

Democracy, Pragmatist Aesthetics, and the Choral Experience

Paul Woodford

The University of Western Ontario, Ontario, Canada

My new book *Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics and the Politics of Practice* (2005a) is at once critical of music education as traditionally practiced in the western democracies and positive in the sense that it provides a healthy social vision for the profession. As I emphasize in the book, criticism is essential to understanding but it should be motivated by a loving concern for humanity and its problems. Far from being an exercise in negativity, as perhaps many in our field are wont to believe, it should be directed towards the improvement of the human condition. My purpose, and responsibility, is thus to improve music education practice. Accordingly, concrete examples of how democratic principles and ideals might be applied to actual music education practice are provided. When writing the book, however, I was careful not to be too prescriptive. While inviting music teachers to test my democratic vision for music education through application to practice, I remain adamant that they should develop their own ideas and strategies. We need more thinkers and visionaries in our field and fewer pedagogues, pedants, and technocrats.

Nevertheless it now behoves me to offer additional suggestions, if only to stimulate further conversation about the practicality of pursuing a democratic purpose for music education. I thus welcome this opportunity to apply my ideas to the choral experience, and it is especially fitting that I do so here in my native Newfoundland and Labrador, a province with a rich vocal and choral music tradition of which I have considerable knowledge.

Music Really Matters

As I explain in my book, music and music education are not just about entertainment or skill-building. Music and the arts are serious business in that they are the propaganda tools of choice of those wishing to seduce, dominate, and control. Today's media moguls and corporate executives rely on music, the arts and the ubiquitous communications media to mesmerize and render us "silent before the spectacle of commodities (Attali, 1985, p. 112)." Politicians and religious and other leaders, too, appreciate the power of music to "silence opposition or to stoke excessive patriotic...religious, or sexual fervor and thus channel, distort, or wipe out thought (Woodford, 2005a, pp. 27-28)." Music can even literally be employed as a form of

torture, such as the Americans have been doing in postwar Iraq and Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, where prisoners are subjected to culturally offensive music as means of breaking down their resistance to interrogation (pp. 27-28). And, of course, probably all of us have experienced the problem of musical incivility. No matter where we go today—whether in restaurants, malls, movie theatres, public parks and schools, or walking along busy streets, and sometimes even at music teacher conferences—we are bombarded with music to which we are expected to passively submit.

Music teachers and curricula, however, seldom have anything to say about these and other ethical and social justice issues, and how students are to make sense of a complex and increasingly technologically driven musical world characterized more by indifference and social fragmentation than any sense of decency and common humanity. Music teachers like to think that music education can transform the world into a utopia with perfect harmony, but that is only sentimentalism, which is practically devoid of thought. This utopian sentiment was especially prevalent during the 1970s when, as I recall, many music teachers adopted as their unofficial anthem the hit song “I’d Like to Teach the World to Sing in Perfect Harmony.” Probably few teachers considered the ethics of programming a song that was originally entitled, and was well-known as, “I’d Like to Buy the World a Coke.” The Coke references were later deleted from the published sheet music version that teachers used, but the fact remains that the song was part of one of the most successful commercials of all time. That song can still be found in elementary music education textbooks (e.g., Hackett & Lindeman, 1997) just as lesson plans based on it are readily available on the internet.

Similarly, few of today’s teachers worry about the ethics of performing Disney tunes and musicals or other kinds of heavily commercialized popular or movie music in schools, which just goes to show how effective music can be as marketing tool for indoctrinating children to consumer culture (Klein, 2000; Barber, 1996, p. 294). But then, music teachers-in-training are seldom required or encouraged to critically examine professional practice and to intellectually engage with the wider world. As Giroux (1994) and other social critics observe (e.g., Saul, 1995), today’s universities are designed to create skilled professionals and not informed public intellectuals who are disposed to challenge the status quo.

