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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to investigate perceptions of choir members (N = 86) who participated in a one-day choral festival designed to bring together salient racial/ethnic groups. Specifically, this study sought to document: (a) singers’ perceptions of intergroup contact conditions—equal status, common goals, cooperation, institutional support, and friendship potential; (b) singers’ perceptions of group social cohesion in relation to musical selections performed; (c) singers’ stated reasons for participating in the event; and (d) themes emerging from responses to open-ended questions. Data were collected from choir members through a survey instrument adapted from the literature.

Category mean score rankings indicated the perceived presence of intergroup contact conditions, from greatest to least, as common goals, cooperation, equal status, institutional support, and friendship potential. In terms of group social cohesion in relation to repertoire, music categorized as African American was perceived as most socially cohesive, followed by music shared by multiple traditions and music categorized as European American. Black/African American, female, and older participants perceived all music, regardless of category, more socially cohesive than White/Caucasian, male, and younger participants. Singers indicated being motivated to participate in the event because of musical and social factors, with responses classified as enjoyment of singing and community building most common. Free-response qualitative data was analyzed and coded into six subthemes: formation of a community comprised of diverse peoples, exposure to something new, personal enjoyment, expressed desire for event to continue, criticism of event philosophy and schedule, and disappointment over attendance. Suggestions for future research were provided.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Several notable leaders in history who envisioned a world with greater equality and peace used musical terminology to represent ideal social relations. In his farewell address from the U.S. presidency, George Washington (1796) encouraged the young country to “observe good faith and justice toward all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all” (para. 31). Martin Luther King, Jr., as part of his Nobel Peace Prize lecture in 1964, stated, “We must see that peace represents a sweeter music, a cosmic melody, that is far superior to the discords of war” (para. 35). Upon release from prison, Nelson Mandela (1990) contended, “A united, democratic and non-racial South Africa is the only way to peace and racial harmony” (para. 42). Despite the tremendous influence of these leaders and their words, harmonious relations among racial and ethnic groups have remained elusive in many places around the world, including the United States. Although overt expressions of prejudice and racism have declined in recent decades, evidence of discord remains (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1986; van Dijk, 2011). Segregation persists in many U.S. residential communities, schools, and religious organizations (Anderson & Massey, 2001), and recent Pew Research studies reported sharp differences of opinion by race in terms of overall racial equality (2013), response to immigration (2014a), and reaction to the police-related deaths of two African American men in separate, high-profile cases (2014b). Even when the diverse peoples of the United States have lived together in relative peace, one would be hard-pressed to describe the relations as harmonious, and perhaps it would be more accurate to describe the society as one where each group largely continues to “sing its own unison song.”
Music and the arts, including singing in a group, have received increased attention as a means to improve relations between social groups (Bergh & Sloboda, 2010b). Bergh (2010a) reviewed several multiethnic projects, including efforts with immigrant culture music in Norwegian schools (Skyllstad, 2000; Pettan, 2010); Portuguese children (Sousa, Neto, & Mullet, 2005); an interfaith, interethnic choir in Bosnia-Herzegovina (Zelizer, 2003, 2004); and Sudanese refugees in Uganda (Reyes, 2010). These studies and others involving intergenerational choirs (Bowers, 1998; Conway & Hodgman, 2008; Darrow, Johnson, & Ollenberger, 1994; Harris & Caporella, 2014), a choir of prisoners and non-prisoners (M. Cohen, 2012), and an ensemble of German and Polish student musicians (Kuchenbrandt, van Dick, Koschate, Ullrich, & Bornewasser, 2014), provided evidence that making music, and singing specifically, might help improve relations between two or more social groups.

Yet, the processes through which singing resulted in enhanced social cohesion have remained largely a mystery. Van der vat-Chromy (2010) referred to the family-like culture in a choral setting as “nebulous…powerful, yet elusively indefinable” (p. 1). Other investigations alluded to this phenomenon and used statements such as, “This study highlights the potential power of music as a pathway to deepening…understanding” (Conway & Hodgman, 2008, p. 235), “It is singing together that transforms people’s lives because it enhances social connectedness” (Dingle, Pennings, Brander, & Jetten, 2010, p. 52), and, “Music has the power to bring people together” (Harris & Caporella, 2014, p. 272). Silber (2005) summarized this sentiment by proposing the following:

The power of group singing surges beyond what any words can describe—to penetrate the soul, to bind and enchant with a magic that no other group activity
can quite achieve. Its tremendous ability to transport and transform is self-evident to anyone who has joined voices with others (p. 251).

Some researchers (Bergh & Sloboda, 2010b; Robertson, 2010) have challenged those investigating music’s effect on social relations to provide a deeper explanation for results than the mere “power of music.” Though Bergh and Sloboda (2010b) did not dismiss music’s potential to improve attitudes between groups, they argued documentation of such events were often from the biased vantage point of event organizers, neglected the perceptions of participants, relied on anecdotal evidence, and did not investigate how the music may have functioned. They (Bergh & Sloboda, 2010b) proposed that future research should use more objective methods that focus on the experiences of the participants for whom the intervention was established to better understand the role music plays in improving social relations. Bergh (2010a) suggested the intergroup contact theory as a lens through which to view music projects designed to improve social relations.

The intergroup contact theory comes from the interdisciplinary field of social psychology (Kelman, 2008). As its name suggests, social psychology is rooted in sociology, the study of human society and social relationships (McCarthy, 2002) and psychology, the study of the mind and behavior (American Psychology Association, 2015). The intergroup contact theory (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) is based on the premise that intergroup contact—contact between two or more salient social groups—will result in reduced prejudice between members of the groups involved. In order for intergroup encounters to be effective, Allport (1954) proposed equal status, common goals, cooperation, and institutional support as necessary conditions of the intergroup contact setting. Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) conducted a meta-analysis of 515 studies that provided evidence intergroup contact typically resulted in lowered prejudice between
members of two groups, an effect significantly higher when Allport’s (1954) original conditions were met.

Two recent investigations examined projects involving choral singing through the lens of the intergroup contact theory (Harris & Caporella, 2014; Kuchenbrandt et al., 2014), reporting improved attitudes between college students and people with Alzheimer’s disease (Harris & Caporella, 2014) and between Polish and German student musicians (Kuchenbrandt et al., 2014).

**Need for Study**

During the past 25 years, dozens of studies have explored the social element of singing in a group. Studies by Gick (2011) and van der Vat-Chromy (2010) provided extensive literature reviews. Several investigations have contributed empirical evidence suggesting that choral singing can improve social cohesion between two salient social groups, including Bowers (1998), M. Cohen (2012), Conway and Hodgman (2008), Darrow et al. (1994), Harris and Caporella (2014), and Kuchenbrandt et al. (2014).

Of the two studies that have examined choral singing through the lens of the intergroup contact theory, Harris and Caporella (2014) collected qualitative data from college singers and singers with Alzheimer’s disease, and Kuchenbrandt et al. (2014) collected quantitative data from one of the two groups involved in the contact setting. Neither study, however, utilized both quantitative and qualitative data from each group in the setting, investigated participants’ perceptions of each intergroup contact optimal condition, nor studied the potential influence of the repertoire performed.

The social aspect of singing in a group has been studied widely, but few researchers have investigated the impact of the repertoire sung in such settings. Duerksen and Darrow (1991) suggested call-and-response literature increased group cohesion, and Silber (2005) provided
supporting evidence. M. Cohen (2012) included a list of repertoire with specific song titles performed by a choir comprised of prison inmates and non-inmate volunteers. Bowers (1998) and Darrow et al., (1994) included information about the genre of repertoire performed in intergenerational choral settings, with the former using gospel and big band songs (Bowers, 1998) and the latter using a combination of contemporary popular, old, patriotic, and Broadway songs (Darrow et al., 1994). Harris and Caporella (2014) described how five pieces of music were selected for an intergenerational choir and provided the title of one song and the composers/original performers for two other selections. No study has investigated singer perceptions of group social cohesion with respect to specific pieces of music during a choral singing experience that sought to improve relations between diverse peoples.

The question concerning what motivates people to participate in choral ensembles has been studied widely. Bell (2004) and van der Vat-Chromy (2010) provided literature reviews and Judd and Pooley (2014), Latimer (2008), and Sweet (2010) also investigated this topic. With the exception of Robertson (2010), no study has explored singer motivation in relation to voluntary participation in a choir in an intergroup contact setting.

The current mixed methods study investigated chorister perceptions during a one-day choral festival designed to bring together salient racial/ethnic groups. The study included singers’ perceptions of the presence of intergroup contact optimal conditions (see Table 1), the perceived impact of individual repertoire selections on group social cohesion, singers’ motivations to participate in the choral festival, and singers’ responses to open-ended questions. A survey instrument was developed to document each participant’s stated perceptions.
Table 1:  
*Intergroup Contact Optimal Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal status</td>
<td>Groups in the contact setting are treated and perceived as equals (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew &amp; Tropp, 2011, pp. 61-62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common goals</td>
<td>Groups in contact setting have shared goals; a characteristic typically displayed by sports teams (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew &amp; Tropp, 2011, p. 62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>The opposite of competition (Pettigrew, 1998); what is necessary to achieve common goals (Allport, 1954; Hodson &amp; Hewstone, 2013, p. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>Authorities support the intergroup contact activity (Allport, 1954) and associated social norms (Pettigrew, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship potential</td>
<td>A contact setting’s ability to bring about non-superficial cross-group relationships (Pettigrew, 1998)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* “Friendship potential” was not among the original four optimal conditions proposed by Allport (1954).

**Definition of Terms**

Due to the interdisciplinary nature of this study, a glossary of terms from the fields of social psychology and music is included below.

**Call-and-response:** A music form that involves alternation between two or more singers, often a soloist’s “call” that is followed by the group’s “response” (Kernfeld, 2001).

**Categorization:** The process of highlighting group saliency where participants in intergroup contact view outgroup members as representatives of another group (Pettigrew, 1998).

**Choral festival:** A celebratory type of music event that serves the community in which it functions, often gathering diverse peoples or choirs for a single performance or series of performances (Aspaas, 2004).

**Choral setting:** A situation that involves a choir or a group of people singing together, often with the intended purpose of performing or working toward a performance (Choir, 2001); for
purposes of this study, no distinction was made between group singing and choral singing/choir.

Contact conditions: Four aspects of an intergroup contact setting necessary for intergroup contact to result in reduced prejudice originally proposed by Allport (1954): equal status, common goals, cooperation, and institutional support. Pettigrew (1998) later proposed friendship potential as a fifth condition.

Decategorization: The process of de-emphasizing differences between groups and maintaining low group saliency (Pettigrew, 1998).

Ecumenical: Used to describe cross-denomination Christian Church activity; often used in association with efforts to promote Church unity (Ecumenical, n. d.).

Generalization: The process by which attitudes extend beyond the immediate contact setting, from an individual to the outgroup as whole, and to outgroups not involved in the original situation (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

Group singing: see choral setting.

Ingroup: A social group to which a person includes the self, and members of this group are considered “we” (Dovidio et al., 2008); opposite of outgroup.

Intergroup contact: Encounters between individuals who are members of different social groups (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

Intergroup contact conditions: see contact conditions.

Instrumental cooperation: A strategy of intentionally structuring a group task in order that success is contingent on the unique contributions of each subgroup involved (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Lamoreaux, 2009).
**Mediators or Mediating factors:** Variables that help explain how intergroup contact leads to reduced prejudice (Hewstone & Swart, 2011).

**Meta-stereotypes:** Relates to people’s anticipation of negative views toward them from members of an outgroup (Vorauer, Main, & O’Connell, 1998).

**Mixed methods study:** Research that uses a combination of quantitative and qualitative data (Creswell, 2009).

**Moderators or Moderating factors/conditions:** Variables that help explain when intergroup contact leads to reduced prejudice (Hewstone & Swart, 2011); the conditions necessary for contact to improve attitudes (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

**Musicking:** A more inclusive term for music making; incorporates all aspects of experiencing music, including those who are not actively involved in making the music (Bergh, 2010a).

**Outgroup:** A social group to which a person does not include the self; members of this group are considered “others” or “them” (Dovidio, Gaertner, Saguy, & Halabi, 2008); opposite of *ingroup*.

**Optimal Contact conditions:** see *contact conditions*.

**Prejudice:** an affective reaction-based attitude about an outgroup; different than stereotyping (cognitive) and discriminatory (behavioral) attitudes (Fiske, 1998).

**Prosocial:** Used to describe thoughts or behaviors related to helping, cooperating with, and benefiting other people (Greitemeyer, 2009; Kirschner & Tomasello, 2010).

**Psychology:** The study of the mind and behavior (American Psychological Association, 2015).
Recategorization: Process by which a salient subgroup identity is replaced with a superordinate identity: changing group identities “from ‘us’ and ‘them’ to a more inclusive ‘we.’” (Gaertner, Rust, Dovidio, Bachman, & Anastasio, 1994, p. 226).

Racialized: A description of a setting where race impacts the way people make decisions related to where to live, who to befriend, who is intelligent, who to marry, etc. (Stanfield, 2011).

Self-disclosure: Sharing meaningful aspects of oneself without being coerced (Vonofakou, et al., 2008).

Social cohesion: A community’s capacity to achieve equality among people while honoring and embracing differences (Slifka, 2009).

Social psychology: An interdisciplinary field rooted in psychology, the study of the individual mind and behavior, and sociology, the study of social relationships (Kelman, 2009).

Subgroup: The group level that exists below the superordinate level (Dovidio et al., 2009).

Superordinate identity: The result when members of two subgroups recategorize to form a new inclusive common group identity (Brewer, 2008).

Delimitations of the Study

This investigation made no attempt to study the following:

- changes in participants’ intergroup attitudes resulting from event.
- the history of the event studied, though relevant aspects of the research setting were included.
- the relationship between perceived conductor effectiveness and group social cohesion.
- the relationship between music preference and perceived group social cohesion.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to investigate choir member perceptions during intergroup contact in a choral music setting. To this end, the review of literature is divided into two primary, corresponding sections, therefore seeking to link the intergroup contact theory from the field of social psychology to research of group social cohesion in choral settings. The first section provides an introduction to the intergroup contact theory and key topics, such as generalization, moderating conditions, mediating factors, minority versus majority group perceptions, and criticisms of the theory. The second section includes an overview of existing research pertaining to group social cohesion in choral settings, including evidence of moderating conditions and mediating factors associated with the intergroup contact theory. The second section also includes research related to singer motivation to participate in choral ensembles and concludes with investigations in choral music settings where salient social groups were present.

Intergroup Contact Theory

The intergroup contact theory relies on a straightforward premise: Contact between individuals of different social groups under certain conditions typically results in a reduction of intergroup prejudice (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). The theory has stimulated extensive research and evidence that mere exposure to a member of an outgroup will improve an individual’s attitudes and that the improved attitudes will generalize to the outgroup as a whole (Hodson & Hewstone, 2013). Evidence of intergroup contact’s ameliorating effect across populations and contexts has resulted in extensive support for contact as a strategy to improve relations between different social groups (Davies, Wright, Aron, & Comeau, 2013; Dovidio,

**History of the Intergroup Contact Theory**

**Origins.** Sociologists Robin M. Williams, Jr. (1947) and Stuart Cook (1957) were among the first to propose that contact between groups could reduce prejudice and improve relations. The concept, however, was reiterated and most notably elaborated upon by psychologist Gordon Allport in his influential book *The Nature of Prejudice* (1954). Allport devoted an entire chapter to the effect of contact between groups, drawing on work by Williams (1947) and others, including Lee and Humphrey’s examination the 1943 Detroit race riots:

People who had become neighbors in mixed…neighborhoods did not riot against each other. The students at Wayne University—white and black—went to their classes in peace throughout Bloody Monday. And there were no disorders between white and black workers in the war plants (Lee & Humphrey, 1943, p. 130).

