

Georgia State University

ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

Music Faculty Publications

School of Music

2011

The Performance-Pedagogy Paradox in Choral Music Teaching

Patrick K. Freer

Georgia State University, pfreer@gsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/music_facpub



Part of the [Music Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Freer, Patrick K., "The Performance-Pedagogy Paradox in Choral Music Teaching" (2011). *Music Faculty Publications*. 38.

https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/music_facpub/38

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Music at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Music Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

THE PERFORMANCE-PEDAGOGY PARADOX IN CHORAL MUSIC TEACHING

(REVISION 2 – 1/19/10)

Title: The Performance-Pedagogy Paradox in Choral Music Teaching (REV 2)

Date: January 19, 2010 (Original: 6/12/09; Revision 1: 11/6/09)

Author: Patrick K. Freer

Position: School of Music, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia (USA)

Address: Dr. Patrick K. Freer
Georgia State University – School of Music
PO Box 4097
Atlanta, GA 30302 (USA)

Phone: 404-413-5949 (office)
404-354-1726 (cell)

Fax: 404-414-5910

Email: pfreer@gsu.edu

Author Information: Patrick K. Freer is associate professor of choral music education in the School of Music at Georgia State University. He is author of the DVD series “Success for Adolescent Singers: Unlocking the Potential in Middle School Choirs.”

Note: A greatly abbreviated version of this paper was presented for the Greek Society for Music Education (Athens) in October 2009. The paper did not appear in the proceedings nor was it distributed to attendees.

Abstract: Choral music teachers simultaneously work toward two potentially competing goals: the quality of the musical performance and the quality of the education they provide for students. Is either goal preeminent, or can both exist in an ever-shifting balance? This paper highlights how this conundrum has existed since the emergence of North American choral music education nearly a century ago. The problem is explored as a paradox, with examples drawn from the author’s personal experience. A proposed resolution supports the validity of both goals, with suggestion that teachers need to increase awareness of how their goals affect decisions concerning policy, pedagogy, and musical practice.

THE PERFORMANCE-PEDAGOGY PARADOX IN CHORAL MUSIC TEACHING

Choral music education has existed in varying forms for hundreds, if not thousands of years.¹ Its incorporation within school settings poses a conundrum about the relationship between education and musical artistry – whether the educative process is of greater importance than the performance product. Or visa versa. Perhaps the debate itself is misguided, and choral music educators can be positioned to achieve both endeavors through a balance of performance and pedagogy. The terms “performance” and “pedagogy” are not completely parallel – until, that is, we consider them as potential objectives or outcomes of what choral music teachers do in their classrooms. Should the teacher’s actions be guided by the goal of performance, or should the teacher’s actions be directed toward pedagogy that supports the musical learning of students? An answer may not come readily. Therein lies the paradox.

A similar paradoxical situation has been created in mathematics education as a result of the current emphasis on achievement testing in the United States. Whereas choral music education has concerts for outcomes, mathematics has high-stakes testing. The best research in mathematics education indicates that student-centered, constructivist pedagogical approaches are the most effective – just as in choral music education. But, the process for such pedagogical approaches is time-consuming and interferes with the specific, proximal knowledge and skills needed for performance outcomes. The teacher’s quandary is, often, to orient her teaching either toward a discreet performance on a test or concert, or to teach toward the students’ broader understanding that can be applied in a variety of contexts. Might resolution come from understanding how *both* process *and* product can contribute optimally to education – and to artistry?

The Paradox in Historical Perspective

The role of performance within choral music education has been the subject of concern since the beginning of the a cappella choral movement in North America. For example, in the 1920s and 1930s, emerging standards for United States high school choirs reflected performance ideals of eminent collegiate and professional ensembles. This could be seen in the work of Jacob Evanson, one the most influential choral music teachers of that time, largely because of a performance of his high school choir at a national convention in 1928. It was written that Evanson was irritated by the attention generated by the public performances of his choir.² He often tried to explain that his goals were educational, with performances serving only as demonstrations of the results.