This is probably especially the case in performance programs dedicated to the pursuit of musical excellence at all costs, divorced from social, cultural, historical, and political factors affecting music’s production and reception. Our programs of highly specialized musical study remain cloistered and taught in relative isolation from other fields such as philosophy, history, religion, science, film studies, and politics, all of

Democracy, Pragmatist Aesthetics, and the Choral Experience

which can inform and potentially enrich practice (Botstein, 2000). Students are required to take other courses, but there is seldom any attempt to establish explicit linkages between music and other subjects (let alone among music courses or between music education and worldly events). Further, the roots of our traditional choirs and bands are in autocratic institutions such as the church and military, not parliamentary ones. Dissent is hardly tolerated in those ensembles, which leads me to wonder whether those performance programs are educating students in the true sense of the word or just training them to passively submit. Our choirs and ensembles may perform with amazing technique and perfect intonation and diction, but those qualities are not always or even necessarily conducive to independent thought and freedom of expression.

I recall one St. John's choir during the 1970s, for example, that was renowned for its highly disciplined and polished performances of music, all learned by rote and through sheer drill. That choir, however, also had a reputation among music festival adjudicators for its musical inflexibility, which is a form of passivity. It is worth noting that totalitarian regimes often value music performance programs for precisely this reason; that highly disciplined methodological instruction of this sort can create a passive citizenry (Jorgensen, 1997; Bute, 2004). Many of our own so-called democratic governments, with their emphases on consumerism, market discipline, Darwinian competition, and religion, are little better in this regard (Barber, 1996, p. 295; Woodford, 2005a, p. 61). For example, while critical thinking is usually included in music curricula in the Western democracies, it is usually conceived and taught as a form of abstract thinking skill divorced from the world and its problems (e.g., Brophy, 2000). It is highly disciplined busywork, which is a perversion of what Dewey, one of the founders of the modern critical thinking movement, intended (Tanner, 1988; Paul, 1984). Those political, corporate, and religious leaders are not interested in creating citizens who might challenge their authority (Carr & Hartnett, 1996; Laxer, 1996; Frum, 1994; Tanner, 1988). Thus, it is no wonder that undergraduates often do not realize that music and music education are worldly and not just distractions from the problems of life; that music and music education, too, are problematic in the sense of presenting interesting and often complex challenges having to do with personal and collective freedom and identity and demanding serious attention and critical scrutiny.

If music education is to help prepare children and undergraduates for adult life and to eventually participate as full-fledged members of democratic society, then teachers and teacher educators need help them understand how the world works, including how music and music pedagogy can be used and abused, by whom, and to what ends (e.g.,

how and why consumer culture actually discourages singing among the great majority of people; see Joyce, 2005). Teachers also need to provide frequent opportunities and ways for students to express and intellectually defend their informed opinions (while receiving and taking into account constructive criticism) and, thereby, to find their own voices. All this needs to be coupled with a sense of social responsibility and a genuine concern for others and their welfare, and particularly the poor and the weak who are usually ill-served by us, but who would benefit immensely from involvement in our programs (Woodford, 2005b). This, I argue, is only the intelligent and humane thing for music teachers to do, for in democratic society teachers are accountable to the public and must contribute to the good of all and not just cater to elites. If music teachers wish to obtain the kind of political legitimacy needed to ensure the future of their programs then they will have to serve the common good, which in part means that they will have to be more inclusive while contributing to a more humane society.

Taking a Longer and Wider View

One way that music teachers and students can begin taking a more humane and intelligent approach to music education is by taking a wider and longer view of music, placing "their own personal problems and creative decisions into a broader perspective by taking into account the intentions and experiences of other people, including previous generations of composers, performers, audiences and critics (Woodford, 2005a, p. 102)." Teachers and students should carefully research the music they are conducting, performing, studying, or listening to so that they can become better informed. And not just about the music, itself, but also about the society in which it was created. Music, after all, does not exist in a vacuum. It makes little educational sense to perform Haydn's *Creation*, Schafer's *Threnody*, the different versions of the *Ode to Newfoundland*, or the rock music of Queen without taking into account composers' intentions and relevant social and political factors, but also performance practices and audience sensibilities and how they have evolved over time. Whenever possible this should also include consideration of contemporary criticism of those works and performances thereof but also consideration of whether our programs are sufficiently representative of our own culture and the world's music.