Allport projected there “must be a formula” (1954, p. 261) to explain the positive contact effects during the Detroit race riots and other settings where racial groups were becoming integrated, such as the Merchant Marine (Brophy, 1946), portions of United States Army (Stouffer et al., 1949, in Allport, 1954), and public housing (Deutsch & Collins, 1951). Observing that contact between social groups had a negative impact if the relationship was competitive, Allport predicted that prejudice would be reduced if the contact situation included specific conditions:

Prejudice (unless deeply rooted in the character structure of the individual) may be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the
pursuit of common goals. The effect is greatly enhanced if this contact is sanctioned by institutional supports (i.e., by law, custom or local atmosphere), and provided that it is of a sort that leads to the perception of common interests and common humanity between members of the two groups (Allport, 1954, p. 281).

Allport’s (1954) proposed conditions—equal status, common goals, cooperation between groups, and institutional support for the contact—were not all listed explicitly in the summarizing quotation above, but were implied over the course of the chapter (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011, p. 64). These optimal conditions provided the basis for what came to be known as the contact hypothesis, and more recently, the intergroup contact theory.

**Reformulation.** Following its introduction in 1954, the contact hypothesis stimulated an increasing number of studies performed in an increasing variety of settings each decade (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011, p. 8-9). As researchers expanded on Allport’s optimal conditions for contact by proposing their own necessary conditions, the hypothesis became progressively more complicated, challenging to implement, and susceptible to criticism (Hodson & Hewstone, 2013, p. 6; Pettigrew, 1986; Stephan, 1987, in Hodson & Hewstone, 2013, p. 6). However, in 1998 Pettigrew addressed many of the complications in an influential paper and was credited with regenerating interest in the contact hypothesis (Hodson & Hewstone, 2013, p. 6; Tropp, 2008). Pettigrew’s (1998) summary of the intergroup contact literature and reformulation of the hypothesis challenged researchers to explore several key topics:

- The problem of causal sequence: Does intergroup contact lead to decreased prejudice or do highly prejudiced people simply avoid contact?
- The need to distinguish between conditions necessary for positive effects and those that only facilitate the impact. Pettigrew suggested the list of additional
conditions proposed by researchers had been placed in the wrong category and were merely non-essential facilitators.

- The problem of how improved attitudes from contact generalize to the outgroup and across settings.
- The importance of cross-group friendships.

Pettigrew (1998) also proposed a three-step sequential model for enhancing the generalizing effects during intergroup contact: *decategorization*, where group differences were not emphasized; group *categorization*, where differences were highlighted and group salience was elevated; and *recategorization*, where similarities between the groups were again the focus.

**Meta-analytic evidence.** In 2006, Pettigrew and Tropp presented a comprehensive meta-analysis of 515 studies and provided compelling evidence of the prejudice-reducing effect of intergroup contact (Hewstone & Swart, 2011). The results (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) indicated intergroup contact typically reduced prejudice (mean $r = -.215$), and the effect of contact was significantly increased when Allport’s (1954) original conditions were met (mean $r = -.287$) compared to when they were not met (mean $r = -.204$). Although the effect sizes were modest (Cohen, 1988), they were reliable ($p < .0001$) and led Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) to conclude, “There is little need to demonstrate further contact’s general ability to lessen prejudice” (p. 768).

Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) also provided meta-analytic evidence that intergroup contact was universally effective by showing improved attitudes between demographic groups, including those based on race and ethnicity, physical disability, mental illness, age, sexual orientation, and mental disability. Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) also presented evidence that contact was effective among different age groups and sexes, though the average effect was significantly higher among college students than older adults. With regard to setting, 28% of the meta-analysis studies were
conducted outside the United States, and no significant differences were found between U.S. and non-U.S. samples (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Investigations in recreational and laboratory situations yielded the highest effects (mean $r = -.299$ and mean $r = -.273$, respectively), in contrast with intergroup contact in tourism and travel settings, which yielded the lowest effects (mean $r = -.113$).

The meta-analysis (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) also addressed a number of the concerns proposed by Pettigrew (1998) eight years earlier. The main effect could not be dismissed due to causal sequence of who participated in the contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Also, contact was effective even without optimal conditions, suggesting that equal status, common goals, cooperation between groups, and institutional support all worked to facilitate beneficial impact, but were not essential conditions to enable improved attitudes (Hodson, Hewstone, & Swart, 2013; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Results (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) also suggested that majority group members benefited from contact (mean $r = -.23$) significantly more than minority group members (mean $r = -.18$).

**Hypothesis to theory.** As a result of contact’s reliable effect of lowering intergroup prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) and work by researchers in the field to overcome the original limitations and omissions of Allport’s formula (Hodson & Hewstone, 2013; Pettigrew, 1998), the title “contact hypothesis” has been replaced with “intergroup contact theory” (Dovidio et al., 2008; Hewstone and Swart, 2011; Lolliot et al., 2013; Pettigrew, 1998). Intergroup contact researchers have continued to advance the theory in new directions during the past decade, exploring the generalization process (Hodson & Hewstone, 2013), the moderating and mediating factors of prejudice reduction, the importance of cross-group friendships (Davies, Wright, Aron...
& Comeau, 2013), and comparisons of minority and majority group member experiences in a contact setting (Christ & Wagner, 2013).

Generalization

In intergroup contact, generalization refers to the process of an individual’s attitudes toward one outgroup member transferring to the entire outgroup, across situations, and to an uninvolved group (Pettigrew, 1998). Since intergroup contact would have little societal benefit if improved attitudes did not extend past the specific contact situation and participants, Pettigrew (1998) deemed generalization as a pivotal issue for researchers to address. In fact, Hodson and Hewstone (2013) contended the limitations in Allport’s (1954) explanation of generalization kept the original hypothesis from obtaining theory status until meta-analytic data (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) indicated that attitudes did generalize to the entire outgroup ($r = -.213, p < .001$) and across situations ($r = -.244, p < .001$).

Generalization to an uninvolved group, also known as indirect contact, implies that face-to-face contact might not be necessary for positive effects to occur (Crisp & Turner, 2013; Hodson et al., 2013). The process of deprovincialization, which includes a person having a more complex idea of how their group relates others (Brewer, 2008), may explain why better attitudes about one outgroup may spread to other outgroups. Pettigrew (1997) introduced the concept of deprovincialization, suggesting those who have frequent meaningful contact with individuals from another group have a broader view of the world:

In-group norms, customs, and lifestyles turn out not be the only ways to manage the social world. The new perspective not only individualizes and “humanizes” out-group members but serves to distance you from your in-group…In addition to what participants learn about each other’s groups, intergroup friendship may often
encourage reappraisal of the in-group. Those with out-group friends gain distance from their own group and form a less provincial perspective on other groups in general (Pettigrew, 1997, p. 174).

Lolliot et al. (2013) suggested that people’s ability to adopt a viewpoint of the world as being multicultural and to develop a sense of increased social identity complexity, where people consider themselves and others a part of many different ingroups, may assist the deprovincialization process and reduce ethnocentrism. Hodson et al. (2013) posited that the area of research concerning deprovincialization and multiculturalism looked favorable, especially given evidence offered by Leung, Maddux, Galinksy, & Chiu (2008) that multicultural contact often promotes creativity and openness.

**Moderating Conditions: When Intergroup Contact Leads to Improved Attitudes**

After observing some intergroup contact actually led to worsened attitudes, Allport (1954) proposed the four conditions of equal status, common goals, cooperation, and institutional support as necessary for contact to reduce prejudice. Pettigrew and Tropp’s meta-analysis (2006) indicated that Allport’s conditions were not necessary for positive results to take place but were significant facilitators in the process, suggesting that when “contact situations are structured in accordance with Allport’s conditions, the contact is especially likely to yield noteworthy reductions in prejudice” (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011, p. 66). Pettigrew and Tropp (2011, pp. 72-73) also encouraged future research that sought to understand people’s subjective perceptions of intergroup contact conditions as opposed to using objective measures: “Prejudice may be reduced to the extent that we can alleviate group members’ concerns and enhance their subjective feelings of acceptance within the contact situation” (p. 73).
**Condition #1: Equal status between groups.** Allport (1954) contended that, no matter the status and power differences between groups in everyday life, groups must have equal status within the contact setting. Pettigrew and Tropp (2011) offered more specificity in regard to how equal status could be achieved:

Equal status might be established in the contact situation through giving members of each group equal opportunities to participate in activities, offer opinions, make decisions, and receive access to available resources. As a consequence, both groups have the opportunity, ability, and power to shape the rules of the interaction (p. 62).

Although a straightforward concept, equal status in intergroup contact has been challenging to measure and attain (Hodson & Hewstone, 2013), and its absence is likely the reason contact is sometimes ineffective (Hodson et al., 2013).

**Condition #2: Common goals.** The second optimal condition involves the pursuit of common goals by the groups in contact. Allport (1954) maintained, “Only that which leads people to do things together is likely to result in changed attitudes” [italics in original] (p. 276). There is evidence that sharing a goal or goals has motivated people to be more friendly, supportive, and cooperative with each other (D. Johnson & Johnson, 1985). Team sports have offered an example of how a common goal of athletic success has persuaded members of a team to work together (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998).

**Condition #3: Cooperation between groups.** Cooperation bears much resemblance to having common goals, and a positive correlation typically exists between the two conditions in ideal contact settings (Hodson & Hewstone, 2012; Pettigrew, 1998). In the widely cited *Robbers Cave experiment* (Sherif, M., Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, C., 1961), summer campers,
separated into groups and intentionally pitted against each other, were initially hostile to
members outside their group. The hostility lessened, however, when both groups were required
to work on tasks that would be of value for everyone involved (Sherif et al., 1961). Likewise, the
“Jigsaw classroom” cooperative learning method requires each student’s contribution and
cooperation for the larger group to be successful. In this method an individual student “masters”
a topic and reports back to the larger group in order to meet the larger goal of the lesson
(Aronson & Bridgeman, 1979; Aronson & Gonzales, 1988). Each student makes a distinctive
and indispensible contribution to the group learning process (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011, p. 63).
Aronson and Gonzales (1988) provided evidence that students in Jigsaw classrooms have less
prejudice toward students of other races than students in more traditional classrooms.

**Condition #4: Institutional support.** Allport (1954) proposed that intergroup contact
was most effective when equal status, cooperative interactions also included support from
institutional authorities. Evidence backing the importance of institutional support has been
gathered from various intergroup contact settings, including schools (Patchen, 1982), the military
(Landis, Hope, & Day, 1984), and religious organizations (Parker, 1968; K. Priest & Priest,
2007). These studies demonstrated that authorities will vary situation to situation, and may
include school administrators, principals, teachers (Patchen, 1982), clergy (Parker, 1968), and
military leaders (Landis, Hope & Day, 1982), as well as the social norms these authorities
endorse (Hodson & Hewstone, 2013). Pettigrew and Tropp (2011, p.63) suggested that
authorities determine group members’ acceptable behavior through the establishment a group’s
social norms.

**Condition #5: Friendship potential.** Though not an original optimal condition, recent
research has provided a growing consensus that establishing cross-group friendships may be
especially effective in reducing intergroup prejudice (Davies, Tropp, Aron, Pettigrew, & Wright, 2011; Davies et al., 2013; Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns, & Voci, 2004; Pettigrew, 1997; Van Laar, Levin, Sinclair, & Sidanius, 2008). Intimate cross-group relationships produced much higher effects than superficial contact typical of neighbors and coworkers (Pettigrew, 1997) and allowed for the long-term impact of frequent and repeated contact in a variety of social settings (Pettigrew, 1998). The power of friendship may be predictable given the resemblance between conditions for friendship and successful intergroup contact (Davies et al., 2011; Pettigrew, 1997; Wright, Aron, & Brody, 2008):

Cooperation to achieve shared goals, support for the relationship from authorities and peers, feelings of equality and interdependence (equal status), and frequent interaction over time, are all found in lists of facilitating conditions of both intergroup contact and friendship formation (Wright, et al., p. 144).

Friendship potential refers to the contact situation’s ability lead to the establishment of new friendships (Dovidio, Gaearnter, & Kawakami, 2003; Pettigrew, 1998). Although Allport (1954), Cook (1962), and Amir (1969) all promoted the need for intimate, non-superficial relationships, Pettigrew (1998) was the first to propose cross-group friendship as a fifth necessary condition of intergroup contact.

Understanding how friendships form and function in intergroup contact has become a primary focus for researchers in recent years. Results from this work have provided momentum for orchestrating contact situations that lead to intimate friendships, empathy, trust, and self-disclosure. (Davies et al., 2013; Tropp, 2008; Vonofakou et al., 2008; West & Dovidio, 2013).
Mediating Factors: How Intergroup Contact Leads to Improved Attitudes

Recent research has also focused on mediating factors, how intergroup contact typically leads to improved attitudes (Hewstone & Swart, 2011). Although Allport (1954) proposed increased knowledge of the outgroup as the main reason attitudes improved, results from a meta-analysis investigating mediators exclusively (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008) indicated contact causes reduced prejudice primarily by first lowering intergroup anxiety and threat, and then by increasing intergroup empathy. Additional evidence suggested trust and self-disclosure also frequently mediate positive effects (Hodson et al., 2013).

**Intergroup knowledge.** Early contact theorists hypothesized that learning about an outgroup was the primary mediating factor leading to reduced prejudice (Allport, 1954; Hewstone & Swart, 2011). The presence of intergroup knowledge has being associated with challenging stereotypes (Kawakami, Dovidio, Moll, Hermsen, & Russin, 2000), informing people how to interact in subsequent intergroup contact, and improving intercultural understanding and sensitivity (Dovidio et al., 2003). However, recent research (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008) has downplayed the importance intergroup knowledge, and Pettigrew and Tropp (2011) offered that a well-intended “transmission of information” (p. 79) without an acknowledgment of differences between groups was responsible for the limited impact, but that “richer and more direct cultural conceptualization of knowledge could bear stronger mediation effects” (p. 95; see also Vorauer, 2013).

**Reduced intergroup anxiety and threat.** Hodson et al. (2013) defined intergroup anxiety as “the psychological experience of concern, worry, and embarrassment at the prospect of interacting with an outgroup” (p. 262-263). Vorauer (2013) suggested the presence of meta-
stereotypes, an individual’s concern of what others think, creates tension in an interaction. This tension can be misinterpreted as unfriendliness (West, Shelton, & Trail, 2009), and given the apparent human propensity for perceiving anxiety during interactions with outgroup members, the feelings of tension are often contagious among all involved (West & Dovidio, 2013). Evidence indicated negative contact effects often occurred in settings where intergroup interaction was involuntary and where participants perceived threat (Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2008). Positive effects were more likely in situations where participants were there by choice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011, p. 195).

W. Stephen and Stephen’s (1985) initial research correlating intergroup anxiety to prejudice stimulated multiple studies that demonstrated contact was successful in alleviating intergroup anxiety and threat (Paolini et al., 2004; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011, p. 206). Meta-analytic data confirmed anxiety reduction as a critical initial step in the process of improving attitudes (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008), and Hodson et al. (2013) posited, “Positive intergroup contact encounters have the power to undo our suspicions and hesitancy about interacting with other groups” (p. 264).

**Increased empathy.** Meta-analytic evidence (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008) indicted once outgroup anxiety has been reduced in a contact setting, empathy becomes the key mediating factor in advancing improved attitudes. The potency of empathy, which exists in the form of perspective-taking or empathetic feelings (Tam, Hewstone, Voci, & Kenworthy, 2006) led Hodson et al. (2013) to assert that “forming an emotional connection with an outgroup member, and/or experiencing the world from their point of view, goes a long way to boosting positive attitudes toward the group as a whole” (p. 264-265). Hodson et al. (2013) also proposed the
awareness of others’ emotions, problematic when experiencing anxiety, becomes a benefit when the same tendency stimulates empathy (West & Dovidio, 2013).