Another significant shift in choral music education occurred in the mid 1970s when conductor Doreen Rao led the Glen Ellyn Children's Chorus in performance and workshop sessions at multiple national conventions of the American Choral Directors Association.³ These appearances redefined standards of excellence for choral music education – this time for elementary choirs. Rao later observed,

The value of music performance in music education can be found *beyond the concert stage* in the development of musicianship, the experience of enjoyment, and the psychological benefits of self-esteem.⁴

The public and professional adulation for these children's choir performances prompted choral music teachers to adopt them as models, and, when the 1990s brought emphasis on standards and assessment, children's choirs were held as exemplars of education through performance.⁵ And, yet, concern remains that emphasis in choral music teaching is on the

performance rather than on the knowledge and skills that young people can apply beyond their school's choral rehearsal room.⁶ Research indicates that choral teachers in the United States generally focus on rehearsal of a limited repertoire with specific goals for performance excellence – at the expense of any other educational goals.⁷ Choral teachers worldwide have similarly struggled to build curricula that achieve a balance between performance and educational goals.⁸ Some related research indicates that young adolescents exhibit lower levels of musical understanding during performance when compared with the activities of composition and critical listening.⁹ Students need performance as an important component, but only one component, of a complete music education.

Which is more important for choral teachers – the performance product or the educational outcome? Perhaps the answer lies in rethinking boundaries that give us the illusion of choice between musical and pedagogical goals. Instead, we need to focus on removing these artificial boundaries so that both performance and pedagogy each can serve one another in artistically and educationally meaningful ways.

Experiencing the Paradox

The paradox can perhaps be best exemplified in descriptions of how choral music teachers encounter it within various facets of their work.¹⁰ I have chosen to situate the present discussion within four brief narratives describing roles in which I confront this paradox: as a choral music teacher, as a teacher of university students, as a choral adjudicator, and as a conductor of choral performances.¹¹ These self-story vignettes describe some of the tensions between performance and pedagogy that I experience as a choral music educator.¹²

Choral Music Teacher

My early years as a choral music teacher were marked by an increasing interest in students who were not enrolled in choir. I taught in a large high school and initially had a very small number of students enrolled. As a way to generate support for choral music, I started an adult community choir and began to listen to the stories of men who had earlier been told by their teachers that they were not good enough singers to join their school choirs. These men had all withdrawn from school music activities and never sang again until with their wives in the choir I started.

My first experience with the tension between choral performance and choral pedagogy came while studying for my masters degree. I was enrolled with a dual major in choral conducting and music education, and my graduate recital was to be given with my adult community choir and orchestra. After one of the final rehearsals, the conducting professor told me that I would need to ask several of the men not to sing if the recital was to be deemed a success. He felt that the quality of the men's voices was not suitable for choral performance. I was presented with a dilemma: withdraw the men and risk repeating their prior experience of being told that they "weren't good enough," or proceed as planned and risk failing my recital.

I failed my recital. Actually, I was informed that the recital would not count toward the degree in choral conducting while it was considered acceptable for the degree in music education. The stated reason was that my allegiances were more clearly toward choral education than choral performance. Implicit in this rationale was that there were lower standards of performance quality for music education than for choral conducting. I was becoming aware for the first time of how philosophy can (and should) inform the practice of teaching. Cindy Bell addressed this tension in a study of adult community choirs:

The objective here is quite noble: a true democratic choral society, where each choir member is nourished in pursuit of his or her full musical potential. Should choruses marginalize the average adult amateur singer from a universal experience of singing within a community, by raising the audition bar so high as to eliminate all but the musically elite?¹³

Colin Durrant also highlighted this tension when he stated, “One of the interesting issues facing the music educator, and the choral music educator in particular, is the provision within the educational context and environment of appropriate learning experiences in the choral area.”¹⁴ My collegiate training taught me a great deal about standards of choral excellence in performance but taught me very little about standards of excellence in choral music education.

University Teacher

Part of my role as a professor is to teach courses in choral music education for undergraduate students who hope to become teachers. As many others have noted, young teachers, especially those who will lead performance ensembles, often emulate the instructional techniques of teachers who influenced them to pursue a career in education. A problem arises when those instructional techniques are not aligned with what we teach at the university, especially when the techniques promote conductor-centered rehearsals rather than learner-centered rehearsals.