I am not arguing that all music is equally good, which is a common position nowadays and one that I consider to be vacuous. Nor am I saying that teachers have a duty to study and perform everything. Rather, I am suggesting that many of our repertorial decisions are based not on reason, but on personal preference, class interest,

Democracy, Pragmatist Aesthetics, and the Choral Experience

or ignorance. Many of us still privilege the classics not because they necessarily epitomize objective excellence, but because we have been trained to reify them. Even by their own standards, however, many so-called classics are over-rated, while excellence can be found in other genres, including popular music. Frankly, I get a lot more intellectual stimulation listening to Frank Zappa's music, which is often quite complex, witty, and socially relevant (if naughty) than to many so-called classical works that are *polite*, but vapid (and of course there is vapid popular music, too, just as there is naughty and highly sexualized classical music).

The above, however, should not be interpreted to mean that teachers should necessarily attempt to perform anything *authentically*. Indeed, I view the pursuit of musical authenticity as problematical, not just because it can promote passivity but because, as Dewey cautioned in his classic book *The Quest for Certainty* (1929), we just do not have sufficient knowledge of the past, or the present for that matter, to claim anything with complete certainty. Accordingly, we should be wary of absolutisms and those claiming exclusive representation of the wishes or intentions of long-dead composers, pedagogues, or of God for that matter. We should also be humble, since none of us knows for sure how to teach or perform in ways that will guarantee success (Beynon, 1998; Schafer, 1975).

Nevertheless, music teachers have an obligation to the dead, the living, and the unborn; the past, present, and future. As scholars they are guides to tradition and culture (I dislike the descriptor "culture bearers" because it implies that teachers are *giving* students the *gift of music*, which implies that students do not have music or minds of their own); as creative artists they are charged with changing the present and not just endlessly reproducing the past; and as teachers they are responsible for preparing the next generation to help shape the future. While teachers should not feel compelled to blindly follow the advice of experts (whose own knowledge is only partial) they should nevertheless be consulted because they can inform decision-making. Thus, for example, when programming Newfoundland or other folk music teachers and students should research its provenance, including how it was originally performed, by whom and for what occasion, but also how its performance may have changed over time and from one location to another. It is liberating and empowering to realize how musical values, including conceptions of musical excellence (such as notions of good tone quality and vibrato) vary from one epoch, culture, group, and location to another, and how musical sensibilities change and evolve more according to whimsy, social class, culture, and political purpose than any kind of natural progression or metaphysical plan.

But while teachers should use knowledge of the past and of current praxis as guidelines to action, they should not feel bound by it, as that would deprive them of any significant creative decision-making and moral responsibility. This admonishment is especially important in light of the continued and growing interest in musical multiculturalism in our schools, as some practices imported into western schools may be inimical to democratic culture. We hear much talk nowadays about inclusivity, which is a democratic principle, but any musical genres and practices employed in our schools need be held to a democratic standard and not just mindlessly accepted or taught on their own terms. In democratic society, nothing should be considered sacrosanct and immune from criticism. For to do less than that would be to treat musical multiculturalism as just another absolutism to be imposed on children, which is hardly democratic (Elshtain, 1993).

This pursuit of a democratic purpose for music education, with the aforementioned emphases on criticism, breadth, and depth of knowledge and social responsibility, presents several profound challenges to music teachers. First, it suggests that our continued emphasis on performance classes, at least as currently conceived and organized in North America, is probably misguided. This is because a democratic purpose for music education implies an exploratory and comparative approach somewhat along the lines of a comparative religion or ethnomusicology class in which students research and compare the musical values of different groups and cultures while appreciating both their similarities and differences. Further, if democratic citizenship is the end then students and teachers should not feel pressured or compelled to accept any particular kind of music, anymore than they should feel compelled to accept any particular religion or enjoy another culture's food. A democratic purpose for music education implies that teachers are no longer arbiters of taste, although I hasten to add that I am not advocating fully democratic classrooms wherein students are considered their teachers' equals. That would be akin to child-centred education, which as Dewey said, and using uncharacteristic language for him, was "really stupid (quoted in Hlebowitsh, 1992, p. 175)."

