on conversations for several years before anybody asks them to read
language. And we’re finding the same thing needs to happen in music.
Ultimately, we want to get rid of the syllables. We don’t want them to have to
use syllables at all. But if you ask them to read with rhythm syllables, he
could.

V: If we’re going to be able to do these without having to read, you’re going to
have to learn the language first before you learn to read the language.

G: Oh, absolutely.

V: Suppose that the first time I have a chance to see these kids is sixth grade.
Then, logically, it would be to my advantage to make sure that the teachers
that have them in grades one through five are using this type of [system].

G: Oh, absolutely.
V: Because, if all they’re doing is the cultural thing or the music appreciation thing—which certainly has its place, but which, as far as I’m concerned, for me it doesn’t do any good.

G: And the worst thing that those teachers can do is introduce notation to kids. What they need to be doing is working with the kids, developing a total vocabulary, a rhythm vocabulary, not notation. And the worst of all, to have been using syllables which are associated with note values. For example, Ta’s and Ti-ti’s. That makes no sense at all. If you associate a Ta with a quarter note… it depends on the context of the quarter note what it feels like. It makes no sense at all.

V: That’s something that I haven’t quite come to grips with yet. Only because of the fact that that’s what I’ve been doing for a long time. And I’ve got a lot of flak from it too because a lot of people that I work with wants to do the 1 e & a thing.

G: Obviously I have a point of view that’s probably different. Either way is based on function, they’re all based on note values. And one of the things that you’ll notice in our book, [is] we have enrhythmic patterns. If you page over a little bit in that book you’ll come to where the kids read patterns in 4/4 and they read patterns in cut time. They sound exactly the same but they look different. It’s just that in the first one, the quarter note is a macrobeat and in the second one, a half note is a macrobeat. But they sound exactly the same. If you’re going to perform that with ta’s and ti ti’s, you’d have ta ti ti, ta ti ti
and in cut time you’d be going ta ta ta, ta ta ta. Makes no internal sense to the kid. Now you giving me the same feeling, and two different labels.

V: I see what you’re saying. Without having all the background about how the system works, I would look at it and I’d say, “Now, wait a minute.” I was always thinking that the kid would be able to sight-read it and say it right off the bat. I always thought that, with the numbers and the Gordon system, the kid had to sit down and figure out how to say it first, before he says it. He has to say, “Well, what syllable or what number am I going to put on this particular note when I say it.” So when I look at Gordon’s system, I say the same thing. I say, “Well, there’s so many different things to choose from. So what exactly does the kid say, and how does he know how to say stuff?”

G: It may seem a little difficult, but when kids come to those rhythms they just blow them off the page. In fact, if you do your job, the way [students] do it, usually, when they get to that page, you don’t even have to tell the kids what to do, they look at it and they just go, “Duh!” It’s so engrained in them!

V: Let’s say then, that I was going to sit down myself and write a method book and I decided that I wanted to use Gordon’s system. Is there a copyright on that system? Or is anybody allowed to use it?

G: You’d have to ask the publisher that. I don’t know if there is a copyright on it. Certainly Froseth uses it in all of his books. We use it in all of our books, and it’s throughout the general music series that’s associated with it. And I know many people around the country are using it. I don’t know that they’ve actually published anything with it. Who invented Do-based major and La-
based minor? I don’t think anybody gives credit to anybody for doing that. But in this case, I would just footnote it. I would document where it came from.

V: Do you think that that might have an influence on other people? They may say, “I’m not going to be able to use this system because this is something that just came up and I know who started it.”

G: No, you’re going to find his syllables are out there. They may not just be in your part of the country, but trust me, they’re all over the country and all over the world. I’ve taught in Portugal and Japan and Germany and Poland and Austria... I mean we’ve been all over the place. . .Gordon much more so than I. But those syllables are all over the world.

V: When I look at your book, the thing that I notice... and I just happen to be in the violin book... I don’t have the other... G: The rhythms are the same.

V: Well that’s my next question then. Your book starts out right away with quarter notes and eighth notes.

G: Oh, absolutely. Because the child is going to give meaning to rhythm or give meaning to the tonal. You have to start with a context. And a context is a feeling of meter. They must have that feeling of bump, bump, bump, bump.

What’s happening in all the other method books is they have that counting and holding this big fat whole note which is the hardest rhythm there is to perform because the kids cannot maintain a consistent tempo underneath it.
V: Some people don’t want to start using the rhythms too early because they haven’t gotten a decent sound out of the instrument or . . .

G: You don’t get a decent sound by playing whole notes. You get a decent sound by listening to good sounds. If you think about Suzuki, Suzuki does not start his students on whole notes. He starts “ya ta ta tum bump ya ta ta tum bump.” Those rhythms are even easier. We have all the Eastman artists playing on our CD because that’s what develops good tone quality—is hearing good tone quality. But playing whole notes and long tones, if you will, that’s a higher order skill. Think about it in terms of language. You don’t start kids speaking slowly for four or five years and then speed them up. If you want kids to establish a good tone quality…which is very suspect because nobody really agrees on what good tone quality is…they need to be performing in a tonality and in a meter from day one. Then they will develop what they want to sound like.

V: I want to push the point here just a little bit. If I’m talking about a wind instrument, and I’m worried about a kid’s embouchure, and I wanted him to play these rhythms, then they also have to use the tongue. And if the embouchure isn’t set and you start to introduce the tongue. . .

G: Oh, you do. We do it from day one. All they do is form their embouchure. And you’ll hear it on the CD on the wind tapes where we have the kids performing just with du du du du du du du du. Then they do it with the airstream. (Whispers) du du du du. Then they even perform songs with the airstream as is in (whispers rhythm to “Mary Had a Little Lamb”). It’s the
easiest thing in the world to get a kid to play with articulation and a good embouchure right up front. I know this may seem strange to you, but some of the kids that use *Jump Right In*, the first day they pick up the horn they’d be playing tunes on it. At musical tempos. . .that’s another thing that has to happen. Because if you don’t play tunes at musical tempos, the kids’ audiation does not kick in. If he’s ever going to read, it’s all about anticipation and prediction. If you don’t play tunes at musical tempo, all the kid’s going to do is imitate. He’s not going to really own the music.

V: Somewhere in the back of my mind, I remember reading Gordon saying something about that the most natural meter is three.

