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ABSTRACT

Repertoire is a critical component of the instructional process at all levels of music education, and more insight into music educators’ repertoire selection practices is a need, especially in the case of the collegiate voice studio. A particular void in this topic is the lack of pre-service instructional training including repertoire assignment strategies for prospective and novice voice teachers. The investigator studied these topics using two data collection phases: 1) collecting descriptive data from vocal recital programs in three universities from the southern United States; and, 2) conducting interviews with five experienced voice teachers recruited from the aforementioned institutions. The investigator conducted a pilot interview with a comparable voice teacher, and the investigator determined that the interview produced an adequate amount of data.

The investigator calculated descriptive statistics for data collected in research phase 1, and results indicated the voice teachers studied assign a core body of titles, composers, and languages. For research phase 2, the investigator coded interviews, directly from the raw data as much as possible, using open coding measures. The investigator analyzed the codes for themes. Several themes emerged amongst participants’ descriptions that will be applicable for prospective and novice voice teachers’ repertoire assignment practices.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Repertoire is a critical component of the instructional process at all levels of music education, and music educators’ repertoire selection practices need further examination, especially in the case of the collegiate voice studio. The repertoire that music educators select for their students is, in essence, their curriculum. A musical piece, rich in concepts spanning the realms of musicality, performance, history, cultural awareness, and aesthetics, provides the vehicle through which students can attain these skills and meet teachers’ goals (Forbes, 2001).

Repertoire studied in the arena of the applied voice studio is no different, Students depend on their teachers for appropriate repertoire choices and believe they should be extremely knowledgeable in this area (Abeles, 1975). Teachers must be “well versed” in this instructional facet (Luckstone, 1948, p. 10). Bronner (2003) notes, however, prospective and novice voice teachers endure challenges in their search for “repertoire that is both age and skill level appropriate” (p. 85). Bronner elaborates on their remedy for this challenge as well as urging caution.

Many new voice teachers, when first selecting material for their students, turn to songs they were taught as novice singers. Yet this approach quickly runs into limitations as new teachers inevitably face students for whom their personal repertoire does not work well. For this reason, it is important for beginning teachers to become familiar with available literature appropriate for the beginning student of each voice category (p. 85).
Researchers have found that applied studio teachers rank repertoire selection highly in the learning process. Kostka (2002) found that 50% of applied teachers at the collegiate level rank repertoire study as the skill that requires the most practice time by students outside of the lesson setting. Students surveyed in the same study agreed with their teachers by ranking repertoire study as the skill requiring the most practice time with 48% ranking it first. Both students and teachers gave high rankings to repertoire study combined with another skill (e.g., technique, tone quality) in practice settings, additionally.

The majority of applied voice teachers’ attention in actual, one-on-one studio instruction turns to teaching through repertoire. Applied voice teachers, based on research Albrecht (1991) conducted on instructional time use in lessons, focus more of their instruction on song literature than technical work. The ratio between the two instructional foci is nearly two to one. Albrecht observed 126 collegiate voice lessons taught by fourteen instructors. The teacher focused 64.3% of instruction in the lessons on song literature, while 35.7% of the lessons’ focus was geared toward addressing technical issues.

Another study concerning the amount of instructional time applied studio teachers use to address repertoire was conducted by Vallentine (1991). Vallentine discovered that as the semester neared its end, the amount of time spent on repertoire targeted for performance in juries increased while time spent on scales/technical exercises diminished. He arrived at this conclusion after observing 30 piano, strings, woodwinds, brass, and voice lessons two or more weeks before juries and an additional 30 lessons in the same studios with less than two weeks before juries. Vallentine coded and quantified
data to determine what behaviors and materials applied studio teachers’ focused on most in their instruction.

Music educators, regardless of medium, must be proficient in choosing repertoire for their students’ skill development. Madsen and Yarbrough (1985) provide support for this statement by commenting that, “regardless of existing materials, the effective music educator needs to develop personal techniques and skills for selecting materials. This includes building one’s personal library and references in order to effect goals and objectives consistent with a high level of music instruction” (p. 20). Bachner (1943) specifies that the effective vocal pedagogue “should be familiar with the literature of song, opera, oratorio, etc. so that he can select from this literature what is necessary to further the development of the student…” (p. 102-103). Collegiate voice students, consequently, feel their teachers are more effective when they take time to choose repertoire that enables them to improve and succeed (Abeles, 1975; Goffi, 1996).

Madsen and Yarbrough (1985) also suggest that the effective music educator’s professional development is an ongoing process by which they actively search for new materials to fit their students’ individual needs. Mallett (1959) recommends that teachers use the summers to search for new repertoire and evaluate their repertoire practices.

Statement of the Problem

The primary purpose of this study is to investigate repertoire selection practices and philosophies of experienced collegiate voice teachers to assist prospective and novice voice teachers’ pedagogical training. Many applied music faculty are untrained in basic procedures and theories of teaching procedures and strategies (Abeles, Goffi, & Levasseur, 1992). Included in this population are prospective and novice voice teachers
who are either currently enrolled in a graduate vocal program or emerging from one. One crucial component of these instructional procedures and strategies is the selection of repertoire for students’ study.

**Rationale**

The investigation of applied voice teachers’ repertoire selection at the collegiate level will provide a valuable resource prospective and novice voice teachers can draw from and apply to their pedagogy. Repertoire lists of the most frequently programmed titles, composers, time periods, and languages on voice recitals will provide prospective and novice voice teachers with curricular ideas. Experienced voice teachers’ descriptions concerning their repertoire selection practices will provide points of application for prospective and novice voice teachers’ repertoire choices.

**Research Questions**

The purpose of this investigation will be to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the curricular content of the repertoire chosen by select vocal studio applied instructors?
2. Are there commonalities among these repertoire selections?
3. What approaches can prospective and novice voice teachers apply to their pedagogy from experienced voice teachers’ descriptions of their repertoire selection practices?

**Limitations of the Study**

The investigator limited the research conducted in this study to a general view of collegiate applied voice instruction. The undergraduate level student is of prime
importance for the investigator in this study. The data contains repertoire performed by graduate students, though the investigator looked at the data as a whole rather than separating the students by academic level. Many performers’ academic levels were indiscernible in the data, further limiting the investigator’s research.

Two additional limitations accompany this study. The data collected in the recital programs may not reflect the entirety of pieces the voice teachers assigned for use in the studio. This study, in other words, may not include a comprehensive list of repertoire assigned by voice teachers investigated in this study. The geographic location for participants, one region of the United States, is another limitation of this study. Limiting the study to the southern United States may result in data that are not generalizable across geographic areas.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this investigation is to study the descriptions of experienced, collegiate voice teachers’ repertoire selection practices in order to assist prospective and novice voice teachers in this critical instructional practice. A look at prior scholarship and research provides context into vocal pedagogues’ views and practices concerning this topic.

Repertoire Assignment Practices of Collegiate Voice Teachers

Research pertaining to teachers’ vocal repertoire programming and assignment practices is scarce. After much searching and investigation, it seems the only researcher that has quantified what teachers assign for their students was Dalton (1980). Dalton investigated the frequency and diversity in programming patterns for voice recitals. He compiled and categorized recital programs from a ten-year period at colleges and universities in the North Central Region of the Music Educators National Conference. Dalton analyzed and calculated data for frequencies concerning types of schools, types of bachelor degree programs, voice classifications, accompaniment type, composers, nationalities, eras, and vocal forms. Dalton found high programming frequencies of certain voice classifications, composer nationalities, languages, and genres. He found, for instance, that 38% of the repertoire was from the Austro-German tradition. Sopranos
performed more than any other voice classification by a little more than half of all recitals studied, according to Dalton’s findings.

**Qualitative Research on Experienced Vocal Pedagogues’ Repertoire Assignment Philosophies**

The researchers who extracted applied voice teachers’ repertoire assignment and programming philosophies did so by conducting studies through a qualitative research lens. These studies included traditional research dissertations, dissertations whose authors completed programs in vocal performance and focused their research on interpretation or performance matters, books, and scholarship in the voice teacher’s primary professional trade journal published by NATS.

**Dissertations Based on Empirical Research**

The bulk of the data collected by Teat (1981) concerning what American art songs voice teachers recommended most was collective via descriptive research methods. Teat approached one phase of her study, though, qualitatively by providing voice teachers a chance to respond to their philosophies on American art song repertoire via open-ended questions. Teat organized teachers’ open-ended responses into five categories:

1. Comments in support of teaching American art song;
2. Comments regarding the type of vocal literature to use with beginning voice students, including additional art-song titles, composers’ names and opinions supporting use of folk-song;
3. Comments concerned with difficulties or problems involved in teaching American art song;
4. General comments on teaching beginning voice students or on the teaching of voice;
5. Comments expressing concern over the availability or cost of music, including the need for new anthologies in the area of American art song (p. 216).

A limitation to her research, though, is that she focused solely on solely American art songs.
Dufault (2008) discovered, in her qualitative study of three exemplary collegiate voice teachers, several philosophies and practices concerning repertoire selection that pervade the teacher interviews, student interviews, and lesson observations she conducted. Three of the students shared one of their positive experiences with their teacher’s repertoire philosophies:

Kelly respected Adams for giving her increasingly challenging repertoire. “I think he has taught me that I can push myself a lot farther than I thought I could. I don’t know if he has been really conscious of that.” Phillip said that Adams always wants the music to be comfortable in the voice—Adams never asked anything to be pushed. “If someone is not capable of singing piano at a certain range, he doesn’t require it . . . a lot of students strain to sing fortissimo.” Ben said that Adams taught him how to select repertoire” (p. 91).

Two of the master teachers disagreed on the level of repertoire students must be assigned. One teacher does not believe repertoire choices should be limited. She believes teachers need to select repertoire that is just beyond their ability level in order to challenge them further. She recommends the further challenge of assigning different repertoire styles that may not necessarily “be considered appropriate for their voice type” (p. 168). Another teacher’s viewpoint is completely opposite from the previous teacher’s. He discourages assigning repertoire too advanced for students’ developmental levels (p. 169).

Clemmons (2007) also found that master teachers empower their students including the area of repertoire selection. Clemmons observed and interviewed four master teachers who participated in the National Association of Teachers of Singing (NATS) Summer Intern Program. Additionally, Clemmons interviewed four to six of their students. A final research method Clemmons employed was a questionnaire that she sent to all 36 master teachers in the program. Four primary themes emerged from the data, and one of those themes was the students’ positive view of teachers who employ
enthusiasm and affirmation in their teaching which. These voice teachers affirm students’
achievement by allowing students to select their own repertoire.

There is evidence that the four Master Teachers purposefully gave students
autonomy over their learning and also worked to instill feelings of competence.
St. John for example expected his students to choose their own music,
purposefully giving them some autonomy over their learning (p. 271-272).

Dissertations Based on Performance Issues

The bulk of the dissertation research from authors who completed doctoral
programs in performance is more analytical in nature toward the topic of repertoire. Their
intended audience was performers rather than teachers. Since the body of this research
area is so copious, the investigator will list only a limited number of citations to represent
each category. Several researchers (Hardenbergh, 1997; Patterson, 1989) based their
research on the vocal repertoire of a specific composer. Other researchers focused their
scholarship on a specific genre (Chilcote, 1991; Collier, 1997) or a combination of genre
and historical time period (Robertson, 1998; Robinson, 1990). Still other researchers
investigated specific works and provided analysis and performance suggestions (Carlisle,
1991; Spencer, 1992). These studies include valuable repertoire lists and performance
guides.

Garner (1979) studied the pedagogical uses of 20th century sacred art songs from
the United State, Great Britain, and Canada. He sought to know what principles voice
teachers, historically, use when analyzing songs and the instructional approaches that
result from analysis. Two approaches emerged as well as categories including “breath
control, phonation, resonance, articulation, interpretation, and intonation” (p. 3). He
concludes his dissertation by providing recommended repertoire titles from the
aforementioned countries and genre. Garner organized these titles by pedagogical corrections and skill building concepts.

Honeycutt (1979) analyzed 320 songs from sixteen collections for various components such as range, vocal flexibility, and others. Her analysis culminated in a meticulously detailed repertory list for voice teachers’ use in selecting repertoire. Each piece’s analysis contains descriptions of meter, tempo, tessitura, melody, text, accompaniment, and assignment recommendations (p. 1-7). Honeycutt performed the same analysis on the sixteen collections, as well. Honeycutt included an appendix with titles arranged by the highest note of each piece to help teachers quickly find pieces that fit certain criteria in terms of range.

Rock (2005) studied a myriad of issues regarding vocal pedagogy concerning the soprano voice, specifically. Included in her study are, (1) a discussion of the components of healthy vocal production while referencing three centuries of renowned vocal pedagogues; (2) an analysis of specific vocal faults and their correction; and, (3) a compilation of vocalises and suggestions for their implementation in voice study. Of prime importance in this study is Rock’s exploration of applying vocal technique to literature in the final chapter. Although she focuses her research on the vocalise and its usefulness as a tool for instilling good vocal technique, the author deduces that “often a problem occurs when a student has mastered a technical difficulty in her vocalizing and finds that she cannot replicate her success in her assigned repertoire” (p. 81). She states that one of the causes of this problem can be found in the repertoire assignment process where it is, all too often, random and void of proper forethought (p. 84). Rock qualifies these causes further by stating that
While presumably not intentional on the part of the teacher, assigned music often impedes vocal progress and healthy singing. The selection of appropriate literature can be the most difficult and least successful function of a teacher of singing. It is easy for busy or inexperienced teachers to fall into the trap of having at their disposal only a limited supply of literature with which they feel comfortable, subsequently assigning this literature indiscriminately to their students, regardless of the students’ unique needs (p. 84).

Rock’s solution to these problems are fourfold: (1) To understand, in advance of repertoire selection the whole student, including a student’s voice and learning style; (2) To diagnose, explain, and treat a student’s vocal faults; (3) To assign vocalises that address a student’s vocal needs; and, (4) To search for repertoire that contains a comfortable range for the singer and builds on assigned vocalises (p. 85). In the search for repertoire, the teacher, according to Rock, must first know the singer’s range, age, vocal development/abilities, and fach. In addition to discussing each of these prerequisite indicators for repertoire search, Rock quotes an important point Kagen (1950) makes regarding the uniqueness of vocal literature selection in comparison to that of instrumentalists. Kagen explains that a vocalist must constantly consider the “very basic nature...the physical nature of his individual voice” as opposed to skill, the dominant factor in instrumentalists’ literature choice (p. 99-100).

Books

Several authors have discussed their repertoire philosophies in scholarship. Fields (1947) compiled repertoire selection philosophical statements from several authors who had discussed the subject to that point in time. Gilliland (1970) includes a repertoire list compiled by category in his writings. Koster (1990), Miller (1990), Schiøtz (1971), and Whitlock (1975) addressed their repertoire assignment philosophies in the form of suggestions for and examples of recital programming.
Two authors compiled statements from two very different historical sets of vocal pedagogues regarding their repertoire selection philosophies. Monahan (1978) collected statements from authorities on vocal study written between 1777 and 1927 (p. 211-213). Burgin (1973) contrasted Monahan’s work by presenting statements from contemporary authors who addressed the same topic (p. 164-165).

Vocal pedagogy scholars have, also, volunteered many and varied factors they consider when selecting repertoire for students to learn. Kagen (1950), in addition to “physical characteristics and limitations,” lists “the singer’s appearance, physique, and personality traits” as factors affecting song selection (p. 101). Kagen discusses these repertoire selection variables in addition to volume and range in a chapter titled “The Study of Repertoire” and concludes this chapter with a recommended list of composers organized by language for repertoire programming considerations.

Peterson (1966) lists several factors to include in the repertoire selection process for beginning voice students. Voice teachers, according to Peterson, should avoid songs that contain excessively long phrases or too many vocal techniques. He prefers lyrical songs that promote legato singing as well as songs that are within a student’s range (p. 9). Peterson provides lists of solo songs recommended for assignment and organized by a variety of criteria.