This problem becomes most noticeable during the extended student teaching experience when students’ carefully constructed lesson plans yield to the demands of multiple daily rehearsals. The result is “let’s start at the beginning and see what happens” rather than sequential pedagogy and instructional scaffolding. In response, I have begun to experiment with alternative

forms of lesson plans such as those advocated by Patrick Freer and Sandra Snow¹⁵ in which conductors plan multiple rehearsal strategies reflecting detailed score study and knowledge of the choir's abilities. This provides an array of options from which conductors can select when responding to the moment-to-moment performance of choristers during rehearsal. The result is a pedagogical plan that supports the choral performance rather than imposes instructional strategies that may not be suited to the artistic elements of the music.

One goal of university music schools is the preparation of future music educators. In turn, a goal of those early-career teachers must be the preparation of musicians – their own students – to engage in future music making whenever and wherever they wish. Bell asks of university teacher preparation programs, “What kind of example is provided for our student conductors? What is their mindset when they create their own rehearsal room and build choral communities? Are they prepared to respect the amateur musical experience, to crave and successfully direct such an experience?”¹⁶

Choral Adjudicator

I grew up and began my teaching career in a part of the United States where choral competitions were not an emphasized component of music education. I now live in a part of the country where elementary choral teachers are encouraged and secondary teachers are required to participate in annual competitions known as “large-group performance evaluations.” These teachers face enormous pressure to have their choirs awarded high scores and they face the possibility of losing their jobs if the scores are not considered acceptable. For many of these choral programs, contests function much as “high-stakes” assessments common in mathematics

and reading. The important issue is the final score or ranking, not the educative and musical processes encountered by the students.

The effects of such evaluations and contests on student self-perceptions are well represented in the research literature. Research indicates that even young children are profoundly influenced by the results of these contests, whether the judges' scores are positive or negative.¹⁷ And, other research suggests that such contests may not hold anywhere near the motivational value as teachers might commonly think.¹⁸

I have served as an adjudicator for these events since beginning my current university position. I am increasingly uncomfortable with my role, dismayed when I see school choirs rehearsing the same two pieces for months simply for the sake of a judge's score, and disturbed by the sheer lack of joy in the competitive experience for both teachers and students. At one recent "festival" where I served as judge, an elementary choral teacher stopped her ensemble during mid-performance, chastised a young boy for singing the wrong note, and turned to the audience to declare that the poor singing of that boy should not reflect negatively on the rest of the choir. The boy stood silently, tears streaming down his face, while the song began again.

Yes, this was one extreme example, but there is no (or very little) joy to be found anywhere during choral competitions. Which is most important: the performance product or the educational process?

Choral Conductor

I am an active conductor of honor choirs where I work with young people selected by audition to sing tremendously difficult music extremely well. I love doing this, and I cherish the musical experiences I am fortunate to share with students across the United States. My role in

these situations is to elicit the highest possible level of performance from these choristers. It is a role that finds me precariously perched on the paradox being considered in this paper. How can I be an advocate for reform in choral music teaching while simultaneously promoting the highest standards of choral performance?

When I conduct a choir at Carnegie Hall, for example, the expectations of all involved are quite different than the expectations for performances given in a school auditorium or cafeteria far removed from the idealized models of professional singers and choral scholars. Or are they? Though the repertoire may vary and the instructional techniques that lead to the point of performance may differ, and the two “choral experiences” should hold the same elements of artistry, goal achievement, collaboration, heightened aesthetic sensitivity, and musical satisfaction. Lower levels of musical satisfaction can be expected for all involved when repertoire or instructional techniques are not suitable for a particular situation. An exquisite amalgam of repertoire and pedagogy can evoke musical satisfaction in any choral setting.

For conductors, performances that do not reach the highest levels of musical satisfaction can lead to disappointment and frustration.¹⁹ American conductor and composer Alice Parker laid this disappointment squarely at the feet of conductor-teachers, observing,

When I am in a situation where I hear three or four choruses in quick succession, it is always fascinating to hear how different each group sounds. And if it is the kind of situation where there are three or four different choruses being led by the same person, or rehearsed by different people, how much each chorus changes with a different director. Whoever is leading is getting basically what they are asking for. Whether or not they are satisfied is beside the point, at this moment. They get what they ask for and each one of us asks for something different.²⁰

Parker's final statement again prompts the question of whether the performance outcome or the educational outcome is more important. The musical satisfaction sought by conductors working at all levels, elementary chorus through professional ensemble, simply will not occur in the absence of careful teaching that allows singers to successfully perform the musical challenges presented by repertoire of increasing difficulty.