G: I don’t recall that. I think that what we know about learning is that kids need to have comparisons and that that’s another thing you will notice in the books is that as soon as we introduce duple, we introduce triple. . . so that they know what something is by what it’s not. We do the same thing with major. As soon as we introduce major, we introduce minor. Now, that’s just totally different from what goes on in most method books. They do duple forever. I think it’s a cultural thing. I think you might find that some kids may find triple easier, some kids may find duple easier. In America, I think you’re going to find that most kids have heard more duple than triple. It would be a cultural thing I think more than anything else. But what we do know is that they do need both from early on.
V: The next question that I had on my list, you already gave the answer to is if you approach rhythms from two different perspectives depending upon if you’re writing for winds or percussion.

G: Let me back up to the previous question. . . how did you determine the order of rhythms that are introduced in your books. First of all, we start with macrobeats and microbeats. We are dealing with probably executive skill issues a bit here in the sense that the kids start to articulate with simple connected and separated styles. At the same time they’re learning those simple macrobeats and microbeats, we have them play lots of tunes. I mean they learn tunes. We’ll have kids in the first year of instruction that can play 50, 100 or more tunes by ear and have not read any notation. Then we introduce the next function, because it’s going to involve a little bit more executive skill.

V: I’m going to stop you right there just for a second. I notice that in your book, on the front cover, you use that phrase, “executive skill.” Would you define that for me?

G: Yes. If you think of it this way: there’s two instruments that you teach. One is what we call the audiation instrument…the thinking instrument. It’s a sense of tonality, a sense of meter, developing all these tonal skills and rhythm skills and improvisation skills. Then you have executive skills. Executive skills have to do with articulation, connected-separated style, embouchure, posture, hand position, fingering. The focus today in instrumental music has been on executive skills. Very little attention has been given to audiation. When you
develop audiation, executive skills are a whole new ballgame. A much simpler ballgame. So that’s the focus. It’s just like language in a sense that you teach people to think before they speak. Unlike most politicians.

(Laughter) In the general music series, Gordon also labels patterns as “easy patterns,” “moderately difficult patterns,” and “difficult patterns.” If you look into the general music series…there’s also a Jump Right In general music series…if you look into that, you’ll find they treat rhythm in there a little bit differently than we do in the instrumental series. Now, your next one, “Do you approach rhythms from different perspectives depending on if you are writing for percussion or winds?” Basically, we didn’t. We do have another percussion book that’s coming out…it’s in the works…where we’re going to do some auxiliary things for percussion. We have the kids playing all those different rhythms on practice pads and also playing them on a keyed instrument. But we are developing some other things where they’ll be learning some more rudiments and things like that because we want to augment that percussion book. I think it needs augmentation. But the unique thing about how we treat percussion is that everybody learns to play a melodic instrument—they’re just not banging on a drum.

V: What I have noticed in other books is that the complexity of the rhythms in the percussion books comes a lot sooner than the winds. So, not having looked at a percussion book in your series…

G: We bring everybody down the same road because I want everyone to have that rhythm proficiency.
V: The next question is: when you were starting to learn music, what type of a system were you taught?

G: What I recall about it was numbers. But it really had very little to do with what I am talking about now. I could count…figure out where 1 went and 2 went. But the big issue was not figuring out where the syllables were, but could you keep a consistent tempo while you were doing it? That’s really what we stress. So, I’m sure I used numbers when I was a kid. I never used Ta Ti Ti because I never went through a general music program. But I used numbers. And then I went through the earlier system which I talk about in that article of…1 na ne 2 na ne 1 na ne 2 na ne. I went through that system for a short amount of time. And in that article I also indicate that in the late seventies we switched over to du da di du da di du da ta da ta di ta du. And du de du de…it’s much simpler.

V: When you started teaching then…

G: When I taught in the public schools, for seven years I was still using just numbers. But when I taught in a laboratory school at the University of Michigan, I started with 1 ne 2 ne and all that and gradually switched to du da di, whatever it happened to be. And then, at the Eastman School of Music, I mean I’ve been here for 25 years and I’ve using the syllable system that’s in the book.

V: That’s interesting because when I first started doing this research, the very first thing I tried to do was find out who started the 1e&a thing, and I had
heard people say, “Well, that’s the Eastman system.” Well, then I found out, no, it’s not the Eastman system.

G: There is no “Eastman system.” McHose, who taught at Eastman for years, had some syllables. Syllable systems are something that usually many people contribute to over the years whatever it happens to be. But Bruce Pearson, in his *Best in Class* book one time referred to a rhythm system called the “Eastman system.”

V: And actually, it’s in the back of the the BRIM method. You know the Breath Impluse?

G: Yes.

V: They call it the “Eastman system,” too.

G: Yes, I guess they probably do. That’s all based on Allan McHose. But he left here…it’s got to be 35 years ago. There’s a variety of systems that are taught at Eastman. Chris Azzara, is here with me at Eastman—the other author of the series. He and I obviously used the same syllables and many other people in the music ed. department—in the other parts of the school, some use a whole variety of things.

V: So, the “Eastman system” is on its way out at Eastman or is it still used to a certain extent?

G: I have no awareness of anybody that is using that. Maybe somebody is, but I’m not aware of it.

V: When you sight read a piece of, how do you figure out how the rhythms go? Do you go through a process in your mind, or do you just play it?
G: Well, it depends how familiar I am with the piece of music. It’s just like reading a book. If you look at the book and say, “Yeah, I know every word that’s on that page! I don’t have to figure out anything…just read!” That’s the myth. I know this is a simple statement, but if you’re going to ask kids to sight read stuff that is not familiar, it just makes sense that they first should have first been taught to read things that are familiar. That’s not what we’re doing. We have *never* taught kids to read things that are familiar. And we’re only asking them to read things that are unfamiliar. The kid’s going to struggle. If you put something in front of me and I just look at it and I say, “There’s nothing on there that isn’t familiar! So, I’m just going to read it. You want it with syllables, you don’t want it with syllables? I give it to you anyway you want it!” If you give me something that’s got some patterns in there that are not as familiar to me, I might have to figure out where the large beats and where the small beats are. I’ll get my body moving to where I feel large beats and small beats and I can use the syllables or not use the syllables. Ultimately, the goal is to get rid of syllables. We don’t want kids singing songs with syllables—tonal syllables or rhythm syllables. We should transcend the syllables. We start without them. We use them to build our vocabulary. Then we get rid of them.

V: That answers all of my questions.
Appendix H
Black Interview

An interview with Dave Black, co-author of Alfred’s Drum Method Book

September 10, 2004, 6:00 P.M. CST

Varley (V): You approach rhythms using the 1e&a system. What was the reason that you picked that particular system?