Unfortunately, it simply is not feasible in traditional choir, band, and orchestra classes to take this exploratory and comparative approach to world music, not just because there is not sufficient instructional time or breadth of teacher training, but because those ensembles are ill-suited to this kind of work. You just can't explore much of the musical world, or even much of one's own culture, through a traditional choir or band class, and that is not even taking into account the problem of how to reasonably approximate the musical values and practices of some non-western or

Democracy, Pragmatist Aesthetics, and the Choral Experience

popular musical groups when relying on performance and pedagogical models expressly designed for classical music genres. I am not saying that teachers should not attempt to stretch their students by presenting them with challenging repertoire, or that there is no place in our schools for our traditional choirs. Nor am I particularly worried about authenticity. I am only asking teachers to acknowledge that the musical values and practices of some groups or cultures may be incompatible with traditional mainstream western musical and pedagogical ones, which raises the question of how teachers and students are to do them justice.

For example, it is difficult to imagine how music teachers might reconcile traditional western pedagogic notions of good vocal health and tone with the more nasal and gravelly vocal qualities preferred in some parts of the world, and sometimes even in our own popular music culture. In my experience at the university level, voice teachers and choral directors are usually too worried about preserving the vocal health of their students to venture much beyond the traditional western repertoire (even vocal jazz is often suspect). In consequence, there is a continued over-reliance on *pretty* music that is guaranteed not to tax students' voices or, it needs to be said, sometimes their minds. I simply cannot imagine how choral and vocal teachers would even begin to approach many of the *rougher* popular genres and some avant-garde classical music with integrity without a willingness to make concessions about vocal health, tone quality, and other musical values.

The Olympic Versus Alternative Models of Choral Music Education

Much of the difficulty here, I think, can be attributed to what I like to call the Olympic model of performance. According to this model, which is privileged in our schools and universities, all students are treated as future musical Olympians requiring the development of ever-increasing levels of complex and sophisticated skill and highly specific local knowledge of the classics and related genres. Unfortunately, this model, with its attendant emphases on precise diction, pure vocal tone, and virtuosic skill is not valued much outside of the classical or jazz fields. The fact is that the vast majority of students are more interested in playing musical street hockey than in becoming professional hockey players. And to extend the sports metaphor, they are also probably more interested in learning about a variety of games than in specializing in only one or two, valuable as those games might be. Following this reasoning, students do not necessarily require tremendous performance skill, except perhaps when they choose to specialize by making a professional commitment to music or music education or to

becoming serious amateurs. As music philosophers now realize, complexity does not necessarily translate into value, anymore than skill and knowledge of complex structures always lead to greater appreciation (Bowman, 1994). Sometimes the simple things in life, such as the lazy sound of Leonard Cohen's voice, Willie Nelson's crooning, the sound of the Cape Breton Miners or of campfire singing, or Bob Dylan's mumbling are deemed more valuable. A similar observation can be made of singers like Louis Armstrong and Tom Waits, whose vocal tone quality would be rated as deplorable by most choral directors' standards, but which countless thousands of people, including me, nevertheless appreciate.

I do not have easy answers for this dilemma, other than that we need to seek out other kinds of performance groupings and strategies that are less restrictive, including more informal strategies involving sing-a-longs and alternative kinds of groupings that are less teacher-centred (Yunker, 2003), and that teachers might reconsider their quest for vocal perfection as something to which all students should aspire. As in sports, many of today's children only participate, if at all, in organized musical activities, which is a shame. Informal music-making is a rare bird nowadays. We need to find ways to invite and encourage children to sing alone, with friends, and even as an entire school body without the pressure of eventual public performance (Smithrim & Uptis, 2003).

