

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Choir was my home in high school—the place where I belonged. My complicated background made it difficult to feel at home in most situations: I am a mestiza (the label in the Philippines for people of mixed race), a Filipina American, and I was raised by a family of a different racial and ethnic origin from my own—a transracial adoptee. I was born, raised, nourished on Ho-Chunk Nation territory in Southwestern Wisconsin. I grew up in a predominantly White, rural community, where the intersectionalities of these marginalized identities created a lot of shame (see Brown, 2012), guilt, and confusion within me. I did not see any of my identities represented in my school curriculum or community, nor did I have the opportunity to study with an educator who self-identified as a person of color. Years of research, personal reflection, and psychotherapy have helped me to make connections between my personal struggles and my education. Because of the emphasis on Western European and European American histories, perspectives, traditions, knowledge systems and practices in schools and universities, I could not see myself in any curriculum from Kindergarten through college. I have struggled with my cultural and ethnic identity, mental health, and self-esteem. I experience anxiety due to ancestral trauma, intergenerational trauma, adoption and relinquishment trauma, racialized trauma, and societal pressures of perfectionism, colonial mentality, and imposter syndrome (see Strobel, 2015; Brown, 2012; David, 2013; Menakem, 2017; Kolk, 2014).

When I began my teaching career in 2014, I quickly realized that I was the first educator of color many of my students had encountered. I felt a heavy weight land on my shoulders as I reflected further on my educational experiences, on how these experiences have shaped me, and on how these experiences could possibly inform my teaching and conducting.

Since embarking on my graduate studies in choral conducting in 2016, the social and political landscape of the United States of America have had a significant impact on my perspective of choral music education. In the fall of 2015, a year before I began my graduate studies at the University of Missouri (Mizzou), a series of protests broke out on the Mizzou campus about the the failure of the administration to respond to reports of racial macro- and microaggressions and a culture of ignoring student complaints. This activated many of the students, staff, and faculty (Shonekan, 2018, p. 16; see also Seltzer, 2018; Yount, 2016; Lai, 2020). Dr. R. Paul Crabb, the Director of Choral Activities at Mizzou, was especially supportive and interested in getting involved in conversations regarding race relations on campus and in the local community (Shonekan, 2018, p. 28). Shonekan (2018), Associate Professor of Ethnomusicology and Black Studies at the University of Missouri, and one of my personal mentors, wrote:

While activists were utilizing music on a collective and individual level, it is also important to discuss how the institution, the University of Missouri, was affected in a unique way by the music of the movement. In the spring of 2016, the only black graduate student in the music conducting program of the School of Music, Ernest (EJ) Harrison, was moved to compose a new piece for the University Singers. EJ had been watching from his position on the sidelines, mentally

affected if not physically involved in the marches and protests. He was inspired to write a new piece of music for the predominantly white university choir, one that reflected the movement and the struggle of black students on their particular campus. The choral conductor, my colleague Dr. Paul Crabb, was faced with a choice of whether or not to include the new piece in the spring concert. It is a beautifully artful fusion of the State of Missouri anthem with the old civil rights song “We Shall Overcome.” It begins with some of the jarring quotes from our local paper and local community, a showcase of racist and xenophobic reactions to black students. These quotes are shouted into the silence by choir members who are sitting among the audience. Then there is the sound of commotion and noise, effective symbolism for the chaotic environment surrounding any social movement. When the commotion dies down, the choir takes over in a beautifully balanced mixture of the voice sections and of the two songs. ...This alliance between EJ and Professor Paul Crabb gives us a model and a symbolic gesture that might attempt to bridge the racial gap. (pp. 28–29)

Ever since Dr. Crabb decided to include EJ’s piece “Anthem” on the spring concert program, the choral program at the University of Missouri has committed to celebrating Black artistry and musicianship through intentional concert programming, as well as facilitating dialogue between university students and local community members about race relations in the United States. When I began my studies at Mizzou in fall of 2016, I was brought into conversations that were continuing from the previous school year (see Worstell, 2017; Gaines, 2017).

As Donald Trump began his term as the 45th President of the United States of America, the educational environment, surrounding issues of race and racism at Mizzou, felt very active and engaged, which supported my desire to pursue issues of identity politics, social justice, and activism in my personal body of academic research and scholarship.