Black (B): There’s probably a couple of reasons. First of all, with publishing or anything else, you’re going by history—what’s been done in the past, because you’re not trying to reinvent the wheel. When we look at books like that, you try and look at what’s been successful, what’s sold well, because you’re trying match that, and then improve upon it. Then in this case, Haskell Harr was the book to beat. That was one reason why we kept it similar in terms of the pacing, notation, and stuff like that. One of the main reasons is that we’re following correlating material like Band Method. That one method, for instance, is used as a supplement to *Yamaha Band Student, Accent on Achievement* or any other band method for a teacher that wants to go into more detail with their percussion student. And since most band methods, at least up to that point. (that book was published 17 years ago) use that system of counting. So, a lot of it was to correlate with existing methods that were out there. With 1e&a, going by history, that’s the way I was taught as a player, that’s what I understand. With 1e&a, there’s a syllable for every note. It makes it very logical. But there are a lot of other things that are tied in, like I said. Just to be brief, existing correlating material like Band Methods, etc., or existing publications that have been tried, proved successful or have long histories that teachers are familiar with and they
like and you don’t want to rock the boat too much because you don’t want to scare them off.

V: The next question then is, as a percussionist, when you sit down and play, if you’re reading something for the very first time, how do you approach rhythms? I mean, if you’ve never seen it before, OK? So now you’re going to sight read the thing. How do you do it inside your own head?

B: You mean like if it’s a very complicated rhythm?

V: Yes.

B: I do the same kind of thing. . .especially being a jazz drum set player, everything is subdivided [Gives triplet example: Ding-a-de Ding-a-de Ding] I’m always thinking triplet subdivision, or eighth note if it’s rock or Latin, or sixteenth note divisions if it’s funk. And there’s always that [Gives sixteenth note example: Ya-ta-ta-ta ta-ta-ta-ta-ta] pulse going. If it’s a complicated rhythm or a passage, I break it down. I think most people tend to, and Frank Zappa used to say this with some of his stuff, everybody just tries to get overwhelmed and read four bars at a time, or whatever. I take half of a measure and I work that out. Then I work on the second half of the measure. Then I put the two together. Then I move on to the second measure and do half. Then I add the first measure and half of that. And that’s the way I’ve always approached it. It makes it very logical and easy to do. If you try and read a long passage or four bars of a difficult rhythm, or two bars, or even a bar without first dissecting it, it becomes frustrating and chances are you become panicked. I just start with one beat, second beat, third beat, whatever, and then I piece it all together.
V: When you do that. . .when you break it down into a half of a measure, do you still use 1e&a in your head?

B: Absolutely.

V: When you wrote the book, how did you determine the order of the rhythms that you were going to use?

B: Well, again, part of it is personal teaching preference. Part of it is, Haskell Harr, Roy Burns or whatever. You had 40,000 people using those books. So, you wanted to put your own stamp on it and we introduce some things differently like the seven-stroke roll. Basically again, it’s what is in the history of what’s out there, what do the majority of teachers teach? Again, you have the correlation? between major band methods and such. How do they introduce? . So, that’s kind of the logic behind that.

V: When you teach a student yourself, do you have a preference as to what system use, or is still the 1e&a thing? Or do use a bunch of different things? Let’s just suppose the book isn’t in the equation and you’re just going to sit down and teach a kid how to play the instrument. What’s your preference to teach a kid rhythms?

B: For me, if it was just a straight book like that, I would still do 1e&a. There’s just no simpler mathematical way to equate two eighths equal a quarter note and four sixteenths equal this. Subdivision for me is everything. As a jazz musician, subdivision of the beat and where it falls is very important. But that’s changing a little bit. I don’t know if you’ll this question, but there is another world out there—the real percussion world, the Orff world that doesn’t necessarily do that? . Have you explored time box notation?
V: No, I haven’t.

B: Yes, that’s becoming increasingly more common. And in some of our books, like the World Percussion Books, it’s a table that has “1 and 2 and 3 and 4 and” and it’s got the dots and stuff so that you’re following the dots and counting, rather than traditional music notation it’s the “dots in the box” notation. But I can send you a copy of those books so you can see.

V: That would be wonderful.

B: And everything now has a DVD or a CD accompaniment to them. Sometimes the CDs have those subdivisions on a fourth track or on another instrument already working for you so that you’re not having to count. That’s kind of unfortunate. It’s just like some of the composing programs or sequences that these keyboards have. They all have quantizing capabilities that fix all that and make it pretty easy to understand.

V: One of the composers that I was speaking with said that when he does rhythms…and he writes for winds…he never starts off with whole notes or half notes because he didn’t think that the kids were able to internalize the beat on those longer notes. And so, he always starts off on quarter notes. And I was thinking that with the CDs and the DVDs, if you start off with a whole, but you have that accompaniment in the background keeping the beat for you. . .

B: Well, there are two different philosophies. I know that the Orff people and the early childhood people, they do do that. They do teach quarter notes first. I just finished a children’s book, a drum book where I did it that way because it is much easier if your stomping 1-2-3-4 to play quarter notes 1-2-3-4, and then half notes 1-2 rest, and then
whole notes. But a woodwind player also has the other added element there. And that is producing tone that they have to carry through for a whole note or a half note that a drummer does not have to do.

V: I think, too, with a woodwind player or a brass player, there’s the tone quality. And I thought what’s more important at the beginning stages: being able to play the rhythms or to have a tone and build an embouchure that you can live with to begin with.

B: I think that’s the first thing that’s important is to get a good sound, learn how to hold the horn correctly, learn how to place it in your mouth correctly and to get a good tone first. And then everything else comes through. We did that with the Drum Method. If you notice we taught quarter notes first, and then eighth notes. We didn’t teach whole notes until they could roll and actually sustain those four beats out. And actually, even then, we do half notes most of the time—a five stroke roll, a seven stroke roll, that type of thing.

V: The next question I have written down here is, “What system were you taught as a child,” but you already answered that. You said the 1e&a system, too?

B: 1e&a. . .without question.

V: Were you exposed to any other system at all, or not?

B: No. I’m older than you think. Now it’s being done by rote or question-answer.

Imitation is the big-big thing now with early childhood, home school parenting, and oral percussion. All of that stuff is done by question-answer. The classroom teacher gets up and goes (claps a short rhythm) and the kids imitate it. And they don’t sit there and go, “One two and three four” (Claps while saying rhythm) kind of thing.
V: That sounds a lot like a Suzuki thing.

B: Most books that we publish as a major publisher, whether it’s a theory book or a drum book or whatever, I still think that the majority of things that we do are still all based on 1e&a 2e&a 1&2&, etc. Except some of the world percussion books that we’ve started doing. And there, we provide the traditional notation above and the box notation below. So, it becomes more a visual thing than reading note values.