Despite indications that empathy is valuable in the process of improving attitudes, orchestrating empathetic feelings between people can disrupt natural interactions and should be done with caution (Cikara, Bruneau, & Saxe, 2011). Consequently, Hodson et al. (2013) encouraged those responsible for organizing intergroup contact to be aware of the differences people bring to situations and to not use “broad-stroke approaches” (p. 266) when attempting to encourage empathy among participants.

Effects of Contact on Minority Status Versus Majority Status Groups

Although contact has shown to improve intergroup attitudes among majority and minority status groups, Tropp & Pettigrew (2005) and subsequent research (Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2008; Hopkins & Kahani-Hopkins, 2006; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Tropp, 2007, 2008) have indicated intergroup contact is more effective among majority group members. Furthermore, the optimum conditions for contact are significantly more influential among majority than minority status groups (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). Researchers have accounted for this difference by suggesting that contact participants bring different perceptions, experiences (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011, p. 141), perspectives, expectations, and motivations (Dovidio et al., 2008) to the intergroup setting. Minority group members are more prone to expect and perceive discrimination, and members of the majority group in a contact situation are more likely to be concerned with appearing non-prejudicial (Hewstone & Swart, 2011). Hodson et al. (2013) suggested the difference of perceptions between majority and minority status groups demonstrates the psychological inherency of intergroup contact, and attempts to reduce prejudice in one group may have an unintended opposite effect on another group (Dovidio et al., 2008).
Minority and majority group members also differ in opinion regarding how the contact setting should highlight commonalities and differences. Minority group members typically prefer a setting where group differences and subgroup identities remain intact (Saguy, Tropp, & Hawi, 2013; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011, p. 141) and topics related to their unfair treatment in society are addressed (Hodson et al., 2013). Conversely, majority group members typically prefer settings that minimize group differences in favor of commonalities (Hodson et al., 2013; Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000) and promote a superordinate category, such as “we are all Americans, rather than Blacks and Whites” (Saguy et al., 2013, p. 115). Evidence of this dynamic exists in the United States, where people who identify as Black/African American are more likely to highlight their racial identity, and those who identify as White/Caucasian are more likely to advocate for colorblindness and downplay group differences (Saguy et al., 2013). Since colorblindness is closely related to assimilation, an ideology that requires members of minority groups to conform to the majority group values, Dovidio et al. (2008) suggested, “to the extent that promoting social change within a society is the objective, minority group members are likely to emphasize both common social connections and group differences within that shared social identity” [italics in original] (p. 82). Consequently, Saguy et al. (2013) posited the ideal contact situation will highlight both the commonalities and disparities between groups concurrently, a concept that supports Pettigrew’s (1998) three-step sequential model for intergroup contact.

Concurrently addressing the concerns of minority and majority group members has shown to be a challenge. Lamoreaux (2008) offered a solution through a process called instrumental cooperation. In this approach, which bears resemblance to the Jigsaw classroom, tasks are structured so the unique contributions of each group are necessary to achieve a goal.
Dovidio, et al. (2009) suggested instrumental cooperation “can satisfy both the majority group’s desire for common identity and the minority group’s need for positive distinctiveness” (p. 13).

Criticisms of the Intergroup Contact Theory

The intergroup contact theory has been the recipient of considerable criticism during its sixty-year history (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011, p. 161). Scholars have described the theory as naïve (McGarry & O’Leary, 1995); simplistic, inconsistent, reliant on false assumptions (Ray, 1983); and dated (O’Brien, 2011). O’Brien (2011) based conclusions on research conducted prior to 1998 and did not address related findings from the past 15 years. Pettigrew and Tropp (2011) contended the theory has been subjected to “erroneous, dated, or overstated criticisms” (p. 163), yet they proposed several issues as unresolved by the field, including problems related to causation, establishing contact, impact on social change, and lack of research methodologies (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011, p. 163).

**Problem of causation.** Determining causation is one of the most challenging facets of social science (Pettigrew, 1996). With respect to intergroup contact, it is unclear if interactions between members of groups lead to improved attitudes or if people who are prejudiced avoid contact (Pettigrew, 1998). Patel, Kunze, and Silverman (2009) noted that those with good attitudes about others might already be interested in pluralism, and the research team stated, “in advocating for a vision of peace and harmony…we are preaching to the choir” (p. 241). Pettigrew (1998) suggested longitudinal studies involving scenarios where people have limited choice regarding their participation to address this issue.

**Problem of establishing contact between groups.** There is considerable consensus that intergroup contact leads to reduced prejudice. Yet, only those who participate in contact activities can benefit (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011, p. 168). Generally, people outwardly support
equality for outgroups and overtly reject negative attitudes, yet cross-group contact remains challenging and infrequent (Davies et al., 2013; Halualani, Chitgopekar, Morrison, & Dodge, 2004; Vorauer & Kumhyr, 2001; West, Shelton, & Trail, 2009), a problem that hinders the theory’s practicality for social policy (Hodson & Hewstone, 2013). Researchers have proposed multiple reasons for contact avoidance, including the tendency for highly prejudiced people to elude contact with members of other groups (Christ & Wagner, 2013), the mentally demanding and draining nature of interacting with others (Richeson & Shelton, 2003), inclination to maintain the status quo (Emerson & Smith, 2000, p. 146), and, in the case of interracial contact, fear of crime taking place (Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2008).

The challenge of establishing contact is especially notable in regions of the world where substantial public effort and policy have attempted to integrate groups historically divided, such as South Africa and the southern United States (Andersen & Massey, 2001). Although these regions have slowly become more integrated over time, segregation and inequality continue (Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2008), and enduring informal segregation and opposition to contact between groups remains an unresolved problem (Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2008; Hodson & Hewstone, 2013).

**Problem of intergroup contact’s influence on social change.** Research demonstrating long-term changes in ideology or behaviors stemming from intergroup contact is limited and conflicting (K. Brown, Brown, Jackson, Sellers, & Manuel, 2003; Dixon, Durrheim, & Tredoux, 2007; Dovidio et al., 2008; Jackman & Crane, 1986; Struck & Schwartz, 1989; Wright & Lubensky, 2009). Pettigrew and Tropp (2011) argued criticisms of this facet of the theory are “outdated” (p. 182) and that “contact does typically improve attitudes toward policy changes” (p.
A related issue concerns the impact of contact specifically on a minority group’s motivation to work against discrimination. In what Saguy et al. (2013) labeled the “Irony of Harmony” (p. 125), a minority group’s improved attitudes about outgroup members may hinder the larger struggle for equality (Wright & Lubensky, 2009). Consequently, a well-meaning effort to improve relations between groups may have the unintended result of diminishing minority members’ incentive to challenge existing inequalities (Dixon, et al. 2010; Hewstone & Swart, 2011). In response to this dilemma, Saguy, Tausch, Dovidio, & Pratto (2009) reiterated the need for intergroup contact situations to address inequalities.

**Problem of a lack of methodology diversity.** Many contact studies have relied on cross-sectional research and self-reports (Hewstone & Swart, 2011). For instance, 71% of the studies in Pettigrew and Tropp’s (2006) meta-analysis were considered survey or field studies, and 81% relied on self-reporting. Although Hewstone, Judd, and Sharp (2011) offered evidence that self-reporting was a valid measure of intergroup contact, Christ and Wagner (2013) contended that the heavy reliance on self-reporting is troublesome and suggested that observational, experimental, and qualitative measures should also be employed when possible. Christ and Wagner (2013) also argued that the social context of the contact should be the focus of more studies, and Hodson and Hewstone (2013) proposed longitudinal tests be utilized more in the future to better assess intergroup contact’s long-term impact.

**Problem of diversity reducing generalized trust.** In what may be the most publicized criticism of intergroup contact, Putnam (2007) provided evidence that ethnically diverse communities in the U.S. resulted in—at least in the short term—lowered levels of social capital,
such as trust (including among one’s own racial group), altruism, cooperation, and fewer friendships. Pettigrew and Tropp (2011, p. 164-165) argued that considerable segregation barriers remained at work in the communities studied by Putnam (2007), and that the positive effects of contact, without segregation, will not lead to lower levels of social capital.

**Problem of generalization.** Another common critique concerns the issue of generalization. Amir (1976), Rothbart and John (1985), and Forbes (1997, 2004) contended that intergroup contact is not an effective means for reducing prejudice because the improvement in attitudes between individuals does not transfer to the entire group. Pettigrew and Tropp (2011, p. 32) maintained that the 1,164 tests in their meta-analysis (2006) collectively demonstrated that prejudice reductions among individuals consistently generalized to the entire outgroup.

**Summary**

Critics of intergroup contact argue that supporters of the theory are overly optimistic and overstate contact’s positive effects (Dixon, Durrheim, & Tredoux, 2005; Jackman and Crane, 1986; Putnam, 2007). Yet, leading researchers in intergroup contact acknowledged that contact is not a panacea for prejudice (Hewstone, 2003; Hodson & Hewstone, 2013; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008, 2011, p. 216), and that the overall effects of contact are small, but consistent and reliable (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Pettigrew and Tropp (2011) projected that permanent institutional modifications are necessary for lasting change, but argued that intergroup contact can play an important and beneficial role in the effort toward intergroup harmony.

**Study in Choral Music Settings**

Considerable debate has surrounded music’s adaptive purpose throughout human history (Honing, ten Cate, Peretz, and Trehub, 2015). Darwin (1871, p. 880) proposed that human music evolved only as a courtship display, a hypothesis reiterated recently by Miller (2000). James
(1890, p. 419-422) and Pinker (1997, p. 525) deemed music to have no functional purpose. Pinker (1997) likened music to dessert, something that may bring pleasure to a person, but has no adaptive function. Others have argued music played a more important adaptive purpose. Freeman (2000) proposed that music played a critical role in the early stages of human intellect evolution and enabled the establishment of human societies. Others have supported Freeman’s view, suggesting music was involved in the process of forging trust and cooperation necessary for raising children (Dissanayake, 2009; Mithen, 2005, p. 81), big game hunting, plant gathering, food sharing (Mithen, 2009), battle rituals, and corporate worship (Clayton, 2009; Dissanayake, 2009). Dissanayake (2009) posited music has been an underlying reason humans have gathered for ceremonial worship:

> By joining with others in music and art-filled ceremonial behaviour, individuals may have felt more a sense of coping with the uncertain circumstances addressed by the ceremony and thereby effects of the stress response were better ameliorated than for those who went their own isolated, anxious ways (p. 25).

Kirschner and Tomasello (2010) offered that spoken words might be a more effective facilitator of goal-driven group behavior, but music may be more efficient at creating a sense of “we” in a group, a phenomenon Freeman (2001) suggested is based on music’s ability to foster trust: “The role of music as an instrument of communication beyond words strikes to the heart of the ways in which we humans come to trust one another” (p. 412).

Though it is even more challenging to prove the necessity of music in modern societies, communal music making has endured. Groups continue to sing together at sporting events, religious services (Baird, 2007; Gaston, 1968, p. 20; Mithen, 2009), during the aftermath of national tragedy (Hutcheson, Domke, Billeaudeaux, & Garland, 2004), and as a part of social
movements (Brooks, 2010). Brooks (2010) reported group singing during protests strengthened a sense of cognitive liberation, group consciousness, and efficacy. Researchers have documented the presence of collective singing in connection with various social movements, including Icelandic men against Danish rule (Faulkner & Davidson, 2006), South Africans against apartheid (Gilbert, 2007), citizens of the Baltic Republics protesting Soviet occupation (Wolverton, 1998), enslaved Africans in the United States persevering against slavery (Durrant & Himonides, 1998), and the African American Civil Rights Movement (Brooks, 2010; Eyerman & Jamison, 1998; Durrant & Himonides, 1998).

Those who use music in therapeutic interventions have also noted the social bonding aspect of music. Music therapy pioneer E.T. Gaston (1968) proposed that music allows for group cohesion and integration, and that rhythmic music is especially effective at bringing about order, a sense of unity, and prosocial behavior. Alvin (1975) concluded that music’s ability to foster social harmony and order made it the ideal form of group psychotherapy:

[Group music making] creates multifarious personal interrelationships between all its members. Each member of the group has to accept a common discipline for the sake of something greater than any of them, namely the music. They have to behave musically and socially in an acceptable way. They have to tolerate one another, to feel free to criticize and to be criticized (p. 89).

Research and speculation on social cohesion and music is not new, but there has been a surge of empirical study of this phenomenon during the past 25 years. This section of the review of literature will examine those studies, focusing on investigations involving singing, and will be organized as follows: After reviewing research that has examined the social aspects of collective singing on a general level, investigations will be organized through the lens of the intergroup
contact theory. Accordingly, studies will be grouped based on their relation to the intergroup contact conditions of equal status, common goals, cooperation, institutional support, and friendship potential, and then by their relation to mediating factors of improved intergroup attitudes, including anxiety reduction, increased empathy, and increased trust. Within each of these topic areas, studies will be arranged according to the type of choral setting. Existing choir studies involve choral singers and ensembles already in operation prior to being researched, and interventions include ensembles initiated for therapeutic reasons and/or for the purpose of empirical study. In order to offer background for additional aspects of this study, there will be an examination of research that has explored the question of why people participate in choral ensembles. The final section of the review will consider several investigations into intergroup attitudes among choral members in settings involving salient social groups.

**Group Social Cohesion in Choral Settings**

**Existing choirs.** Perceived group social cohesion has been a documented aspect of singing in choir among singers of a variety of populations, including children (Chorus America, 2009; Mills, 2008), adolescents (Adderley, Kennedy, & Berz, 2003; Arasi, 2006; Campbell, Connell, & Beegle, 2007; Hylton, 1981; Kennedy, 2002; Morrison, 2001; Parker, 2014; D. Rohwer & Rohwer, 2009), college students (Clift & Hancox, 2001; Jacob, Guptill, & Sumsion, 2009; Kokotsaki & Hallam, 2007; McCrary, 2001; Mellor, 2013; van der Vat-Chromy, 2010), adults (Bygren et al., 2009; Chorus America, 2009; Clift et al., 2007, 2010c; Faulkner & Davidson, 2006; Holmquist, 1995; Judd & Pooley, 2014; Latimer, 2008; Pitts, 2004; Southcott & Joseph, 2010; Tonneijck, Kinébanian, & Josephsson, 2008; Willingham, 2001; Wilson, 2011) adults with psychological challenges (Clift et al., 2010b, 2010c; Dingle, Brander, Ballantyne, Baker, 2012; von Lob, Camic, & Clift, 2010), and older populations (Creech, Hallam, McQueen,
& Varvarigou, 2013; Davidson et al., 2014; Skingley & Bungay, 2010; Southcott, 2009; Wise, Hartmann, & Fisher, 1992). In these studies, descriptors such as “team unity” (Parker, 2014, p. 26), “social unity” (Kokotsaki & Hallam, 2007, p. 99), “interdependency” (van der Vat-Chromy, 2010, p. 67), “safe and connected to others” (Tonneijck et al., 2008, p. 173), and “family-like” (Judd & Pooley, 2014, p. 277), were among the many words used to portray singer perceptions of social cohesion in choral settings.