Growing up, I was exposed to various political viewpoints, but I did not always understand the impact of politics on my personal and professional life. For the past five years in graduate studies, however, I have committed to academic scholarship that centers the experiences and musical contributions of Black, Indigenous, Latinx, and People of Color (BILPOC), and other marginalized communities. This has helped me develop self-awareness around my positionality as a researcher and music educator, and to understand my multiple identities—cisgender, able-bodied, mestiza, Filipina, transracial adoptee. In the past year, I have committed to my own decolonization journey in order to reclaim my connection to my pre-colonial, Filipinx ancestry and Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices (IKSP) (Strobel, 2010), reconcile my complex identities and intersectionalities, and recontextualize negative experiences caused by systems of oppression, such as colonialism and white supremacy. Through this process of reclamation, reconciliation, and recontextualization, I have been able to look at choral music through a different lens—a lens that centers IKSP and challenges structures that uphold white supremacist belief systems, behaviors, and values (Strobel, 2010; see also Strobel, 2004; 2013; 2015; David, 2013; Anzaldúa, 2012; Crenshaw, 1991; Smith et. al., 2019).

On May 20, 2020, I publicly committed to my decolonization journey on a social media blog under the social media handle @decolonizing_kiki and posted my introductory picture and caption (Steiner, 2020). During the summer months of 2020, I connected with individuals and community organizations, including podcasts, blogs, academic scholars, activists, psychotherapists, healers, musicians, creatives, and educators within and across the Filipinx diaspora, as well as conductors, music educators, anti-racist educators, and activists from diverse backgrounds, who are also committed to social justice and community work (see Clark, 2020). In the past nine months, I have connected with other Filipinx individuals on social media, gathered resources, and learned about Filipinx history, culture, languages, food, Spanish colonization, activism, and politics (David, 2013; Francia, 2010; Ocampo, 2016; Apostol, 2010). Through this venture, I have connected with my Filipinx *kapwa* (community; to see the self in the other) and have begun to reclaim my cultural and ethnic identities. Clark (2020) describes her experience as an academic and intellectual on Black Twitter: “Social media gives us the ability to be vulnerable, to drop the mask in public ways that we dare not attempt among members of our cohort or in front of faculty” (p. 3). As I have continued to develop this presence online, I have experienced something similar, as I drop my “mask” about different aspects of my multiple identities, interests, and hobbies. Especially important to my decolonization journey, I have been guided to a line of academic scholarship to ground my decolonization work and academic research in my Filipinx identity (Strobel, 2010; see also Strobel 2013; Strobel, 2015).

As a transracial adoptee, the exposure to decolonization frameworks, created by and for Filipinx Americans, gave me the sense of being heard, as if this process of “dropping my masks” and reclaiming my multiple identities was actually my ancestors beckoning me home all along.

In *Red Pedagogy*, Styres (2019) briefly describes the concept of “journeying” as: “a process of coming to know. It is essentially learning through the chaos of moving from the familiar through to the unfamiliar while maintaining and observing a reflective frame of mind” (p. 29). At this time in history, our discipline has the opportunity to journey together through the unfamiliar to better understand ourselves, our art, and what we as choral conductors, educators and artists stand for. Styres (2019) continues:

Trusting in the sacredness of the journeying process ensures that we will find that what was once unfamiliar and uncertain territory is now filled with all that we can now know and connect to that serve to make this new place familiar to us. It is a place enriched with new knowledges and greater awareness and understandings because of this learning experience. Journeying is a place where our stories intersect and become interconnected with other stories—layers upon layers. (p. 29)

Now is the time for us to navigate our way through the uncertain terrain and begin to reimagine and reconceptualize choral music education together in community.

Need for the Study

As we know it today, the American collegiate choral ensemble upholds the belief and value systems of the Western European classical musical tradition (Freer, 2011). For choirs, the modern understanding has roots in the Middle Ages.

With such an extensive history, choral educators and pedagogues have felt tension between upholding tradition and encouraging innovation or reconceptualization (see Jorgensen, 2003). Through choral rehearsals and performances, musicians and audiences alike perpetuate a culture that continually reproduces expectations, standards, and traditions from a Western European perspective, known as the white racial frame (Schubert, 1986, p. 29; see Feagin, 2013).