V: The only other question I have is, “What systems do you use as a teacher.” And I think you answered that one, too.
Appendix I
Gordon or Froseth/Blaser Syllables

One of the unintended results of this study was the discovery of a controversy over the authorship of the rhythm system currently used by Gordon. Some research that was included in Chapter 2 of this study attributes the rhythm system that uses the syllables “du ta de ta” as Gordon’s (Colley, 1987). Other research (Palmer, 1976; Colley, 1987) cites the Gordon system as “1 ta Ne ta.” In the case of Colley, Gordon’s “1 ta Ne ta” system is dated 1971.

Froseth and Blaser published a recording in 1979, *Improvise in Popular Jazz Idioms: An Aural Skills Approach to Spontaneous Music Making*. In it, Froseth and Blaser included syllables to help with rhythm reading. These syllables included “Du de” in duple meter and “Du Da Di” in triple meter. (Figures 12 and 13)
According to Froseth and Grunow (personal correspondence), Gordon initially gave credit to Froseth for the “du ta de ta” system in his 1980 edition of *Learning Sequences in Music*. Gordon wrote,

In previous publications by the author [Gordon], particularly in the earlier edition of this book, numbers instead of syllables were used for macro beats and different syllables were used for micro beats in usual meters. The reason for the changes is that students find the new syllables easier to comprehend and to use. Further, the syllables can be efficiently transferred to instrumental performance. They lend themselves quite naturally to all styles of music, including jazz; they can be comfortably and precisely articulated. From a theoretical point of view, the new syllables are also superior. When usual meter becomes unusual meter as a
result, for example of the introduction of a quintuplet, the music can be more easily interpreted because the verbal association for all macro beats is the same. Also, there is not the difficulty of deciding how to “count” 3/4 and 4/4, for examples, in terms of successive macro beats in a pattern. The author is indebted to Professor James O. Froseth of the University of Michigan for the research that brought about the revision of the [rhythmic] syllables (p. 197).

Grunow (1992) confirms Froseth and Blaser’s contribution in his article, “The Evolution of Rhythm Syllables in Gordon’s Music Learning Theory.” In it, Grunow writes,

Gordon (1980, p. 197, and 1989, p. 265) credits the influence of James Froseth and Albert Blaser for his decision to extend the syllables that he used previously for tempo beats in unusual meter to a parallel use in usual duple and usual triple peters. The practical research of Froseth and Blaser indicated that the syllables were easier to comprehend, and that they were easily transferred to instrumental performance (p. 62).

In 1988, Taggart identified the rhythm syllables, Du, de, etc. as Gordon’s with no reference to Froseth and Blaser. In subsequent editions of Learning Sequences in Music, Gordon, omitted the attribution to Froseth. It is possible that, as Grunow states (personal communication, November 15, 2004) that Gordon’s use of the syllables was different from the use Froseth and Blaser had intended. Nevertheless, the origin of the syllables seems to come from Froseth and Blaser. For this reason, the researcher felt that it would be appropriate to refer to the
syllable system in question as the Froseth/Blaser system for the purpose of this study.
Appendix J
Assent to Participate in Research Activities (High School Students)

**Department of Music**
8001 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis, Missouri 63121-4499
Telephone: 314-516-5981
E-mail: paul_varley@clayton.k12.mo.us

---

**Assent to Participate in Research Activities (Minors)**
An Analysis of the Various Rhythm Systems in the United States:
Their Development; Frequency of Use by Teachers, Students, and Authors; and Relation to Perceived Learning Preferences

1. My name is Paul Varley. I teach band in the School District of Clayton and am currently working on my Ed.D. at the University of Missouri—St. Louis.
2. I am asking you to take part in a research study because we are trying to learn more about how students learn to read rhythms as compared to how teachers teach them.
3. If you agree to be in this study you will be asked to fill out a survey while you are waiting in line to audition for the SLSMEA All-Suburban Band Auditions.
4. There are no risks to you if you chose to take this survey.
5. You will benefit from this survey by knowing that you helped teachers learn to teach music students better.
6. Please talk this over with your parents before you decide whether to participate. I also will ask your parents to give their permission for you to take part in this study.
7. If you don't want to be in this study, you don't have to participate. Remember, being in this study is up to you, and no one will be upset if you don't want to participate or if you change your mind later and want to stop. Even if your parents give permission, you may still withdraw from the study.
8. You can ask any questions that you have about the study by calling me at home (314-989-0565) or on the evening of the audition. If you have a question after the auditions, you can call me at home.
9. Signing your name at the bottom of the All-Suburban Audition Form means that you agree to be in this study.

We have read the Assent to Participate in Research Activities which has been attached. I understand that my child will be completing a short survey concerning their experiences in instrumental music. I also understand that all information will be kept anonymous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participant’s Printed Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent or Guardian’s Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Parent or Guardian’s Printed Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s Age</th>
<th>Grade in School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K
Modified Audition Form (Middle School Students)

ALL-SUBURBAN JUNIOR HIGH/MIDDLE SCHOOL
CONCERT BAND AUDITION FORM

a. a BRING THIS COMPLETED FOR ON AUDITION NIGHT. PLEASE PRINT a. a.

NAME ________________________________
INSTRUMENT __________________________
ADDRESS ______________________________

CITY ___________________ ZIP _______ HOME PHONE ________________

(Office use only)
Audition Number __________
Total Score __________

☐ Please check if also auditioning for the All-Suburban Honor Jazz Band

In order to publicize SLSMEA and the achievements of its member’s students, SLSMEA requests to use your child’s likeness and name on its website. Use on the SLSMEA website will follow policy limiting use to group photos and identification of students by first name and last initial only.

☐ I give permission for my child’s name and likeness to be used by SLSMEA.

☐ I deny permission for my child’s name and likeness to be used by SLSMEA. However, I understand that in large group settings, my child’s likeness may be used.

If selected for the All-Suburban Honor Band, I will attend all rehearsals, practice my music, and exhibit the behavior expected of an horn band instrumentalist.

Student signature: _____________________________________________

Parent signature: _____________________________________________ Date: __________

TO BE COMPLETED BY YOUR BAND DIRECTOR:

NAME ____________________________ EMAIL ____________________________

SCHOOL __________________________ DISTRICT _________________________

SCHOOL PHONE ___________________ SCHOOL FAX _____________________

I certify that the above student is a member of our Jr. High/Middle School band program and meets all requirements of the SLSMEA. I recommend the above student for membership in the SLSMEA All-Suburban Honors Band.