Recognizing the Paradox

This paradox is experienced when choral music teachers seek to balance the competing goals of performance and pedagogy. Instead of balance and harmony, the paradox creates tensions affecting curriculum, instructional techniques, repertoire selection, assessment techniques, classroom environment, and performance expectations. Without a clear set of guiding principles, we are often reluctant to make choices and/or changes in response to these tensions. We instead acquiesce to traditional and conservative standards for choral performance in education, riding the prevailing winds of the profession regardless of how they agree or disagree with our personal philosophies. And, in so doing, we ignore the paradox, accept the resulting tensions, and exert increasing authoritarian control over our student ensembles as we attempt to extract ever-higher levels of performance excellence.

This is unnecessary. Just as the infamous Emperor viewed his new clothing, we convince ourselves that a high level of choral performance quality alone somehow imparts the knowledge and skills necessary for a lifetime of making music. While that does occur in the classrooms of some choral teachers grounded in principles of sequential and developmentally appropriate pedagogy, it most certainly does not in the vast majority of classrooms where so-called "teaching" is mere variation on rote or imitative rehearsal techniques.

I encountered an example of this paradox while developing the concepts for this article. As I wrote, I found it difficult to articulate the separate goals of music education, the choral ensemble performance, and the individual teacher. Then, I recalled a finding from my own research that choral teachers alter their pedagogical techniques and instructional language to reflect changes in performance expectations.²¹ The same teacher might, in practice, hold different goals for different ensembles in a balance that changes over time. We need to consider how choral music's artistic/educative paradox is omnipresent in the experiences of choral music teachers and their students.²²

Underlying this ubiquity are two seemingly contradictory purposes of the two endeavors. One purpose of choral performance is the authentic reconstruction of music composed in the past, whether two centuries ago or two weeks ago. This is articulated, for example, in promotional material for New Zealand's ensemble The Tudor Consort, which aims to "set the standard for early choral music: an innovative approach to repertoire selection and interpretation, accuracy of presentation through historical reconstruction, and an emphasis on choral excellence through superb balance, blend and vocal technique."²³ Though scholastic choirs are not professional and do not have the same defined mission as The Tudor Consort, the purpose of choral performance is the same for both: to prepare and present choral repertoire as authentically as possible. The role of performers, including conductors, is to bring authenticity to the performance through study, technique, and physical involvement.

The purpose of authentic *reconstruction* lies in potential conflict with one purpose of choral music pedagogy: the *construction* of knowledge and skills that enable the creation of vocal music by humans at ever-increasing levels of sophistication, nuance, and manipulation. The basic skills of phonation and singing are present in virtually every individual, and choral

music pedagogy ideally amplifies those skills to permit engagement with other singers in the collaborative experience of performance. Though the vocalization of choral repertoire is the demonstrative outcome of both performance and pedagogy, the purposes that guide them are potentially oppositional. In this sense, performance is principally informed by a focus on repertoire while pedagogy is fundamentally guided by a focus on people.

Reconceptualizing the paradoxical situation might begin by considering performance as a communicative bridge between composers, performers, and the audiences who interact with musical compositions. This perspective positions compositions as highly structured plans for performance, with each human performance being the actualized musical work.²⁴ It would be impossible for the aural and structural conceptions of composers to become music were notational representation and music education not available to realize those compositions.²⁵ The paradox is made evident when the realization of a score through performance is established as a goal unequal to the current skills, abilities and development of singers.

The knowledge and skills afforded through music education make it possible for performance to breathe life into choral compositions. Performance in choral music requires a pedagogical process guided by a conductor-teacher, whether the setting involves professional singers in Carnegie Hall or youngsters in an urban elementary school. The difference concerns what the conductor-teacher brings to the setting in terms of repertoire and pedagogical techniques. When repertoire and pedagogy are aligned with the abilities and capabilities of singers, the result can be the highest levels of performance quality and musical satisfaction. The goals and purposes of choral performance and choral pedagogy are not hierarchical – they are complementary and synonymous.