For many decades, choral educators from various settings have discussed issues of diversity and multiculturalism in order to broaden the scope of the choral canon and encourage a more diverse population to participate in choral music. These conversations, however, have not always gotten to the root of the issue—choral ensembles in the United States, stem from exclusive and elitist hierarchical models and power structures that emphasize the white racial frame (Feagin, 2013). Intentionally or not, they sustain settler colonialist knowledge systems and practices. These tokenize and “other” BILPOC, LGBTQIA+, differently abled, and marginalized communities (see also Ewell, 2019; Strobel, 2015; Talbot, 2018; Lind & McKoy, 2016; Palkki, 2015; Palkki, 2017; Fuelberth & Todd, 2017).

The first step in disrupting and dismantling the white racial frame and settler colonial thought is to identify these philosophies within the discourse of collegiate choral music programs. When choral music began in Western Europe over six hundred years ago, choirs naturally conformed to the feudalist social and political models of the day. In the Middle Ages (5th-15th century), European society was separated into categories based on class, from least empowered to most: serfs, peasants, merchants, farmers, knights, nobles, and the ruling monarchy. This hierarchy was at the heart of all the

intertwined political, religious, and academic structures of medieval Europe. The choral ensemble can trace its roots to the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, when cathedral schools provided education for boys beginning around ages eight to ten, who were trained to provide music for church services. Their main musical duty was to perform all choral chants, such as the Psalms, hymns, antiphons, and the Ordinary Mass (Wright, 1989, p. 181). The educational system was deeply hierarchical (Wright, p. 99–100).

As choral music traveled across the Atlantic Ocean with American colonizers in the seventeenth century, the choral ensemble took on a slightly different form. Eventually, the singing school emerged. Crawford & Steele (2014) explain a series of instructional sessions of a type prevalent in the 18th and 19th centuries, devoted to the teaching of the rudiments of singing and note reading, with a focus on sacred music. A singing-school usually lasted no more than two or three months—long enough for a class of beginners, meeting regularly under an instructor, to master the basics of singing and reading music.

One of the earliest known singing-schools occurred in 1710-1711 (Crawford & Steel, 2014). Singing-schools led by singing masters, including William Billings (1746-1800) and Lowell Mason (1792-1872), prioritized the teaching of note reading and part singing, which provided music education, as well as socialization for community members (Broyles et. al., 2014). These singing masters were compensated by collecting tuition fees. This demanded that the singing masters select music to study that was interesting and engaging to their paying students and participants (p. 92).

In addition, the singing masters sold their own tunebooks, which were method books on singing, creating revenue for the singing masters and a market for music publications in the new colony (Crawford & Steel, 2014). As the choral ensemble entered American public education in the late nineteenth century, this model of instruction from the singing masters greatly influenced choral music pedagogy, with a focus on teaching sight-singing and a standard choral canon (Broyles et. al., 2014).

Lowell Mason was best known for his contributions as an American sacred music composer, anthologist, and music educator (Broyles et. al., 2014; see also Crawford, 2001). Broyles et. al. (2014) wrote:

Mason's reputation lies in three areas: an advocate for musical taste based on European classical music; a composer and anthologist of church music, including many original hymns; and an educator largely responsible for introducing music into the public schools. His success in all three areas made him one of the most influential musicians in 19th-century America. (p. 1)

Often called "The Father of Music Education," Mason's foundational principles, firmly rooted in his advocacy for European classical music, are still widely accepted and practiced in the music classroom today (see Broyles et. al., 2014; Crawford, 2001).

One of Mason's innovations was to present free singing schools for children, a project he began around 1830 (Crawford, 2001, p. 147) Around the same time, Mason was introduced to an American educator, William Woodbridge, whose pedagogical practices were greatly influenced by Swiss reformer Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (Crawford, 2001, p. 148; Broyles et. al., 2014). Broyles et. al. (2014) wrote:

Pestalozzi believed that education is best accomplished by children learning through direct experience and active and creative participation, as opposed to rote regurgitation and structured environments typical of the time. Rather than learning the rules of music and practice in note singing until errors were corrected, in Mason's adaptation children were taught simple tunes by rote, then note singing, then part-singing approached first through simple canons. Emphasis was upon natural singing, and the belief that all children could sing. (n.a.)