Other studies have relied on physiological measures to better understand social effects of singing in a group. Increased levels of secretory immunoglobulin A (sIgA), an antibody located on mucosal surfaces of the human body (Deinzer, Kleineidam, Stiller-Winkler, Idel, & Bachg, 2000), have been linked to satisfying social events (I. Miletic, Schiffman, Miletic, & Sattely-Miller, 1996). Research among professional (Beck, Cesario, Yousefi, & Enamoto, 2000), amateur (Kreutz, Bongard, Rohrman, Hodapp, & Grebe, 2004), and college (Kuhn, 2002) singers found significantly higher levels of sIgA after singing than before. Kuhn (2002) and Kreutz et al. (2004) found that listening to music did not have the same effect, suggesting active music making impacts sIgA levels more than passive music experiences. Researchers also reported increased levels of oxytocin, a hormone associated with social bonding (Huron, 2001; Lee, Macbeth, Pagani, & Young, 2009), among people who recently completed a singing activity (Grape, Sandgren, Hansson, Ericson & Theorell, 2003; Kreutz et al., 2004). Huron (2001) proposed that a link between music and oxytocin brings with it important social implications:

There would be good neurophysiological reasons for lovers to enjoy music while courting, for union members to sing while on the picket line, for religious groups to engage in collective music making, for colleges to promote alma mater songs, and for warriors to sing and dance prior to fighting (p. 57-58).
Vickhoff and colleagues (2013) investigated singer heart rates and respiration. In providing evidence that people who sing in a group are inclined to synchronize these bodily functions, they offered the following:

Eighty percent of the neural traffic between the heart and the brain goes from the heart to the brain. The natural question is how this affects the behavior of individuals and their perception of the world (during singing and after). Does choral singing produce a common perspective? (Vickhoff et al., 2013, p. 14).

Wiltermuth and Heath (2009) proposed performing an activity in synchrony, including singing, “may produce positive emotions that weaken the psychological boundaries between the self and the group” (p. 1). Faulkner and Davidson (2006) offered that singing in harmony is especially binding and is “a ‘metaphor’ for ideal human relationships” (p. 235). Together, these studies suggested that music making may bind people together socially, and may help explain Busch and Gick’s (2012) finding, where in a study of two choirs, the choir with no socializing time had the same amount of improvement in terms of social well-being as the choir with built-in time to socialize apart from singing.

**Interventions.** Intervention studies, where choirs and group singing projects were orchestrated specifically to target a specific population and/or conduct research, have documented social elements among a variety of populations, including children (Kirschner & Tomasello, 2010) individuals who are homeless (Bailey, 2006; Bailey & Davidson, 2001, 2002, 2005), individuals who are prisoners (M. Cohen, 2007, 2009, 2012; Silber, 2005), individuals with mental illness (Grocke, Bloch, & Castle, 2009; Lesta & Petocz, 2006; Millard, & Smith, 1989; Davidson & Fedele, 2011; Harris & Caporella, 2014), individuals with eating disorders (Pavlakou, 2009), and individuals with respiratory disease (Lord et al., 2010). In these studies,
researchers described observed behaviors and feelings associated with group singing as “cooperative and helpful” (Kirschner & Tomasello, 2010, p. 354); “feelings of connection, pride, contribution, and empowerment” (Bailey & Davidson, 2005, p. 297); “making friends” and “getting along with others” (M. Cohen, 2012, p. 46); “sense of working within a team” (Grocke, et al., 2009, p. 100); and “building of a community across generations” (Harris & Caporella, 2010, p. 279).

Evidence of Intergroup Contact Theory Moderating Conditions in Choral Settings

**Condition #1: Equal status.** Allport (1954) posited that a successful intergroup contact setting would allow participants to be of equal status despite inequalities faced in everyday life. Bergh (2010a) and Boyce-Tillman (2009) suggested musicking could provide a space where traditional status hierarchies are challenged.

**Existing choirs.** Evidence emerging from the study of existing choirs has been inconsistent in terms of the presence of equal status among singers. Offering evidence the condition was present, Kennedy (2002) reported members of an eighth and ninth grade choir valued mentoring friendships that extended across grade levels, an aspect Kennedy (2002) referred to as “a significant part of the social dynamics of the vocal ensemble” (p. 33). Some research suggested the presence of equal status in the act of singing itself. Members of an Icelandic men’s chorus indicated they had to fit their individual voice into their own part and the parts around them when singing in harmony (Faulkner & Davidson, 2006). One representative singer stated, “I’ve been more willing to listen to others and I would like to find it even more, to find the sound with another voice…you feel much better in harmony with others” (Faulkner & Davison, 2006, p. 227). Faulkner and Davison (2006) also reported the choir frequently rehearsed in mixed-voice formation while standing in a circle, as the men sought to balance their
own voice with the voices of others. Skingley and Bungay (2010) provided evidence the act of singing, separate from non-musical socialization, was perceived by a choir comprised of older people to be equalizing and helped them to be on the same level with each other despite differences in individual wellness levels.

There is also evidence that a music ensemble’s culture can lack equal status, especially if the director dominates the experience (Willson, 2009) or if social cliques and egos go unchecked (Parker, 2014). Overall, the high school students interviewed by Parker (2014) indicated the choral ensemble was perceived as a team, yet multiple singers indicated a struggle in terms of everyone being equal in status, represented by one student who stated, “I just want to fit in so I’m not standing off to the side while everyone is having fun.” (“Stefania,” in Parker, 2014, p. 25-26). Likewise, Morrison (2001) speculated that many of same social hierarchies present in the surrounding high school population also exist in ensembles, but contended the different social groups were likely to come into contact in the music performance settings:

Whereas in the wider school setting these students’ paths may only occasional converge, the school ensemble demands regular and extensive interactions – shared experiences and goals – among its members. We might even say that the time spent with “others” is far greater in the performance culture than in many other aspects of real life (p. 26).

In a study of an inter-religious choir in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Robertson (2010) noted unequal status with regard to music ability, a result of the soloists being perceived as more advanced than other singers and, when compared to the seconds, the firsts in each voice part being considered superior.
**Interventions.** In the study of a choir organized for female prisoners, Silber (2005) reported social gains among participants and indicated the choir provided a safe space where singers could express themselves apart from the surrounding prison environment. Silber (2005), who was both choir director and researcher in this study, sought to disrupt the typical authority figure-to-prisoner hierarchy relationship and to exist with the singers “on a single plane” (p. 258). To this end, she selected repertoire that was familiar to the singers and allowed singer input on musical issues such as tempo (Silber, 2005). Bailey and Davidson (2005) reported that members of homeless choir were also allowed to voice their opinions and help make decisions during rehearsals. Likewise, Pavlakou (2009) indicated members of a choir comprised of singers with eating disorders chose what voice part they sang, with whom they sat, and that there was an overall sense of equality because all the singers were struggling with similar issues. In these three studies, all of which reported social gains, singers during the choral rehearsal were given the opportunity to provide opinions and help make decisions, two strategies for fostering equal status endorsed by intergroup contact researchers (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011, p. 62).

Bailey and Davidson (2005) also indicated that performances given by the homeless choir led to increased feelings of equal status with the general public:

The reciprocity that occurs between the choir and the audience enables members…to connect with the larger society from which they have been estranged. The audience provides opportunities to experience feelings of connection, pride, contribution and empowerment. Through performing, the marginalized choristers are able to introduce themselves to society in a way that is removed from the stereotype of the street dweller (p. 297).
**Condition #2: Common goals.** The presence of common goals in a contact setting bears much resemblance to condition #3, cooperation, and the two typically correlate (Hodson & Hewstone, 2013). Researchers in the choral music field have also linked the two conditions, and Cox (in Glenn, 1991) and Kempton (2002) each suggested that the act of members of an ensemble striving for a common goal necessitates cooperation.

**Existing choirs.** Some have described the choral ensemble as a place where diverse peoples unite their efforts in pursuit of a common musical goal (Cox, in Glenn, 1991; Kempton, 2002; Wise, Hartman, & Fischer, 1992). Kempton (2002) observed the merging of individual singer interests and ego into the common goals of the larger ensemble:

> [The choir serves to] draw students together rather than turning them against each other…They are also bonded by the kinships they feel with other like-minded souls. Sometime between auditions…and the end of the semester, students choose to dedicate their own talents and efforts to the greater musical and social interests of the choir (Kempton, 2002, p. 209).

In several studies, the presence of common goals has been associated with teamwork. Parker (2014) reported the common goal of musical excellence motivated high school singers to rely on each other and work together as a team. Von Lob et al. (2010) found “community feeling” (p. 48) associated with the experience of adult choir members who had experienced an adverse life event, and included a representative quote from a participant: “We are all in this together as a team. There are 150 people with a common goal who are making something really beautiful” (p. 48). Choirs have been compared to sports teams in regard to the existence of a common goal (Cox, in Glenn, 1991; Parker, 2014; Smith & Sataloff, 2013; von Lob et al., 2010),
but with a greater sense of shared success (Parker, 2014) and an aesthetic result not found in sports (Pitts, 2004).

**Interventions.** Researchers in intervention settings have credited the existence of a common goal for observable changed behaviors, such as a decrease in smoking breaks among female prisoners (Silber, 2005) and a transition from quarrelsome to prosocial behaviors among choristers who were homeless (Bailey & Davidson, 2002). When homeless individuals combined with volunteers to form a single choir, the volunteers perceived the presence of a common goal between the two groups (Bailey & Davidson, 2005). M. Cohen (2012) organized a choir comprised of prisoners and outside volunteers and reported that both groups perceived a common goal. Upon providing evidence that children who participated in joint music making were more cooperative and empathetic during subsequent tasks, Kirschner and Tomasello (2010) hypothesized the following:

Joint music making, as in our study, not only creates a higher level of coordination compared to other non-musical group activities, but also encourages the participants to maintain a constant audiovisual representation of the collective intention and shared goal of vocalizing and moving together in time, thereby strengthening their sense of acting together as a unit (p. 362).

**Condition #3: Cooperation.** Kempton (2002) projected that a group’s ability to achieve a common goal is incumbent on its members’ ability to cooperate. Mithen (2009) shared this view and proposed that humans 500,000 years ago needed to cooperate in order to achieve the group goals of hunting and providing food for families. Mithen (2009) and others (Freeman, 1997; Wiltermuth & Heath, 2009) have suggested synchronous activity, such as group music
making, may have been the means in which these communities brought about a sense of “we” in the effort to foster cooperation and achieve group goals.

**Existing choirs.** Cooperation and similar concepts, such as teamwork, camaraderie, and the sense of being part of something greater than the self, have been reported frequently in investigations of singer perceived values of choral music participation. The presence of teamwork is an especially common theme among research with adolescent and high school level choristers (Adderley et al., 2003; Kennedy, 2002; Hylton, 1981; Jaros, 2008; Parker, 2014; Sweet, 2010; G. Stollak, Stollak, & Wasner, 1991). Kennedy (2002) relied on singer comments and her own observations to conclude that members of a eighth and ninth grade choir valued the group experience, felt a strong attachment to each other, and worked as a team. In a study of high school band, choir, and orchestra musicians, Adderley et al. (2003) indicated that students felt they were a part of a team, part of something greater than the self, and able manage the psychological challenges of being adolescents through their involvement in a musical ensemble. Likewise, Parker (2014) reported that all 36 high school participants in her study alluded to family-like teamwork in the choral ensemble. Parker (2014) concluded that “team” was the central social identifying phenomenon in the ensemble, with some respondents equating choir with “a large machine where each part was required for the entire machine to function” (p. 26). G. Stollak, Stollak, & Wasner (1991) related cooperation to musical achievement, reporting singers in more successful high school choirs sensed teamwork and a family-like choral culture in the ensemble. Parents and educators of children in choirs have also perceived a connection between cooperation and ensemble singing, and considered children involved in choir to work together in groups better than non-singers (Chorus America, 2009).
Cooperation was also reported in investigations of collegiate singers. Kempton (2002) observed cooperation among members of a college choir, noting that singers resisted the urge to complete in order to meet group ensemble goals. Mellor (2013) named psychosocial characteristics, including cooperation, working together, and being part of a team, as one of five categories of perceived well-being resulting from participation in a college choir.

Research among adult community choirs has yielded similar results. Chorus America (2009) provided evidence choristers considered themselves “better team players” (p. 5) than people not in a choir, and they attributed this characteristic directly to choir participation. In a study exploring aspects of social capital in a choral setting, Langston and Barrett (2008) concluded that choir members “show a willingness to work as a team or cohesive unit in order to further the ends of the group and to ensure success” (p. 132). Likewise, Willingham’s study (2001) of an adult community choir highlighted communal and social aspects of participation, indicating that cooperation existed for musical and social reasons:

There is a sense of teamwork, of interdependency, of pulling together and…people in this community care and take responsibility for each other’s well-being. There is safety in striving for excellence in this community, and there is a shared sense of quality in performance, and quality or depth of experience. As in all communities, there are tensions. People bring anxieties, personal issues, strained relationships, loneliness, shyness, and in some cases, their own sense of inadequacies…(but individuals) believe they are able to achieve more collectively than they can individually (p. 166).

The specific act of singing in harmony may also have a relationship with cooperation. Silber (2005) indicated singing in harmony led to feelings of support. Parker (2014) concluded
that singing in a group required choir members to rely on each other to produce chords and proposed this phenomenon separates choral singing from other teambuilding activities. Faulkner and Davidson (2006) explored cooperative aspects of singing in harmony, noting members of a men’s choir relied on each other to hear and sing correct pitches: “They are aurally sensitive and quick to confer if there is not unanimity, without waiting for the conductor to correct them.” The cooperation needed to sing correct pitches and achieve balance between voice sections led Faulkner and Davidson (2006) to suggest that singing in harmony is a metaphor for how humans should relate to another:

When singing in harmony in a large collective, singers appear to make sense of themselves and their place in the world by recognizing their own voices and the different voices of those around them and by collaborating to find an ideal vocal and social state (Faulkner & Davidson, 2006, p. 235).

**Interventions.** Two studies relied on interventions to investigate the relationship between singing in a group and subsequent cooperative behavior (Anshel & Kipper, 1988; Kirschner & Tomasello, 2010). Anshel and Kipper (1988) separated participants into four groups, with each participant singing in a group, listening to music, reading poetry, or watching a movie. In an ensuing game requiring teamwork, the group that sang together was observed to be significantly more cooperative than the other groups (Anshel & Kipper, 1988). Using a similar design, Kirschner and Tomasello (2010) studied two groups of four-year-old children. Children who performed a joint music activity that included synchronous singing, dancing, and playing of percussion instruments were more cooperative during a subsequent task than the group of children who did not perform the music activity (Kirschner & Tomasello, 2010). Together these studies provided data that group singing fosters cooperation in comparison to other activities.
(Anshel & Kipper, 1988) or no activity at all (Kirschner & Tomasello, 2010), and in doing so, added evidence in support of theories promoting the adaptive function of music among humans to be social cohesion. Kirschner and Tomasello (2010) concluded that spoken language might be a more effective method of rallying people to perform a goal-directed behavior, but “music might be more efficacious in mobilizing joint intentionality per se—in the sense of feeling a ‘we’ unit, thus getting people to experience each other as co-active, similar and cooperative members of a group” (p. 362).

Group singing interventions among diverse populations produced similar outcomes. Bailey and Davidson (2002, 2005) observed singers in a homeless choir to be increasingly cooperative with subsequent rehearsals, with participants indicating camaraderie experienced in choir indicative of feelings usually reserved for family and friends (Bailey & Davidson, 2002; 2005). Similar findings were reported among choirs involving prison inmates. Richmiller (1992) indicated all participants in a prisoner-staff choir considered the experience beneficial, with one staff member writing, “A choir teaches that through cooperation with other people and through persistent and hard work the participants can produce harmony and inter-dependence and enjoyment for themselves and others” (as cited in M. Cohen, 2009, p. 54). Silber (2005) reported cooperative behaviors among women in a prison choir, and like Faulkner and Davidson (2006), proposed singing in harmony as representative of relationship:

The individual is called upon to control her own voice, and at the same time blend with the voices of others in balance and with appropriate dynamics. This delicate balance requires personal skills…and the relational skills necessary to produce a harmonic whole in negotiation and cooperation with a diverse group (Silber, 2005, pp. 253-254).
Likewise, themes of teamwork and achieving something as a group were present in studies investigating the impact of group singing interventions among participants with respiratory disease (Lord et al., 2010), eating disorders (Pavlakou, 2009), and mental illness (Grocke et al., 2009). Pavlakou (2009) reported, “the experience of singing in a group resulted in participants feeling connected with the other group members and needed by others, as everybody’s musical contribution was important for the overall musical experience” (p. 41).