Sable (1982) agrees with Peterson (1966) that voice teachers should consider a song’s range for the physical capabilities of a singer when perusing repertoire. She lists additional characteristics for consideration in repertoire selection including dynamics, color, language, and appropriateness of text and style (p. 83). Sable, also, provides a
concise yet beneficial outline of the art song’s history from the medieval period through contemporary music in her work.

Caldwell and Wall (2001) provide additional categories as well as advice to voice teachers for assistance in their selection of repertoire. These categories include consideration of the student’s voice classification, vocal skills, musical ability, personality, preference, as well as potential performance occasions for songs (p. 34-36). Several vocal concepts for consideration in repertoire assignment, as well, accompany each category. Examples of these concepts are range, tessitura, diction, phrasing, rhythm, melody, and text (p. 34-35).

Several authors of textbooks for the voice class discuss what teachers and students need to look for in their song selection. Lightner (1991) recommends that teachers choose works in the English language for students in voice classes in order to remove the barrier of a foreign language that may hinder their progress. He views that voice teachers do not focus on American art song literature enough in their studios (p. 2). Songs for voice classes, according to Lightner, should be appropriate for the students’ technical work while, at the same time, possessing appealing characteristics in terms of a singable melody and meaningful texts. A major goal Lightner sets for his voice class students through repertoire study is the combination of emotions and intellect found in the text and expression of the two elements through performance (p. 2).

The audience Paton and Christy (2002) focused on was the voice class students themselves who, generally, are instrumentalists or people who have never studied voice before. Examples of song selection criteria that these authors listed for this population include the consideration of words one can believe in and shorter songs rather than longer
songs (p. 34). Lindsley (1985) agrees with the aforementioned authors’ suggestions to voice class students and adds one’s personal tastes and performance situation suitability as criteria to consider for song selection (p. 95-96). Ware (1995) also addressed voice class students in his textbook and recommended that they choose repertoire that is not exceptionally difficult to learn unless they are ready for pieces to challenge and stretch them. Ware indicates the repertoire should best match the students’ musical and vocal abilities (p. 91).

Authors not only discussed what to look for in vocal songs to assign for study but specific titles and genres for them to consider in their repertoire philosophy choices, as well. Witherspoon (1925) devoted a chapter of his work to the discussion of repertoire for study. He holds the philosophical view that singers should first learn the works of the 17th and 18th centuries in order to lay the foundations for the study of later works. A work from this time period, according to Witherspoon, “with its great demands upon the musical knowledge of the singer, and its lesser physical demands, affords the very best medium for study and development, with the least danger of forcing the voice” (p. 49). Witherspoon also believes that teachers should not assign intense works in terms of dramatic content until students have an extensive amount of training and development (p. 49).

Davis (1998) outlines a four-year undergraduate curriculum for voice students in terms of repertoire goals. Each year, Davis believes teachers’ repertoire assignments should be increasingly more challenging as the student progresses through their undergraduate study. Teachers, in his view, should assign students easy English and Italian songs in year one. Davis suggests that teachers add the more challenging
languages and genres such as German *Lieder* and easy arias in year two which followed by the addition of French *mélodie* in year three. Year four of a student’s undergraduate study culminates with a comprehensive review via the senior recital (p. 139).

Mabry (2002) directed her scholarship to pedagogical discussions concerning vocal music from the 20th century. In her chapter, “Choosing Appropriate Repertoire,” she lists several variables to consider when selecting music from this time period for students’ study. These variables include the capabilities of the singer’s vocal instrument, range, tessitura, and diction (p. 14-27). Manning (1998) addressed the topic of new, contemporary vocal repertory and rated each title according to a five-level scale for either technical or musical demands required by the singer (p. 4).

Kimball (2005) focused on the genre of art song in her publication. She provides a brief background and interpretation for selected art songs by German, French, American, British, Italian, Russian, Scandinavian, Spanish, South American, and Eastern European composers. Of particular interest is the inclusion of a guide to creating “style sheets” (p. 23). Kimball intended to summarize composers’ representative styles and tendencies by the following categories: melody, harmony, rhythm, accompaniment, and poets/text. Kimball provides representative examples of these style sheets in her work (p. 23-37).

Miller (2000) categorizes the different types of sopranos in his work where he focused on providing pedagogical tools for teaching each type. Repertoire assignment recommendations accompany these soprano types in the form of specific song titles, song cycles, operas, and composers in Miller’s book. Miller (1993) makes similar suggestions for repertoire in a comparable work for the training of tenors and includes excerpts from the repertoire for teaching certain concepts.
Several scholars have produced editions containing repertoire lists for the solo voice. Espina’s (1977) two-volume work contains a copious amount of specific titles and collections organized by nationality, type, and genre. Espina provides a brief description of many composers’ historical backgrounds and vocal writing characteristics. All songs listed include their title, most appropriate voice type(s), poetry source, operatic characters and acts, range, tessitura, musical requirements commentary, accompaniment difficulty, and bibliographic codes (p. xvii-xviii). Kagen (1968) produced a similar work to Espina’s in terms of scope and breadth as did Carman, Gaeddert, Myers, and Resch (1987) with the addition of descriptors for the piano, difficulties for the singer, mood of the song, and uses of the piece for study (p. xv).

Articles

The National Association of Teachers of Singing (NATS) is a professional organization that many voice teachers join, and this organization publishes a bi-monthly journal containing articles based on a plethora of topics concerning voice study. Several authors dating back to the 1940’s have written articles regarding the topic of repertoire assignment for vocal study in this publication.

Nix (2002) penned the most applicable article concerning the topic of repertoire selection for the voice studio. Nix listed four criteria for consideration when selecting vocal repertoire for students’ study. These criteria included (1) the singer’s physical limitations; (2) the singer’s voice classification; (3) expressive and emotional factors; and, (4) musicianship skills (p. 217). He, additionally, discusses the dangers of selecting inappropriate repertoire, elements commonly found in vocal literature for beginning students, and the role of the teacher in repertoire selection.
One author, Sharon Mabry, had a recurring column in the NATS periodical from 1985-2009 entitled “New Directions,” where she discussed contemporary trends in vocal literature. Mabry (1998) assessed the state of contemporary, 20th century vocal repertoire as the century ended and deduced that singers had “been given more diverse choices of musical style in this century than in any previous historical period” (p. 49).


Several authors have composed articles dealing with the topic of voice recitals and the repertoire programmed on them. Golde (1957) and Whitlock (1963) discuss general strategies for building a recital program in their writings. Green (1976) posits a creative recital format where the singer sings two settings of a particular textual work, one by a male composer and the other by a female composer. Kimball (2009) writes about some creative ways in which a singer and teacher can organize recitals by song groups. Mabry (1998) recommends programming a recital of extremes, because in
“the fast-paced world of today, audiences seem to relish in the quick change, the surprise, the avant-garde, and the lack of sameness” (p. 50).

Other authors have dealt with the issue of assigning repertoire for appropriate certain age groups, ability levels, and/or voice classifications. Trump (1961) discusses repertoire for the young beginner. Pazmor (1955) and Freed (1991) outline repertoire expectations for a four-year undergraduate voice major. Mabry (1986) recommends song literature from the 20th century for the moderately advanced singer. Selfridge (1953) discusses the usefulness of Lieder for male singers’ study, while Pazmor addresses voice building for female singers via the study of specific repertoire titles.

Mabry (2007) provides a list of strategies voice teachers can involve students in the repertoire selection process with the ultimate goal being that they become more independent. Examples of these strategies include allowing young students to choose early in their study from a limited list of titles, direct students to listen to a variety of styles and genres, and encouraging students to research composers and works unfamiliar to the teacher (p. 228). Mabry illustrates the danger of not allowing students to be a part of this instructional process by relaying an encounter with a singer in her thirties. This singer reflected on her collegiate study:

When I was a student I never chose my own repertoire or had any part in that. I just relied on my teacher to pick things for me. I didn’t think why or how she did that, but now that she isn’t there to do it, I’m lost (p. 227).

Ross (1959) agrees with this danger and believes that too much guidance by the voice teacher lowers students’ initiative and personal responsibility levels (p. 131).
Quantitative Research on Vocal Pedagogues’

Repertoire Assignment Philosophies

Several scholars investigated the repertoire assignment philosophies of voice teachers in a variety of ways. Teat (1981) conducted descriptive research in her study concerning what songs voice teachers would recommend assigning to beginning voice students. She surveyed a 10% random sample of National Association of Teachers of Singing (NATS) members throughout the United States in order to compile a list of American art songs most recommended for beginning voice students. She asked, additionally, several open-ended questions of these teachers. Of the ten American art songs most frequently recommended by respondents for beginning voice students, Samuel Barber, interestingly, composed the top two (p. 54).

Teat (1981), additionally, sorted the respondents’ most commonly named American art-song repertoire into the following categories: range (high, medium, low, and all), the students’ gender, students’ academic level (senior high school, first year college, second year college, community adult, all students), vocal line difficulty, piano score difficulty, improving musicianship, and improving technique. Lastly, she provided voice teachers a chance to provide open-ended responses concerning their views on pedagogical aspects of and suggestions for teaching American art songs. More discussion will follow on this final, qualitative aspect of this study in the subsequent section.

Goffi’s (1996) research goal was to design an evaluation tool for measuring applied studio voice teachers’ effectiveness. One of the thirty statements presented to voice students for validation of the evaluation tool pertained to repertoire selection. The participants validated the following item in their response to a pilot research instrument:
“He/She listens to my career plans and tries to steer me in choices of songs” (p. 73).

Another item concerning repertoire that was considered for the survey but not included after it was not validated in the pilot instrument was the following: “He/She helps me select pieces that are demanding and will make me work to improve my voice” (p. 64).

The research conducted by Abeles, Goffi, and Levasseur (1992) served as the model for Goffi’s (1996) study with the participants being the primary difference between the two studies. Goffi created an evaluation tool for assessing applied voice studio teachers’ effectiveness, while Abeles, Goffi, and Levasseur created a generic measurement tool. Out of the thirty statements the authors of the latter study used in their measurement tool, five phrases pertain to repertoire assignment.

- Music is chosen to strengthen the student’s weakness
- He/she is absent-minded and forgetful, and never seems to remember what music the student is working on from week to week
- He/she knows little music outside of his/her own interests
- He/she has a good knowledge of the repertoire
- He/she has a good knowledge of good performing editions of music in his/her field (p. 20).

Peterson (1994) studied private voice practices and philosophies of high school choral directors and private voice teachers who teach voice lessons to high school students. Although Peterson focused his study on voice study at the high school level, his research is applicable to the present study because few differences exist between late high school and underclassmen at the collegiate level in terms of vocal maturity. The High School Vocal Solo Committee in the Minnesota chapter of the American Choral Directors Association (ACDA) categorized the repertoire was into three levels of difficulty. These levels included Entry Level (first year of private study), Intermediate Level (second year of private study), and Advanced Level (third year of study, or
superior second year student). Criteria for each level included the following categories, which increased in difficulty and scope as the student progressed in years of study: range, language, technical/musical difficulty, dynamics, phrasing, and accompaniment complexity (p. 27-28). This committee compiled a list of 68 songs recommended for use in teaching high school students private voice lessons.

Peterson’s (1994) second phase of research consisted of a questionnaire he sent to high school choral directors and private voice teachers who taught voice lessons to high school students. Participants rank ordered instructional concepts and areas, one of which was repertoire, in terms of importance. Out of the eight concepts, participants ranked repertoire sixth. Peterson hypothesized that repertoire may not be a primary concern to the teachers as their goal may be to help the student learn basic technique, a specific solo for choir, or a specific song. He, also, mentions the debate between voice teachers whether to assign literature to young singers when technique is not soundly established (p. 47-48).

Ralston (1999) created an instrument for measuring the difficulty of vocal repertoire. Being able to determine a piece’s level of difficulty, according to Ralston, is a crucial facet of the repertoire selection process. Ralston created this instrument because previous tools for measuring the difficulty level of vocal repertoire did not contain specified criteria for each category. Thirty-four of 100 randomly selected college voice teachers rated the difficulty level for five randomly chosen vocal pieces using Ralston’s measurement tool. Upon comparison among the respondents’ ratings, Ralston determined that the instrument she devised was an accurate tool for measuring the difficulty level of solo vocal repertoire.
Lyon (2003) investigated the teaching practice of vocal expression via the relationship between the musical score and text. She surveyed voice teachers from educational institutions and vocal websites in the United States who had five or more years of teaching experience and an available e-mail address. Lyon identified twenty-four concepts from the participants’ responses to the four-question survey, and one of these concepts included repertoire selection. According to two of the respondents, it is “necessary to fit the repertoire to the student,” and teachers can implement this practice by “finding different facets of the student’s personality and assigning him/her repertoire that utilizes those facets” (p. 87). In another respondent’s view, selection of text comes before music. Lyon summarizes this concept by stating that “as the student’s repertoire increases, so will the range and variety of expression that they are able to convey” (p. 87).

**Research on Prospective and Novice Applied Voice Teacher Preparation**

Research on the preparation of prospective and novice applied voice teachers is limited. Researchers from outside the realm of music education, however, support the claim made by Abeles, Goffi, and Levasseur (1992) concerning the lack of preparation in instructional methodology and materials for the aforementioned group (Golde & Dore, 2004, p. 25). Higher education researchers and authors recommend several strategies for fulfilling this void all of which occurs either in graduate school or during the initial years of service. These strategies include graduate programs providing greater focus on teaching in general, teacher training, opportunities to teach, and application of knowledge learned in the students’ respective programs (Boyer, 1990; Dalgaard, 1982; Eble, 1972).
Fee (1961) conducted the primary study concerning prospective and novice voice teachers’ pedagogical preparation. He researched voice teachers’ pre-service preparation as well as their views concerning the importance of training components and recommendations for future training. Fee collected data via a questionnaire. Though many teachers indicated they had completed undergraduate and graduate coursework such as vocal technique and repertoire, vocal pedagogy, and vocal repertoire, he deduced that no teachers studied completed a true program that specifically prepared them to teach applied voice. Teachers expressed their desire for more training in repertoire familiarity with pieces written for voices other than their own (p. 118). Over 80% of the teachers, however, valued the importance of training in vocal technique, repertoire, and sightsinging. An additional skill the teachers recommended for future teachers to gain is to be “prepared to assessing appropriate literature from the beginning stages of musical experience to the level of professional performance” (p. 118).

Researchers have compiled helpful materials for prospective and novice voice teachers. Clements (2005) created a practical guide for graduate assistants in their first year of teaching applied voice. Clements addressed repertoire selection in one section of the guide. One of Saathoff’s (1995) goals for collecting vocalises from voice teachers in her research was to provide a body of exercises to help future and new voice teachers. Bronner (2003) compiled a guide for beginning voice teachers to use in teaching beginning students. This guide primarily contains a list of anthologies arranged by developmental stage and/or genre with commentary.

Several NATS journal authors as early as 1947 addressed the topic of voice teacher training. Douglass (1947) admits that most voice teachers’ true training is not
accomplished in the classroom or in personal study but by doing—the actual process of teaching. She advocates for additional systematic training of prospective voice teachers. Carson (1948) goes a step further and recommends the examination and licensing for voice teachers, much like public school educators. Elbin (1952) outlines the roles an expert voice teacher must perform: psychologist, physiologist, musician, voice builder, and friend (p. 18).

Cleveland (1998) collected information from twelve graduate vocal pedagogy programs across the United States. The common purpose of these programs was to prepare vocalists for a career teaching applied voice. All programs’ curricula contained coursework in vocal literature/repertoire. Several of the vocal pedagogy programs, additionally, implemented internship requirements where students would teach private voice in a supervised setting. The NATS Advisory Committee on Vocal Education (1950) outlined a curriculum for undergraduate and graduate programs to train prospective voice teachers. This curriculum contained courses in the areas of vocal literature/repertoire, voice teaching methods and principles, and a practice teaching internship (p. 7-8). A similar committee two years earlier (NATS Advisory Committee on Vocal Education, 1948) supported many of these same courses as being basic to the requirements for a teacher of singing. Two of these courses, vocal repertory and practice teaching, pertain to prospective and novice voice teachers’ training (p. 4).