There is also no good reason why children cannot take more responsibility for leading and conducting groups. There is a mystique about conducting that needs to be dispelled (Yunker, 2003), for in reality and for the majority of school repertoire conducting is a relatively simple and intuitive affair. It can, however, be immensely satisfying (I think in part because conductors are among the few people in our highly repressed middle class society who are permitted to dance). I see no reason why teachers should not share the wealth, while of course still supervising and offering guidance to students. Hopefully this would have the added benefit of helping students emphasize with conductors while also encouraging greater personal responsibility. Teachers should look for ways to gradually increase children's levels of personal responsibility, and conducting is one of the most responsible activities of all. Alternatively, and for some compositions, teachers might dispense with conducting altogether, as some chamber orchestras and choirs already do, while inviting students to participate in discussions about matters of interpretation and repertoire selection (Yunker, 2003; Allsup, 2003; Yunker & Burnard, 2002). Free-improvisation exercises such as are used in theatrical training might also help to promote personal creativity in students by temporarily freeing them from needless restrictions. In general, teachers

Democracy, Pragmatist Aesthetics, and the Choral Experience

need to engage in more musical and pedagogical risk-taking while reminding students not to obsess about excellence or always *getting it right*.

Learning strategies employed by popular and other community musicians could also be imported into the classroom or rehearsal room. Regardless of the musical genres, cultures, or pedagogical strategies employed, however, teachers should once again ensure that democratic principles are brought to the fore. For example, when resorting to rote learning, drill, or master-apprentice models, teachers and students should consider how they may impinge on their freedom to interpret and to what ends. Much the same conversation could be had about the roles and responsibilities of participants, including conductors, but also choir and audience members. Teachers could also invite students to consider whether it is always appropriate to abstract aboriginal music and attempt to replicate it in schools, or whether arranging Newfoundland folk music for choir might constitute a form of cultural distortion (I once saw the Newfoundland comedy troupe, Codco, brilliantly parody local choirs singing *earthy* Newfoundland folksongs in a classical style. I think they were referring to Nish Rumboldt's highly popular Memorial University choir during the 1960s and 70s).

When wishing to make music performance more socially relevant and important to children, their peers and parents, music teachers can choose to program and rehearse music by composers such as Schafer, many of whose avant-garde works during the 1970s were not just intended as social criticism (e.g., of the bombing of Nagasaki and Hiroshima) but were actually written for, and performed by, children. This may be one of the most difficult challenges of all for music teachers, as I personally cannot think of another choral composer for today's school-aged children who conceives of his or her own music as social criticism. But imagine how gripping it might be for today's students and audiences were they to be presented with newly commissioned choral works that, like Vaughan Williams' *Dona Nobis Pacem* (1936) and Schafer's *Threnody* (1966), addressed the futility, inhumanity, and horror of war (and of terrorism); that commemorated momentous and joyous events such as the collapse of the Berlin Wall; that counteracted racism (such as the Rock Against Racism movement of the 1970s did); or that parodied consumer culture, such as many of Zappa's songs did. Folk and popular music illustrating various social protest themes (such as anti Vietnam War protest songs or some hip-hop tunes) can also be studied and performed. I recommend Ian Watson's book *Song and Democratic Culture in Britain: An Approach to Popular Culture in Social Movements* (1983) as one source for ideas that might easily be applied to the teaching of folk and popular music in schools. Another informative and useful book for

teachers to consult is Robin Denselow's *When the Music's Over: The Story of Political Pop* (1989).

Obviously, and in addition to listening to and performing that music, teachers and students should research its social context and background while paying closer attention to the meaning of the lyrics, which all too often continue to be glossed over or censored without any substantive discussion (as, for example, often happens with hip-hop music).

Government, educational institutions, and music teachers should also spread the wealth by reinvesting in community choral music. During the 1960s and early 1970s the Memorial University Extension Service supported 12 choirs, three orchestras and a concert band, all as a public service (Woodford, 1991). At its peak there were 7,522 people across the province participating in Extension music programs, which is an amazing number when you think about it, and those individuals became ardent supporters of music education in the schools and university. Indeed, the case can be made that the Memorial University School of Music would not have been instituted in the mid-1970s without their support and that of public service organizations such as the Rotary and Kiwanis clubs (Woodford, 1984, p. 49). The levels of public support provided by those and other interested groups and individuals provided the necessary stimulus to the university and government. The Extension Department later eliminated those programs because, so it was claimed, they were not developing sufficient levels of excellence. This was a mistake and an abdication of social responsibility on the part of the university which, thereafter, abandoned its commitment to community music in favour of specialist education. Obviously there is a place and role in society for specialists, but publicly funded universities should serve all of society, and not just future experts or, in the case of teachers, future music majors. We are still paying for this abandonment of community music and of the public interest today with reduced levels of audience participation and government support. The Memorial University School of Music might thus consider reinvesting in community music by helping to promote and organize amateur choirs and other ensembles and programs (as it did in the late 1970s when it ran a Saturday Morning Band Program for children and instituted a provincial music camp).