And, yet, we often fail to achieve excellence in choral performance because of our (occasionally) well-intentioned attempts to “teach the music,” as we isolate and remove musical elements such as rhythms, pitches, and vocal technique from the artistic contexts their composers have created.²⁶ Part of the problem is that many choral music teachers have yet to consider the appropriate balance of performance and educative ideals, torn between the curricular mandates of schools and governmental entities and the longstanding, tradition-bound standards of choral music performance.²⁷

This paradox is persistent, partly because choral music teachers rarely seize the opportunity to question what they do or why they do it. At least in North America, music teachers are presented with workshops and clinics offering quick and easy answers to the most vexing and situated of problems. However, choral music is uniquely complex among art forms, demanding a singular, educable combination of musical knowledge, physical skill, aesthetic awareness, and interpersonal and intrapersonal responsiveness. Choral music demands of performers the ability to instantaneously shift attention to any one of myriad aural stimuli without the aid of a mechanical instrument, object or, in chamber ensembles without a conductor, a physical/visual gesture. When choral music educators establish high educative goals without simultaneously seeking high artistic goals, the results include performances that are musically unsatisfactory and students who lack the experiences necessary to sustain motivation toward a lifelong pursuit of choral singing.

Confronting the Paradox

Choral music teaching is, consequently, guided by both performance and pedagogical goals, with neither more important than the other. This brings to mind Howard Slaatte's definition of paradox:

A paradox is an idea involving two opposing thoughts or propositions which, however contradictory, are equally necessary to convey a more imposing, illuminating, life-related, or provocative insight into truth than either factor can muster in its own right.²⁸

In the current paradox, our two opposing propositions might be stated as: 1) the performance itself is the primary goal of choral music teaching, and 2) the acquisition of knowledge and skills that lead to performance is the primary goal of choral music teaching. These statements are not contradictory in an "either-or" sense, where only one can be true if the other is false. Rather, these statements can be more accurately described as oppositional in a "both-and" sense since both performance and skill acquisition occur in choral music education.

Those of us who criticize the emphasis on performance may need to recognize that the experience of performing can serve educative purposes extremely well, especially for students like those flourishing under existing practices. On the other hand, those of us who emphasize the values of performance may need to recognize that these practices aren't necessarily congruent with the needs or musical interests of a large majority of students in our schools. We might therefore consider the following question: are the goals of choral music performance congruent with the goals of providing music education to all students? Or, asked more pointedly, have we lapsed into a self-imposed trap by elevating our standards of school-based choral performance to the point where they exclude more students than they include?

Surely this is not intentional. But, it's easy to see how we have arrived at this point. The most celebrated models of school-based performance – the choirs we hear at conventions – are selectively auditioned. These choirs enroll only a small minority of students, drawn from an already diminished population of those who remain interested in choral music by the time they mature into older adolescence. What about those students who might be engaged by choral singing, or any type of music education for that matter, if there truly were opportunities for their involvement?²⁹ Do we focus our attention so intently on the perfection of the next concert that we neglect the opportunity to ensure that students walking the hallways of today's schools become the adult singers in choral performances twenty years from now? Have we established a caste system within the ranks of music educators where choral teachers who conduct an elite cadre of meticulously trained student musicians are held in higher regard than those who teach/conduct a more general population of students?

There are additional concerns about durable outcomes of music education. These include issues of persistence within an educational paradigm for secondary schools grounded almost entirely in performance ensembles.³⁰ We may also want to reconsider the importance of the diverse benefits of choral music education, including utilitarian benefits that extend past repertoire and musicianship.³¹ These benefits are currently being explored with groups as diverse as prison choirs³² and intergenerational ensembles.³³

And, there are additional concerns about the connection between curriculum and broader cultural values. Quincy Jones, celebrated musician and scholar of African-American music, recently commented that, including schools, “We currently have prestigious institutions tasked with overseeing the promotion and caretaking of our cultural legacy but regrettably, they have been unable to open up the vast treasures of our culture to all segments of our society.”³⁴ This

problem is occasionally exacerbated, for example, when choral teachers venerate certain genres of choral music at the expense of equally well-crafted music that might be both more approachable and pedagogically appropriate for their students.³⁵ Additional concerns may arise when the content of school choral instruction does not reflect the predominant choral tradition of the surrounding community or culture.³⁶