The American Academy of Teachers of Singing (1996), an organization comparable to NATS, published a list of qualifications the believed voice teachers should meet. Two of these qualifications pertain to the selection of repertoire for students’ study.
These qualifications include the teacher possessing a broad knowledge of repertoire and the ability to assign repertoire to the students’ appropriate developmental levels.

**Repertoire Selection Philosophies from Other Music Disciplines**

Additional research exists from applied studios other than the discipline of voice that pertains to repertoire selection practices. Williams (2002) interviewed three former musicians who had quit applied piano study. Williams asked Beth, one of the interviewees and a former pianist, if she was given the choice to select any of her repertoire after she expressed dissatisfaction in the repertoire she played. Beth answered that her teacher did not allow her to choose repertoire until the very end “when her teacher realized she was not enjoying her lessons” (p. 3). Beth played a piece she liked, but her teacher disliked it. Beth expressed to the researcher that she still wished she could play certain pieces, including classical pieces, which she called “their” pieces, and popular pieces that are “completely different from classical music and more difficult to play” (p. 3). Williams believes that Beth, though she studied piano privately for five years, still did not “own” classical music (p. 4).

Duke and Simmons (2006) videotaped 25 hours of private lessons taught by three world-renowned artist-teachers. After analyzing the lessons, Duke and Simmons found 19 common elements among their instructional approaches. One such element, under the heading “Goals and Expectations,” directly relates to repertoire selection: “The repertoire assigned to students is well within their technical capabilities; no student is struggling with the notes of the piece” (p. 11).
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The first phase of this study consisted of a modified replication of Dalton’s (1980) study. Differences between this study and Dalton’s include the omission of several data categories including composer nationalities, historical time periods, degree programs, genres, and voice classifications. The investigator collected solo vocal recital programs from fall, spring, and summer semesters between Fall Semester 2007 through Spring Semester 2012, a five-year academic year range, at three institutions of higher education. These institutions are located in three different states within the southern United States.

Before data collection, the investigator sought Institutional Review Board approval for the study. IRB granted approval and deemed the study “exempt” from additional IRB oversight due to the low or minimal risks involved for the participants. Appendix A contains the study approval letter from IRB.

The investigator contacted music staff members at the institutions who had knowledge concerning the availability of their respective institutions’ recital programs via e-mail and, subsequently, contacted music administrators via e-mail to obtain permission to use the recital programs in this research project. The permission letter sent to institutional administrators is in Appendix B. The investigator found all recital programs were accessible, and all institutional administrators consented to the data’s collection.
The investigator chose these universities based on two criteria—type and enrollment. Institution A is a large, public university. Institution B is a small, private university. Institution C is a medium-sized, public university. Table 3.1 reflects these institutions’ total student and music school/division/department enrollments for the 2011-12 academic year. Sources for this data appeared in the institutions’ respective factbooks and brochures, which were available online. The investigator believed that these contrasting populations would reflect excellent variety in the data.

Table 3.1
*Participant Institutions’ Descriptive Statistical Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Music Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Music Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>34,816</td>
<td>450*</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4,758</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12,212</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *Based on an estimate from the school’s official recruitment brochure.*

This investigator transcribed the repertoire performed on the collected recital programs into a spreadsheet and organized the data into the following categories: (1) title; (2) composer; and, (3) language. The investigator completed descriptive statistical analysis measures for the data in each category resulting in frequency and mean calculations.

The investigator sorted and separated the data into two categories: all teachers from all institutions and the interview participants. The investigator sorted the data further by composer and title and calculated frequencies for these categories. In preparation for the creation of questions concerning the assignment of certain composers’ based on their pedagogical value, the investigator extracted the five most frequently programmed composers by interview participant.
**Participation criteria, selection, and justification**

Interviews with five \( n = 5 \) experienced voice teachers who teach at the universities targeted in the first phase of the study comprised the second phase of this study. Two primary qualifications governed the selection of these voice teacher participants. From the investigator’s knowledge, the interview participants had many years of teaching experience both in total and at the respective institutions (Clemmons, 2007). Additionally, they taught at institutions where available recital program data were accessible. The study of collegiate voice teachers’ repertoire assignment practices and philosophies required them to have a substantial amount of experience (Clemmons, 2007, p. 56).

The investigator selected participants using a homogeneous sampling strategy, which is based on the premise that they “are chosen, by the researcher, according to some specific criterion such as affiliation to a certain group” (Beidernikl & Kerschbaumer, 2007, p. 92). The group chosen in this instance was one of experience and data availability.

The participants consisted of three males and two females. The participants included two tenors, two sopranos, and a baritone, in terms of voice classification. The intent for selecting participants with contrasting voice types was to provide richness to the data and validity to the study (Dufault, 2008, p. 54-55).

The investigator sent five recruitment e-mails to the prospective participants at institutions A and B. The letter of recruitment for the participants is in Appendix C. Four of the five participant targets affirmed their willingness to participate in the interview, and one participant declined to participate. Due to the small population for this qualitative
phase of the study, the investigator recruited institution C and sent e-mails to two target participants from that institution. Both of these voice teachers affirmed their willingness to participate in the interview. The interviews occurred in April-May, 2013 by phone, and the investigator recorded the interviews.

**Interview Instrument Construction**

The investigator constructed interview items, primarily, from items found in existing research. The investigator calculated the frequency of vocal terms/concepts, questions, and/or statements found in similar survey and interview instruments. The investigator assigned terms appearing more frequently in the existing research instruments and aligned more closely with the research intent of this study to items that contained a four-point Likert scale or open-ended response items. Sections 2 and 3 of the interview instrument contain these items. Section 2, also, contained open-ended response items on particular composers that the participants frequently programmed. Section 1 of the interview instrument contained questions that focused more on the participants’ background, education, and experience (Fee, 1961; Peterson, 1994). Appendix D contains an example of the interview instrument and the accompanying citations that aided its formation.

**Pilot Study**

In order to test the validity and worthiness of the interview instrument, the investigator recruited a collegiate voice teacher who was not a part of the study. This pilot participant teaches at an institution in a state that is not included in this study. This teacher has, though, a comparable amount of experience, when comparing total years of experience and longevity at her current institution, and degree type to the official study
participants. These facts provided support to the recruitment of this individual as a pilot participant for this investigation.

The investigator sent the same recruitment e-mail and letter intended for the official participants to the targeted pilot participant. This teacher agreed to participate, and the investigator conducted an interview using the same planned protocol. The investigator used the most frequently programmed composers amongst the official interview participants for items on the interview instrument that required such data, since the investigator had not analyzed recital programs at the pilot participant’s institution. The interview lasted for 39:37, and the interviewee’s responses provided an adequate amount of adequate data.

Data Analysis

The investigator assigned a number to the participants for organizational and confidentiality purposes. These assignments are in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Voice Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Baritone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Tenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Tenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The investigator coded the data using open coding techniques (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Open coding is the “analytic process through which concepts are identified and their properties and dimensions are discovered in the data” (p. 101). The investigator’s primary objective was to use raw data from participants’ responses for the language of the codes.
The investigator coded the data using HyperRESEARCH®, a qualitative research software coding program. The investigator compiled participants’ responses for each interview question into a single word processing documents by item. Appendix E contains a compilation of these participants’ responses. The investigator imported the document into the software program and assigned codes to data containing similar characteristics. The investigator analyzed the codes extracted from the data for themes within and across items. Validation for these codes is internally robust, because the investigator extracted them from the raw data itself. The investigator organized common themes by interview item.

**Role of the Researcher**

The investigator has a past professional relationship with all participants. One of the participants was one of the investigator’s former voice teachers. The investigator based the selection of these participants on the potential for the extraction of rich data from candid yet professional one-on-one interviews.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Phase 1: Recital Program Data

Titles

The voice teachers at all five institutions programmed 3,096 pieces over a five-year period. No single title appeared as one of the most frequently programmed for all voice teachers at the three institutions. Table 4.1 contains a list of fifteen titles most frequently programmed titles at all institutions. The highest frequency for any of the teachers who participated in the interviews was four.

Table 4.1
The Fifteen Most Frequently Programmed Titles at All Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widmung</td>
<td>Schumann, Robert</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beau soir</td>
<td>Debussy, Claude</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Après un rêve</td>
<td>Fauré, Gabriel</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre amour</td>
<td>Fauré, Gabriel</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allerseelen</td>
<td>Strauss, Richard</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>Fauré, Gabriel</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adieu</td>
<td>Fauré, Gabriel</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En prière</td>
<td>Fauré, Gabriel</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An die Musik</td>
<td>Schubert, Franz</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il pleur dans mon coeur</td>
<td>Debussy, Claude</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>Debussy, Claude</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standchen</td>
<td>Schubert, Franz</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vedrai carino</td>
<td>Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wie Melodien zieht es mir</td>
<td>Brahms, Johannes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adieu</td>
<td>Fauré, Gabriel</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Composers

The teachers at the five institutions programmed, in total, 535 composers. The ten most frequently programmed composers by title instances in recitals comprise 35.46% of all titles programmed by all voice teachers at the five universities. Table 4.2 includes a list of these composers. These most frequently programmed composers comprised 42.22%, 35.17%, and 40.79% of all pieces at Institutions A, B, and C, respectively.

Table 4.2
Ten Most-Frequently Programmed Composers as Represented in Titles for All Teachers at All Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Total Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Schubert, Franz</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Schumann, Robert</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fauré, Gabriel</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Debussy, Claude</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Handel, George Frideric</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wolf, Hugo</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Brahms, Johannes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Strauss, Richard</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Vaughan Williams, Ralph</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 contains the five most frequently programmed composers according to titles by voice teachers who participated in the interview portion of this study. The total percentages of titles these composers comprised a range of 21.25 to 44.75% for the participants. Three of these five composers, Robert Schumann, Gabriel Fauré, and Franz Schubert, appeared in all five participants’ most frequently programmed lists. Additional composers frequently programmed by selected interview participants include Hugo Wolf (Participant 1), Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (Participants 2 and 5), John Jacob Niles and
Henri Duparc (Participant 3), Samuel Barber and Alessandro Scarlatti (Participant 4), and Benjamin Britten (Participants 3 and 5).

Table 4.3
Five Most Frequently Programmed Composers in Titles by All Interview Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Schubert, Franz</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Schumann, Robert</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fauré, Gabriel</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Debussy, Claude</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Handel, George Frideric</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total %</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>27.64</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ten most frequently programmed composers by title instances in recitals comprise 35.46% of all titles programmed by all voice teachers at the three universities. The most frequently programmed composers for each institution encompass a large percentage of the titles performed. Interview participants’ percentages compare favorably with the percentages of all voice teachers’ programming.

Languages

The investigator calculated percentages and average percentages for languages represented in the recital programs by title. Table 4.4 includes this statistical data for all teachers at the three institutions. The investigator conducted the same statistical analyses for the five interview participants, and this statistical data appears in Table 4.5.
Table 4.4
Percentages and Averages of Languages as Reflected in Titles Programmed by All Voice Teachers at Participating Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Institution A</th>
<th>Institution B</th>
<th>Institution C</th>
<th>Total Average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>29.62</td>
<td>39.65</td>
<td>34.64</td>
<td>34.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td>21.89</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>19.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>28.52</td>
<td>24.91</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>24.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>16.09</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>16.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total %
98.66

Table 4.5
Percentages and Averages of Languages as Reflected in Titles Programmed by Interview Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>1 %</th>
<th>2 %</th>
<th>3 %</th>
<th>4 %</th>
<th>5 %</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>25.83</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>37.28</td>
<td>30.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>17.11</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>20.73</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>18.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>32.13</td>
<td>29.11</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>25.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td>28.92</td>
<td>17.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total %
96.93

The four most commonly programmed titles by language by all teachers and interview participants were English, German, French, and Italian. All teachers and interview participants except one programmed more titles in English. Participant 1 programmed more titles in German. The four most frequently programmed languages by title constitute a significant majority of the total titles represented in the data.
Phase 2: Interviews

Section 1

Section 1 of the interview contained questions regarding the educational and experience background of the participants. Appendix D contains these questions, for reference.

All participants held a Doctor of Musical Arts (DMA) degree with a major in vocal performance. Participants’ responded that they completed between two to eight vocal literature courses in their graduate study. Four out of five participants indicated they had completed four or more courses in this area. Participants, also, indicated they completed between two and four graduate courses in vocal pedagogy with the mean being 2.6.

The participants’ responses varied to the question concerning whether or not teachers addressed repertoire assignment strategies in their graduate vocal literature and/or pedagogy courses. Only Participant 3 responded with a “no” for this item, though he commented that it had been quite a while since he had taken those courses and was having trouble remembering their content. Participant 3 recalled vocal physiology as the primary topic covered in his vocal pedagogy courses. Participants 1, 2, and 4 affirmed that teachers covered repertoire selection strategies in both their graduate-level vocal literature and pedagogy courses. Participant 1 qualified his answer with more specificity:

Even in the literature courses, there were some songs assigned to be prepared. The survey courses were not as demanding, but the courses that focused on particular kinds of literature had a public recital with the participants each performing two or three pieces. The vocal ped [pedagogy courses] did not have any performance in it other than what you learned about how to teach others.
Participant 4 stated that the teachers in her graduate-level vocal pedagogy courses addressed repertoire assignment strategies, but the teachers in her graduate-level vocal literature courses did not address repertoire assignment strategies.

Participant 1 has the greatest number of total teaching experience with 33 years, which caused this mean to be slightly higher. The mean average for the other four teachers is 20.25 years. Participants taught between 13 and 24 years at their respective institutions with the mean being 18.4 years. Appendix F contains additional specific statistical data regarding the participants’ backgrounds.

Section 2

The investigator asked the participants questions concerning their repertoire selection practices and philosophies for Section 2. Appendix E contains the participants’ transcribed responses to each question.

Question 7: Do you allow students to participate in the repertoire selection process?

A general theme that emerged from the participants’ responses was that teachers generally allow more participation in the repertoire selection process as they progress in their vocal study. Four out of five participants supported this theme in their responses. Codes extracted from the raw data to help qualify this theme include “underclassmen rarely” and “upperclassmen more frequently.” Participant 5 sees this progression of selection freedom for students as an expectation, because “when they get to be upperclassmen of course, then, they should [be involved in repertoire selection]. They start to know some repertoire, and they have their own ideas.”

Participants 1 and 2 addressed the importance of the repertoire being “appealing” to the students. Voice students will learn pieces more easily if they appeal to them,
according to Participant 2. This theme connects with a later question concerning participants’ consideration of musical preferences in repertoire selection.

Question 8: If you do not allow students to participate in the selection process, could you elaborate on your reasons for implementing that policy?

No participant responded with an answer of “no” to question 7, so the investigator did not ask this question in the interviews.

Question 9: If you do allow students to participate in the selection process, at what point(s) in the semester do you normally implement this practice?

Respondents stated that they allowed student participation in the repertoire assignment process either at the “beginning of the semester” or the “end of the semester.” Participants 1 and 4 were, in fact, in the process of assigning repertoire for the fall semester, because the interviews coincided with the end of the participants’ academic terms. The purpose of assigning repertoire at the end of the academic term, according to Participant 1, is “the hope that when they begin study they will already know most of their literature. They may not be able to perform it, but they will have done transcriptions, translations, and have at least identified what the musical and vocal challenges are.”

Question 10: How many pieces do you allow students to choose, generally?

The investigator assigned three codes to the responses for this item, and two themes emerged from the data. Interview participants indicated that they allow upperclassmen to choose more repertoire than underclassmen. Participants, on average, allow underclassmen to select one to two songs in a given semester. The interview participants allow upperclassmen and graduate students more input into repertoire selection, especially in terms of recital programming since they are more mature and have
more knowledge concerning repertoire and composers’ styles. The number of pieces upperclassmen and graduate students may choose varies among the participants.