**Condition #4: Institutional support.** Allport (1954) suggested intergroup contact would be most effective when institutional authorities endorsed the activity. Although little research has explored the presence of institutional support in a choral setting, this condition might be implied due to the mere existence of a choral ensemble, which typically requires funding approved by people who are in leadership positions. The popularity of singing as a leisure activity (Chorus America, 2009; Clift et al., 2010b) might also suggest choral participation is considered a social norm (Hodson & Hewstone, 2013) supported by authorities in many communities. Among intervention studies, institutional support may be implicit in terms of the investigation being allowed to take place. Nearly every published study requires approval of a human subjects institutional review board and permission from research site gatekeeper in order to gain access to a particular population. For example, M. Cohen (2012) and Silber (2005) each discussed communication with prison authorities related to their study of choirs in prison settings.

**Condition #5: Friendship potential.** Friendship potential, which can be described as a situation’s capability to lead to new, non-superficial cross-group relationships, was not an original necessary condition for contact (Allport, 1954), but proposed later by Pettigrew (1998). Due to friendship’s association with perspective taking, empathetic feelings, and overall improved attitudes over time after the initial contact has taken place (Davies et al., 2011;
Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), researchers have highlighted the importance of organizing contact situations that stimulate meaningful relationships. Some scholars have suggested musical environments may be especially fertile ground for relationship forming. Small (1998) proposed that musicking is primarily about relationships, both musical and social:

Those relationships…model, or stand as metaphor for, ideal relationships as the participants in the performance imagine them to be: relationships between person and person, between individual and society, between humanity and the natural world and even perhaps the supernatural world (p. 13).

**Existing choirs.** There is extensive evidence of friendships existing in choirs and being valued by choir members, especially younger singers. High school musicians frequently named friendships as social benefit of participating in an ensemble (Adderley et al., 2003; Campbell et al., 2007; Hylton, 1981; Neill, 1998; Kennedy, 2002; Parker, 2014; D. Rohwer & Rohwer, 2009), a phenomenon that led Adderley et al. (2003) to conclude the environment found in a high school music ensemble “provides a favorable combination of circumstances for friendships to develop” (p. 200) and, in essence, a “home away from home” (p. 204). Other research demonstrated that adolescents perceived their music ensemble experience as an opportunity to make friends with people they might not interact with otherwise (Campbell et al., 2007; Hylton, 1981). D. Rohwer and Rohwer (2009) reported that some singers valued the social aspect of singing in choir even if they perceived themselves as having limited musical skills. One participant stated, “I may not be the best singer or the strongest sight-reader, but I’ve made a bunch of good friends in the past year and I’ve had many experiences that won’t be easy to top” (D. Rohwer & Rohwer, 2009, p. 257). Neill (1998) reported that “friends” tied with “concerts” as the second most motivating factor leading to participation in choir among 1,020 high school
students surveyed. Seventy-seven percent of parents surveyed by Chorus America (2009) said their child had “become more social with other children and made more friends since joining a choir” (p. 17).

Friendship was also a perceived value among collegiate choir participants (Clift & Hancox, 2001; Mellor, 2013; van der Vat-Chromy, 2010), with Kokotsaki and Hallam (2007) providing evidence that college students perceived their music ensemble as a place to make new friends and interact with people they might not have met without the shared music activity. Van der Vat-Chromy (2010) reported friendships were important to members of auditioned and non-auditioned collegiate choirs, but were not the primary reason for participation in the ensemble. Clift and Hancox (2001) examined perceptions of choristers in an ensemble comprised of undergraduate students, college staff, and community members, and reported younger singers “were more likely to agree that membership brought social benefits (especially meeting with friends for a drink in a local bar after rehearsals!” (p. 255).

Investigations involving adult choristers provided additional evidence of friendship development among a variety of populations, including amateur singers (Baird, 2007; Langston & Barrett, 2008; Southcott, 2009), adults who had experienced an adverse life event (von Lob et al., 2010), and adults struggling psychologically (Clift et al., 2007, Clift et al., 2010b). Baird (2007) reported that urban residents, church choir members, and small choir members valued the opportunity to make new friends in choir more than members of suburban community choirs and large choirs. Von Lob et al. (2010) indicated choir was a place for singers to make friends, to interact with people who they might not meet otherwise, and that “the group often felt like a substitute family” (p. 48). Choir-as-family was also a theme in research by Latimer (2008), Southcott (2009), and Southcott and Joseph (2010). Latimer (2008) suggested the gay men’s
chorus he investigated functioned “to provide not only a safe social environment for these men, but a ready-made surrogate family” (p. 31). Southcott and Joseph (2010) reported friendship potential in a community choir: “Over years friendships have been developed and connections have been made...[a] sense of family and community permeates group membership” (p. 23).

**Interventions.** Bailey and Davidson (2002) indicated membership in a choir provided prison inmates “with a familial atmosphere in which to develop more appropriate interpersonal behaviours and accomplish group goals” (p. 245-246). The same authors (2005) reported social support among singers and provided evidence of behaviors usually reserved for friends and family. Silber (2005) offered evidence that members of her prison choir forged new relationships with each other, citing behaviors such as increased physical affection and direct communication. M. Cohen (2009) provided qualitative indications of prison inmates making new friends when they collaborated with non-prisoner volunteers in a choir. Harris and Caporella (2014) structured rehearsals in a manner to facilitate friendships between singers in an intergenerational choir of college students and older adults with Alzheimer’s disease. Harris and Caporella (2014) reported substantial relationship gains among singers, citing observed behaviors between cross-group couples, such as hugging, laughing, and increased time spent talking before and after rehearsal:

Some people exchanged e-mail addresses, and some of the couples made plans to meet for lunch a few weeks later. Thus, based upon the focus group data and the observations of the choir members’ interactions, it appears that participating in the intergenerational choir has the potential to lessen the social isolation of people with AD and their family members. But even more than that, it has the potential to “build community” (Harris & Caporella, 2014, p. 278).
Intergroup Contact Theory Mediating Factors in Choral Settings

Mediators of intergroup contact specify how contact leads to improved attitudes. Research has indicated contact results in reduced prejudice as a result of a decrease in anxiety and an increase in outgroup knowledge, empathy, trust, and self-disclosure (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008; Hodson & Hewstone, 2013). Studies documenting social aspects of singing in a group have not investigated learning about another group or self-disclosure, yet investigations have linked group singing to decreased anxiety and increased empathy and trust.

Anxiety reduction. Bergh (2010a) proposed past and future joint music events could help “lubricate social interactions” (p. 212-213) between members of different groups by providing conversational material. Grocke et al. (2009) reported a decrease in social anxiety after singing, and the studies below provided evidence that singing in a group could be relaxing and reduce general stress and anxiety.

Existing choirs. Clift and Hancox (2001) reported general stress reduction and relaxation as a primary perceived health benefit of singing in a choir, with various percentages of respondents indicating the activity helped them to relax (80%); reduce stress (79%); feel calmer (78%); and forget worries (66%). In an investigation of college student motivation to join and stay in a choir, answers that fit in the theme “class is fun; stress relief after a long day” ranked second of eleven themes among Gospel choir members and fourth of eleven among “traditional” choir members (McCrary, 2001).

Sanal and Gorsev (2014) used a randomized controlled experimental design to study the psychological and physiological impact of singing in a choir and reported significant decreases in regard to singer state (temporary) anxiety levels. Clift and colleagues (2010c) provided evidence of positive health benefits among singers classified as having low psychological and
proposed a connection between anxiety reduction and the type of breathing necessary for singing:

Singing involves deep controlled breathing, which counteracts anxiety. It is obvious that singing as an activity is powered by the lungs, and promotes conscious awareness of depth and control of breathing. Breathing is also highly responsive to emotional states, and anxiety and stress can lead to rapid and shallow breathing, and relaxation can be induced by making an effort to breathe more deeply and slowly (Clift et al., 2010c, p. 29).

One study relied on biological measures to suggest a link between singing in a group and reduced anxiety. Beck et al. (2000) studied members of a professional choir and reported a significant level increase of S-IgA, an antibody linked to lower anxiety (Graham, Bartholemeusz, Tabonpong, & La Brooy, 1988), after rehearsals and performances. Evidence from the same study also indicated lowered levels of a cortisol after rehearsals, but higher levels of this hormone, which is connected to stressful life events, following a performance (Beck et al., 2000).

**Interventions.** Studies exploring the therapeutic benefits of music have provided evidence choral and group singing settings can lead to reduced anxiety. Houston, McKee, Carroll, & Marsh (1998) reported significant reductions of anxiety among older residents of a nursing home who sang humorous songs in a group setting. Yet, the research team (Houston et al., 1998) also noted that the residents’ enjoyment of the activity was largely a result of the researchers being perceived as fun and humorous people. Likewise, Lord et al. (2010) reported quantitative evidence of reduced anxiety among adults with respiratory disease who participated in group singing classes, but cautioned the improvements may have resulted, not from the
specific act of singing together, but from the regular social interactions that resulted from the classes. Working amid individuals with severe or enduring mental illness, Grocke et al. (2009) organized a group music therapy intervention that included singing, composing, and improvising. Quantitative evidence suggested significant social gains resulting from the music activities, including increased eye contact with others. Furthermore, the theme “it was a relaxing experience” was one of five primary emergent topics from focus group interviews (Grocke et al., 2009).

**Empathy.** Friendships and other forms of non-superficial relationships typically result in emotional bonds between the individuals involved (Hodson et al., 2013). Of these emotional connections, empathy and perspective-taking are especially helpful in the intergroup contact setting because “prejudice lessons as we become more able to sense how outgroup members view and feel about the world” (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2010). Some of the research already examined in this review with regard to friendships and family-like connections also provided evidence of empathy between singers in a choral setting.

**Existing choirs.** Southcott (2009) observed older singers sharing each other’s challenges and difficulties and found that members of the choir provided a community that enhanced the healing process.

**Interventions.** Kirschner and Tomasello (2010) found that children who participated in a joint music activity involving singing were more likely to help another student experiencing a mishap. Kirschner and Tomasello (2010) contended four-year-old children would likely not make a conscious choice to help someone because they had just made music together, but rather “made an intuitive decision to help the other child because they felt immediate empathetic concern with the peer’s misfortune the moment they saw the accident happening and felt
committed to give support somehow” (p. 361). Bailey and Davidson (2002) reported a choir comprised of homeless people resulted in a “familial atmosphere” (p. 245), and in a similar study, proposed that a choral experience helped homeless singers achieve an “increased understanding of self and others” (2001, p. 31), motivating them to improve their life situation. Silber (2005) observed choristers demonstrating openness and support as they sang in harmony while backing up a soloist, suggesting that the act of singing together, by itself, may stimulate empathetic feelings:

One of the less popular and apparently depressed participants, who had been placed in solitary confinement for self-harming a few days earlier, approached me about singing one of the verses of a song as a soloist. She asked me not to disclose to the group that this was her prayer for her mother who was dying of AIDS. I agreed, but asked her to sing it in a fashion that was truly prayerful. Taking the risk, she sang passionately, buoyed by the soft harmonic support of the other voices. Upon completion of the solo, all the choristers joined her for the chorus section of the song. When the last bar had been sung, a brief silence followed. It was clear that for the soloist, it was as if the group had not only supported her in her prayer but ultimately answered ‘Amen.’ At the close of the rehearsal, she commented that she felt better and enjoyed the session. Despite the fact that she was wary not to expose her feelings of pain and loneliness, she had found a means to communicate to and be consoled by those around her (p. 263).

**Trust.** Non-superficial relationships usually include elements of trust (Hodson et al., 2013). Mithen (2009) suggested that our human ancestors needed to establish group trust and
cooperation when hunting together and providing food for families. Group music making may have been the most efficient facilitator of such feelings. Likewise, neuroscientist Walter Freeman (1996) suggested ancient Dionysian ceremonies fostered “bonds of trust” (p. 70) through singing and dancing, and proposed that oxytocin, a brain chemical associated with singing (Grape et al., 2003; Kreutz et al., 2000), was an important facilitator of trust. Freeman posited, “Trust comes when we are able to predict what other people will do, and we achieve that by repeated cooperative actions” (p. 70).

**Existing choirs.** Studies of existing choirs have provided evidence the choral ensemble is frequently perceived as a setting where trust and the related concept of a “safe place” (Roussin, 2008) occur. Two studies (Judd & Pooley, 2014; Langston and Barrett, 2008) relied on in-depth qualitative interviews to provide evidence of trust in community choirs. Judd and Pooley (2014), after identifying “group dynamics” as one of eight themes in a study of psychological benefits of singing in a choir, concluded, “choir has a nurturing, trusting ethos that allows the members to expose a vulnerable part of themselves as they commit to learning new material and performing to their best ability” (p. 276). Citing specific elements of trust, such as the director’s belief in a soloist to perform a solo and the reliability of chorister attendance, Langston and Barrett (2008) suggested that choirs were “strong community resources, fostering trust, learning, interaction, participation, civic involvement and fellowship” (p. 118).

Adult participants in a study by Arasi (2006) recalled their high school choir as a non-threatening, safe environment that encouraged acceptance, openness, and a place to perform free from ridicule. Likewise, Tonneijck et al. (2008) reported “choir functioned as a ‘platform’ where participants felt safe, connected to others, experienced a sense of wholeness” (p. 175). Van der Vat-Chromy (2010) investigated the impact of four college choral culture formative elements,
including safety, identity, transmission, and enculturation. Out of 15 questions, singers ranked “The ensemble is a safe place for me as a person” as most important, leading van der Vat-Chromy (2010) to conclude, “Given there were over sixteen different conductors involved with the seven ensembles in this study, the results indicated that, consciously or unconsciously, the formative element of safety was being addressed…for hundreds of singers each week via these ensembles” (p. 131).

Trust was especially evident in a choral ensemble comprised of individuals who had experienced an adverse life event (von Lob et al., 2010). Overall, respondents referred to the choir as accepting and non-judgmental, and some stated the choir “had enabled them to trust again” (von Lob et al., 2010, p. 49). Members of a gay men’s chorus perceived the ensemble as a “safe environment” (Latimer, 2008, p. 31) where they could “be themselves as gay men and be affirmed and celebrated by one another” (p. 31).

**Interventions.** Several studies have examined trust among participants of group singing interventions. Anshel and Kipper (1988) found that men who sang together scored higher on an ensuing trust questionnaire when compared to men who participated in other activities. Silber (2005) found trust evident in the musical behaviors of a prison choir, such as the willingness of choristers to back up soloists as well as the ritualized call-and-response singing at the beginning of rehearsals (Duerksen & Darrow, 1991). Given the usual absence of trust among prison inmates, Silber (2005) found these results especially notable and led her to conclude that singing in a choir promoted trust among participants:

> Although choral work requires trust, it is also a venue for building trust. As an inherently cooperatively and interdependent enterprise, multi-vocal singing offers a number of non-verbal conduits in which singers can be heard and can express
their feelings and inner voices without risking unnecessary personal exposure (p. 262).

Like prisoners, people with eating disorders are often socially isolated and lack trust in self and others (Fairburn, et al., 1990; Pavlakou, 2009). Pavlakou (2009) reported members of a choir comprised of people with eating disorders felt a connection to each other due to a collective lack of singing experience and challenges related to food. Evidence that participants felt an ease to be themselves without being judged led Pavlakou (2009) to conclude that the choir engendered a trusting, therapeutic, and accepting atmosphere.

**Motivation for Participation in Choral Ensembles**

The topic concerning singer motivation to participate in choral ensembles has received considerable attention from researchers. Overall, there is agreement people participate in choirs for primarily social and/or musical reason, but there lacks consensus as to which of the two factors is most influential.