Working Within the Paradox

Despite this cluster of questions and concerns, we do not need to abandon those components of choral music education that are working very well. Choral music performance does provide an efficient and effective music education, albeit for a limited population. It should continue as such, though newly-conceived of as a pivot point around which other types of ensemble singing occur in schools. There would be opportunities for change at the peripheral edges of a choral music education paradigm where the traditional performance-driven model is the nucleus of a much larger system. This system would require thoughtful considerations regarding educational goals, musical artistry, curriculum, and ensemble structure. This elaborated conception of choral music education would invite discussions, above what Patrick Schmidt labels “mere conversation,”³⁷ around issues of democracy, social justice, access, and privilege. Nearly a century after the a cappella choral movement established standards of performance quality in North American schools, we would begin to redefine the role of choral music teaching in light of new demographics, new standards, new musics, and new technologies. The core of school-based choral performance would remain intact while choral pedagogical practice would grow to encompass the “music for every child” mantra we have chanted for much of the past century.³⁸

Is this idealistic? Certainly. Though this is likely congruent with the stated philosophies found in most college methods texts and the ubiquitous “I believe” teaching statements placed in employment dossiers by prospective music teachers, it is incongruent with much of current practice. Choral music teachers, especially those in high schools, would need to teach more students in larger ensembles. This would require fewer auditioned choirs, with those that remain serving as nub of the model. The established and distinguished standards of choral music performance in our schools would therefore be preserved. Replacing the other, currently auditioned (or otherwise restricted) choirs would be ensembles that potentially serve larger numbers of students and that may or may not have public performance as a goal. These would be crafted to address a variety of ways in which ensemble singing functions in the world, embracing vocal traditions as they exist in communities, cultures, and economies worldwide. Would these facets require new pedagogical approaches and materials? Yes – a boon for the music industry. These new choral encounters would create a need for domain-specific professional development for current and emerging teachers. They would cause us to rethink the boundaries between philosophy and practice. We would retain the best of choral music performance in our schools, following, in part, the model of the North American children’s choir movement that elevated both performance standards and pedagogical quality in elementary school music.³⁹

Deanne Bodgan defined this as living “within the eye of paradox,” confronting “dissonance within consonance.”⁴⁰ Randall Allsup similarly described a “new kind of relationship” in music education “where the oppositional or hierarchical nature of binaries co-exists peacefully *without* tension.”⁴¹ Confronting the performance-pedagogy paradox with a view toward this non-hierarchical prospect will result in the uncovering of new (or newly understood)

principles upon which the future of choral music teaching will be built. William James wrote that, in a situation like this, “New truth is always a go-between, a smoother-over of transitions. It marries old opinion to new fact so as ever to show a minimum of jolt, a maximum of continuity.”⁴² For choral music teachers, the continuity will be embodied in the celebration of long-standing choral traditions, with the added jolt of newly enthusiastic students experiencing choral music participation for the first time.

Conclusion: Resolving the Paradox

In summary, the performance-pedagogy paradox can be deconstructed into two opposing propositions: 1) the performance itself is the primary goal of choral music teaching, and 2) the acquisition of knowledge and skills that lead to performance is the primary goal of choral music teaching. When the paradox is seen as a “both-and” duality where both propositions are true, resolution comes by balancing the two goals. It may be that the balance constantly shifts in response to the politics of teaching situations, the musical concerns of specific performances, and the pedagogies required for individual students and choirs. When the paradox is experienced in ways similar to or divergent from the four encounters I described, it may be recognized for how it guides a host of decisions we make in our rehearsal classrooms, from the design of instruction to the repertoire we choose, from the performance traditions we perpetuate to the manner in which we measure the success of our efforts.

Recognition of how the “both-and” paradox is realized within our classrooms may lead us to confront various effects of one or the other proposition as we seek to align the reality of our teaching with the multiple priorities inherent to the performance-pedagogy paradox. In our efforts to do so, we will find ourselves working within the paradox, encountering innumerable

tensions between musical compositions, educational standards, artistic goals, and human beings. Our conscious and analytic embrace of these tensions will allow the continued evolution of our teaching as it occurs within our academic edifices, our community gathering places, and in performance halls specifically designed to celebrate the results of this enigmatic paradox.