A second theme that emerged from the data concerning this item was the amount of student input in repertoire selection depended on their “investigation and interest levels.” When the teachers see that their students show a particular interest in a particular “composer, style, or poet,” in the words of Participant 1, they give more responsibility to the students. For students majoring in areas that are non-vocal performance such as music education and music therapy, Participant 4 allows them to construct one set of their own for their senior recitals. Examples she provided include performing arrangements students create themselves as well as organizing small vocal and/or instrumental ensembles to involve in such sets. Participant 5 asks to list particular composers they were drawn to in their music history classes and guides them through the exploration of these composers’ repertoire for selection purposes.

Question 11: Do you administer a student inventory (i.e., survey, interview) prior to their study with you to obtain more information about their musical preferences? Please, explain further.

All participants indicated that they ask students to submit a “repertoire list” or “information sheet” prior to their study with them. Three of the five teachers inquire about students’ musical preferences in their pre-assessment of students. Students’ initial music preferences may not align with the repertoire expectations of the vocal areas at their respective institutions in terms of style, genre, and/or appropriateness for their present skill level, at times. Teachers’ approaches vary in terms of steering these students in repertoire selection. Participant 5 occasionally allows students to sing a song they are
not quite ready for in terms of skill, though the student truly prefers that selection. These students, according to Participant 5, by in large discover rather quickly that they “see what you [the voice teacher] mean” and put the piece away as a goal for later study. Participant 4 shared her experience with a student that prefers pop music and wanted to study it in the applied voice studio. The investigator will examine this example further in the discussion of Question 12, because that question is, actually, the one in which Participant 4 shared this example.

**Question 12:** Do you limit students’ involvement in repertoire selection to specific genres? Please, explain further.

Four out of the five voice teachers stated that their institutions expect the study of “classical music.” Participant 5 goes further by stating that classical music is the genre expected by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) for accreditation purposes. Participant 5 will not allow her students to sing pieces from popular music genres such as rap and country. Citing the student who prefers to study pop music in the voice studio in the aforementioned question, Participant 4 suggested to the student that they “put that away so we could do the classical thing, and then once we got that in place, we could probably go back to that later.”

Most of the participants expressed that they do not want to limit a student’s interests. Participant 5, for example, expressed that she will listen to students and tell them what she hears when they bring a vocal jazz piece in to sing, even though it is a genre in which she has neither experience nor expertise. Participants 4 and 5 welcome the study musical theatre pieces in their studios. Participant 4 stated that “she’s getting suited to really want to do musical theatre.” In spite of the fact that a performance medium is
not really in place for that style at her institution, Participant 4 encourages students to perform in the musical theatre category at NATS competitions. Many students of Participant 5, who come in with a preference for musical theatre, quickly make the connection to opera and develop a passion of that genre, according to the teacher.

Question 13:  How do you keep track of what a student is singing during a semester and what they have sung in the past?

All voice teachers organize their repertoire assignment records well by keeping track of what pieces students have sung in the past, are currently singing, and plan to sing in the future via “paper file” or “computer file.” The organizational method of Participant 5 is worth noting. This teacher keeps a record of every lesson with all vocalises, repertoire, and periodic range assessments in a binder. The cover sheet for this binder includes a range assessment for the very first lesson as well as vocalises covered in that lesson. This cover sheet provides a helpful reference point for future assessments.

Question 14:  Elaborate on the influence your teacher(s) had on your philosophy of repertoire assignment.

Three themes emerged from participants’ responses to this question. Participants 1, 2, and 5 reflected on their first voice teachers and concluded that the repertoire they assigned to them were highly appropriate for their “developmental stage” at that time. Several qualifiers Participant 2 mentioned concerning this appropriate repertoire include pieces that did not have large ranges, were melodic, and did not overstretch the voice.

Some of this repertoire for beginning students such as in the case of the aforementioned participants includes selections from the early Italian aria collections. Participants 2 and 3 vouch for the simple nature of these songs and their appropriateness
for teaching the younger singer. In the words of Participant 4, one of her teachers “believed that all those songs gave you all of the technical prowess that you needed for anything else.”

Participants 1 and 2 shared the philosophy imparted to them in their study concerning the focus on voice “building and sequence.” Areas of growth related to voice “building,” according to the experience imparted by Participant 2, include technical, artistic, and language learning skills. Participant 1 describes the teacher that most affected his teaching as being systematic in his approach to vocal technique development through repertoire selection. This participant qualifies his experience and his application to his teaching by stating that “as he worked with me and I saw him work in his studio. That affected patterns. And, it both affected the kind of sequence I would learn or would use, and it also affected one of my approaches to literature.”

The investigator extracted the next set of questions from the frequencies of repertoire titles assigned by the five interview participants in phase 1 of this research project.

Question: Please comment on the pedagogical value of teaching repertoire composed by Franz Schubert.

Several teachers indicated their affinity for teaching Schubert vocal works for their simple melodies and melodic contour. Coinciding with Schubert’s melodic value, two participants believe his vocal lines are good tools for teaching students how to phrase since they are not long. A final pedagogical value two respondents expressed is the opportunity to teach correct German diction in Schubert Lieder.
Question: Please comment on the pedagogical value of teaching repertoire composed by Robert Schumann.

Themes found in participants’ replies concerning the value of teaching Schumann repertoire include “melodic value,” “poetic value,” and “word-melody relationship.” Three of the five teachers remarked that Schumann wrote melodies that are “lyrical, wonderful,” (Participants 1 & 2, respectively) and “valuable for teaching” (Participant 3). Two teachers commented on the poetry Schumann used as being “deep in thought” (Participant 5) and wonderful opportunities to work with in terms of interpretation. The relationship between these two elements, word and melody, are valued by Participants 1 and 2, as the latter states Schumann’s settings help “students learn to sing a beautiful melody, a beautiful phrase shape.”

Participant 4 did not mention the value of Schumann’s pieces for voice in terms of the three aforementioned themes. This participant advocates the usefulness of Schumann songs for teaching German diction. She, additionally, believes Schumann vocal pieces fit male singers better due to their commonly low melodic tessituras.

Question: Please comment on the pedagogical value of teaching repertoire composed by Gabriel Fauré.

Four of five interviewees value pieces by Fauré for instruction in “beginning French diction.” One participant prefers teaching students French diction via Fauré as opposed to Debussy. Participant 5 summarizes this value by stating that they “are so accessible, just beautiful French. The French is set so well.” She further supports Fauré’s works for teaching the complicated schwa sound in French, “because [in Fauré’s works] you know exactly the right thing to do with the schwas. You don’t have to guess.”
Participant 1 uses Fauré’s early vocal works to aid students’ acquisition of French diction skills, though he and two other participants caution against the use of Fauré’s later works with younger students. These participants view these works as more challenging and sparse in terms of texture and melodic contour when compared to his earlier works.

Question: Please comment on the pedagogical value of teaching repertoire composed by Claude Debussy.

Vocal works composed by Debussy are, according to the teachers interviewed, not for the young singer. These works, in their view, are “harmonically complex” with “complex melodies” and “wide ranges.” These teachers advocate assigning Debussy to older students who, in the words of Participant 3, “there’s a little more nuance that could be introduced which the younger students [are] not able to grasp.”

Question: Please comment on the pedagogical value of teaching repertoire composed by George Frideric Handel.

Respondents advocate assigning vocal titles by Handel depending on their level of musicianship and maturity. According to Participant 1, Handel’s recitatives and arias present varying levels of difficulty, which coincide well with the varying levels undergraduate voice students a voice teacher faces in his/her studio.

The teachers, also, value works by Handel for introducing students to Baroque style and form through their melismas, ornamentation, and da capo arias. Two teachers, finally, assign vocal works by Handel for their worth in teaching agility and flexibility, concerning vocal technique.

Question: Please comment on the pedagogical value of teaching repertoire composed by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart.
Participants 2 and 5 frequently programmed works by Mozart. They communicated their affinity for more simple songs by Mozart in teaching younger undergraduate students. Participant 2 reserves the arias, more complex in nature, for older students.

Participant 5 values the content of Mozart’s vocal works for teaching students how to phrase. She believes that “if you [the student] learn to make a beautiful, Mozartian phrase, you are set. Then, you can make a phrase in anything.”

Question: Please comment on the pedagogical value of teaching repertoire composed by Benjamin Britten.

Participants 3 and 5 frequently programmed works by Britten. These participants indicated that they primarily use Britten’s settings of British folk songs in their teaching. Both participants find Britten’s piano accompaniments for these settings to be challenging. Participant 3 chose them specifically for that musical aspect, because they are more interesting than the accompaniments of other British composers’ settings for voice and piano, namely Cecil Sharp and Ralph Vaughan Williams, in his view. Participant 1, also, described the piano accompaniments of Schubert “interesting.” Participant 5 believes Britten’s vocal works are good for students to study, because they require students to “be absolutely independent” due to the bitonality of the piece with piano and voice parts in different keys.

Question: Please comment on the pedagogical value of teaching repertoire composed by Samuel Barber.

Participant 4 commonly programmed vocal works by Barber. She specifically labels one of his pieces, “Sure on this shining night,” as “the most perfect American art
song,” because “it has everything in it that an American art song should have.” This teacher lists several qualities of the song, which, in her view, make this song the perfect American art song: a good text, beautiful melody in the vocal line and the piano accompaniment, and dynamic contrast.

Participant 4 views the works of Barber and, especially, “Sure on this shining night,” poses three challenges to students’ study. She believes that Barber and other American art songs pose the challenge of teaching the correct way to sing an American r. Breath management for the long phrases found in Barber’s songs, also, presents a challenge for students in her opinion. Breath management is easier to accomplish in the phrases found in Schubert’s Lieder, according to prior commentary by this participant on that composer’s pedagogical value. The theme of “nuance” appears again concerning this participant’s belief that one must execute phrasing nuances in American English and, specifically, Barber’s works. Participant 3 previously mentioned this term as a component of Debussy’s songs.

Question: Please comment on the pedagogical value of teaching repertoire composed by Alessandro Scarlatti.

Participant 4 frequently programmed the vocal works of the Italian, Baroque composer, Alessandro Scarlatti. This teacher uses Scarlatti pieces to help students with flexibility and moving the breath. Both participants 4 and 5 mentioned flexibility or agility as being of prime importance for teaching the works of another Baroque composer, Handel. Participant 4, additionally, teaches proper Italian diction through the works of Scarlatti.
Question: Please comment on the pedagogical value of teaching repertoire composed by Hugo Wolf.

Participant 1 programs many *Lieder* by the Austrian composer Hugo Wolf for his students, according to the data. This teacher views the “word-melody” characteristic of Wolf’s *Lieder* as being even more detailed and prominent than Schumann. Wolf, according to Participant 1, was a text painter, and the level of detail in shaping the words’ meaning would be so great that an individual word or harmony would have a specific rhythm or shape.

The negative to Wolf is his use of chromaticism which may prove challenging for the novice singer attempting to process of melodic and harmonic contexts, in the view of Participant 1. The description of Debussy’s vocal works and the challenges a younger singer might encounter contains these unfamiliar harmonic and melodic contexts, as well.

Question: Please comment on the pedagogical value of teaching repertoire composed by John Jacob Niles.

Participant 3 frequently programmed the compositions and arrangements of John Jacob Niles for his students’ recitals. This participant’s sole purpose for programming these works was to acculturate his students with the songs of their regional heritage. He did not particularly care for the arrangements, which he found to be simplistic in nature. This teacher, however, believed his students should know these works especially since they hailed from that region.

Question: Please comment on the pedagogical value of teaching repertoire composed by Henri Duparc.
Participant 3 frequently programmed mélodies of Duparc, as well. Participant 3 assigned these pieces to older students and graduate students due to their melodic and rhythmic complexity. This participant’s view echoes his another other participants’ previously stated belief that some works, such as mélodies by Debussy and arias by Mozart, should be saved for older students when they are more ready in terms of technical and maturity levels.

Section 3A

The investigator asked participants to rate their level of consideration for a list of vocal terms in their repertoire selection process. The investigator provided an opportunity for participants to qualify their ratings with additional comments in interview Section 3A. Table 4.6 contains the participants’ frequency of ratings per consideration level, and the transcriptions for their open-ended responses appear in Appendix E. Not all participants provided an open-ended response for these items.
Table 4.6
Participants’ Levels of Consideration for Vocal Terms when Selecting Repertoire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocal Term/Category</th>
<th>Frequency of Participant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breath management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resonance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range/tessitura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voice classification</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>posture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rhythmic accuracy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pitch accuracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dynamics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrasing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legato</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tone color/timbre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>text analysis/interpretation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge of composer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musical skills/musicianship</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Musical Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personality</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical maturity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotional maturity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude/temperament</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life experience</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directions: For the following vocal terms, please rate your level of consideration when selecting repertoire for your students’ study, and qualify your answers with additional comments, if applicable.

Interview participants, overall, consider most of the vocal terms listed in the interview when selecting repertoire for their students’ study. All participants rated their consideration of two items “often,” the highest rating. These items include “breath management” and “musical skills/musicianship.” Consequently, only two participants indicated negative ratings. These participants stated that they “rarely” consider their...
students’ voice classification, dynamics, and/or their students’ life experience as factors for repertoire choices. None of these teachers qualified their ratings of “rarely” or “never” with additional responses.

Participant 1 indicated that he “rarely” considers the aspect of diction when selecting repertoire. He qualified, however, his rating by stating that he always considers what the challenges are in the repertoire, yet the challenges don’t necessarily dictate his repertoire choices. His job, in his words, “is to help them learn the diction.” The response by Participant 5 echoes this code, to “help them learn” something, for the terms “phrasing” and “legato.” Participant 5, who indicated that she “rarely” considers either concept when selecting repertoire, qualified her rating by exclaiming that she “would just teach them.” In other words, she would simply teach them the concept without considering repertoire that specifically addresses that concept.

Another common theme exists in the comments by Participants 1 and 4 concerning rhythm accuracy considerations in vocal repertoire selection. Both participants expressed their desire to choose repertoire that is not too difficult rhythmically for them to successfully study. Participant 1 applies this theme to the concept of pitch accuracy with Participant 5 supporting his view. This concept of choosing repertoire that is “within the students’ capabilities” carries over to voice classification, as well. Participant 1 attempts to choose appropriate keys for his students’ physiological capabilities when selecting repertoire, but he does not necessarily match up repertoire with voice types. Participant 2 considers physical maturity “often,” especially concerning young men, in his repertoire selection.
Participant 2 twice addressed his goal to simply “get noises made” and not concern himself with specifically selecting music to teach dynamics and tone color/timbre. This participant stated that he “sometimes” considers these concepts when choosing repertoire, but he states that he does not “want to pigeonhole” and wants them “to get comfortable making whatever noise they can.”

Section 3B

A second component of section 3 consisted of statements concerning applied vocal study and required participants to indicate their level of agreement with the statements. The investigator presented the opportunity for participants to qualify their answers with additional comments, if applicable. Table 4.7 contains the participants’ frequency of ratings per level of agreement with the statements. The transcriptions for their open-ended responses organized by item appear in Appendix E.

Table 4.7
Participants’ Agreement Levels Concerning Statements on Applied Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Frequency of Participant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I select music to strengthen student’s weaknesses. Music students need to listen to their studio teachers and do what they say even if they don’t agree. A studio lesson at the college level should be a partnership rather than a one-sided relationship where the teacher is in control.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 3 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements, and qualify your answer with additional comments, if applicable.
Statement 1: I select music to strengthen student’s weaknesses.

Participant 4 “agreed” with this statement, yet she qualified her rating further by stating that it is “not the only thing I use when I’m choosing it, because sometimes choosing repertoire that works on a particular technical thing just draws too much attention to it. We can work on a couple of things, but I don’t want to choose all the repertoire on what needs to be fixed.” Participant 1 agreed with this view of not choosing repertoire solely based on students weaknesses.