Overall, Mason's pedagogical approach was more collaborative than was typical of his contemporaries (Crawford, 2001, p. 148). Even though his approach was unusual, Mason's influence on American music education was critical to infusing Eurocentric attitudes into the discourse of choral music education.

After the 1957 launch of Sputnik I by the Soviet Union, the United States government supported educational efforts to make the US more competitive in mathematics and science (Werner, 2009, p. 101). By the mid-twentieth century, however, music educators began to rethink and reimagine what a choral ensemble could accomplish beyond teaching musical notation and Western European music. Regional and national projects explored the practices of music educators to discover more comprehensive ways of teaching and learning music. These include the Yale Seminar (1963), the Manhattanville Project (1965-70) and the Wisconsin Comprehensive Musicianship through Performance (CMP) Project (1977).

The Yale Seminar (1963) was one response to the national push for education reform. Most of the participants in the Yale Seminar were composers, theorists, and musicologists from the northeast region of the United States (Werner, p. 102).

Werner (2009) reported the participants made recommendations in the following ten different areas of music education:

1. Musicality
2. Repertory
3. Music as Literature
4. Performing Activities
5. Courses for advanced students
6. Musicians in Residence
7. Community Resources
8. National Resources
9. Audiovisual Aides
10. Teacher Training and Retraining (p. 102)

Although the seminar addressed these ten areas, the one that received the most attention following the seminar was the recommendation for and about repertory (Werner, 2009, p. 103). Werner (2009) states their recommendation: “Repertory—the present repertory of school music should be brought in line with contemporary composition and advances in musicology, while being strengthened in its coverage of the standard concert literature” (p. 102). Nowhere in this recommendation does it address a need to expand the repertory to include more BILPOC composers or music from communities of color. Additionally, the seminar was criticized for having participants mainly from the northeast coast of the United States and for involving too few K-12 teachers, which greatly impacted the lens in which these recommendations were made (p. 102).

Werner (2009) stated:

Almost half of the participants were composers, theorists, and musicologists; the rest included two music critics, two jazz musicians, only one performer, a school administrator, three college music educators, five public and private school music teachers and even the educational advisor from the White House. (p. 102)

This critique is especially important because it provides more context for who held power, who made decisions, and what their values were at the time.

The Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program (1965-70) was financially supported by a \$221,000 federal grant, which is worth approximately 1.8 million dollars in today's dollars, from the Arts and Humanities Program (AHP) (Moon & Humphreys, 2010, p. 75; U.S. Official Inflation Data). Again, in response to the launch of Sputnik I, this grant was given in efforts "to develop an alternative music curriculum for grades K-12" (Moon & Humphreys, p. 76). The program was rolled out in three phases over the course of three years, from 1967-1970, where music educators met in the summers to address current concerns in music education. Over the course of the three years, the participants developed multiple drafts of a reconceptualized K-12 music program. Prominent music educators involved in the program were Robert A. Choate, George H. Kyme, and Edwin E. Gordon (*Music Learning Theory*) (p. 76). By simply acknowledging those with the most powerful voices within the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program as being male and White, the white racial frame reveals itself.

In the first year, a pilot group of nineteen current music teachers attended an intensive summer workshop at the Manhattan College (Moon & Humphreys, p. 76). During this workshop, the participants identified five basic elements of music that

became the basis of instruction: dynamics, timbre, form, rhythm, and pitch (p. 76). When the participants returned to their respective schools, each music educator was encouraged to test lessons and strategies developed in the program over the summer (Moon & Humphreys, 2010, p. 77). The next year, the participants reconvened for a two-week period to discuss their experiences and create a first draft of the curriculum (Moon & Humphreys, p. 78). After the fourth revision, in the third phase of the project, the Manhattanville Program published its final draft of the curriculum, called *MMCP Synthesis: A Structure for Music Education* (Moon & Humphreys, p. 79).