In their examination of middle and high school choristers, Conway and Borst (2001) reported students being motivated to participate by a combination of social/group, music, academic, and psychological reasons (in Sweet, 2010). Neill (1998) provided quantitative evidence high school students joined choir because of love of singing and performing. In contrast, Adderley et al. (2003) reported social climate as the prevalent theme over music, academic, and psychological benefits. The research team (Adderley et al., 2003) concluded that ensemble members valued the prospect of meeting people, the opportunity to develop intimate relationships, and the network of peer support one turns to when experiencing difficult times associated with adolescence.
Among college students it appears that singers participate in choir for primarily musical reasons (Buchanan, 1998; Saunders, 2005; Sichivitsa, 2003; McCrary, 2001). Buchanan (1998) reported that non-music majors in choirs were motivated by musical reasons significantly more than non-musical reasons. McCrary (2001) provided qualitative evidence college students joined “traditional” and Gospel choirs primarily because they like singing, but also because they enjoyed sharing in a group effort. In response to the lack of participant cultural diversity in the “traditional” choir, McCrary (2001) challenged collegiate choir directors to include “music that is expressive and representative of the lives and cultures of people whose music experiences extend beyond Western European traditions” (p. 29).

Bell (2004) reviewed studies examining community choirs and also concluded the primary motivation for singing was a love of music (Holmquist, 1995; Vincent, 1997; Chorus America, 2003), though social aspects were also frequently mentioned. As with McCrary (2001), Bell (2004) noted the diversity found in community choirs in the United States was not representative of the overall diversity of the country and proposed future research should investigate this issue. In contrast with other studies among college and adult singers, Latimer (2008) reported the “feeling of community” was the highest motivating factor for participation in the gay men’s chorus he studied. In Judd and Pooley’s (2014) investigation of choral singer perceived psychological benefits, participants expressed the love of singing as the primary motivating factor for participation and enjoyment of the activity was the primary stated benefit.

**Improved Intergroup Attitudes in Choral Settings**

Researchers have also investigated the function music and arts play in bettering intergroup relations. Bergh (2010a) provided an extensive review of such efforts around the world, focusing on the use of music in conflict transformation. Bergh (2010a) proposed
musicking provides a space where intergroup contact can occur in a relaxed environment, where anxiety is lessened in part because the interaction can take place without having to talk to each other. Yet, Bergh (2010a) criticized many of the music in conflict transformation that relied on organizer perceptions, as opposed to the participants whose attitudes were supposedly being improved. Bergh (2010a) also noted a lack of evidence demonstrating that improved attitudes exhibited by participants during the music event transferred into everyday life.

Several studies have investigated attitudes among salient social groups participating in choral/group singing settings. Zelizer (2003, 2004) and Robertson (2010) offered accounts of a multi-religious, multi-ethnic choir in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Zelizer (2004) provided evidence some members were initially reluctant to sing the music of religions not their own, but over time, attitudes improved and new relationships help stimulate more impartiality. The choir also faced external hostility in its early years of existence and some audience members were apparently uncomfortable with the public display of diversity:

Several members of the choir were members of religious orders and at times would wear their religious clothes. In some public performances, the audience might see a priest, sitting next to a nun, sitting next to a Muslim woman wearing a headscarf, all singing a Jewish song. A number of people were threatened by this public display (Zelizer, 2004, p. 168).

Despite these initial challenges, Zelizer (2004) reported, “the choir has gone on to widespread acceptance and admiration” (p. 169) in Bosnia-Herzegovina and abroad. Robertson (2010) offered another, more recent perspective on the same ensemble and provided ethnographic evidence that most of the choir members continued to participate in the group for purely musical reasons and were less concerned about the choir’s peace building mission. Even
with apparent diminishing social gains among singers, Robertson (2010) provided evidence that some audience members had emotional responses to the choir’s performances as they recalled a time prior to war and they had an accompanying feeling of hope for the future.

M. Cohen (2012) provided quantitative and qualitative evidence that choral singing in a choir comprised of prisoners and non-prisoners could lead to better attitudes between the two groups:

As the prisoners began to realize how much the volunteers enjoyed the opportunity to sing with them, they shifted their self-perceptions and began to realize they were ‘accepted’ by the people from outside the prison. In turn, prisoners began to build their internal social networks with other prisoners who shared their interest in choral singing and they also found new friends among the volunteer singers (M. Cohen, 2012, p. 52).

Research among intergenerational choirs also has yielded positive results (Bowers, 1998; Conway & Hodgman, 2008; Darrow et al., 1994). Darrow et al. (1994) investigated attitudes between high school singers and older persons. Teen attitudes toward the older singers moved in a positive direction, leading Darrow et al. (1994) to conclude that an intergeneration choir can help foster non-superficial relationships, downplay stereotypes and prejudice, and minimize the generation gap. Bowers (1998) also reported improved attitudes among a choir comprised of college female students and older community choir members, suggesting group singing can help diminish stereotyping between generations. Conway and Hodgman (2008) researched a joint college and community choir project and reported singers “were apprehensive at the start of the project, that they benefitted musically and socially from the project, and that they gained a greater respect for others” (p. 231).
Two recent studies have investigated choir and group singing between salient groups through the lens of the intergroup contact theory. Harris and Caporella (2014) organized a choir comprised of undergraduate college students and early-stage Alzheimer’s disease. In the effort to abide by the principles of the intergroup contact theory, leaders attempted to obtain the condition of equal status by having the choir rehearse in a circle and referring to everyone by first name. The director used humor to reduce anxiety and intentionally worked to foster teamwork and cooperation. Preparation for the concert at the end of the eight weeks of rehearsal served as a common goal, and each college student, paired with a person with Alzheimer’s disease, participated in relationship building activities in an effort to establish cross-group friendships (Harris & Caporella, 2014). Using a pretest, a test at the halfway point, and a posttest, Harris and Caporella (2014) reported college students had improved attitudes about people with Alzheimer’s disease. Harris and Caporella (2014) also indicated a choir intervention could lead to meaningful cross-group friendships.

Kuchenbrandt et al. (2014) investigated attitudes of 99 German college students who participated in a joint music project with Polish musicians, using questionnaires administered before, immediately after, and four weeks following the event. This study, which included a control group that did not participate in the intergroup music activity, indicated significant improvement in attitudes only after the German students went to Poland. This finding led Kuchenbrandt et al. (2014) to suggest the experience in Poland afforded a greater variety of meaningful contact experiences, including staying with host families and other displays of hospitality.
Purpose of the Study

A review of intergroup contact theory and social cohesion in choral settings research has provided a foundation for further study. The purpose of this study was to document: (a) singers’ perceptions of intergroup contact conditions (equal status, cooperation, common goals, institutional support, and friendship potential) in an intergroup choral setting; (b) singers’ stated perceptions of repertoire in relation to group social cohesion; (c) singers’ stated motivation for participation in an intergroup choral event; and (d) additional singer perceptions through qualitative measures.

In particular, this study endeavored to answer the following research questions:

1.) To what extent did choral singers perceive the presence of intergroup contact conditions in a one-day choral festival designed to bring together salient racial/ethnic groups:
   a. equal status,
   b. cooperation,
   c. common goals,
   d. institutional support, and
   e. friendship potential?

2.) Did choral singers perceive different levels of group social cohesion in relation to each music selection performed during the event?

3.) What motivated singers to participate voluntarily in a choir purposefully comprised of members of salient social groups?

4.) What themes emerged from answers to open-ended survey questions regarding singer perceptions during the event?
CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to investigate perceptions of choir members who participated in a one-day choral festival designed to bring together salient racial/ethnic social groups. Specifically, this study documented: (a) singers’ perceptions of intergroup contact conditions (equal status, cooperation, common goals, institutional support, and friendship potential) in a choral setting; (b) singers’ perceptions of the relation between individual performed music selections and sense of group social cohesion; (c) singers’ stated motivations for participation in an intergroup choral event; and (d) additional singers’ perceptions found in responses to open-ended questions.

In recognition of the interdisciplinary nature of the study and in the attempt to neutralize the biases characteristic of a single research method, a mixed methods approach was used (Creswell, 2009; O’Brien, 2011). Participants completed self-administered, cross-sectional questionnaires that sought to document their subjective perceptions during intergroup contact (Kuchenbrandt et al., 2014, Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011).

Because the researcher for this study also served as the choral festival’s co-organizer, a portion of singer perceptions were gathered using quantitative measures, a form of data collection that avoids the same investigator interpretation inherent in qualitative designs (Creswell, 2009). Free-response, qualitative data were also collected in the effort to document portions of participant experiences challenging to quantify, such as the immeasurable spiritual and emotional aspects of a racialized setting (Christ & Wagner, 2012; Stanfield, 2011, p. 30). Qualitative data also allowed for potential insight into quantitative responses (Creswell, 2009),
and emergent themes could provide new areas of study for future research. The survey instrument used to collect data is included in Appendix E.

**Participants**

Participants in this study ($N = 86$) were singers in a one-day choral music festival designed to bring together people of diverse ethnic/racial groups in a medium-sized city in the southeastern United States. Participants were recruited from area church, college, and community choirs by various means, including social media, emails to area choir directors, and personal visits by the researcher to choral rehearsals. The choral festival was in its second year after being co-founded by the researcher the year prior to this study.

**Equipment**

The survey instrument (see Appendix E) adapted from the literature (Bailey & Davidson, 2005; Kuchenbrandt et al., 2014; McCrary, 2001; van der Vat-Chromy, 2010) was designed to document participant perceptions and experiences and contained the following sections: (a) demographic questions regarding participant gender, age, race/ethnicity, religious affiliation, and singing experience, (b) a free-response question regarding reason(s) for participation, (c) 13 quantitative questions measuring perceived presence of intergroup contact conditions, (d) 13 quantitative questions measuring the perceived relation between each piece of performed music and sense of group social cohesion, and (e) four open-ended free response questions.

The 13 intergroup contact condition questions asked respondents to rate each statement pertaining to the presence of equal status, cooperation, common goals, institutional support, and friendship potential ($1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree, and 4 = neutral$). Questions were randomized for order effect, and several questions were worded negatively, implying the absence
of a condition, and required respondents to disagree with the statement to provide evidence that a condition’s presence was perceived.

The 13 repertoire questions asked respondents to rate each music selection in terms of felt social cohesion/togetherness/community ($1 = \text{weak social cohesion}, \ 7 = \text{strong social cohesion}, \text{and} \ 4 = \text{neutral}$). Included in the instructions for this section was a reminder that these ratings intended to measure the social aspects of the performance, and were not necessarily an indication of how well the music was performed.

Due to its length, the survey was divided into two parts and administered at separate times during the day. Participants completed part 1, which included demographic information and reason(s) for participation, at the conclusion of the rehearsal. It was assumed responses to these questions would be the same regardless of when they were answered. Participants completed part 2, which included questions regarding intergroup contact conditions, social cohesion associated with each music selection, and open-ended questions, at the conclusion of the performance during the organ postlude. The survey was piloted and reviewed by an expert in the field and three choral graduate students. Questions deemed confusing were reworded or eliminated.

**Procedures**

**Context for research.** The choral festival took place in a mid-sized city in the southeastern United States. According to 2010 census data, 35% of the city’s population identified as Black/African American, 57% as White alone, and 2% as Two or More Races. The choral festival was in its second year at the time of this study and was held at a prominent African Methodist Episcopal church in the city. The previous year’s festival was held at a
prominent Presbyterian church in the city where approximately 100 singers participated in the choir and approximately 200 people attended the performance as audience members.

**Timeline.** The one-day festival included a single 3-hour rehearsal starting at 9:00 a.m. on a Saturday and concluded with a performance at 5:00 p.m. There were no rehearsals in the days and weeks leading up to the event, and all singers received a packet of music and a nametag (Harris & Caporella, 2014) when they arrived at the church. The co-organizer/researcher and the co-organizer each addressed the choir at the beginning of the rehearsal, welcoming the singers, and encouraging them to do their best when singing in unfamiliar styles and to rely on each other to get through challenging sections. A preliminary introduction to the research project was also delivered by the co-organizer/researcher at the same time (see Appendix C).

**Repertoire.** The co-organizer/researcher (White/Caucasian) and event co-organizer (Black/African American), were both doctoral students in choral music education and active church musicians at the time of the study. Based on principles put forward by existing scholarship (Christerson, Edwards, & Emerson, 2005; K. Preist & Priest, 2007), the co-organizers collaborated to select repertoire that represented the music and worship traditions of those recruited to participate in the choir. To this end, the co-organizers selected 12 pieces of music, and classified four as “African American,” four as “European American,” and four as “shared” by both traditions. Given the subjectivity involved with assigning repertoire to these categories and to provide details of why each piece was included in the program, a detailed rationale for each selection is provided in Appendix F. Within the broad categories of African American, European American, and shared traditions, the co-organizers selected a variety of music that would necessitate varied music instrumentation and teaching styles. Specific information about each selection, including title, composer, instrumentation, teaching method,
Table 2: Characteristics of Performed Musical Selections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Musical Selection</th>
<th>Assigned Category</th>
<th>Instrumentation</th>
<th>Teaching Method</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Siyahamba</em> (We are Marching) – trad. South African</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>Soloist and choir, <em>a cappella</em></td>
<td>Music in hand</td>
<td>Soloist sang first line as a “call” and choir responded with remainder of each verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Praise to the Lord, the Almighty</em> (<em>LOBE DEN HERREN</em>)</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>Choir and congregation, accompanied by organ and brass quartet</td>
<td>Music in hand</td>
<td>Verses two and three of this hymn were sung in harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Heavens are Telling</em> (<em>The Creation</em>) – F. Haydn</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>Choir and trio of soloists, accompanied by piano</td>
<td>Music in hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>God Welcomes All</em> – John Bell</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>Choir and congregation, <em>a cappella</em></td>
<td>Aural, no music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I Dream a World</em> – André Thomas</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>Choir, accompanied by piano</td>
<td>Music in hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>It is Well with My Soul</em> (<em>VILLE DU HAVRE</em>)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>Soloists, choir, and congregation, accompanied by piano, organ, and brass</td>
<td>Music in hand</td>
<td>Soloists sang verses 1 and 2, men of choir and congregation sang verse 3, and all members of choir and congregation sang verse 4 and all the refrains throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oh Give Thanks</em> – Judith McAllister</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Choir and congregation, accompanied by piano and drums</td>
<td>Not rehearsed, Aural</td>
<td>Sung during the sharing of the peace/greeting time and was not rehearsed prior to the performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Rationale for each selection’s inclusion in a given category can be found in Appendix F. Teaching method refers to whether the choir members had music to look at when learning music or if they learned music entirely by ear. *A cappella* indicates music was performed without instrumental accompaniment. “*LOBE DEN HERREN*,” “*VILLE DU HAVRE*,” and “SINE NOMINE” are names of hymn tunes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Tradition Category</th>
<th>Instrumentation</th>
<th>Teaching Method</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perfect Praise – Brenda Moore</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Choir, accompanied by piano and drums</td>
<td>Music in hand</td>
<td>Solo French horn improvised the verses and choir hummed the refrain to “My Lord What a Morning” while the poem “On the Pulse of the Morning” was read, and at the conclusion of the poem, the choir sang the text of the refrain two times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Pulse of the Morning / My Lord What a Morning – Maya Angelou / trad. Spiritual</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Choir, <em>a cappella</em>, alternating with French horn</td>
<td>Music in hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For All the Saints (<em>SINE NOMINE</em>)</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>Choir and congregation, accompanied by organ and brass</td>
<td>Music in hand</td>
<td>Verses 1, 5, 7, and 8 were sung by choir and congregation; verse 2 was sung by women, verse 3 was sung by men, and verses 4 and 6 were sung by a small choir of graduate choral students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer for Peace – David Cherwien</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>Choir, accompanied by organ</td>
<td>Music in hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Praise is To Our God – John Bratton and Hezekiah Walker</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Soloist and choir, accompanied by piano and drums</td>
<td>Aural; only text was provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasia in G Major – J.S. Bach</td>
<td>European American</td>
<td>Organ</td>
<td>None; organ only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Rationale for each selection’s inclusion in a given category can be found in Appendix F. Teaching method refers to whether the choir members had music to look at when learning music or if they learned music entirely by ear. *A cappella* indicates music was performed without instrumental accompaniment. “*LOBE DEN HERREN*,” “VILLE DU HAVRE,” and “*SINE NOMINE*” are names of hymn tunes.*
and other relevant performance details are found in Table 2. The texts for most selections are found in Appendix G.