Notes

- ¹ Robert Walker, "We All Came Out of Africa Singing and Dancing and We Have Been Doing it Ever Since," *Research Studies in Music Education* 24 (2005): 4-16.
- ² Richard Irl Kegerris, "Flint Central Launches the High School A Cappella Choir Movement," *Journal of Research in Music Education* 14, no. 4 (Winter 1966): 260.
- ³ Doreen Rao, personal correspondence via email, 10 June 2009. Rao's email message contained the following chronology of the initial ACDA national convention activities of Doreen Rao and the Glen Ellyn Children's Chorus. This information is not otherwise readily available and is included here for the record: 1975 (St. Louis), first performance-demonstration appearance by a children's choir not based on the European boy choir model; 1976 (Interlochen), choral-orchestral performance of American repertoire at the ACDA Bicentennial International Conference; 1977 (Dallas), series of interest session workshops; 1978 and 1979, series of demonstration concerts at regional and national ACDA conventions; 1979, invitation from ACDA for Rao to chair the first National Committee on Children's Choirs.
- ⁴ Doreen Rao, "Children's Choirs: A Revolution from Within," *Music Educators Journal* 80, no. 3 (November 1993): 44.
- ⁵ Hilary Apfelstadt, "First Things First: Selecting Repertoire," *Music Educators Journal* 87, no. 1 (July 2000): 19, 22, 46; Colleen Kirk, "Choral Music Education in America: 1892-1992" in *The Ithaca Conference on American Music Education: Centennial Profiles*, ed. Mark Fonder (Ithaca, NY: Ithaca College, 1992): 75.
- ⁶ Robert Walker, *Music Education: Cultural Values, Social Change and Innovation* (Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 2007): 132-133.
- ⁷ Rick A. Stamer, "Choral Ensembles for Independent Musicianship," *Music Educators Journal* 88, no. 6 (May 2002): 46.
- ⁸ Unita Liberta Wolff, "Choral Unit Standards and Support Material for Primary Schools in South Africa" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria, 2001): i.
- ⁹ Keith Swanwick and Cecilia Cavalieri Franca, "Composing, Performing and Audience-Listening as Indicators of Musical Understanding," *British Journal of Music Education* 16, no. 1 (March 1999): 5-19.
- ¹⁰ Hildegard Froelich, "Institutional Belonging, Pedagogic Discourse, and Music Teacher Education: The Paradox of Routinization," *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 6, no. 3 (2007): 9. Available at http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Froelich6_3.pdf.
- ¹¹ Amia Lieblich, "Introduction" in *The Narrative Study of Lives, Volume 5*, ed. Amia Lieblich and Ruthellen Josselson (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997): xi.

- ¹² For a description of self-story, see Robert V. Bullough, Jr. and Stefinee Pinnegar, "Guidelines for Quality in Autobiographical Forms of Self-Study Research," *Educational Researcher* 30, no. 3 (2001): 13-21.
- ¹³ Cindy L. Bell, "Toward a Definition of a Community Choir," *International Journal of Community Music* 1, no. 2 (2008), 238.
- ¹⁴ Colin Durrant, "Making Choral Rehearsing Seductive: Implications for Practice and Choral Education," *Research Studies in Music Education* 15 (2000): 41.
- ¹⁵ Patrick K. Freer, "Beyond Error Detection: A Cycle of Pedagogical Skills for Choral Conductors," *Choral Journal* 50, no. 3 (2009): 34-45; Sandra Snow, *Choral Conducting/Teaching: Real World Strategies for Success* [DVD] (Chicago, IL: GIA Publications, 2009).
- ¹⁶ Bell, "Community Choir," 238.
- ¹⁷ Debra Gordon Hedden, "Differences Between Elementary Student Participants and Nonparticipants in a Choral Festival," *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education* 25, no. 2 (Spring 2007), 47-58.
- ¹⁸ Rick A. Stamer, "Changes in Choral Student Perceptions of the Music Contest Experience," *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education* 25, no. 1 (Fall-Winter 2006), 46-56.
- ¹⁹ Maria Ann Butke, "Reflection on Practice: A Study of Five Choral Educators' Reflective Journeys," *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education* 25, no. 1 (Fall-Winter 2006): 64; Patrick K. Freer, "The Conductor's Voice: Working Within the Choral Art," *Choral Journal* 48, no. 4 (November 2007): 31-46.
- ²⁰ Mark Gresham, *Choral Conversations: Selected Interviews from Chorus! Magazine* (San Carlos, CA: Thomas House Publications, 1997): 10.
- ²¹ XXX, "Teacher Instructional Language and Student Experience in Middle School Choral Rehearsals," *Music Education Research* 10, no. 1 (March 2008): 107-124; "Focus on Scaffolding Language and Sequential Units During Choral Instruction," *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education* 28, no. 1 (Fall 2009): 33-40.
- ²² Estelle R. Jorgensen, *The Art of Teaching Music* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2008): 282.
- ²³ The Tudor Consort. *About the Choir*. Available at <http://www.tudor-consort.org.nz/profile.php>. 19 January 2010.
- ²⁴ Jane W. Davidson and Jorge Salgado Correia, "Meaningful Musical Performance: A Bodily Experience," *Research Studies in Music Education* 17 (2001): 80.