When I talk about using literature in pedagogy, I say that the goal is that the student learns something from each piece. But, you can’t ask them to take a piece where they have to learn twenty-seven things in order to get it right. You’ve got to know what they can do and, specifically, where they’ll be stretched and help them learn how to do that. In the whole process of choosing the 8-10 pieces for the semester, you are trying to give them a good balance and diet so that they develop different skills so that we don’t have a rhythm semester and we don’t have a pitch semester. But, we’re trying to move them along vocally in all these categories.

Statement 2: Music students need to listen to their studio teachers and do what they say even if they don’t agree.

Participant 4 was the only teacher to negatively rate her level of agreement with this statement and, in fact, this is the only instance where a teacher gives a rating of “disagree” or “strongly disagree” among the three statements. She believes that a student should never do anything their teacher asks them to do if it hurts physically. Participant 2 rated “agree” for this item, yet he relates a story that provides some support to the rating applied by Participant 4. Participant 2 tells of a teacher who asked him to do something in the studio that he saw no profit from doing, yet he did what the teacher asked of him because of his respect for him. Participant 2 asked his teacher to explain and clarify his reasoning for using the instructional approach. Though the teacher was not injuring him physically through his methods, Participant 2 still disagreed with his teacher’s approach.
He continued to disagree, because he believed that he wasn’t advancing as fast as he
should have been.

Statement 3: A studio lesson at the college level should be a partnership rather than a
one-sided relationship where the teacher is in control.

Participants 4 and 5 agree that as the student progresses through his/her study and
gains experience and knowledge along the way, the character of the teacher-student
relationship should move toward that of a partnership. Participant 5 creatively stated that
with each year of undergraduate study, she would move the rating higher. In her view,
she would “strongly disagree” that a freshman and a teacher should be a partnership, but
she would “strongly agree” that a senior-teacher relationship should be more like the
partnership model.

Summary

The investigator analyzed the collected data for each research phase and
calculated descriptive statistics for research phase 1. Frequency calculations of titles,
composers, and languages revealed commonalities between all voice teachers at the
institutions studied as well as between the interview participants.

The investigator transcribed, coded, and analyzed interview responses for themes
in research phase 2. Several themes concerning the participants’ repertoire selection
practices emerged from their descriptions. Discussion and in-depth analysis for each
research phase follow in the subsequent chapter.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research project was to investigate the descriptions of experienced collegiate voice teachers’ repertoire selection practices for use in prospective and novice voice teachers’ formation of their pedagogical approaches. The investigator attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the curricular content of the repertoire chosen by select vocal studio applied instructors?
2. Are there commonalities among these repertoire selections?
3. What approaches can prospective and novice voice teachers apply to their pedagogy from experienced voice teachers’ descriptions of their repertoire selection practices?

The investigator quantified and analyzed these teachers’ repertoire, as reported through recital programming. The investigator, subsequently, interviewed five voice instructors from the three institutions, described their repertoire assignment practices, and extracted themes from codes assigned to the participants’ responses. The investigator condensed these themes into major headings for the purpose of analysis and discussion that follows in the subsequent section.

Titles and Composers

The voice teachers’ curricular content contained several titles frequently programmed across all three institutions studied. When compared to the 3,096 total
pieces programmed, though, the most commonly programmed piece comprises only a minute fraction of the entirety. “Widmung” appeared only 16 times in recital programs. Interpretation of these results suggests that voice teachers vary their curricular assignments. In a similar study, Dalton (1980) confirms this finding. These results may indicate that voice teachers consciously or unconsciously attempt to assign a varied curriculum of titles for their students.

Prospective and novice voice teachers can apply the curricular content of the voice teachers studied to their own curriculum construction. By varying their repertoire selections, new voice teachers provide a broad curriculum of study for their students. The importance of exposing students to a variety of repertoire aligns well with national standards for music education concerning “a varied repertoire of music” (NAfME, 1994). Although music education stakeholders originally constructed these standards for K-12 education, researchers have investigated their importance, applicability, and implementation in collegiate studios (Abrahams, 1999; Frederickson, 2007).

Works written by Schubert, Schumann, Fauré, Debussy, and Handel commonly appeared in vocal recital data. Voice teachers frequently include these composers in their curricular content (Dalton, 1980). As reported by the interview participants, the aforementioned composers’ works embody certain characteristics that help singers grow in their path to achieving artistry. Several characteristics common to the interview participants’ descriptions of these composers’ pedagogical value include diction, interpretation, phrasing, building, and sequence.
Diction

Interview participants assign repertoire by a common group of composers to teach students diction skills. Teachers facilitate singers’ acquisitions of German diction by programming works by Schubert and Schumann, Fauré for French diction, Scarlatti for Italian diction, and Barber for the American version of English diction.

Prospective and novice voice teachers can add works by these composers to their curricula in order to teach diction skills for a variety of languages. The fifteen most commonly programmed works by all teachers at the institutions is a list of specific works new teachers can immediately assign for teaching French and German diction. Works by Schubert, Schumann, and Fauré, composers valued by the interview participants for teaching diction skills, appear on this list.

The voice teachers commonly assigned pieces in the English and German language, followed closely by French and Italian. This finding contradicts the previous research literature concerning vocal pedagogues’ choices for cultivating beginning students’ diction skills. Vocal pedagogues prefer assigning works in English and Italian first to beginning students (Freed, 1991; Lightner, 1991; Miller, 2004; Patterson, 1989; Pazmor, 1955; Trump, 1961; Whitlock, 1966, 1975). Voice teachers compliment the assignment of songs in English with Italian works due to their musical, technical, and language accessibility (Pazmor, 1955). Garner (1979) vouches for teachers’ philosophy for programming English yet cautions against its use, as well.

Although English is recommended as a singing language for beginning English-speaking students in order to ensure familiarity, confidence, and understanding, it is granted that English is a difficult language to sing. Many authors place its difficulty on a par with French and German, while others that that it is harder to sing than either (p. 123-124).
Garner cites specific diction challenges singers face in their strife to perform English in a legato manner such as vowel combinations found in diphthongs/triphthongs and certain types of consonants not found in any other language. New voice teachers can balance their curriculum for beginning students with early Italian works and songs in English. Based on the challenges researchers and vocal pedagogues outlined, new teachers should be careful when choosing works in English for their curriculum.

**Interpretation and Phrasing**

The explanation for the interview participants’ commonalities in German and French title frequencies is not limited to the merits of teaching diction skills via Schubert and Schumann *Lieder* and Fauré *mélodie*. The interview participants choose these composers’ works for their curricula, because students to learn shape melodic phrases and interpret deep, thoughtful poetry through the musical content. Vocal authorities value *Lieder* composers such as Schubert, Schumann, and Wolf for the pedagogical tools embodied in their works (Espina, 1977; Miller, 1999). In addition to the *Lieder*, the interview participants value early *mélodie* by Fauré and all *mélodie* by Debussy for their word-melody craftsmanship and opportunities for interpretation through performance. Vocal pedagogues support these voice teachers’ views of these *mélodie* composers’ prosody and “rare gift of making words sing with the music and the music speak with the words” (Espina, 1977, p. 389). Additional repertoire selected interview participants’ value for teaching students phrasing concepts includes simple songs by Mozart and art songs by Barber.

New voice instructors will encounter a variety of skill levels and pedagogical needs in their teaching assignments. For students who have difficulty shaping phrases or
interpreting the textual meaning of a piece, prospective and novice voice teachers can apply can apply the interview participants’ approach of assigning works by the aforementioned composers. These composers’ works contain a variety of styles prospective and novice teachers can employ in their instructional planning.

**Building and Sequence through Vocal Concepts and Genres**

Interview participants seek to build students’ voices by logically sequencing vocal concepts and genres in their curriculum. Fundamental concepts rated highly by the interview participants are breath management. Many vocal authorities from the research literature value these basic concepts, as well (Andreas & Fowells, 1970; Burgin, 1973; Dayme, 2005; DeYoung, 1958; Frisell, 1972; Fuchs, 1967; Lightner, 1991; Monahan, 1978).

The voice teachers addressed advanced concepts by delaying specific repertoire and composers to the junior and senior years in students’ undergraduate work. Vocal scholars support these concepts outlined by the interviewees: flexibility in Handel and Scarlatti works (Huie-Armbrister, 1982), melodic and rhythmic complexity in works by Debussy, Duparc, and late Fauré (Espina, 1977; Honeycutt, 1979; Kagen, 1968), Baroque phrasing and articulation in Handel’s works (Kagen, 1968), melodic and harmonic independence in works by Britten (Mabry, 2002), and issues in rhythm and chromaticism for works by Wolf (Espina, 1977). The aforementioned concepts are better addressed later in a student’s undergraduate study once technique and other introductory concepts are solidified (Freed, 1991).

The voice teachers assign the aforementioned genres of the early Italian aria and American art song for younger singers’ study due to their appropriate range, diction, and
musical content. Vocal authorities represented in the previous literature support this curricular approach (Freed, 1991; Lightner, 1991; Miller, 2004; Patterson, 1989; Pazmor, 1955; Trump, 1961; Whitlock, 1966, 1975). The previously discussed German Lieder and French mélodie are more appropriate genre assignments for later undergraduate voice study. Though some vocal scholars support assigning Mozart arias for students to set lofty goals (Barbereux-Parry, 1979), the interview participants and majority of vocal scholars reserve these arias for more technically developed voices (Gluck, 1996; Kagen, 1950; Stohrer, 2006). The interview participants and authorities on vocal literature (Espina, 1977; Kagen, 1968) agree that the variety found in Handel’s airs and songs fit a myriad of voice types and singers’ skill levels. Handel “accommodated the needs of all voices” in his writing (Espina, 1977, p. 732).

These findings are important to new voice teachers when assessing pieces for their complexity. Undergraduate students present a variety of skill levels for which the prospective or novice voice teacher must account, and the aforementioned concepts and genres are excellent sources for their selection criteria when developing undergraduate students’ voice curricula. New voice instructors could use existing resources for establishing repertoire selection criteria and sequencing concepts such as a repertoire difficulty measurement tool (Ralston, 1999), criteria checklist (Nix, 2002), or style sheet (Kimball, 2005).

Organized Instructional Practices

The experienced teachers monitored their students’ repertoire assignments in an organized manner. They carefully evaluate what they want students to learn when planning for instruction via repertoire selection following the administration of a student
information sheet inventory or perusal of their repertoire list. This practice serves to learn more about students’ backgrounds and preferences. Vocal pedagogues support the administration of a student inventory to gather more information concerning students’ musical preferences, backgrounds, and goals (Mallett, 1962; Patenaude-Yarnell, 2003). Prospective and novice voice teachers must be organized and structured in their instructional practices and routines, especially concerning repertoire selection. Implementation of a student inventory prior to study would benefit new voice teachers as evidenced in the experienced voice teachers’ descriptions.

**Rapport**

The participants believe that the student-teacher relationship should be a partnership and that a student should trust his/her teacher’s decisions, especially concerning their repertoire selections. This relationship or partnership fits within the category of rapport which, when cultivated, has a positive impact on the vocal studio (Chang, 2001; Clemmons, 2007). Chapman (2006) lends support to the participants’ views and ratings through her qualitative interviews with voice students. She summarizes their desire concisely and thoroughly.

The singers hope that their unique needs will be addressed in a professional partnership, which is also a genuine relationship. They see themselves as collaborative partners in their own future, and at the same time, they want to be able to trust the teacher with their most prized possession—their voice (p. 174).

In the participants’ description, the partnership between student and teacher should grow and, eventually, involve the teacher allowing students to be more involved in the repertoire selection process and take initiative in the process as they progress through their programs. Researchers and vocal authorities encourage this approach by interview participants toward establishing rapport (Clemmons, 2007; Mabry, 2007).
The teachers communicated that they do not necessarily limit students’ repertoire choices in terms of genre. They do maintain, however, certain expectations communicated by their respective institutions and NASM concerning the type of music to be studied in the applied studio. New voice teachers should consider maintaining a balance between what repertoire they will allow students to help choose and maintaining their standards for repertoire value. To accomplish this balance, Mabry (2007) directs new teachers to

- allow younger students to choose repertoire from a limited list
- encourage students to research titles and composers unfamiliar to the teacher
- arrange collaborations with composition majors
- listen to students’ preferences (p. 228-229).

Conclusions

Research Question 1

What is the curricular content of the repertoire chosen by select vocal studio applied instructors?

Though the select applied vocal studio instructors chose a variety of repertoire for their curricula, several titles appeared more frequently in the data. “Widmung” by Robert Schumann was the most frequently programmed title followed by “Beau soir” by Claude Debussy. Two works by Gabriel Fauré, “Après un rêve” and “Notre amour,” and “Allerseelen” by Richard Strauss conclude the five most frequently programmed titles. Many of the titles’ programming frequencies align with previous research findings (Dalton, 1980). Prospective and novice voice teachers could select these titles for undergraduates’ study. New voice teachers can vary their selection of titles to provide a breadth of styles and concepts for students’ learning, as well.
Research Question 2

Are there commonalities among these repertoire selections?

Commonalities existed in voice teachers’ composers and languages programmed for the recitals. The five composers most frequently programmed by interview participants appear in the top six of the ten most frequently programmed composers by all voice teachers at the institutions investigated. These composers include Franz Schubert, Robert Schumann, Gabriel Fauré, Claude Debussy, and George Frederic Handel. Comparable commonalities between the two groups exist when comparing language selection frequencies. Similar composer and language commonalities appear in previous research (Dalton, 1980). Prospective and novice voice teachers can select works by these commonly assigned composers and languages for their curricula.

Research Question 3

What approaches can prospective and novice voice teachers apply to their pedagogy from experienced voice teachers’ descriptions of their repertoire selection practices?

The voice teachers interviewed in this study provided descriptions of their repertoire assignment practices filled with many points of application for prospective and novice voice teachers in their pedagogical formation. Selection of specific works such as Schubert and Schumann Lieder and Fauré mélodies is one approach interview participants described for use in teaching students diction concepts. Teachers reference many of the aforementioned composers’ works for teaching interpretation and phrasing skills. Experienced voice teachers approach repertoire planning longitudinally and save works that enhance advanced skills for study in the junior and/or senior years. Teachers organize instruction well by continually updated and organized repertoire assignment
records, taking an inventory of students’ abilities and preferences, and considering a variety of vocal terms and concepts when choosing repertoire. The interview participants, generally, want to approach their relationship with students as a partnership and gradually allow them more input into curricular choices. Prospective and novice voice teachers can refer to these approaches and apply them to their pedagogy in terms of curricular choices, planning instruction, staying organized, assessing students’ needs, and establishing healthy rapport with students.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Researchers could replicate this study in a variety of ways, beginning with other applied performance areas. Expanding the range of dates and the variety institutions and/or participants in a replication of this study would provide more data for analysis. Adding a third area of data such as student interviews and/or observations of teachers’ lessons would provide triangulation of data for replications of this study.

Researchers interested in this topic could expand the body of titles recommended by teachers for study via descriptive survey research methodology (Kennell, 2002; Wexler, 2009). An example of this possibility of research is replication of Teat’s (1981) study though using different genres, composers, and/or languages as the topic of investigation. Teat only focused on voice teachers’ recommendations for 20th century American art songs in her research.

Though the interview participants programmed a variety of titles for their students’ recitals, another interpretation of this data could be that voice teachers lean heavily toward assigning composers and titles from Western European and American
classical traditions. Researchers could survey collegiate applied voice teachers regarding their knowledge, experiences, and preferences in multicultural repertoire.

Applying case study methodology, a qualitative research approach, to this research topic would add another varied and valuable lens. A researcher might focus on a specific collegiate studio for a semester or academic year. Interviews of teachers and students could provide rich data for analysis of themes between the two populations. The culminating assessment of the jury, which usually contains commentary provided by all the studio teachers in an institution, would provide a third source of data and ultimately, triangulation.