One of my own personal accomplishments of which I am most proud was the cofounding in 1998 (with Betty Anne Younker) of a 140 member adult band program at the University of Western that has become a source of inspiration to many (McWilliams, 2000). Catering to the needs of adults of all ages and levels of musical experience, the program is affiliated with about 120 similar bands in the United States and Canada (our

Democracy, Pragmatist Aesthetics, and the Choral Experience

University of Western Ontario New Horizons band program was the first of its kind in Canada) and there are various affiliated summer camps, cruises, exchanges, and trips in which our members can participate either individually or with friends and family. Currently, as I write, one of our three adult bands is touring Hungary and the Czech Republic, while only several weeks ago our members hosted a sister band from Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Although these adult band programs do not aspire to any high musical purpose, I nevertheless consider them music education of the highest order because they meet an important need for social and intellectual stimulation among older adults. I am not aware of any similar kind of international choral program and network for singers of varying ages and levels of ability. These kinds of programs, however, have the potential to revitalize music education by facilitating intergenerational learning and the development of a wider sense community that is often lacking in contemporary society. Further, undergraduates and older children have much to learn from these passionate and committed amateur musicians in terms of zest for life and learning. The challenge for all of us involved in these kinds of community music programs is now to make them more accessible to all of society and not just, as is currently the case with our own program, the well-to-do who can afford them (Beynon, 2005).

Similarly, churches and other social service organizations should consider offering choirs for the poor and the homeless, while school teachers might consider other ways of providing public service. During my youth in St. John's, for example, it was fairly common for children's choirs and other ensembles to perform in local senior citizens' homes or, as in the case of my school band, and in a rock group in which I was a member, at the Waterford Hospital (a psychiatric hospital). That was public *service* of the highest order. Music teacher educators might also encourage music education majors to student teach in less affluent schools and to perform volunteer work in local schools or even in prisons. Individuals wishing to get involved in music education programs and activities for prisoners should consult the Arts in Prison organization in Kansas (at www.artsinprison.org) for information and advice about how best to proceed (thanks to Mary Cohen for brining this organization to my attention). This organization currently runs choral music activities in minimum and maximum security prisons and publishes its own newsletter entitled *Arts in Prison Quarterly*. That, too, is public service of the highest order.

The Ideology of Fun

Finally, and as I have already stated, the kind of music education program that I envision is simply too broad to be achieved through performance alone, or even primarily through performance. Performance has long been viewed by music teachers as the core school activity, and particularly of late with the growth in popularity of Elliott's (1995) praxial philosophy of music education. When I was a teacher in Newfoundland during the late 1970s and 1980s, however, it was the general music class that was considered the core activity. Performance was enrichment. We should go back to that model because it potentially offers far greater breadth of experience while also providing more frequent and sustained opportunities for students to explore the world's music with an open and critical mind. However, and unlike how it was usually taught in the past, the general music program needs to be better integrated into the overall school curriculum (especially history, art, religion, and social studies). Further, and as I have also suggested, music teachers should attempt to link what goes on in the school with the real world while also teaching civility and democratic citizenship. They need to teach children to be more selfless and considerate of others while also teaching them to pay more attention to how music is both used and abused in society; that music and music education really matter and are not just about entertainment and skill-building. Above all, teachers need to confront the ideology of fun that permeates music education, but that relegates it to the margins as a distraction from life (Barber, 1996, p. 72). That, as I have suggested in my book, is far more likely to justify music education's place in the schools than is performance or music alone.