²⁵. See Nicholas Cook, *Music: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998): 70-71.

²⁶. Durrant, "Making Choral Rehearsing Seductive," 41.

²⁷. For example, see Keitha Lucas Hamann, "Influence on the Curriculum Choices of Middle School Choir Teachers," *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education* 26, no. 1 (Fall-Winter 2007): 64-74.

²⁸. Harold A. Slaatte, *The Persistence of the Paradox: The Dialectics of Reason-in-Existence* (New York: Humanities Press, 1968): 4.

²⁹ Chorus America, *The Chorus Impact Study: How Children, Adults, and Communities Benefit from Choruses*. Available at http://www.chorusamerica.org/documents/Impact09/ImpactStudy09_Report.pdf. 19 January 2010.

³⁰. Roger Mantie and Lynn Tucker, "Closing the Gap: Does Music-Making Have to Stop upon Graduation?," *International Journal of Community Music* 1, no. 2 (2008): 225.

³¹. Deborah V. Blair and Shinko Kondo, "Bridging Musical Understanding through Multiculturalism," *Music Educators Journal* 94, no. 5 (May 2008): 55.

³². Mary L. Cohen, "Conductors' Perspectives of Kansas Prison Choirs," *International Journal of Community Music* 1, no. 2 (2008): 319-333.

³³. Colleen Conway and Thomas M. Hodgman, "College and Community Choir Member Experiences in a Collaborative Intergenerational Performance Project," *Journal of Research in Music Education* 56, no. 3 (October 2008): 220-237.

³⁴. Quincy Jones, "Arts Education in America," *The Huffington Post*, 9 May 2009. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/quincy-jones/arts-education-in-america_b_201127.html. (May 9, 2009).

³⁵. Paul G. Woodford, *Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics, and the Politics of Practice* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2005): 59.

³⁶. Walker, *Music Education*, 287; Annette Stephens, "Education for an Australian Choral Tradition: Evaluating the Philosophies of Stephen Leek" (Masters thesis, Australian Catholic University, 2004). Stephens notes that composer Stephen Leek has long sought to provide curricular materials to Australian choral music teachers in an effort to improve the vocal/choral performance standards of adult ensembles.

³⁷. Patrick K. Schmidt, "Democracy and Dissensus: Constructing Conflict in Music Education," *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7, no. 1 (January 2007): 22. Available at http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Schmidt7_1.pdf

³⁸. See Hildegard Froelich, "Mirror, Mirror on the Wall . . . Or the Challenge of Jumping Over Our Own Shadows," *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 5, no. 2 (December 2006). Available at http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Froehlich5_2.pdf.

³⁹. Judith Anne Jellison, "It's About Time," *Journal of Research in Music Education* 52, no. 3 (2004): 191-205.

⁴⁰. Deanne Bogdan, "Book review," *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 6, no. 1 (Spring 1998): 73.

⁴¹. Randall Everett Allsup, "A Response to Estelle R. Jorgensen, 'Four Philosophical Models of the Relationship Between Theory and Practice,'" *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 13, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 104.

⁴². William James, *Writings 1902-1910* (New York: Library of America, 1988): 513.