The study of experienced applied voice teachers’ descriptions of their repertoire assignment practices is important for future collegiate voice teachers. Looking at what voice teachers programmed for their students on recitals can be helpful to prospective and novice vocal pedagogues for assigning appropriate vocal literature. These experienced teachers speak from many years of teaching of practicing their craft, and their descriptions should be especially beneficial for future and novice applied voice teachers’ repertoire selection practices.
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Letter of Permission to Institutional Administrators
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Institutional Name
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Institutional City, State, and Zip Code

Dear Institutional Administrator,

My name is David Stephenson, and I am a doctoral candidate in music education at the University of South Carolina. I am, currently, researching repertoire programming practices and philosophies of applied voice teachers in selected colleges and universities across the southeastern United States. Your institution has been targeted as one of these potential research sites.

In order to complete a crucial phase of my research, would you permit me to collect data from solo voice recitals performed by your institution’s students from 2007 to 2012? No names, whether they are students, teachers, or your institution itself, will be discernible in my study. Codes and pseudonyms will be applied to ensure anonymity. Maintaining confidentiality is one of my highest priorities in this study.

I am confident that my findings will especially help novice and prospective applied voice teachers in the future. Data from your institution will be most beneficial to achieving this goal. If you could reply via e-mail with your decision concerning your approval for data collection at your institution, I would greatly appreciate your response.

Thank you so much for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

David G. Stephenson
Ph.D. music education candidate
The University of South Carolina
APPENDIX C

Letter of Recruitment to Prospective Interview Participants

Date

Voice Teacher Name
Institutional School/Department
Institutional Name
Institutional Street Address
Institutional City, State, and Zip Code

Dear Voice Teacher,

My name is David Stephenson, and I am a doctoral candidate in music education at the University of South Carolina. I am currently researching repertoire programming practices and philosophies of applied voice teachers in selected colleges and universities across the southeastern United States. Your institution is included as one of these research sites. In order to complete my research, would you assist me by participating in an interview? The interview will not take much of your time, and it will occur over the phone at your convenience. Neither your name nor affiliated institution will be discernible, as codes and/or pseudonyms will be applied. Maintaining confidentiality is one of my highest priorities in this study.

If you agree to participate in the interview, would you also consider permitting me to record the conversation? Being able to record the interview would immensely simplify the transcription of data. The sound files will be safely stored, and anonymity will, again, be upheld. I am confident that my findings will especially help novice and prospective applied voice teachers in the future. Your contributions will be most beneficial to achieving this goal. If you could reply via e-mail with your decision concerning your participation in the study and your consent for recording the interviews, I would greatly appreciate your response. Thank you so much for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

David G. Stephenson
Ph.D. music education candidate
The University of South Carolina
APPENDIX D

Interview Instrument

**SECTION 1: BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

_I will, first, ask you a few questions regarding your educational and experience background:_

| 1. | What is your highest earned degree type and specialization? |
| 2. | How many vocal literature courses did you complete in your graduate study? |
| 3. | How many vocal pedagogy courses did you complete in your graduate study? |
| 4. | If you completed courses in vocal literature, pedagogy, or both, were vocal repertoire assignment strategies addressed in those courses? |
| 5. | How many years have you taught voice at the collegiate level total? |
| 6. | How many years have you taught voice at your current institution? |

**Source(s)**

**SECTION 2: REPERTOIRE SELECTION QUESTIONS**

_Next, I will ask you some questions concerning your repertoire selection practices and philosophies._

| 4, 8 | 7. Do you allow students to participate in the repertoire selection process? |
| 4 | 8. If you do not allow students to participate in the selection process, could you elaborate on your reasons for implementing that policy? |
| 4 | 9. If you do allow students to participate in the selection process, at what point(s) in the semester do you normally implement this practice? |
| 4 | 10. How many pieces do you allow students to choose, generally? |
| 4 | 11. Do you administer a student inventory (i.e., survey, interview) prior to their study with you to obtain more information about their musical preferences? Please, explain further. |
| 4 | 12. Do you limit students’ involvement in repertoire selection to specific genres? Please, explain further. |
| 7 | 13. How do you keep track of what a student is singing during a semester and what they have sung in the past? |
| 7 | 14. Elaborate on the influence your teacher(s) had on your philosophy of repertoire assignment. |

*Please comment on the pedagogical value of teaching the following composers:*

| 6 | One of the top-5 most frequently programmed composers by the teacher being interviewed |
| 6 | One of the top-5 most frequently programmed composers by the teacher being interviewed |
| 6 | One of the top-5 most frequently programmed composers by the teacher being interviewed |
| 6 | One of the top-5 most frequently programmed composers by the teacher being interviewed |
| 6 | One of the top-5 most frequently programmed composers by the teacher being interviewed |
| 6 | One of the top-5 most frequently programmed composers by all interview participants. |
| 6 | One of the top-5 most frequently programmed composers by all interview participants. |
| 6 | One of the top-5 most frequently programmed composers by all interview participants. |
| 6 | One of the top-5 most frequently programmed composers by all interview participants. |
### SECTION 3A: REPERTOIRE SELECTION CONSIDERATIONS

For the following vocal terms, please rate your level of consideration when selecting repertoire for your students' study and qualify your answers with additional comments, if applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5, 6, 8</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3, 7, 13, 14</td>
<td>breath management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3, 7, 13</td>
<td>resonance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4, 7, 9, 10-13</td>
<td>range/tessitura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4, 7, 10-13</td>
<td>diction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 11</td>
<td>voice classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3, 7</td>
<td>posture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Interpretative Factors

| Source(s) | Rhythmic accuracy | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |
| 4, 7, 12, 13 | pitch accuracy | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |
| 4, 7, 13 | dynamics | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |
| 4, 7, 12, 13 | phrasing | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |
| 2, 13 | legato | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |
| 3, 4, 7, 11, 13 | tone color/timbre | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |
| 4, 7, 10, 13 | text analysis/interpretation | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |
| 4, 7, 10 | characterization | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |
| 10, 13 | knowledge of composer | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |
| 4, 10, 11 | musical skills/musicianship | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |

#### Non-Musical Factors

| Source(s) | Personality | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |
| 4, 11 | Physical maturity | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |
| 4, 9, 11 | Emotional maturity | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |
| 4, 10, 11 | Attitude/temperament | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |
| 4, 9, 10 | Life experience | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |

### SECTION 3B: PHILOSOPHY OF APPLIED STUDIO PEDAGOGY

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements and qualify your answer with additional comments, if applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I select music to strengthen student’s weaknesses.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Music students need to listen to their studio teachers and do what they say even if they don’t agree.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A studio lesson at the college level should be a partnership rather than a one-sided relationship where the teacher is in control.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D.1
*Sources from Existent Literature for Interview Item Construction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abeles (1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alt &amp; Greene (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Blades-Zeller (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clements (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clemmons (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dalton (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dufault (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Goffi (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jones (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lyon (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nix (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ralston (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Teat (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wexler (2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* See Reference section for complete citations.
APPENDIX E

Transcriptions of Interview Participants’ Responses

Question 3

Participant 1. Yes. Even in the literature courses, there were some songs assigned to be prepared. The survey courses were not as demanding, but the courses that focused on particular kinds of literature had a public recital with the participants each performing 2 or 3 pieces. The vocal ped did not have any performance in it other than what you learned about how to teach others.

Participant 2. Yes, both.

Participant 3. No. Not as I remember. I’m sure we discussed it, but I could not tell you at this point. That’s been such a long time ago. Mostly what I remember from my vocal pedagogy courses are the vocal physiology. Of course, we addressed the lit. But, I could not be specific.

Participant 4. Yes, they were addressed in the pedagogy classes. Literature: no.

Participant 5. Yes.

Question 7

Participant 1. To some degree. Freshman—hardly at all, maybe one from two or three. I may have already chosen the anthology, and they have learned one or two songs out of it. Then I say pick something else from this same group. It might be something they have heard another student sing, or it’s something that’s just appealing to them. By the time they get to an undergraduate recital, I would say they are choosing half the literature—some of it from limited choices and some of it from things they have asked to do.

Participant 2. I do allow them to have some input, yes. The goal behind that is to see to it that I’m going to find pieces that resonate well with the student, because if that piece resonates well with the student there will be an easier time for them to learn the piece. That’s resonating well melodically, from the text standpoint, all these kinds of things.

Participant 3. I did not allow the younger students, beginning students through sophomore year. Once they’ve got to their junior and senior years, I allowed them some participation, yes. And then, of course, graduate students had more participation.
Participant 4. As a student progresses in the program, yes. Very seldom do I let freshmen choose their repertoire. But as we move along year by year, I give students more freedom to help choose their repertoire.

Participant 5. It depends, in part, on their level. I will, usually, give a choice, maybe not for a first song or two to an outright, beginning freshman. After that, I may give them a choice between a song or two that accomplishes the same pedagogical aim. You know, “Do you prefer this song or this song?” and, that will go on for quite a while. When they get to be upperclassmen of course, then, they should. They start to know some repertoire, and they have their own ideas. They’re always welcome to bring their ideas, because if they’re interested enough to bring something to me, then, they’re going to be interested in learning it. However, I do retain veto power. If I feel it is completely out of the question or a bad choice for whatever reason, then I will usually share the reason with them. But, I have had to say “no” or, sometimes, “Wait; hang on. Hang on a semester or two, and the reason I’m saying no is because of this technical requirement, so we’re going to make that a goal.” Then we will work on whatever the technical challenge is to see if they can master that well enough that then the piece will be successfully learned and, eventually, performed.

Question 9

Participant 1. I always try to have all of the literature chosen before the beginning of the semester. In other words, right now I am making choices for my students for next fall with the hope that when they begin study they will already know most of their literature. They may not be able to perform it, but they will have done transcriptions, translations, and have at least identified what the musical and vocal challenges are.

Participant 2. Repertoire assignment occurs at the beginning of each semester. At the beginning of the session for the brand new student, I want to get to know their voice well. So I will spend a couple, sometimes three weeks, vocalizing this voice trying to get all the kinks out so I can find out where the natural voice really is for what rep I feel is best suited for guiding the voice along. With incoming freshmen it would be appropriate for me to, especially if they have not had lessons before, choose some pieces that I feel best build the voice. Whether they like the pieces or not is important to me. They don’t necessarily participate so much in that process unless it’s just a song that they really, really don’t like, and then I will find something else for them to sing. In terms of them bringing in rep or choosing rep themselves, they are welcome to find pieces. I encourage them to go out and find new pieces. Whether we use them in the lesson at that initial point or not, it determines how best I feel that piece works with that voice at that time dealing with where they are technically and all these kinds of things. If their musicianship level is not at the level or they’re not technically at the level to pull of that piece, we don’t work on that piece.

Participant 3. When I allowed them to be a part of that practice, it was always at the beginning of the semester.
**Participant 4.** Generally, I am assigning literature at the beginning of the semester and at the end of the semester for the following semester, which is, actually, what I was doing tonight. Sometimes, when students want to participate in NATS musical theatre, for example, I will let them bring in a list of things that they are interested in working on, and then we will make choices. Largely, I try to base it, mostly, on what they bring in, and if I find some things that are not particularly in their best interests, then I will suggest substitutions. I will often ask an upper level student, “What composers have you worked on in music history that you’re particularly interested in? Are there any composers that you heard their music and really like it?” Generally, in my mind I’m thinking about what’s going to work on flexibility, range extension, particular technical problems that I know they have. Women, for example, I’m not going to try and jump into that mid-range and try and strengthen it, initially. We’re going to try and extend the range, instead. Because, by sophomore or junior year if they want to sing some Ricky Ian Gordon, for example, that’s going to be in that range, then, I’ll say yes.

**Participant 5.** We, generally, choose the repertoire within the first few weeks of the semester, so it would be at the beginning. Or, if we’re close to the end and they’re ready for their jury or they’ve had a performance and are ready for new repertoire, as appropriate for when new repertoire is chosen.

**Question 10**

**Participant 1.** In the freshman year, they’re choosing one at most. By the time they’re seniors and they’re learning ten or twelve songs a semester, a couple of those may be free choices. That is, I will ask them, “What would you like to sing, either pieces or types?” And, then, another three or four may be what I call limited choices. I have sent them to a particular composer, style, or poet, and said “Here, you choose from this area.” And, then, depending on what they choose, I may choose something complimentary. If they have chosen a Fauré song that is real fast, than I may choose a slow one just to provide some musical balance.

**Participant 2.** Regarding the undergraduate students the freshmen, who have a minimum of six pieces; I say two max unless there are some really good things that they wanted to work on that are appropriate at that time. But, it’s usually two. As I’m working with a more astute or better informed student or more gifted student, I will allow them to have more input in the process. It depends on how much they’re willing to investigate. Often times, people only want to sing things that they like, and I’m more concerned with having them sing beneficial, profitable pieces that are going to help them to grow technically.

**Participant 3.** Generally, one or two.

**Participant 4.** Junior or senior year one to two a semester. That isn’t always the case. With students that are going to be going to graduate school in performance, for example, I feel I have to be a little more directed. But, they are the ones that say, “I really want to do a set by Brahms,” and I say, “Ok, go and listen to some Brahms, and tell me what you like and then we’ll try and come up with a cohesive set.” So, I’d say probably one or two
a semester in junior and senior year. But with music ed people and music therapy, I’m actually encouraging them because for both of them on their senior recitals, I let them construct one set of their own. They either do arrangements of some kind that they are particularly interested in. The therapy people, usually, do something with an instrumental ensemble. That can be contemporary Christian. Sometimes, it’s just one piece; sometimes, it’s two or three. I think you were in school with [mentions a student’s name]. When she did her senior recital, she wanted to do a set of songs in Gaelic, for example. She and [mentions another student], the two of them actually arranged those for violin, guitar, piano, and voice. I try to make sure there is a desire there. Two years ago, I had a student who graduated who was from Texas, and so I suggested to him, “Why don’t you do a set of songs that has something to do with Texas?” So, he arranged those. He really was a strong choral singer [sings a bit of one of the songs he arranged]. It has a three-part harmony in it. He recruited the singers to sing with him, and he arranged it for piano, guitar, and violin.

Participant 5. A good many of them, I may ask the question, “In your music history classes, or if they’ve had vocal repertoire, which I teach, did a certain say we’re looking for Lieder... a Lieder group. “Which composers, or did a certain composer speak to you? Did you feel drawn to Brahms or Wolf?” for instance, which are two very different Lieder composition. If they feel drawn to one, then I may say, “Ok, you’re drawn to Wolf. Let’s look at (because I know the repertoire better than they) the Spanisches Liederbuch and see what selections in there you may like and I feel are good for you to sing.” Then, we’ll begin a little journey into those songs, those Lieder.

Question 11

Participant 1. I don’t do it before they study unless that is a part of a conversation that they initiate before they come. But, at the beginning of a semester with every new student, I have them do an inventory and repertory list. And I try to learn both what they know in terms of literature and what they are interested in. I try to get them to assess their musical and vocal strengths and weaknesses and their learning strengths and weaknesses. Now, of course for students who haven’t studied much, their own assessment may be way off. But, it helps me know, at least, how they think about it.

Participant 2. I do have a questionnaire, believe or not, that I have given out. I didn’t give it out this year, but in previous years I have given out this questionnaire that has everything from, “Why do you sing?” to “How far do you really think you’re going to go?” or “How far do you really think you’re doing to make it?” and “Is there anything else you could be doing?” “What is your other strengths?” things of that nature just as a way of getting to know the student. At the same time, I have them make a list of all the previous solo repertoire they have studied.

Participant 3. Not about their musical preferences. We did have an information sheet, as part of the department, for their entrance into the voice area at most universities where I taught full-time.
Participant 4. Yes. Usually, I will try and get a rep list from them of what they’ve worked on solo before they’ve come to college. Then, I’ll [unintelligible-9:42] part of my records that I keep on them their entire time here at [mentions school]. I do try and find out: Have they sung in church? What foreign language did they study in high school? Have they done solo competitions before? Have they sung in a band? What kinds of music do they prefer to listen to on the radio? Usually, students volunteer that; sometimes, they don’t. That’s sort of the kind of inventory that I try to do…the rep that they’ve worked on before. Did they sing with a praise band, or have they been a worship leader? Have they been in a band of some kind…rock ’n roll, country/western, bluegrass? What do they listen to in the car? What’s on their iPod®?