The Wisconsin Comprehensive Musicianship through Performance Project was a study conducted by a pilot group of eight music educators that met at Lawrence University in Appleton, Wisconsin, in 1977 (Sindberg, 2008, p. 25). The participants were nominated and recognized by colleagues for their success with their performing ensembles (Sindberg, 2008, p. 30). From those nominated, the steering committee chose two middle school band educators, two middle school choral educators, two high school band educators, and two high school choral educators to serve the project for two years (p. 31). Like the seminars and programs preceding it, this project reflected the fact that band, orchestra, and choral ensembles were the primary means of delivering music education at that time. Sindberg (2008) discussed the goals of the music educators who gathered over forty years ago:

While they were well aware that students in their particular region played and sang with technical prowess, these music educators believed in the possibility of broadening the musical experience for students in band, choir, and orchestra.

They envisioned a musical education with breadth and depth that was multi-faceted and would more fully engage students in the ensemble setting. (p. 25)

According to Sindberg (2008), the participants discussed the behaviors of excellent ensemble directors. They especially encouraged their students to achieve a high level of technical skill (p. 32). The CMP model, however, did very little to expand the lens through which choral music was being taught or performed. Instead, it continued a bias toward the Western European choral canon through its focus on teaching “quality literature,” another phrase that requires unpacking. Both the content and the methodology of the CMP model were filtered through the white racial frame (Kerzmann, 2017, p.12; Sindberg, 2012; Feagin, 2013; Broyles et. al., 2014).

In the past, choral music educators and scholars have attempted to address the dominance of Western European traditions in music education through the concept of multicultural education (Au, 2014). It is important however, to acknowledge the inconsistency of definitions of the following terminology: multiculturalism, diversity, and anti-racist education. Conversations in choral music education surrounding multicultural education usually refer to diversifying and expanding the repertory of the standard choral canon. This has resulted in music from non-Western cultures being whitewashed and largely tokenized (Armstrong, 2018). Many choirs appropriate non-Western European cultures and ignore the systemic problems that keep marginalized communities out of choirs. In addition, this approach to multiculturalism in music education upholds a colonization framework that “others” non-Western European music traditions and continues to center whiteness as the standard (Cho, 2015; McCarroll, 2016; Yoo, 2017).

Strobel (2015) writes:

Likewise, the concept of “multiculturalism,” which has been co-opted to mean the celebration of diversity while preserving a European-based common culture, is being redefined to mean not only the tokenistic inclusion of “diverse others” in the U.S. society, nor the liberal notion of extending the canon, but the radical questioning of the assumptions behind the European-based common culture. (p. 82)

Purpose of the Study

One of the definitions of “institution” in Merriam-Webster is “a significant practice, relationship, or organization in a society or culture.” In *Transforming Music Education*, Jorgensen (2003) eloquently explains the challenges that pervade established institutions, as well as the need for institutional change. There is a practical need for institutions: they allow for stability, continuity, conflict resolution, cooperation, and socialization (Jorgensen, 2003, p. 6). Institutions, however, do just that—institutionalize values, beliefs, and norms that can also encourage “dehumanizing forces of exclusivity, oppression, violence, patriarchy, selfishness, and disdain of different others” (Jorgensen, 2003, p. 6). Some choral traditions and choral practices that we accept as given nevertheless cause harm. For example, concert dress codes that uphold the gender binary exclude and harm gender queer and diverse individuals. Such traditions need to be carefully interrogated, examined, and discarded (Hearns & Kremer, 2018; Blaisdell, 2018; Palkki, 2017; Rastin, 2016). A Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of historical scholarship and current public collegiate choral program websites can demonstrate that the discourse of collegiate choral music is based in a hierarchical philosophy that

propagates the white racial frame and settler colonialist ideals (Feagin, 2013; see also Ewell, 2019; Grande, 2004; Smith, 2012; Smith et. al., 2019; Strobel, 2013; 2015; Patel, 2016; Kremer & Jackson-Paton, 2014; Locke, 2004; Wodak & Meyer, 2001; Meyer, 2001; Weiss & Wodak, 2003).