Director’s Signature (REQUIRED): __________________________________ Date: __________

Permission to Participate in Research Survey

We have read the Assent to Participate in Research Activities. I understand that my child will be completing a short survey concerning their experiences in instrumental music. I also understand that all information will be kept anonymous.

Participant’s Signature Date Participant’s Printed Name

Parent or Guardian’s Signature Date Parent or Guardian’s Printed Name

Participant’s Age Grade in School

The Notice of Privacy Practices (a separate document) describes the procedures used by UM-SL to protect your information. I will make one available to you on the evening of the audition.
Appendix L
Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities

Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities

An Analysis of the Various Rhythm Systems in the United States:
Their Development; Frequency of Use by Teachers, Students, and Authors;
and Relation to Perceived Learning Preferences

Why am I being asked to participate?
You are invited to participate in a research study about how teachers teach students to read rhythms conducted by Paul Varley from the Music Department at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. You have been asked to participate in the research because you are a music teacher and may be eligible to participate. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the research. Your participation in this research is voluntary.

What is the purpose of this research?
This research is part of the investigator’s doctoral dissertation. The purpose of this research is to identify the various ways in which teachers teach rhythms and the reasons for their choice of systems. In previous surveys, the investigator asked students to identify the various ways they had been taught to read rhythms and their perceived learning styles.

Who should I contact if I have questions?
The researcher conducting this study is Paul Varley. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may contact the researcher(s) at (314) 989-0565

Consent to take this survey
By agreeing to take this survey you are giving consent to participate. You may refuse to answer any questions you do not want to answer and still remain in the study.
Appendix M
IRB Approval

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Interdepartmental Correspondence

The UM-St. Louis Human Subjects Committee reviewed the following protocol:

Name:        Paul Varley
Title:       Rhythm System Surveys

This proposal was approved by the Human Subjects Committee for a period of one year starting from the date listed below. The Human Subjects Committee must be notified in writing prior to major changes in the approved protocol. Examples of major changes are the addition of research sites or research instruments.

An annual report must be filed with the committee. This report should indicate the starting date of the project and the number of subjects since the start of project, or since last annual report.

Any consent or assent forms must be signed in duplicate and a copy provided to the subject. The principal investigator is required to retain the other copy of the signed consent form for at least three years following the completion of the research activity and the forms must be available for inspection if there is an official review of the UM-St. Louis human subjects research proceedings by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office for Protection from Research Risks.

This action is officially recorded in the minutes of the committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protocol Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature - Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>040705V</td>
<td>7/30/07</td>
<td>Chair's Signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N
IRB Exemption for Teacher Survey

University of Missouri-St. Louis
Institutional Review Board - Human Subjects Committee

ANNUAL REPORT/MODIFICATION OR FINAL REPORT FORM

Principal Investigator:
Paul C. Varley, Jr.

Department or School:
Department of Music

Project Title:
Rhythm Systems Survey for Music Educators attending MMEA

Date Approved:
July 30, 2004

The Human Subjects Committee (HSC) approved this proposal for one year, beginning on the date listed above. The original approval certification specifies that the Principal Investigator (PI) must file an annual report with the HSC describing the status of the project. If the project is ongoing, the PI must request an extension of the approval period. All modifications to a previously approved protocol must be reported in writing to the HSC whose approval is required before the modifications are implemented.

Protocol Number
040705V

Proposed Number of Subjects: 300
Number of Subjects to Date: 0

Check all that apply:
☐ Annual Report
☐ Final Report
☐ Request for First Extension
☐ Request Additional Extension
☐ Modification
☐ # of Modifications to date

(Attach Summary of Modifications if more than one)

Describe any changes in research design that affected selection of subjects or data collection, or a statement that such changes did not occur.

No changes have occurred in the area of data collection. I would like to receive an IRB exemption so that I can administer the survey without the requirement of an assent/consent form.

Have there been any adverse outcomes? If so, please describe actions taken to minimize/eliminate unfavorable situation.

No.

Signature of Principal Investigator: [Signature]
Date: [Date]

Effective Extension or Modification Date:

PLEASE RETURN COMPLETED FORM TO: OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION
341 WOODS HALL, 8001 NATURAL BRIDGE ROAD, ST. LOUIS, MO 63121-4499
### Table 1
Levels and Sublevels of Skill-Learning Sequence (Gordon, 2001, p. 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Sequence</th>
<th>Sublevel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination Learning</td>
<td>Aural/Oral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symbolic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading and Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composite Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading and Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inference Learning</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aural/oral, verbal association, and symbolic reading and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity/Improvisation</td>
<td>Aural/oral and symbolic reading and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Understanding</td>
<td>Aural/oral, verbal association, and symbolic reading and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galin-Cheve-Paris (18??)</td>
<td>Tae Tae Tae Tae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Curwen (1846??)</td>
<td>Taa-aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell Mason (1836)</td>
<td>Mason uses speech patterns based on total syllables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luther Whiting Mason (1883)</td>
<td>Tae ou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luther Whiting Mason (1899)</td>
<td>Tā -ā -ē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luther Whiting Mason</td>
<td>Ta-e-o-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodaly</td>
<td>Ta-a-a-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Helen Richards (1964)</td>
<td>Tole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sueta (1986)</td>
<td>Too oo oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froseth/Blaser (1979)</td>
<td>Du</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Syllable Counting System Comparison Using Simple Rhythms (Cont.)
### Table 3
Syllable Counting System Comparison Using Complex Rhythms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Gain-Chievres-Paris (1877)</th>
<th>John Curwen (1846?)</th>
<th>Lowell Mason (1836)</th>
<th>Luther Whiting Mason (1883)</th>
<th>Luther Whiting Mason (1899)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ta-a-ee Ta-a-te Fe</td>
<td>Ta-a-e Ta-a-ee Ta-a-e Fe</td>
<td>Ta-a-ee Ta-a-ee Fe</td>
<td>Ta-a-ee Ta-a-ee Fe</td>
<td>Ta-a-ee Ta-a-ee Fe</td>
<td>Ta-a-ee Ta-a-ee Fe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Syllable Counting System Comparison Using Complex Rhythms (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ti ti Ti ti Ti</td>
<td>Ti di Ti di Ti</td>
<td>Ti di Ti di Ti di Ti di</td>
<td>Ta Ta Ta Ta Ta</td>
<td>Du Ta Du Ta Du Ta De</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Tim Tim Tim</td>
<td>Ti di Ti di Ti</td>
<td>Ti di Ti di Ti di Ti di</td>
<td>Ta-e T-e T-e</td>
<td>Du Ta Du Ta Du Ta De</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ti n i Ti n i Ti</td>
<td>Ti di Ti di Ti</td>
<td>Ti di Ti di Ti di Ti di</td>
<td>Ta T-e Ta T-e</td>
<td>Du Ta Du Ta Du Ta De</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ti n i Ti n i Ti</td>
<td>Ti di Ti di Ti</td>
<td>Ti di Ti di Ti di Ti di</td>
<td>Ta T-e Ta T-e</td>
<td>Du Ta Du Ta Du Ta De</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Heinrich Hohmann</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1842)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Heinrich Hohmann</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1910 Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilo Hovey (1933)</td>
<td>Nothing introduced for half notes or longer</td>
<td>Nothing introduced for half notes or longer</td>
<td>After eighth notes are introduced, 1234</td>
<td>1-2 and 1</td>
<td>da an da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haskell Harr (1937)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Krone &amp; Schaeffer (1937)</td>
<td>Wu-u-u-un</td>
<td>Wu-un wu-un</td>
<td>One one one</td>
<td>One-two</td>
<td>One-ta-two-ta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Number Counting System Comparison Using Simple Rhythms
Table 4
Number Counting System Comparison Using Simple Rhythms (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>1-un-un-un</th>
<th>1-un-two-o</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McPhail Eastman (1944)</td>
<td>Influened by upcoming substitutions</td>
<td>Influened by upcoming substitutions</td>
<td>1 la le a</td>
<td>2 la le a</td>
<td>1 da up da</td>
<td>2 da up da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Clyde Duvall (1960)</td>
<td>Uses</td>
<td>System plus breath impulses in order to subdivide the beat</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>1 ta</td>
<td>2 ta</td>
<td>3 ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton and Robinson (1950's)</td>
<td>Uses</td>
<td>Uses</td>
<td>1 ta Ne ta</td>
<td>2 ta Ne ta</td>
<td>3 ta Ne ta</td>
<td>4 ta Ne ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon (1970's)</td>
<td>Uses</td>
<td>Uses</td>
<td>1 ta Ne ta</td>
<td>2 ta Ne ta</td>
<td>3 ta Ne ta</td>
<td>4 ta Ne ta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Number Counting System Comparison Using Complex Rhythms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian Heinrich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hohram (1910 New Edition)</td>
<td>1 da-an</td>
<td>2 da-an</td>
<td>1 &amp; ah</td>
<td>2 &amp; ah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilo Hovey (1933)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>e &amp;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>e &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haskell Harr (1937)</td>
<td>1 (m)</td>
<td>2 h</td>
<td>1 (m)</td>
<td>2 h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Krone &amp; Schaeffer (1957)</td>
<td>1 (a)</td>
<td>2 (a)</td>
<td>1 (a)</td>
<td>2 (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHose Eastman (1944)</td>
<td>One-</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>Two-</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>One-</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>Two-</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ta</td>
<td></td>
<td>ta</td>
<td></td>
<td>ta</td>
<td></td>
<td>ta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Number Counting System Comparison Using Complex Rhythms (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Rhythm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middleton and Robinson (1950’s)</td>
<td>Uses System plus breath impulses in order to subdivide the beat. In addition, tapping is used.</td>
<td>1 da up da 2 da up da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Clyde Duval (1960)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 da up da 2 da up da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon (1970’s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ta Ne 2 ta Ne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## Table 6  
A Comparison of Beginning Instrumental Method Books/Rhythm Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Copyright</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Rhythm System</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21st Century Band Method</td>
<td>Bullock &amp; Maiello,</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Belwin</td>
<td>Counting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accent on Achievement</td>
<td>O'Reilly &amp; Williams</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>Counting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred's Drum Method Book 1</td>
<td>Feldstein &amp; Black</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>Counting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All for Strings</td>
<td>Anderson &amp; Frost</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Kjos</td>
<td>Counting/Mnemonics</td>
<td>Uses Mnemonics only in the beginning few pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistry in Strings Book 1</td>
<td>Frost, Fischbach, &amp; Barden</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Kjos</td>
<td>Counting/Mnemonics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band Builder</td>
<td>Douglas &amp; Weber</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warner Brothers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only counts beats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band Plus</td>
<td>Swearingen &amp; Buechman</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Counting/Kinesthetics</td>
<td>Uses foot taps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band Today</td>
<td>Ployhar</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Belwin</td>
<td>Counting/Kinesthetics</td>
<td>Uses foot taps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belwin Comprehensive Band Method</td>
<td>Erickson</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Belwin</td>
<td>Counting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best in Class</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Kjos</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Book 1 does not introduce eighth notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeze-Easy Method</td>
<td>Kinyon</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Warner Brothers</td>
<td>Counting/Kinesthetics</td>
<td>Uses Foot Taps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornet Student</td>
<td>Weber &amp; Vincent</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Belwin, Inc.</td>
<td>Counting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do It! Book 1</td>
<td>Smith &amp; Froseth</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>GIA</td>
<td>Mnemonic</td>
<td>Lyrics for songs are placed under the notes. Books include CD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drum Method for Band &amp; Orchestra</td>
<td>Harr</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>M.M. Cole</td>
<td>Counting</td>
<td>1e&amp;a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Explorer Books 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Dabczynski, Meyer &amp; Phillips</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>Counting/Mnemonics</td>
<td>Lyrics for selected songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamaha Band Student Books 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Feldstein &amp; O’Reilly</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>Counting</td>
<td>Subdivides after eighth notes are introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythms and Rests Conductor’s Score</td>
<td>Frank Erickson</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Method for band. Goes to Grade V.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6  
A Comparison of Beginning Instrumental Method Books/Rhythm Books (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Copyright</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Rhythm System</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed Sueta Band Method</td>
<td>Sueta</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Macie</td>
<td>Language/Counting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Elements</td>
<td>Rhodes, Bierschenk, &amp;</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Hal</td>
<td>Counting/Kinesthetics</td>
<td>Subdivides immediately. Uses foot tapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Elements 2000</td>
<td>Lautzenheiser, Higgins, &amp;</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Hal</td>
<td>Counting</td>
<td>1e&amp;a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Division Band Method</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Belwin</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Nothing written in the student book. The accompanying CD gives examples of system. The teacher’s edition gives a detailed explanation of the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jump Right In Book 1</td>
<td>Grunow, Gordon, Azzara, &amp;</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>GIA</td>
<td>Froseth/Blaser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen, Move, Sing and Play for Band</td>
<td>Froseth</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>GIA</td>
<td>Language/Kinesthetics</td>
<td>Froseth/Blaser syllables, lyrics, and various body movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now Go Home and Practice!</td>
<td>Probasco, Grable, Meeks, &amp;</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Counting/Kinesthetics</td>
<td>Uses counting during rests and foot tapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier Performance</td>
<td>Sueta</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Ed Sueta</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Similar to Kodály. Syllables are designed for embouchure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm Vocabulary Charts Books One &amp; Two</td>
<td>Sueta</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Macie</td>
<td>Language/Counting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubank Elementary Method Clarinet</td>
<td>Hovey</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Hal</td>
<td>Counting</td>
<td>Shows notes as ratios to other notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sounds Spectacular Band Course</td>
<td>Balent</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Counting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Excellence</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Kjos</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
A Comparison of Beginning Instrumental Method Books/Rhythm books (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Copyright</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Rhythm System</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Rhythm Bible</td>
<td>Dan Fox</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>Counting, Syllables, Mnemonics, Kinesthetics-Tapping</td>
<td>Uses variety of systems and instructions for playing “straight” and “swing.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strictly Strings</td>
<td>Dillon, Kjelland, &amp; O’Reilly</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>Counting</td>
<td>Counting does not start until the introduction of notes on the staff (p. 15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Beat--Conductor's Guide</td>
<td>Haines &amp; McEntyre</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Counting/Kinesthetics</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2 &amp; 1 ne 2 ne 1 na ni- 2 na ni Clapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Individualized Instructor</td>
<td>James Froseth</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>GIA</td>
<td>2 Counting/Lyrics/Kinesthetics</td>
<td>Rhythm system is left to the teacher’s preference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Rhythm a Week</td>
<td>Anne C. Witt</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Belwin</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Workbook dedicated to learning rhythms. Uses a variety of approaches and techniques. Includes worksheets, flash cards, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirty Days to Rhythm</td>
<td>Betsy Henderson</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Hal Leonard</td>
<td>Counting, Kodály, Words/Mnemonics, Kinesthetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7
An Analysis of Method Books and Their Rhythm Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Used</th>
<th>No. of Books</th>
<th>% of Books</th>
<th>No. of Books</th>
<th>% of Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counting/Kinesthetic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counting/Mnemonic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counting/Syllable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesthetic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnemonic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnemonic/Kinesthetic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Combinations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllable/Kinesthetic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllable/Mnemonic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Books Examined</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8
Distribution of Rhythm Systems Used by All Examined Method Books
Table 9.
Breakdown of Method Books and the Different Counting Systems with Subdivision of the Eighth Note