Participant 5. I surely do. Sometimes they may prefer something that’s not appropriate. They may prefer, you know, “Oh, I love Rachmaninoff. I want to sing a Rachmaninoff song,” which there aren’t that many anyway. But they may be too heavy. If they have a Schubert voice, Strauss, or something of that nature…if you aren’t going to be appropriate, it won’t be what they can sing successfully. Occasionally, if I have somebody really stubborn, I may let them learn what doesn’t work by letting them by saying, “Ok, you can sing that. You may work on that this semester.” Usually, they’ll get a little ways into it and say, “Okay, now I see what you mean,” or, “Now, I understand why.” They will, usually, back out of it themselves before they have a public crash. But, I do try to always explain, “This is why this is good for you. This is why this is the right…meaning…you’re a high, light soprano, so maybe heavy Brahms is not what you should do. Or, “You have a little more meat in your voice and can sing really long phrases, so maybe Brahms is what you should do. Or, “You find lots of colors in your voice; you’re a perfect match for Hugo Wolf.” Of course, the other side of that is unless it’s something that’s unhealthy, and I really, really strive to never allow anyone…if it’s going to be unhealthy, then we’re not doing it. Then, I will explain to them why that they’re not going to do it. But, say Wolf is not what they would choose, it still might be good for them to do a little, short Wolf, for instance so that they can access things…different colors and different thoughts and different poets that they wouldn’t have known to choose for themselves. Yes, a little of both. If they have studied before, I have them send me a repertoire list and then I will look at it with them and say, “Ok, this is your repertoire list. What, in particular, did you like?” and I’ll take note of that. If they aren’t a student who has had any kind of extensive study either in high school or an undergraduate or they’re a new graduate student, then I’ll just ask them, “What are some things that you’ve sung you’ve liked if you don’t have a repertoire list?” or even, “What are some choral pieces?” Sometimes, you can get a clue from that, “What are some choral pieces you liked and that you sang in high school that you felt successful with?” That’s what you want to do—meet them where they are, and then try to challenge them and open new doors and new pathways for them.

Question 12

Participant 1. It depends on student/level. I am trying to do two things: I am trying to provide a solid musical and vocal education, but I am, also, trying to find out what it is they can do well and where they want to be stretched. So, freshman year, you have
everybody pretty much learning the same things, not so much for music but for vocal technique and learning patterns. Through the sophomore and junior years, you are increasingly stretching them. But, then I always promise to a student that I’m not going to put him or her on stage hoping they can do something. It will be things that they demonstrated their ability to do and have already been successful with. I may continue stretching them in the studio, but I’m not going to absolutely go out and jump higher than they have in their life in a recital.

**Participant 2.** At our school, we are what is known as a traditional school of music where we always study classical music in an applied lesson. I have some students who are non-university who are in local high school and musical theatre productions. I will work with them on that repertoire and have no problems doing it. I have some other students who are working in churches doing contemporary Christian music or gospel music or whatever. I will work with them on whatever repertoire they are working on all to help facilitate a healthy product, bottom line.

**Participant 3.** No, I didn’t limit, not to specific genres. I allowed only the “classical” literature. I didn’t allow anything else.

**Participant 4.** You’re asking this question at a very interesting time. I’ve had a very challenging freshman this year who came in really wanting to do nothing more than [mentions men’s a cappella group at the school] style of music. Billy Joel is his favorite performer ever, and Frankie Valli. So I’ve been fighting Billy Joel and Frankie Valli coming into my studio most every week for the past academic year. In the case of this student, I had to be brutally limiting about the kinds of things I would let him work on. Unfortunately, he went ahead and auditioned for [a cappella group], although I told him not to and almost got him expelled from my studio, because he was dishonest about it. I told him that he really need to put that away so we could do the classical thing, and then once we got that in place, we could probably go back to that later. That’s really what he thinks he wants to do in his high school choral program. In that case, when there are people who come in with those kinds of preferences that I know are going to be very difficult to overcome with classical technique, it’s going to be very difficult for those not to fight each other. I will insist that a student not pick up anything like that, period. A kid that has done popular repertoire like that, I’ll say no. You can’t work on that right now. In the case of this student, he just decided he was going to do it anyway, and it’s been to his detriment. For example, that is one that I’ve had to be very careful with.

I’m getting more suited to really want to do musical theatre, but we don’t really do that here. So, I am having to be very specific with students about what kinds of musical theatre things are in their best interest. I’m trying to make sure if they do want to do musical theatre that we try to do NATS and do the musical theatre area for that. But for some of them, I’ve had to tell them, “No, you can’t do musical theatre right now until we get this taken care of.” I have a singer right now who takes chest voice up too high, and she’s had me for a while. I thought it was just color, and then a kind of, for a lack of a better word, there’s kind of a pop that was happening in the medial range between B line and F line what I call “The Bermuda Tritone.” You can use that, it’s fine. I haven’t copy
written that or anything. This pop started happening right there. So then I took her above
that range and had her bring head voice down, and it didn’t happen anymore. So, she has
really been able to bring that heavy adjustment up higher than I could really even hear
with my own ear. So, that was when I had to take away everything that was F space or
below, and then, insist that she not do any musical theatre for a while until we can get
that worked out.

Participant 5. We have NASM standards, of course, and expectations. Even at an
audition to be a voice major we will tell them, at present, when they are studying voice,
they are studying classical training. For me, that’s bel canto training. I’m not going to
include any kind of rap, not country music. Sometimes, they’ll sing with the jazz
ensemble, and that can bring that. I will try to help them. That’s not my area of expertise,
and I’m always honest with incoming students or my students. “That’s not my area of
experience. I can tell you what I hear, but our jazz ensemble director will have to guide
you into whether or not you are doing this in a stylistic fashion.” Most of our students, at
present, most of my students are not real involved and are not super interested in doing
musical theatre. And I do find that sometimes when they come in interested in musical
theatre, that they really quickly if they get involved in very fine singing and get interested
in technique, they quickly find out that they love opera. It’s the same but higher-level
music and more technique required. But, if you love music theatre to use it the way
Wagner would have used that word, then you love musical theatre. It doesn’t have to be a
song that requires yelling and is not well crafted. It could be something that requires good
singing and is well crafted. But, we usually call that by a different name, right? But, we
call that operetta, at the least, or opera. So, I don’t necessarily limit them. But, what I
offer them will be art song or, depending on who it is and what, it could be operetta. I
don’t think everybody has an operatic voice. A post-1750 opera, I don’t ask everybody to
sing that. The things before that, the 26 Italian Songs and Arias so to speak, a lot of those
are, actually, opera arias. But, they’re so light, and they’re so much more like what we
would just call a song. Now, it’s not like asking a young person to sing Puccini or Strauss
or something like that…Verdi, certainly not.

Question 13

Participant 1. I keep a combination of paper and computer files. I used to do it all by
paper, but more and more I’ve used to computer record. That’s also easier for them to
manipulate in terms of putting together a rep list or that kind of thing.

Participant 2. I keep a running electronic file on my computer of all my students even
dating back almost to the beginning of when I came here. So I’ve got that much
information backed up on disks and things of that nature. But, I keep on the hard drive at
least the current five years.

Participant 3. I have a rep list each semester for each student, and just kept up with that
for each successive semester. So, we had an idea when it came time for their recitals and
participation in other performances. Then we had a list of their repertoire—what we
could draw from.
Participant 4. I keep a file folder that I list all of the repertoire that they’re working on for me. We, also, have jury sheets which, obviously, keeps track of the repertoire that they present for juries. I keep notes on each lesson. I, also, keep a running file on my computers that is typed up by semester that includes the repertoire that they are working on for completion of juries and also if they’re doing any competitions or graduate school auditions. I keep all of that in their file. If students want that, I can print that off for them when they leave, because that becomes what they can build their long-term repertoire list from.

Participant 5. If they come with a repertoire list, if they give that to me electronically or even just write it out, I will keep that. I will print it out, if it’s electronic or keep it. I have a 3-inch binder of just my current students, and their very first lesson with me ever, they fill out an information page that includes all sorts of questions the basic things, obviously, “today’s date, your name, your phone numbers. Where do you live? How much previous experience, and what is it? Are you in a choir? What part do you sing?” One important question, I think, is “What are your goals for singing?” And they fill out that page, and on that I also put on the date and what their range is that day. Then, on the back of that page I start, that day, writing down technical exercises that I give them to do. So, if they’re with me for very long, that gets pretty filled up. But, I try to try to write small enough that it lasts them at least through an undergraduate degree. And that becomes their cover sheet for their section in my big binder. And I put their name on a tab on that cover sheet. And then behind it, I have a repertoire list that I use every semester. So, it’ll have their name, the date, the semester, the date the song is assigned. Underclassmen do a song analysis sheet for each song and when their song analysis sheet is due, what the name of the song is, who the composer is, and what book I pulled it out of so that I’m not trying to remember each and every time. So, they’ll have a whole page, and it fits however many songs for that semester on that whole sheet of paper. So, each semester, I put the new one on top. So, I have their cover and their technique page and their current repertoire are the first things I turn to in their section. Each semester stays behind there. So, I can look back…my seniors this fall…I can look back, and we can see what they sang their very first semester with me. And if they happened to start with me in high school…I have a student that just graduated, and he started with me seven years ago. I have each and every semester. I have what he studied. I have what songs he did in his first lesson with me.

Question 14

Participant 1. I would say more indirect than direct. One not very good part of my background is that, particularly as an undergraduate and as a high school student, my teachers were pleased I could sing as well as I did and they didn’t teach me much real technique. They would give me literature that they thought I could do. And it really wasn’t until I got to graduate school where I got with a teacher that was more systematic and tried to really help me develop vocal technique and to choose literature that would really help that. But I studied with that teacher for 4 years. And, so, as he worked with me and I saw him work in his studio, that affected patterns. And, it both affected the kind of sequence I would learn or would use, and it also affected one of my approaches to
literature. I tend to do in a given semester literature from the same composer with nearly everybody in the studio. So, for instance, this semester all of my students are singing Debussy, and just about all of them are singing Schubert. And I overlap those two languages by a semester so that we’ll be through with Debussy this spring, but we’ll do another semester of Schubert in the fall. And that way they get to know more of a composer’s style from hearing other students sing it, and they get a better sense of style and language. And, so, by the time a student has finished an undergraduate degree, I want them to have done three out of the four major Lieder composers. I want them to have done two of the major mélodie composers. I will deviate from that at some time for particular students, but I do that pretty systematically, again, to try and help them know the literature.

Participant 2. Even from my earliest days of singing classical music before I had private lessons in high school, my choral director who was also my band director asked me if I would be the soloist for literary competition and asked me if I’d be in the quartet and, of course, in the choral stuff. So, in selecting repertoire he would find things that were melodic that didn’t have huge ranges and things that would not damage or overstretch the voice always in English. I did nothing for competitions in high school in anything other than English. I would sing lied in English, chanson in English, whatever I was singing was going to be in English. But, I was learning these different composers and learning some of their music. I just wasn’t learning it in the language it was composed in. In undergraduate school, I was introduced to Italian art song, healthy Italian art song, simple. I was introduced to German art song in undergraduate my first couple of years there. I’ve had four applied teachers at the collegiate level whom I had for my total degree, and all of them made what I consider to be wise choices regarding repertoire. It was always a matter of voice building—the technical building, the artistic skill building, language learning skills were all involved in that process.

Participant 3. Younger students—simple, Italian, often the 26 Italian Songs for their beginning lit. Then, always had Italian and English folk or art song for the first year. Then, for each successive semester after that, we added German and then French. Always, there was a Latin piece. Especially in my latter years of teaching I began using, often, the Gregorian chant and early Medieval French literature because of its simplicity, only its melodic simplicity. My teachers’ influence was the same, really. They did the same sort of things that I just described except for the medieval music. The medieval music was my own, and none of them knew about medieval music.

Participant 4. I had one teacher who was very conscious about programming that you always had something serious, something light, something fast, something slow. She was always about making sure that there was good diversity and variety on the program. That has influenced me. I had this thing about having a balanced program. If you start with one big number, I like to finish with one big number of some kind. It’s what I call “bookending.” If I’ve got two sets in the first half, and frankly my favorite is one thing, two sets, and then one thing for the first half and then one thing, two sets, and one thing for the second half. It’s good balance. It helps to pace the voice. It also gives order to the program for people who come. It’s sort of like that implicit thing that we have about
Mozart: You know what’s going to happen when, and it has balance. Now, that can be a little pedantic; I agree with that. So there are times that if I don’t recommend students do sets like that, we will create a bigger set of shorter pieces. It kind of depends. Some of the repertoire…my graduate reading language is French. I’ve studied French more than anything else, and that influenced me. My French teachers, and there were a lot of them, encouraged me to explore French composers which I have, to a large extent. I haven’t had teachers who were particularly strong advocates of contemporary music. There was a teacher who was, specifically, very fond of French art song. He continued to encourage that. Actually, a roommate of mine was the first to encourage me to investigate Russian art song. It was a roommate I had; it wasn’t a voice teacher. I did have one teacher who was a big advocate of the Italian art song collection…that you really, really needed to know all of those songs. If I remember his philosophy here, he really believed that all those songs gave you all of the technical prowess that you needed for anything else.

DS: So, you’re referring to the 24 or the 26 book?

Participant 4: Yes, the 24 or the 26. This was before the 26. It’s back in the dark ages. He was a strong advocate of those, that if you had worked on all of those, you pretty much had the technical ability to sing anything else. I don’t know if I necessarily agree with that, but he believed it and, at one time, he was national president of NATS. So, he must have known something about what he was talking about.

Participant 5. I think I’ve been very fortunate. One of my first teachers, in high school, was also a college teacher. He taught in my hometown, as well, some private students. Looking back, I can see that he gave me exactly the right thing for me to sing. And, I’d had piano since I was seven and had studied French in high school. So, he was able to give me, probably, more musically sophisticated music. I sang in English, and I sang in Italian. And, after I had a little bit of technique, since I had so much French in high school, then he started me on French. So, I think that was a really good start and a good example of what to give young students. I had great teachers, truly. The repertoire classes, I think, broadened what I knew was possible for not just my voice, really but other voices, as well. I did my doctorate at the University of ____________, and my teacher, who is no longer there, was Dr. ____________. He’s at ____________ University, now. He had great studio classes, and, because, I was a doctoral student, I probably heard more discussion of why you’d give this to this person and why than probably a lot of people. In all of the repertoire classes that I had with him, each person in the class would be responsible for singing some of the things. So, I got to hear how it would work for different voices. I was, also, part of a Brahms project that faculty and graduate students, in fact they auditioned you when you first wanted to be a part of it. We spent three years and sang all 206 solo songs by Johannes Brahms, and that was really, really good. We would meet for a month in May and study every song that was going to be on the concerts the next year. And you could understudy some, and you would have yours you would memorize. And that was really great, because I got to hear what was appropriate for what voices, and then, what of our group would be the next most-appropriate, and those would be the understudies. That was a really good compare and contrast, and even though that was all Brahms, still, the concept of what was appropriate
and all of the heaviness of the voice or the lightness or whatever, agility…whatever…the concept could still be applied to any repertoire. I think that was really great training.

Another thing that I did, I went twice to the Institute for Performance Pedagogy at Oberlin Conservatory. I went to that two different times. They were eight-day long events in the summers, and I went three years apart in the 1990’s. Richard Miller was alive then, and Richard Miller ran them. That man was a pedagogical genius. I cannot say enough about what I learned and how that impacted my teaching and my own singing, as well. Between Richard Miller and his teaching and his books, but for sure those weeks that I spent with other teachers from across the country listening and watching and learning from him plus (her teacher), if I’m not a good teacher, it’s certainly not their fault. They were amazing.