**Research.** Part 1 of the survey was administered at the conclusion of the rehearsal. The researcher read from a script (See Appendix C), which included an explanation of the nature of the research, consent requirements, and a request for participants to be open and candid with responses and not merely indicate what they assumed the researcher might want to hear. The first survey took about five minutes to complete and it, along with signed consent forms, were returned the researcher immediately. The second survey was administered at the conclusion of the performance during the organ postlude and returned along with the music packet.

To safeguard participant anonymity, the researcher separated signed consent forms from demographic information. Only the researcher has had access to individual surveys. A Human Subjects Approval Memorandum and Informed Consent Form can be found in Appendix A.

**The Researcher’s Role**

The role of the researcher is never completely impartial, and the findings in this study are shaped by the researcher’s background. In respect to the topic in the current study, the researcher is male, White/Caucasian, Christian, a choir director, a leader of music in European American Christian worship settings, and has organized several joint music projects prior to this study that were designed to challenge social barriers. The researcher has reflected on how his personal experiences and desire for joint music events to improve relations among diverse peoples might shape the current study. He has worked to suspend any preconceptions in the effort to understand participant experiences more completely (Creswell, 2013).
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to investigate perceptions of choir members who participated in a one-day choral festival designed to bring together salient racial/ethnic social groups. Specifically, this study documented: (a) singers’ perceptions of intergroup contact conditions (equal status, cooperation, common goals, institutional support, and friendship potential) in a choral setting; (b) singers’ perceptions of the relation between individual performed music selections and sense of group social cohesion; (c) singers’ stated motivation for participation in an intergroup choral event; and (d) additional singer perceptions found in responses to open-ended questions.

Demographic data were reported in terms of race/ethnicity, gender, age, and singing experience. Mean scores and standard deviations were calculated for each of the 13 questions pertaining to perceptions of the presence of intergroup contact conditions and ranked by strength of response. Individual question mean scores were combined with other individual means scores from the same condition category (e.g., cooperation), and category grand means were reported. Question means, standard deviations, and category grand means were also reported by race/ethnicity, gender, and age.

With regard to perceived social cohesion associated with individual music selections, mean scores and standard deviations were calculated for each of the 13 questions and ranked from highest level of perceived group social cohesion to lowest. Individual question means were combined by repertoire tradition category (e.g., African American) and category grand means
were reported. Individual question means, standard deviations, and category grand means were also reported by race/ethnicity, gender, age, and choir director experience.

Qualitative data pertaining to reasons singers participated in the event were sorted in categories and quantified. Data were reported by number of total responses and percentage of singers who provided a response per category. Three choral experts were notified of research goals, made aware of the researcher’s categories, and independently analyzed 20% of qualitative responses. Choral expert reliability for responses to this survey question was .82.

Qualitative data collected from responses to four open-ended questions were transcribed from surveys to a word-processed document and read aloud in their entirety several times by the researcher (Creswell, 2009). From the transcript, significant phrases and statements (Colaizzi, 1978) were extracted, analyzed, and assigned formulated meanings. The formulated meanings were analyzed and clustered (Colaizzi, 1978) into themes. Three choral experts were notified of research goals, made aware of the researcher’s themes, and independently analyzed 20% of qualitative responses to establish reliability. Choral expert reliability for the analysis of responses to the four open-ended questions was .69. Quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed separately and not combined until the discussion session of this document.

**Demographic Data Analysis**

Of the 112 singers who participated in the choral festival rehearsal, 92 people (82%) completed part 1 of the survey, and 86 (77%) people completed both part 1 and part 2 of the survey. Only those who completed both parts of the survey were included as participants in the study. As shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2, analysis of self-reported demographic data indicated study participants were predominantly White/Caucasian (73%), female (77%), and Christian (87%). One participant identified as More Than One Race, both Black/African American and
White/Caucasian. Another individual identified as African/Tanzanian, but not Black/African American. In an attempt to honor each person’s preferred identification, the former was included in both categories selected, and the latter was included in the Additional Race/Ethnicity category. The mean age of participants was 45.05 years. As represented in Table 3, there was nearly equal representation for each of the three age categories, not counting the seven participants who either indicated a non-specific age or no age at all.

Figure 1. Participant Demographics: Racial/Ethnic Group and Gender

Figure 2. Participant Demographics: Religious Affiliation
Participants indicated a range of choral ensemble experiences (see Table 4), including membership in a church choir (59%), community choir (45%), and/or college choir (26%).

Table 3:
Participant Demographics: Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group (in years)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not specify age</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Singers also indicated a variety of music leadership roles, with 32% specifying experience as a choir director and 25% noting they had sung professionally (i.e., been paid to sing in a choir or as a soloist).

Table 4:
Participant Demographics: Singing Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of a church choir</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of community choir</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of a college choir</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choir director</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been paid to sing</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently in a choir</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A choral festival similar in philosophy and format was held the previous year in a different church in the same city. A majority of singers in the present study indicated they did not participate the previous year’s event (62%), while 22% indicated they did participate, and 16% did not answer the question.
Research Question 1

To what extent did choral singers perceive the presence of intergroup contact conditions (equal status, cooperation, common goals, institutional support, and friendship potential) in a one-day choral festival designed to bring together salient racial/ethnic groups?

Each participant indicated the extent to which intergroup contact conditions were perceived as present by agreeing or disagreeing with 13 separate statements on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree, and 4 = Neutral). Table 5 displays means, standard deviations, condition category, and overall ranking for the 12 questions pertaining to intergroup contact conditions during the choral festival. Question 8, “In everyday life, I feel that people of my racial/ethnic group are treated as equals to people of other racial/ethnic groups” was not included in this table since the statement conveys the perception of equal status outside the contact situation. Some questions (3, 7, and 9) implied the absence of a condition and required disagreement with the statement in order to provide evidence a

Table 5:
Perceived Presence of Contact Conditions: Means, Standard Deviation, and Overall Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7. Other ethnic groups kept choir from succeeding</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1. Participants demonstrated cooperation</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2. Sense of shared, common goals among participants</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>(0.87)</td>
<td>Common Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5. Participants demonstrated teamwork</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>Coop./Com. Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12. My ethnic group was of equal status during event</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>(1.36)</td>
<td>Equal Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3. One ethnic group was more important during event</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>(1.46)</td>
<td>Equal Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4. Pastor, professor, or teacher was supportive of event</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>(1.44)</td>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9. Atmosphere during event was competitive</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>(1.57)</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11. Ethnic diversity made choir more successful</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>(1.39)</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13. Met someone who will become a friend</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>(1.77)</td>
<td>Friendship Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10. Government officials aware and supportive</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>(1.36)</td>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6. Exchanged contact information with someone</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>(2.12)</td>
<td>Friendship Potential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Questions 3, 7, and 9 were worded in a manner that required participants to disagree with the statement to indicate the condition was perceived as present. Means for these questions were inverted when determining question rank.
condition was perceived. For example, question 12, which reads, “During today’s activities, I felt that my racial/ethnic group was of equal status with other racial/ethnic groups” corresponds with question 3, “During today’s activities, it seemed like one racial/ethnic group was more important than the other.” A lower rating on the latter question would indicate disagreement with the statement, and consequently, a stronger level of perceived equal status. Question 5 regarding teamwork was included in both “common goals” and “cooperation” categories (Hewstone & Swart, 2013; Pettigrew, 1998).

Grouping of individual question mean scores into condition category grand means indicated the presence of the conditions were perceived in the following order (from greatest to least): Common goals – cooperation – equal status – institutional support – friendship potential (see Table 6). The categories of common goals, cooperation, and equal status all scored above 6.44 (with 7 = strong agreement). The means indicating perceived presence of institutional support and friendship potential were each lower and closer to neutral than strong agreement or strong disagreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Rank</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
<th>Total Answers</th>
<th>Grand Mean</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Common Goals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Equal Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>(1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>(1.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Friendship Potential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>(1.99)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean scores for questions 3, 7, and 9 were inverted when calculating category grand means to reflect negative question wording. Question 8 measured equal status outside the contact setting and was not included.
Perceptions of Intergroup Contact Condition Presence by Race/Ethnicity

Grand category mean scores between Black/African American and White/Caucasian responses were within .5 for each category except friendship potential (see Table 7). In terms of individual questions, both groups had the strongest response to question 7, “Overall, people from other ethnic/racial groups made it difficult for the choir to succeed,” indicating clear disagreement with the statement. Black/African American participant agreement with question 1, “During today’s rehearsal and festival, participants demonstrated cooperation” was nearly as

Table 7: Perceived Presence of Intergroup Contact Conditions by Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and Question</th>
<th>Black/African American</th>
<th>White/Caucasian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equal Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. One ethnic group was more important during event</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My racial/ethnic group is equal to others in everyday life</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My ethnic group was of equal status during event</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Totals:</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sense of shared, common goals among participants</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Participants demonstrated teamwork</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Totals:</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Participants demonstrated cooperation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Participants demonstrated teamwork</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other ethnic groups kept choir from succeeding</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Atmosphere during event was competitive</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ethnic diversity made choir more successful</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Totals:</strong></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pastor, professor, or teacher was supportive of event</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Government officials aware and supportive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Totals:</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendship Potential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Exchanged contact information with someone</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Met someone who will become a friend</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Totals:</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* When calculating grand category means, scores for questions 3, 7, and 9 were inverted to reflect negative wording. Question 8 was not included in category mean total since it measured equal status outside of the contact setting.
strong as the response to question 7. Question 8, “In everyday life, I feel that people of my racial/ethnic group are treated as equals to people of other racial/ethnic groups” and question 6, “I met someone of another race/ethnicity today with whom I exchanged contact information and/or became friends on social media” had the least agreement between the two groups.

Perceptions of Intergroup Contact Condition Presence by Gender

As seen in Table 8, individual question means and category grand means revealed even smaller differences by gender than by race/ethnicity. There was also unanimous consensus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and Question</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equal Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. One ethnic group was more important during event</td>
<td>19 1.89 (1.59)</td>
<td>67 1.55 (1.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My racial/ethnic group is equal to others in everyday life</td>
<td>19 4.21 (1.82)</td>
<td>63 3.78 (2.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My ethnic group was of equal status during event</td>
<td>19 6.36 (1.07)</td>
<td>63 6.39 (1.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.24 (1.34)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sense of shared, common goals among participants</td>
<td>19 6.12 (1.41)</td>
<td>65 6.74 (0.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Participants demonstrated teamwork</td>
<td>19 6.42 (1.39)</td>
<td>66 6.64 (0.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.26 (1.39)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Participants demonstrated cooperation</td>
<td>19 6.47 (1.39)</td>
<td>67 6.85 (0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Participants demonstrated teamwork</td>
<td>19 6.42 (1.39)</td>
<td>66 6.64 (0.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other ethnic groups kept choir from succeeding</td>
<td>19 1.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>66 1.12 (0.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Atmosphere during event was competitive</td>
<td>19 1.95 (1.84)</td>
<td>67 1.64 (1.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ethnic diversity made choir more successful</td>
<td>19 6.05 (1.27)</td>
<td>65 6.03 (1.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.33 (1.36)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pastor, professor, or teacher was supportive of event</td>
<td>19 6.05 (1.90)</td>
<td>66 6.41 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Government officials aware and supportive</td>
<td>17 3.47 (1.50)</td>
<td>60 3.75 (1.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.83 (2.14)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendship Potential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Exchanged contact information with someone</td>
<td>19 3.89 (2.13)</td>
<td>62 3.53 (2.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Met someone who will become a friend</td>
<td>18 4.39 (1.54)</td>
<td>64 4.42 (1.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.14 (1.86)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* When calculating grand category means, scores for questions 3, 7, and 9 were inverted to reflect negative wording. Question 8 was not included in category mean total since it measured equal status outside of the contact setting.
Table 9:  
*Perceived Presence of Intergroup Contact Conditions by Age Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and Question</th>
<th>18-39</th>
<th>40-59</th>
<th>60-79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equal Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My ethnic group was of equal status during event</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.19 (1.70)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My racial/ethnic group is equal to others in everyday life</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.85 (2.09)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. One ethnic group was more important during event</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.63 (1.39)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Totals:</strong></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.28 (1.54)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sense of shared, common goals among participants</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.25 (1.29)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Participants demonstrated teamwork</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.57 (0.60)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Totals:</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6.51 (0.70)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Participants demonstrated cooperation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.74 (0.45)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Participants demonstrated teamwork</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.57 (0.60)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other ethnic groups kept choir from succeeding</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.04 (0.19)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Atmosphere during event was competitive</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.37 (2.20)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ethnic diversity made choir more successful</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.26 (1.08)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Totals:</strong></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>6.42 (1.23)</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pastor, professor, or teacher was supportive of event</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.48 (1.22)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Government officials aware and supportive</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.80 (1.38)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Totals:</strong></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.19 (1.87)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendship Potential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Exchanged contact information with someone</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.44 (2.08)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Met someone who will become a friend</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.69 (1.85)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Totals:</strong></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.06 (2.05)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* When calculating grand category means, scores for questions 3, 7, and 9 were inverted to reflect negative wording. Question 8 was not included in category mean total since it measured equal status outside of the contact setting.
among all 19 males that the choir was not less successful because of its racial and ethnic diversity. Individual question means and category grand means indicated a slight trend of female participants perceiving all conditions with the exception of friendship potential more strongly than male participants.

**Perceptions of Intergroup Contact Condition Presence by Age Group**

Of the four demographic categories included the survey, the choir was most diverse in terms of age, with almost equal representation from the three groups shown in Table 9. Analysis of category grand means indicated a trend of choir members from the 60-79 age group perceiving the conditions of equal status, common goals, cooperation, and friendship potential stronger than the younger age groups. The 18-39 age group indicated the highest level of perceived institutional support.

**Research Question 2**

_Did choral singers perceive different levels of group social cohesion in relation to each music selection performed during the event?_

Participants rated each music selection performed for associated perceived levels of social cohesion/togetherness/community on a 7-point Likert-type scale (_1_ = weak social cohesion, _7_ = strong social cohesion, and _4_ = neutral). Table 10 shows rankings of each selection from most socially cohesive to least. Each selection’s tradition category designation was not indicted to participants at any point during the festival or on the survey.

Three of the top four ranked selections were African American Contemporary Gospel selections and four of the top six were categorized as being from the general African American tradition category. Four of the five lowest ranked selections performed by the choir were pieces categorized as European American. The organ postlude required no active participation from the
choir members, and singers completed surveys while it was being performed. Participants indicated the organ postlude was the least socially cohesive of the selections. As seen in Table 11, when music selections were combined into their respective tradition categories, selections categorized as African American were perceived as most socially cohesive followed by music shared by both traditions, then by music categorized as European American.

Table 10:
*Perceived Social Cohesiveness of Music Selections: Means, Standard Deviations, Tradition, and Overall Rank*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Tradition*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Every Praise is To Our God</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.79 (0.51)</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is Well with My soul</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.57 (0.65)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Perfect Praise</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.54 (0.85)</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oh Give Thanks</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.33 (1.04)</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>God Welcomes All</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.13 (1.06)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My Lord What a Morning</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.09 (1.11)</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I Dream a World</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.07 (1.14)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Praise to the Lord, the Almighty</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.90 (1.14)</td>
<td>European American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Prayer for Peace</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.72 (1.27)</td>
<td>European American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Siyahamba</em> (We are Marching)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.67 (1.41)</td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Heavens are Telling</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.57 (1.42)</td>
<td>European American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>For All the Saints</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5.52 (1.37)</td>
<td>European American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Organ Postlude: Fantasia in G Major</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.45 (1.60)</td>
<td>European American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *see Appendix F for rationale regarding each selection’s placement into a given tradition.