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method Books</th>
<th>Counting Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harr, Balent, O’Reilly &amp; Williams, Ployhar, Feldstein &amp; O’Reilly</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2 &amp; 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullock &amp; Maiello, Hovey, Probasco, Grable, Meeks, &amp; Swearingen, Dabcynski, Meyer, &amp; Phillips, Kinyon, Weber, &amp; Vincent, Weber</td>
<td>1 + 2 + 3 + 4 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swearingen &amp; Buehlman, Hovey</td>
<td>1 and 2 and 3 and 4 and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10
A Comparison of Responses From Authors of Method Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Order of teaching rhythms</th>
<th>Personal preference for teaching</th>
<th>System taught as a child</th>
<th>System(s) used as teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>Whole note first, then subdivisions</td>
<td>Down-up (Movement)</td>
<td>1e&amp;a</td>
<td>1e&amp;a Down-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldstein</td>
<td>“Take away method.” (e.g. 8 eighths, then 1 quarter and 6 eighths, etc.)</td>
<td>1e&amp;a</td>
<td>1e&amp;a</td>
<td>1e&amp;a Variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Reilly</td>
<td>Whole, quarter, half notes</td>
<td>1e&amp;a</td>
<td>1e&amp;a</td>
<td>1e&amp;a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barden</td>
<td>Quarter, eighth, then longer notes</td>
<td>1e&amp;a</td>
<td>1e&amp;a Foot tapping</td>
<td>1e&amp;a Word phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Based on work of Harr and correlation with other method books.</td>
<td>1e&amp;a</td>
<td>1e&amp;a</td>
<td>1e&amp;a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grunow</td>
<td>Macrobeats then microbeats</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>1e&amp;a</td>
<td>1e&amp;a Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sueta</td>
<td>Half, half—quarter, dotted half, eighths</td>
<td>Sueta and Harr</td>
<td>1e&amp;a</td>
<td>Sueta, 1e&amp;a and Foot tapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabcynski</td>
<td>4 Quarters 4 eighths + 2 quarters 8 eighths 1 quarter + 2 eighths</td>
<td>1e&amp;a McHose Gordon</td>
<td>1e&amp;a Rhythmic Movement</td>
<td>1e&amp;a McHose Gordon Orff Kodály</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witt</td>
<td>Correlates with other method books</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2 &amp; 3 &amp; 4 &amp;</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2 &amp; 3 &amp; 4 &amp;</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2 &amp; 3 &amp; 4 &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>Whole, half, quarter, eighth. Simple rhythms first, then syncopated</td>
<td>Student should be able to sing rhythm and develop “Inner hearing.”</td>
<td>Pasquale Bona's Rhythmical Articulation</td>
<td>Experience is primarily as a performer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froseth</td>
<td>“Long tones” are introduced briefly. Children’s songs are then introduced that use rhythms no longer than two beats. Wants avoid the “blat-rest” method.</td>
<td>1e&amp;a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10
A Comparison of Responses From Authors of Method Books (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Rhythm System(s) utilized in author’s method book</th>
<th>Reason for choice of rhythm system(s) in book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>No particular system. Teacher’s edition gives explanations of three systems.</td>
<td>Wanted to be able to have book used with any system. Believes that rhythm systems are a personal preference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldstein</td>
<td>1e&amp;á</td>
<td>Believes that it is the most popular system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Reilly</td>
<td>1e&amp;á</td>
<td>Believes it is the most logical and makes the most sense to kids because of mathematical connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barden</td>
<td>1e&amp;á and Suzuki</td>
<td>Uses the “best of both worlds.” However, labeling of rhythms ends so that teacher can use the system that they prefer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1e&amp;á</td>
<td>It correlates with other books that have a history of success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grunow</td>
<td>Gordon (Froseth/Blaser)</td>
<td>Was a natural choice due to work with Gordon. Believes that actual system is not important as long as it is based on note function and not note value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sueta</td>
<td>Sueta, 1e&amp;á</td>
<td>Sueta system is modified Kodály, changing the vowels to match mouth shape of embouchure. Bases choice on experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabcynski</td>
<td>1e&amp;á</td>
<td>It is a widely used way of counting, very easy to reproduce on paper and includes the actual beat number, which makes sense visually on paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witt</td>
<td>No particular system.</td>
<td>Personal choice of teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>1e&amp;á, syllables, foot tapping and some mnemonics</td>
<td>Bases choices on personal experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froseth</td>
<td>Has students sing lyrics to songs. Believes that voice should be used as a “tool for developing aural acuity.” Earlier books utilize the Froseth/Blaser Phonetic Rhythm Syllables.</td>
<td>Books are based on his research and that of Glaser, Gordon, Musell and Hargiss.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11
Comparison of System Combinations Taught to and Systems Used by Students
Table 12
Comparison of Systems Taught to and Used by Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Taught</th>
<th>System Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harr</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodaly</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnemonic</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froseth/Blaser</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seda</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHose/Eastman</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t remember</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13
Student Perceived Learning Styles Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14
Student Survey: Perception of Learning Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total population</td>
<td>44.20%</td>
<td>35.86%</td>
<td>29.34%</td>
<td>37.68%</td>
<td>14.85%</td>
<td>25.36%</td>
<td>25.36%</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15
Rhythm Systems Taught to Students
Table 16
Rhythm Systems Used by Students