Franz Schubert

Participant 1. Well, obviously the melody there, because they’re generally pretty obvious. The accompaniments are interesting and provide some rhythmic continuity, but they’re not particularly complex. In fact, we’re studying this semester. What the freshman student has for Schubert this semester is going to be quite different than what a graduate student has. But I think it’s good for the freshmen to hear the graduate students to hear where more complex literature goes.

Participant 2. Schubert is fine for the freshman or even some high school students who can handle. Writes beautiful music, challenging, fun, folk-like in many ways. So accessing those melodies would be very easy for the younger student and so-forth. I would look for introducing them to some of those simple storylines and as they get older we’d go into some more advanced poetry and I would be asking of them to do the more advanced interpretations and, definitely, handling some technical things in a much more artistic fashion. I always make the distinction between an artist and a singer and the singer being the lesser of the people. A vocal artist is one who actually has some vocal skills and craftsmanship to really be a “vocal dramatist” is the phrase.

Participant 3. Schubert was a mainstay, also, for me as far as the German language and for the collaborative instruction for the pianist and the singers, as well. I’m not sure really how I would classify the difference in Schubert and Schumann except that Schumann was a little more melodic. Also, in addition to the Schubert, I did Wolf songs which is a little more difficult. I taught several of them. But all, mainly, for the German language and learning the Lieder, obviously. I taught all three of those composers.

Participant 4. Schubert, I find, is better for women to sing, because the tessitura and the range, especially in the high keys, is especially good for sopranos. It’s not impossible to find things for mezzos to sing. The Rückert Lieder, for example, by Schubert…there are five or six of those. Those in the medium keys are, actually, quite good for mezzos. Schubert’s a good way to learn how to sing in German, for women. Obviously, guys…you can teach them anything from the song cycles, and those are good. Schubert has good melodic contour. In general, his phrases are not so long. They are more easily manageable for students who don’t have a great deal of breath management skills. In my
opinion, that’s why you don’t give a freshman Brahms. But, Schubert and Schumann are great stepping-stones to Brahms, eventually. And also, the other value for Schubert is all of the Goethe poems he set. The Goethe poems are beautiful; you don’t always hear them very often. Another advantage there is that students are going to be exposed to really good German poetry, which is important.

**Participant 5.** Again, good phrasing. This would be lighter. This you can give to a young student who is new to German. It’s going to be healthy. It’s not going to be crazy, out there. Pretty easy phrasing. Light voice is just fine. The thing that makes people crazy with Schubert is all the verses. If they have to memorize all the verses, they might lose their minds. It’s good; it’s well-set. Good prosody; good stuff.

**Robert Schumann**

**Participant 1.** Schumann has good lyrical melody. It helps students to learn, particularly, the relationship between voice and piano and between word and melody. The downside is that Schumann, often, has wide ranges.

**Participant 2.** I love teaching Schumann songs, because they have wonderful melodies. They afford you wonderful poetry to work with and the idea of interpreting the poetry has so much to do with helping students learn to sing a beautiful melody, a beautiful phrase shape. But, then once you get the understanding of what the text is, we can start dealing with vocal color at the same time, so that you can bring out all of the emotional colors and passion in the text, phrase shape, and all these kinds of things. They afford you opportunities to use your breath extremely well. I usually, will have students speak the text, whisper the text or things of that nature or sing the melody on a single vowel or hum the melody and give me phrase shaping and line direction and these kinds of things in these melodies. Schumann and Schubert, both, write beautiful melodies that I think are so appropriate for the young singer. For the young singer who is not so comfortable with German I would, of course, not start with German but start with a Latin or an Italian or something of that nature or have them sing something in English. Robert Schumann is a wonderful composer for the voice.

**Participant 3.** Oh, the melodic value there. I always taught melodic singing and Schumann, certainly, would be taught in that area…a little more so than Schubert.

**Participant 4.** Schumann has a tendency to really…some of that stuff really hangs down in the middle of the voice, especially for women. I find Schumann is, actually, better for men, in general, in my humble opinion. I find it’s easier to teach how to sing in German for guys, with Schumann. Although, I had these tenors this year that have totally blown that theory right out of the water. They jumped right into Schubert and just took off with it. I find that he’s a good composer to teach, with trying to convince students that music theory is their friend and not their foe, because Schumann has what one of my literature teachers calls “economy of means.” He uses an idea, and uses an idea, and uses an idea, and uses an idea. I understood what she meant immediately. That isn’t always the case,
because he does have through-composed things in the cycles. Schumann, like I say, is really good for teaching people how to sing in German, in my opinion.

**Participant 5.** Deep in thought…those are cerebral, I think. Maybe not all of them, but those are very cerebral. They’re not always something that you can show somebody and they’ll get immediately excited about. But I think those are very thoughtful *Lieder.* And again, obviously, the prosody is great, the phrasing is great.

**Gabriel Fauré**

**Participant 1.** Fauré lived long enough and wrote long enough that there’s pretty wide variety in his works. I use the early works, especially, to help teach basic French diction, because the melodies and harmonies are not very complicated. Then you get into some of his middle stuff, and the texture gets pretty thick and there’s imitation, and so on. Then you come to his last works which are, quite sparse, in texture. So, it is almost like having three composers. But, if I’m spending two semesters with Fauré, as I often do, I can start them with simpler songs and move them to different kinds of complexity in the second semester.

**Participant 2.** The works I am most familiar are more accessible for the younger singer—the compositional style, the accompaniment. It’s all more aurally accessible for the younger singer.

**Participant 3.** Again, Fauré was the early involvement in singing French just for the diction. That’s where I went…as a mainstay for teaching them diction in the French literature. That’s where I started, where I began with those. I used a lot of Fauré.

**Participant 4.** His setting of French is not perfect, but he is easier to learn to sing in French than Debussy. Fauré has really good melodic contour that generally, although he didn’t think so. You know by the end of his career, he wasn’t writing melodies anymore anyway. He was basically writing melodic contour that was dictated by the spoken word. He left melody almost completely. One of his last works, “La chanson d’Ève”…there’s no melody there at all. It’s really clear from how he progresses in his career that he thought that the French language itself had its own melodic beauty, and that’s what he went to. Fauré has good melodic contour. In general, the French is set fairly well. There are enough songs by Fauré that don’t have a great deal of extremes—not too low, not too high. Those can be easier for younger singers to sing. There are a lot of people who don’t think that he used the best poetry, but he and Schubert have that in common for me. They don’t necessarily set the best poets, but they sure turn them into darn good songs. If they aren’t good poems, it doesn’t matter. His songs are fabulous.

**Participant 5.** The easier ones like “Lydia”…once somebody has done a little bit of French, that’s a really good song to give a young male singer. “Mai” is good. International publishes those volumes in three keys, and I think there are 30 in each one. Those are so accessible, just beautiful French. The French is set so well. Because you know exactly the right thing to do with the schwas. You don’t have to guess. That’s really
good, and they’re not so crazy with the keys that the singers can’t learn to do a little bit of shifting tonality. Now, the late Fauré like the “La chanson d’Ève,” that’s like a different composer. That is not for the young singer.

Claude Debussy

Participant 1. Of course with Debussy, you face the complexity of harmonies in a style that is unfamiliar to many of them. It often takes listening to the style before they can find their way into the chromatics and figure out, “What is this man trying to do?” Also, you have wide ranges there. You have rhythms where he’s trying to imitate the language. The good and bad part is they get a good feel for the language, but it’s complex on the way to doing so.

Participant 2. I personally prefer waiting until the second semester sophomore or junior year to start, in general, introducing all the students to French. That’s because most students have not taken French as their second language in most American public schools. But if they have, I would gladly go there. I would not start with the young, young ones unless they’re musically astute With Debussy, the harmonies being a little more challenging, the melodies being a little more challenging for them. I start with someone who has a simpler melody than Debussy like Fauré. But Debussy, definitely, for juniors, seniors, and above, because they should be challenged that early.

Participant 3. Impressionistic. Again, Debussy, I used for the older students, because there’s a little more nuance that could be introduced which the younger students were not able to grasp.

Participant 4. I seldom assign Debussy to lower level undergraduates, except “Nuit d’Etoiles,” “Beau Soir” or other very early works. I hate “Romance.” With upper undergrads, his music makes a good intro to twentieth century idioms. Debussy doesn't always set French well, and often asks for decrescendi in awkward places. Don't find that his music is particularly well suited to male voices generally.

Participant 5. The thing with Debussy is that it’s more rangy than Fauré. Definitely, a little more drama, because it’s a little more extreme. I don’t think it’s good for young, young, young, young. Saying that, one of the first French songs that my teacher gave me in high school. But, then again, I played piano for years and years and years and years, and I played Debussy. He gave me, I believe the name of that piece is “Romance,” and that’s, probably, the easiest one. But then, you get into other things that are just so much more difficult. I have a student now singing the Ariettes oubliées, that set. And she’s a graduate student, and she can do that and float those high things. That’s more advanced. I will give one of those Fauré from that small volume well before I’ll give Debussy. Don’t overlook, though, things like Chaminade. There are some nice things. That Women Composers…It’s either Hal Leonard or Alfred. There are some really nice selections in there, and there’s a Chaminade piece in there, “Mots d’Amour” that’s just lovely and really good. I have a junior that is singing it, and it’s perfect for him, just perfect.
George Frideric Handel

**Participant 1.** I regularly use Handel at three points in the development of undergraduate singers. (1) His simpler arias provide a comfortable harmonic context for legato phrases that are repeated at different pitch levels in the singer's range. They present an introduction to simple melismas, sequences, and forms. (2) Recitatives from *Messiah* offer an introduction to singing in this style with literature that will be of permanent value in the singer's repertory. (3) For advanced singers, there are arias for all voices that present every musical and vocal challenge one could want!

**Participant 2.** I do find Handel works profitable for even early study. Some of the shorter arias are great for the young sopranos in particular. There are a number of works that are in English so the young singer would both have the foreign language challenge. Those written in Italian are even more attractive for me as I love teaching young singers the clarity of pure vowels and then move forward to the ideals of open, closed, mixed and eventually modifications of vowels and why. Handel works are great for introducing the singers to melismatic works, inventions of ornamentation, usage of *da capo* form and its explanation. A number of these works are quite good for male and female voices and I do highly recommend them for inclusion in the undergraduate studio. The more challenging works may be introduced as the student acquires more basic musicianship, technical facility and artistic skills.

**Participant 3.** Handel, just a mainstay for any of the English and German Baroque pieces. As far as the value of teaching them, it’s just that detached, Baroque style of singing and often in Handel, a lot of ornamentation can be taught. I’m not saying I did a very good job of it, but I used Handel a lot for that.

**Participant 4.** Handel, specifically, I use him for breath energy, breath freedom. Also for, flexibility. Those are the best pieces to learn how to change your pitches on the vibrato.

**Participant 5.** The pedagogical reason to do Handel is you have to be able to do agility, or you’re going to die. I think, sometimes, we believe Handel is lighter than it is. I think Handel might take a little more voice than we sometimes think that it does. But, definitely, it’s the agility factor, and that would be the thing. If somebody brings to me, even “Rejoice, Greatly,” or one of the other pieces from *Messiah* and says they want to sing this and they can’t move their voices quickly. Then, I say, “Well, ok. Then, we’re going to start with a lot of agility exercises, and we’ll see how you do. And, then, you can do Handel.”

**Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart**

**Participant 2.** I usually, there are some Mozart things that are quite appropriate for the young singer. However, for me, I will go and deal with Mozart aria work only for my…I prefer waiting until junior or senior year. It is definitely going to depend on the individual student—their readiness to approach this repertoire. That is true about any piece of
music. If the particular student that you’re working with has artistic and academic aptitude and talent to handle more advanced rep, then it’s quite appropriate to go ahead and lend yourself to giving time to doing that. Mozart’s works, the arias in particular, are definitely challenging for the tenor. Hence, I would steer clear and find something simpler for the tenor. There are some smaller pieces, and I’m trying to pull up titles right now and not able to but that’s ok, that would be appropriate for some of the young ladies.

**Participant 5.** Oh, phrasing. I was just having a conversation the other day with one of my advanced students. We were talking about phrasing, and we were talking about some modern choral piece that the phrasing is done for you and how some things it’s not. And, we were talking, specifically, about Mozart. I think if you learn to make a beautiful, Mozartian phrase, you are set. Then, you can make a phrase in anything, I think. I think Mozart…those songs…I wish there were more of them. I think that they’re great for phrasing, the prosody is just perfect, whatever language it happens to be in. The arias, of course, there are more of them. There are many that are good for younger singers.

**Benjamin Britten**

**Participant 3.** I think most of the things that I taught of Britten’s were folk songs. I don’t remember that I taught too many of the Canticles. I sang all of those Canticles, but I didn’t teach those. Mostly, I taught the folk songs from Britten. His accompaniments were much more interesting than say Cecil Sharp or Vaughan Williams, to me. I appreciated his ingenuity in the accompaniment.

**Participant 5.** Ear training, oh my goodness, yeah. You know, even just something like “The Ash Grove,” his settings of the folk songs are tough. Of course, you have to have an excellent pianist. I like to give “The Ash Grove” to someone who has a pretty good to really make them do it, because the second verse is bitonal. Britten is good for just making the singer be absolutely independent, because sometimes, it sounds like the singer is in one piece and the pianist is in the other.

**Samuel Barber**

**Participant 4.** Frankly, I think “Sure on this shining night” is the most perfect American art song. It’s the only one. It has everything in it that an American song should have. It has good text. It has a beautiful melody. It has a beautiful piano accompaniment that doesn’t necessarily double the vocal line. There are high notes; there are low notes. There’s soft, and there’s loud. It requires a great deal of breath management. I don’t like the “c” [control] word. The nuances of phrasing American English; you have to be able to do that in Barber. I do it myself, and I try to teach my students to sing with American r’s in Barber. Not everybody agrees with me on that. If it’s American lit, I think that American English is fine. I’m not going to [demonstrates incorrectly done r], but I do use American r’s and I’ve used Barber to teach that technique of finding a good way to sing American r’s. In fact, I even do it with the Irish, for example. I know Stevens was Irish, so I know it was an American ear and an American composer that was setting the language. I find Barber’s really good for English inflection, the American idiom. His aunt
was a famous singer, and his uncle was a composer, too. Louise Homer was his aunt, and he learned a lot about singing from her and her husband, Sidney Homer, a composer himself. Barber obviously, as you know, he was a singer and a pianist. He was the only triple major to graduate from Curtis in composition, piano, and voice. Pretty amazing stuff, actually.

**Alessandro Scarlatti**

**Participant 4.** There is some flexibility. Basically, I use Scarlatti to try and teach singing in Italian because, in general, Scarlatti sets Italian better than just about everybody else. That is the stresses, generally, come on the right syllable; not always. I also use him for flexibility, for getting the breath moving.

**Hugo Wolf**

**Participant 1.** Wolf, even more on the word/melody thing, because he was text painter and would even do detailed rhythms or shapes or harmonies or individual words. I really think it helps people get a grasp of the language. The downside there is how chromatic his work, often, is. So, a student who doesn’t have much background with literature finds his music very difficult.

**John Jacob Niles**

**Participant 3.** I taught a little John Jacob Niles really for the value of the students being from _________ [mentions a state] needing to know their Appalachian heritage. His music is quite simplistic, and I was not appreciative of his accompaniments, whatsoever. But, there was a body of literature that I thought students from ______ ________ [mentions a region of a state] should be familiar with.

**Henri Duparc**

**Participant 3.** They were a little more advanced. The more advanced students—the graduate students and seniors. Mostly, graduate students would get into those songs just because they were a little more…I don’t want to say difficult, because all of them are difficult, I think, to pull off. More advanced melodically and rhythmically, I think, as far as difficulty goes.


## APPENDIX F

### Interview Participants’ Statistical Information

Table F.1

*Participants’ Descriptive Background Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th># of Vocal Literature Courses</th>
<th># of Vocal Pedagogy Courses</th>
<th>Total Years of Full-Time Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Years of Experience at Current Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>