This call for action is not the first of its kind. Patricia O'Toole (2005) expressed her personal frustrations with choral ensembles that operate within hierarchical structures: "I find that the conventions of choral pedagogy are designed to create docile, complacent singers who are subject to a discourse that is more interested in the production of music than in the laborers" (p. 2). Most importantly, O'Toole (2005) reminds us that choral discourse originates with only one segment of the population, namely men (to which I would add the designation "White"):

Surrounding the conventions of choral pedagogy is a pervasive discourse that privileges male culture. Historically, choral music has been organized almost exclusively around the contributions, achievements, and advancement of men. Male composers, performers, and conductors have received central attention in historical and theoretical analysis of music. The canonized contributions of these historians and theoreticians, most of whom were men, created the standards by which music is judged worthy of study and performance. By promoting this specific version of history, men have tightly controlled the meaning-making system within music; consequently, the dominant discourse in music is partial to male culture. Further, discourse concerning what is considered "quality" music, how music is thought about and listened to, and

how music is talked about in terms of appreciation and aesthetics has been crafted in large part by men and serves primarily the interests of male culture. (p. 5)

I would expand O'Toole's "male culture" to include the closely associated white racial frame and settler colonialism. Through individual and collective reflection, choral educators must address personal and institutional biases, such as requiring students to wear tuxedos and dresses, that uphold what I am calling the white racial frame and settler colonialist thought, which O'Toole (2005) describes as "male culture." Male culture, or patriarchy, predominates in a colonized society (see Feagin, 2013).

In order to examine how the use of language in choral music education has centered whiteness and perpetuated settler colonialist thought, this preliminary study presents a narrative Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of collegiate choral program websites, looking especially at their structure, language, and imagery. Styres (2019) writes:

As we well know language is never neutral—it can teach us, inform us, entertain us, persuade us, and manipulate us—it can misguide and misdirect truths, thereby perpetuating colonial myths and stereotypical representations, or it can disrupt normalizing and hegemonic dominant discourses and liberate critical thought (p. 25).

Through this narrative analysis, I identify the ways that discourse in choral music, specifically on collegiate choral program websites, centers whiteness by employing the white racial frame (Feagin, 2013) and embodying settler colonialist ideals (Grande, 2004; Smith, 2012; Tuck & Yang, 2012; Smith et. al., 2019). Current curricula and pedagogies culturally reproduce these points of view by centering European historiographies,

traditions, and practices (Grande, 2004; Feagin, 2013; Schubert, 1986). Styres (2019) writes:

Whiteness is not about racial profiling based on identity and skin color but rather relates to whiteness as a structural-cultural positioning of relations of power and privilege. It is not about *who* is whiteness but rather *how* whiteness is perpetuated and maintained through networks and relations of power and privilege within and across societies and—in this case—within educational contexts. (Smith et. al., 2019, p. 31)

As choral music educators work to build a more diverse repertory and culturally responsive teaching pedagogies (Hess, 2019), it is important to acknowledge how the language that is used in our discipline is infused with settler colonialist ideology. Consciously or unconsciously, we uphold power structures that further marginalizes oppressed communities (Smith et. al., 2019; Smith, 2012; Tuck & Yang, 2012; Grande, 2004).

Current approaches to collegiate choral program design and structure follow traditional hierarchical models (Major & Dakon, 2016, p. 110). A typical collegiate choral program consists of a treble choir, bass choir, mid-level treble-bass choir, and a mixed-voice choir, which are formed through an audition process (see Estes, 2013). These ensembles are typically designed to prepare students for the next advanced chorus, with treble choirs being at the bottom and the mixed choirs at the top. Estes (2013) and Conway (2020) have both written extensively on the perception that treble choirs are inferior to mixed-voice choirs. With this traditional approach, students are placed in a

specific ensemble decided by the Director of Choral Activities (DCA) or the choral faculty as a whole. Estes (2013) states:

Women's choirs have been perceived as less prestigious than and inferior to mixed choirs. This view has been reinforced by a continuing reliance on the system currently in place in most academic choral programs: a hierarchy that preferences mixed choirs above all other types by making them the most selective. (p. 1)

In this hierarchical model, choral educators have assumed that the challenge of moving up to the next ensemble in the hierarchy will motivate student learning and achievement (Major & Dakon, 2016, p. 110; see Estes, 2013). According to Kremer & Jackson-Paton (2014), although a hierarchical structure may be successful in certain learning and teaching contexts, it is important to remember that values of "hierarchy" and "individualism" are characteristic of a Western mind, whereas a characteristic of Indigeneity focuses on the "collective" (p. 44). Kremer & Jackson-Paton (2014) defines "collectivism" as "Defining the self in terms of relationship to other people and groups and giving priority to group goals" (p. 44). To take it one step further, collectivism is a quality of a broader Indigenous worldview—"A holistic cultural paradigm of living and being in the world which not only attempts to avoid separation but actively maintains an integral relationship with ancestors, nature, spirits, place, astronomy, history, and so on" (Kremer & Jackson-Paton, 2014, p. 428). From an Indigenous perspective, there is an encouragement for all humans, regardless of origin, to connect deeper with one's existence in the natural world, including one's relationships to self and to others.