References

- Allsup, R. (2003). Mutual learning and democratic action in instrumental music education. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 51 (1), 24-37.
- Attali, J. (1985). *Noise: The political economy of music*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Barber, B. R. (1996). *Jihad vs. McWorld: How globalism and tribalism are reshaping the world*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books, 1996.
- Beynon, C. (1998). From music student to music teacher: Negotiating an identity. In P. Woodford (Ed.), *Critical thinking in music: Theory and practice*. Studies in Music at the University of Western Ontario, 17, 83-105.
- Beynon, C. (2005). Lifelong learning: Privileging the privileged? In P. Woodford (Ed.), *Music and lifelong learning*. *International Journal of Community Music*, 2 (1).
- Botstein, L. (2000). The training of musicians. *The Musical Quarterly*, 84 (3), 327-332.

Democracy, Pragmatist Aesthetics, and the Choral Experience

- Bowman, W. (1994). Sound, sociality and music. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning*, 5 (3), 50-67.
- Brophy, T. S. (2000). *Assessing the developing child musician: A guide for general music teachers*. Chicago, IL: GIA Publications.
- Bute, D. (2004). *A history of the national conservatory of Bucharest, Romania*. Unpublished thesis.
- Carr, W., & Hartnett, A. (1996). *Education and the struggle for democracy: The politics of educational ideas*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Denselow, R. (1989). *When the music's over: The story of political pop*. London, UK: Faber.
- Dewey, J. (1929). *The quest for certainty: A study of the relation of knowledge and action*. New York, NY: Minton, Balch, & Co.
- Elliott, D. (1995). *Music matters: A new philosophy of music education*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Elshtain, J. B. (1993). *Democracy on trial*. Concord, ON: House of Anansi Press.
- Frum, D. (1994). *Dead right*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Giroux, H. (1994). *Disturbing pleasures: Learning popular culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hackett, P., & Lindeman, C. A. (1997). *The musical classroom: Backgrounds, models, and skills for elementary teachers*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hlebowitsh, P. S. (1992). Critical theory versus curriculum theory: Reconsidering the dialogue on Dewey. *Educational Theory*, 42 (1), 69-82.
- Jorgensen, E. (1997). *In search of music education*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Joyce, V. M. (2005). The 'subject' is singing: Singing as social practice. *International Journal of Community Music*, 2 (1).
- Klein, N. (2000). *No logo: Taking aim at the brand name bullies*. Toronto, ON: Vintage Books.
- Laxer, J. (1996). *In search of a New Left: Canadian politics after the neoconservative assault*. Toronto, ON: Penguin.
- McWilliams, H. (2000). UWO's New Horizons band means never having to say you can't play. *London Citylife Magazine*, 1 (5), 25-29.
- Paul, R. W. (1984). Critical thinking: Fundamental to education for a free society." *Educational Leadership*, 42 (1984), 4-14.
- Saul, J. R. (1995). *The unconscious civilization*. Concord, ON: House of Anansi Press.
- Schafer, R. M. (1975). *The rhinoceros in the classroom*. London, UK: Universal Edition.
- Smithrim, K., & Uptis, R. (2003). Contaminated by peaceful feelings: The power of music. *Canadian Music Educator*, 44 (3), 12-17.
- Tanner, L. N. (1988). The path not taken: Dewey's model of inquiry. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 18 (4), 471-479.
- Watson, I. (1983). *Song and democratic culture in Britain: An approach to popular culture in social movements*. London, UK: Croom Helm.
- Woodford, P. (1984). *The life and contributions of Nish Rumboldt to music in Newfoundland*. St. John's, NL: Creative Publishers.
- Woodford, P. (1991). Music. In C. Poole (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Newfoundland and Labrador*. St. John's, NL: Cuff Publications.
- Woodford, P. (2005a). *Democracy and music education: Liberalism, ethics, and the politics of practice*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Woodford, P. (Ed.). (2005b). Music and lifelong learning. *International Journal of Community Music*, 2 (1).

- Yunker, B. A. (June 2003). *Communities of singing: A democratic approach*. Paper presented at the Phenomenon of Singing International Symposium IV, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Yunker, B. A., & Burnard, P. (2002). *From solos to duets: A reflective dialogue on the role of creative thinking in research partnerships*. Paper presented at the European Society for the Cognitive Sciences (ESCOM) Conference, University of Liege, Belgium.