Table 17
Students’ Perceived Learning Styles
Table 18
Years of Teaching Experience of Surveyed Teachers

Table 19
Distribution of Grade Levels Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Student</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20
Distribution of Teacher Specialty Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty Area</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Music</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21
Rhythm System Combinations Teachers Were Taught as Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhythm System Combinations</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22
Rhythm System Combinations Teachers Were Taught in College

Table 23
Rhythm Systems Teachers Teach to Their Students
Table 24
Rhythm Systems Teachers use Personally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>System Combinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 25
Rhythms Systems Taught to Teachers as Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froseth/Blaser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sueta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHose/Eastman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnemonics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Remember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26
Rhythms Systems Taught to Teachers in College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harr</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froseth/Blaser</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sueta</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McN霍/Eastman</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodaly</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnemonics</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Remember</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27
Rhythms Systems Teachers Teach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harr</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froseth/Blaser</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sueta</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McN霍/Eastman</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodaly</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnemonics</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28
Rhythm Systems Teachers use Personally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harr</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froehl/Blaser</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suhr</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MtHose/Eastman</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodaly</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnemonics</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29
Reasons Teachers Give for Using Their Preferred Rhythm System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Way I was taught</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only system I feel comfortable with</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Supported reasons</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal experience says it's the best</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30
Teachers’ Knowledge of Research

- Know of Research: 25%
- Do Not Know of Research: 75%

Table 31
Teacher Willingness to Switch to New Rhythm System if Presented with Research

- Would Switch: 32%
- Would Not Switch: 12%
- Unsure: 56%
Table 32
Comparison of Knowledge of Research and Willingness to Switch to More Effective Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Know of Research</th>
<th>Would Switch</th>
<th>Would Not Switch</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know of Research</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33
Knowledge of Research
0-5 Years of Teaching Experience

- Know research: 23%
- Do not know research: 77%
Table 34
Knowledge of Research
6-10 Years of Teaching Experience

Know research
29%
Do not know research
71%

Table 35
Knowledge of Research
11-15 Years of Teaching Experience

Know research
33%
Do not know research
67%
Table 36
Knowledge of Research
16-20 Years of Teaching Experience

Know research: 33%
Do not know research: 67%

Table 37
Knowledge of Research
More Than 20 Years of Teaching Experience

Know research: 19%
Do not know research: 81%
Table 38
Comparison of Knowledge of Research Concerning Rhythm Systems and Willingness to Switch to More Effective Systems
0-5 Years Teaching Experience

Table 39
Comparison of Knowledge of Research Concerning Rhythm Systems and Willingness to Switch to More Effective Systems
6-10 Years Teaching Experience
Table 40
Comparison of Knowledge of Research Concerning Rhythm Systems and Willingness to Switch to More Effective Systems
11-15 Years Teaching Experience

Table 41
Comparison of Knowledge of Research Concerning Rhythm Systems and Willingness to Switch to More Effective Systems
16-20 Years Teaching Experience
Table 42
Comparison of Knowledge of Research Concerning Rhythm Systems and Willingness to Switch to More Effective Systems
More Than 20 Years Teaching Experience

![Pie chart showing willingness to switch]

Don’t know
56%

Would switch
27%

Would not switch
17%

Table 43
Teachers’ Knowledge and Qualifications of Rhythm Systems

![Bar chart showing number of teachers by knowledge and qualifications]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhythm System</th>
<th>Know and qualified</th>
<th>Know and not qualified</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harr</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodaly</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnemonic</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froseth/Blaser</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sueta</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHost/Eastman</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIM</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 44
Teachers’ Knowledge and Qualifications to Teach Rhythms
0-5 Years Teaching Experience

Table 45
Teachers’ Knowledge and Qualifications to Teach Rhythms
6-10 Years Teaching Experience
Table 46
Teachers’ Knowledge and Qualifications to Teach Rhythms
11-15 Years Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Know and qualified</th>
<th>Know and not qualified</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harr</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodaly</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnemonic</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froseth/Blaser</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sueta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHose</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIM</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 47
Teachers’ Knowledge and Qualifications to Teach Rhythms
16-20 Years Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Know and Qualified</th>
<th>Know and not qualified</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harr</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodaly</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnemonic</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froseth/Blaser</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sueta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHose</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIM</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 48
Teachers’ Knowledge and Qualifications to Teach Rhythms
More than 20 Years Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Know and qualified</th>
<th>Know but not qualified</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harr</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodaly</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnemonic</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froseth/Blaser</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sueta</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHose</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 49
Systems Used Exclusively by Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harr</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodaly</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnemonic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froseth/Blaser</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sueta</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHose/Eastman</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 50
Exclusive Use of Rhythm Systems Sorted by Grade Level

Table 51
Exclusive Use of Rhythm Systems Sorted by Subject Area
Table 52
Reasons Teachers Use Preferred Method Books

Table 53
Teachers’ Preferred Method Books
Table 54
Teacher Perceived Learning Styles Combinations

Table 55
Teacher Perceived Learning Styles Distribution
Table 56
Comparison of what systems teachers and students were taught as children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harr</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froseth/Blaser</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sueta</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHose/Eastman</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodaly</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnemonics</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Remember</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 57
Comparison of rhythm systems teachers and students use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harr</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Froseth/Blaser</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sueta</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHose/Eastman</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodaly</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnemonics</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Remember</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 58
Comparison of student and teacher learning styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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