This paradigm shift, from the Western to the Indigenous within collegiate choral music discourse, provides an opportunity to further our commitments to anti-racist and anti-bias teaching.

A Paradigm Shift

In order to disrupt the normal discourse of a doctoral document, and commit to a decolonized methodology (Smith, 2012), I have engaged in critical story-telling and re-membering of four significant American collegiate choral programs on Indigenous land called Turtle Island. Turtle Island, also known as North America, received this name from various Native American nations and origin stories explaining the history of their motherland being formed on the back of a turtle. Kremer & Jackson-Paton (2014) explain how “remembrance” is so critical to the decolonization process:

Acts of remembrance for those of Eurocentered inheritance include the underworld material of conquest needed to be incorporated into the self (Kremer & Rothberg, 1999) and what has been called “rituals of inquiry” (Jackson-Paton, 2008). This includes acts of remembering how our ancestors (among other settlers) narrated their experience of place in North America. Recovering participation is also such an act of remembrance, as is a genealogical imagination. As descendants of settlers, remembrance of the other includes acceptance of narratives of survivance. Remembrance makes space for richer – and transformative – stories of self and other (Hooker & Czajkowski, 2012; Regan, 2010).

This re-membering is followed by an analysis of current uses of language in choral music education through a narrative CDA, in the style of Socratic dialogue. In Chapter 2, I

describe my methodology for the narrative CDA and discuss the literature collected, in order to provide a critical historical re-telling of four significant collegiate choral programs. I have also included a description of the various frameworks, methodologies, and theories informing the CDA. I have chosen this unusual approach to a doctoral document intentionally to disrupt and challenge the norm for academic discourse of this nature. This study and its presentation intentionally disrupt the emphasis on objective measurements, data collection, and dehumanization of the “other” in Western research methodologies. Knezic et. al. (2009) write about the roots of the Socratic Dialogue method explaining the historical context from which it emerged—Athens, Greece in 5th century BC. Knezic et. al. (2009) explain the Socratic method, as it is known in Greek, means “midwifery”:

Socrates claimed that just like his mother he was practising midwifery. Only his mother helped pregnant women deliver babies, whereas he helped his followers deliver knowledge. He did so mostly by questioning: first driving his collocutors into self-contradiction (elenchus) and thus freeing them of their false preconceptions and then helping them deliver the true knowledge (p. 1105).

In Chapter 3, I offer a critical re-membering of settler colonialism and chattel slavery, and the impact these power structures have had on four significant collegiate choral programs: Fisk University, Hampton University, St. Olaf, and Westminster Choir College. To represent different narratives and lenses, I have provided a historical re-telling of the founding of choral programs at four institutions—two Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs) and two Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). In Chapter 4, the narrative CDA, called “Decolonizing Kiki,” will be a Socratic dialogue

between a fictional character, Kiki, and her four *Ates* (elder females). In this dialogue, Kiki is talking to her *Ates* about going to college in the fall to begin her Bachelor of Music degree in Vocal Music Education. Through this conversation between Kiki and her *Ates*, I will analyze commonly used words in the discourse of choral music education found on choral program websites. Lastly, in Chapter 5, I will discuss the emergent themes from the Socratic dialogue between Kiki and her *Ates* and conclude with my suggestions for future research.

Research Questions

1. How have power structures, such as the white racial frame (Feagin, 2013) and colonialist knowledge systems and practices (see Grande, 2004; Patel, 2016; Strobel, 2015; Smith, 2012; Smith et. al., 2019), shaped collegiate choral music programs?
2. Which power structures are found within discourse on collegiate choral program websites?
3. How does the language used on collegiate choral program websites reinforce and reproduce power structures?
4. How do power structures in collegiate choral music discourse affect underrepresented communities?
5. How have power structures in collegiate choral music discourse affected me and shaped my experiences as a music student and music educator?