Table 11:
*Perceived Social Cohesiveness of Music Selections: Grand Category Mean Scores and Standard Deviations by Tradition Category*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Grand Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>6.44 (0.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>6.11 (1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American*</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>5.67 (1.30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *Organ postlude was not included because it was not performed by the choir.
Perceived Social Cohesion During Music Selections by Race/Ethnicity

Means shown in Table 12 indicate a trend of Black/African American participants rating 12 of the 13 musical selections higher than White/Caucasian singers, with 9 of 12 means being more than .5 higher. “Every Praise is to Our God” was the only selection White/Caucasian participants scored higher, with both groups having nearly identical means and standard deviations.

Each racial/ethnic group indicated music from the African American tradition as most socially cohesive, followed by music shared by both traditions and music from European American tradition. Black/African American singers scored all three categories higher, including music categorized as European American (see Table 13).

Table 12:
*Perceived Social Cohesiveness of Music Selections by Race/Ethnicity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Black / African American</th>
<th>White / Caucasian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siyahamba (We are Marching)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.23 (0.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise to the Lord, the Almighty</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.14 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heavens are Telling</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.05 (1.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God Welcomes All</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.62 (0.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Dream a World</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.55 (0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is Well with My Soul</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.82 (0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh Give Thanks</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.77 (0.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect Praise</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.64 (0.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Lord What a Morning</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.55 (0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For All the Saints</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.17 (0.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer for Peace</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.44 (0.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Praise is To Our God</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.75 (0.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ Postlude: Fantasia in G Major</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.95 (1.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>6.43 (0.91)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13:
Perceived Social Cohesiveness of Music Selections: Grand Mean Scores by Tradition Category and Racial/Ethnic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Black / African American</th>
<th>White / Caucasian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Grand Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>86                        6.67 (0.62)</td>
<td>238                        6.39 (0.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>87                        6.55 (0.68)</td>
<td>242                        5.99 (1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American*</td>
<td>85                        6.21 (1.04)</td>
<td>241                        5.53 (1.31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Organ postlude was not included because it was not performed by the choir

Perceived Social Cohesion During Music Selections by Gender

Calculated means indicated a trend of female singers scoring all 13 selections as more socially cohesive when compared to ratings given by male singers (see Table 14). The differences were most pronounced for the organ postlude and “For All the Saints.”

Table 14:
Perceived Social Cohesiveness of Music Selections by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siyahamba (We are Marching)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.17 (1.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise to the Lord, the Almighty</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.78 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heavens are Telling</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.33 (1.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God Welcomes All</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.72 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Dream a World</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.61 (1.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is Well with My Soul</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.33 (0.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh Give Thanks</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.06 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect Praise</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.11 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Lord What a Morning</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.78 (1.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For All the Saints</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.76 (1.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer for Peace</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.39 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Praise is To Our God</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.56 (0.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ Postlude: Fantasia in G Major</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.53 (1.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>5.64 (1.35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Though female singers indicated each tradition category as being more socially cohesive, both groups maintained that music categorized as African American was most socially cohesive, followed by music shared by both traditions, and then music categorized as European American (see Table 15).

Table 15: 
*Perceived Social Cohesiveness of Music Selections: Category Grand Means by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Grand Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American*</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *Organ postlude was not included because it was not performed by the choir*

**Perceived Social Cohesion During Music Selections by Age**

As shown in Table 16, mean scores for individual songs indicated a trend of the 18-39 age group rating selections as less socially cohesive than the 40-59 and 60-79 age categories. Differences in mean scores between the youngest age group (18-39) and oldest age group (60-79) were especially pronounced for “The Heavens are Telling” and the organ postlude.

Grand mean scores for each category indicated a slight trend of each type of music being perceived as progressively more socially cohesive as singer age increased (see Table 17). The differences stated by age group are most pronounced for music categorized as European American.
Table 16:  
*Perceived Social Cohesiveness of Music Selections by Age Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>18-39</th>
<th></th>
<th>40-59</th>
<th></th>
<th>60-79</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siyahamba (We are Marching)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.37 (1.82)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.73 (1.15)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.90 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise to the Lord, the Almighty</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.56 (1.31)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.04 (1.11)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.16 (1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heavens are Telling</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.93 (1.52)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.96 (1.11)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.80 (1.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God Welcomes All</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.12 (1.21)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.08 (1.06)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.13 (1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Dream a World</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.74 (1.22)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.12 (1.03)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.28 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is Well with My Soul</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.59 (0.57)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.63 (0.58)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.52 (0.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh Give Thanks</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.15 (1.22)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.52 (0.71)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.33 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect Praise</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.33 (1.04)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.72 (0.46)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.54 (0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Lord What a Morning</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.88 (1.40)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.04 (1.02)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.32 (0.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For All the Saints</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.17 (1.34)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.38 (1.53)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.92 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer for Peace</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.26 (1.53)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.92 (1.04)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.96 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Praise is To Our God</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.74 (0.59)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.71 (0.60)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.96 (0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ Postlude: Fantasia in G</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.50 (1.87)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.65 (1.40)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.09 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>5.74 (1.45)</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>6.11 (1.09)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>6.22 (1.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17:  
*Perceived Social Cohesiveness of Music Selections: Category Grand Means by Age Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>18-39</th>
<th></th>
<th>40-59</th>
<th></th>
<th>60-79</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Grand Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Grand Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Grand Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>6.28 (1.13)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6.50 (0.77)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6.54 (0.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5.97 (1.35)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6.13 (1.02)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>6.20 (1.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American*</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>5.22 (1.43)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5.82 (1.22)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5.96 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *Organ postlude was not included because it was not performed by the choir.*

**Perceived Social Cohesion During Music Selections by Choir Director Experience**

Means were also calculated for each song in terms of choir director experience (see Table 18). Results indicated a slight trend of non-choir directors perceiving all but two selections to be more socially cohesive.
Table 18:
*Perceived Social Cohesiveness of Music Selections by Choir Director Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Choir Director</th>
<th>Non-Choir director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Siyahamba</em> (We are Marching)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise to the Lord, the Almighty</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heavens are Telling</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God Welcomes All</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Dream a World</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is Well with My Soul</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh Give Thanks</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect Praise</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Lord What a Morning</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For All the Saints</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer for Peace</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Praise is To Our God</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ Postlude: Fantasia in G</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand category means reported in Table 19 indicated choir directors and non-choir directors perceived the selections categorized as African American to be most socially cohesive. Non-choir directors also scored all three categories slightly higher than choir directors.

Table 19:
*Perceived Social Cohesiveness of Repertoire: Category Grand Means by Choir Director Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Choir Director</th>
<th>Non-Choir Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Grand Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *Organ postlude was not included because it was not performed by the choir.*
Research Question 3

*What motivated singers to participate voluntarily in a choir purposefully comprised of members of salient social groups?*

Eighty-six participants stated reasons they took part in the choral festival, and their complete answers are included in Appendix H. Participant responses were coded into 15 categories (See Table 20) and quantified in order to more easily compare results from this study to existing research. Respondents provided 176 total reasons for participation, and each singer supplied, on average, 2.05 reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Representative quote; Singer number in ( ).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy singing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>“I enjoy singing in choirs” (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-building</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>“Wanted to…meet new people” (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of music</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>“Have always wanted to sing in a Gospel choir” (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable experience</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>“It sounded like a very fun experience when it was presented to me” (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support organizers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>“One of the organizers is my colleague and I want to support him” (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous participation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>“I had a great experience last year” (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious or Spiritual experience</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>“Spiritual fulfillment” (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Experience</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>“Opportunity to experience something new” (68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn Something</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>“Feel this event will provide helpful experience for my future career as a music educator” (80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing in a Large Choir</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>“Great experience for big group singing” (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required to Attend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>“[My] Gospel Choir was required to attend” (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>“People in our choir recommended it” (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Importance of Event</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>“I am missing the 5pm confirmation Mass and Bishop’s visit because I think this is so important” (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>“I had the time” (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member influence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>“Fun outing to do with my wife today” (64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Category 1: Enjoy Singing

Of those who answered the question, 43% indicated they participated in part or whole because they enjoyed singing. Representative responses included, “I love to sing” (singer #27), “I enjoy singing in choirs” (singer #52), and “[this event is] an opportunity to sing” (singer #22). Nine singers gave no reason for participation other than the enjoyment of singing.

Category 2: Community Building

Many of the respondents (34%) indicated the community-building aspect of the event, especially in terms of bringing together diverse cultures, as an influence for their participation. Singer #35 indicated the festival “seemed like a wonderful multi-cultural event.” Others participated for the opportunity “to meet new people” (singer #21), the enjoyment of “fellowship” (singer #14), “bringing community together” (singer #77), and showing “support for ecumenical events” (singer #61). One participant noted, “I feel a need to encourage all races to worship together – it makes worship feel more meaningful” (#42).

Category 3: Type of Music

Approximately one in five (22%) singers indicated participation was influenced by the repertoire and style of music to be used for the event. Many of the related statements were general in nature, such as “I…was intrigued by the diverse music” (singer #28). A few participants indicated being influenced by a specific style of music, with statements such as, “I love congregational song!” (singer #46) and, “[I] have always wanted to sing with a Gospel choir” (singer #49).

Category 4: Enjoyable Experience

A similar number of singers (20%) indicated they were influenced by the prospect of having a good time, and did not reference specific social or musical reasons. Representative
responses included, “It sounded like a very fun experience when it was presented to me” (singer #11) and, “I thought that I would enjoy the experience” (singer #41).

Category 5: Support for Organizers of the Event

Some singers (14%) stated that they participated out of a sense of support, collegiality, or friendship with the co-organizers of the event. Most of these responses mentioned the co-organizers by name and included statements such as, “One of the organizers is my colleague and I want to support him” (singer #6) and, “I believe in the cause of coming together to sing. Plus, [the co-organizer] is a friend” (singer #66).

Category 6: Previous Participation

Nearly the same percentage (13%) indicated an influence of prior experience, alluding to the previous year’s event, or in one case, “[I] have done this many times” (singer #30). Other representative statements included, “It was so much fun last year” (singer #33) and, “I enjoyed the fellowship and challenge last year so much I wanted to do it again” (singer #63).

Category 7: Religious or Spiritual Experience

Some participants (12%) reported being drawn by the opportunity to “worship together” (singer #42) or “praise the Lord” (singer #1). Some people used Christian-specific terminology, such as singer #50, who wrote, “I love singing and Jesus.” Others were less specific, referring to a “sense of Grace” (singer #34) or “blessing” (singer #37). One participant wrote “spiritual fulfillment” (singer #58) as the only reason for participation.

Other Categories

Motivating factors in the remaining categories were stated by less than 10% of those who participated, and included a desire to have a new experience (8%), learn something (8%), sing in a large choir (5%), membership in an ensemble required to attend (5%), the experience was
recommended by an acquaintance (3%), a perception the event was important (3%), they had the time (3%), and the influence of a family member (1%).

**Research Question 4**

*What themes emerged from answers to open-ended survey questions regarding singer perceptions during the event?*

From open-ended responses made by 86 participants (see Appendix H), 336 significant statements were identified. Table 21 provides examples of significant statements with their formulated meanings.

**Table 21:**

*Selected Examples of Significant Statements of Choral Festival Participants and Associated Formulated Meanings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Statement</th>
<th>Formulated Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having the opportunity to meet new people and bring one voice to music in our community (77).</td>
<td>The choral festival brought together people who might not otherwise interact around the activity of singing in a choir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of participants in choir, all colors, ages, professionals, etc. (40)</td>
<td>Choristers represented different races. Choristers represented different ages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think fellowshipping should be a stronger theme. Perhaps a lunch after can help foster a feeling of reaching across racial/ethnic lines w/ other [people] (63).</td>
<td>The festival did not include as much opportunity for social interaction as desired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling more practice might have made for a better service (52).</td>
<td>Not enough rehearsal time was planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a better understanding of how others express their faith through music (21).</td>
<td>Participation in the event led to increased knowledge across ethnic lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was a very worthwhile, educational, fun, and important experience to have. Thank you and keep it up! (21)</td>
<td>The choral festival is meaningful event that should continue in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt very moved by some of the hymns in tonight’s program. I felt liberated to praise the Lord in this space (86).</td>
<td>Singing in the festival choir was a religious/spiritual experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22:  
*Example of a Theme Cluster With Related Formulated Meanings*

---

**Formation of a community comprised of diverse peoples**

- Choir was comprised of people typically segregated  
- Choristers represented different races  
- Choristers represented different religions  
- Variety of ability levels in the choir  
- Sang with people I did not know  
- A sense of community  
- Feeling of unity  
- Choir formed superordinate identity  
- Made new friends

---

**Theme 1: Formation of a Community Comprised of Diverse Peoples**

Data from this theme describe social connections between members of the choir and includes perceptions related to the diversity of the choir and overall sense of community. Despite the demographic data suggesting the choir was not exceedingly diverse, especially in regard to race/ethnicity and gender, more than 25% of respondents perceived the choir to be comprised of a variety of people. Some used the words “diverse group” (singer #64) to describe the make-up of the choir, and others were more specific and perceived the choir to be comprised of people of “all colors, ages, professions” (singer #40). One singer had a negative impression of the influence of one the universities represented in the event and indicated there was “too much [particular university]” (singer #70).

Nearly two thirds of respondents commented positively regarding the sense of social bonding, and that the experience, for example, brought “various ethnic groups and various ability groups together” (singer #26). In their description of social connections, some indicated a formation of a new community where one may not typically exist. Singer #3 referred to the
festival as “a wonderful opportunity to share something very personal and typically very segregated.” Other singers indicated those around them in the choir were not familiar, labeling them as “mostly strangers” (singer #21), “folks I’ve never met before” (singer #38), and “others in the community I’ve never sang with” (singer #27). Participants who mentioned the social aspect of the day viewed the opportunity to meet and sing with new people as positive experience, a sentiment that led to individual conclusions that the event brought “one voice to music in our community” (singer #77) and of “how limited we are when we are sanctioned off in our race[]s denominations” (singer #47). One singer even indicated the social aspect of the experience was going to lead to future interactions with others and wrote, “I will be attending several services across [the city] due to the people I met” (singer #81). On the whole, statements by participants suggested a feeling of unity and equality throughout the ensemble. However, one respondent indicated the feeling of inequality resulting from a select group of singers that was pulled out of the large choir in order to sing two verses of one of the hymns: “The separation of the ‘trained choir’ and the larger group was not beneficial to the overall goal of equality” (singer #46).

Several singers acknowledged a perceived group identity related to faith. Singer #50 indicated the most positive aspect of the event was “singing to the Lord with other believers from all over” and singer #34 wrote, “It is such a community of faith – How can you sing and not feel His power!” Others indicated an overarching musical identity, represented by the statements such as “Singing with others who thoroughly enjoy singing” (singer #29) and, “[This event helped in] reminding me how much music and song can bring people together” (singer #45).
Theme 2: Exposure to Something New

More than one third of respondents indicated the festival was novel in some way. Many of the respondents used the word “new” to describe their experience. Singer #31 stated the event “provided the opportunity to sing new choral music with a new and diverse group” and singer #13 was also impacted by “learning new music and experiencing new kinds of conducting.” Several respondents communicated they were “exposed” to “a variety of music” (singer #18) and “other church community choirs and traditions” (singer #46). Others reported being impacted in terms of “becoming aware of how other’s worship services are” (singer #10) and “other genres of religious music I don’t have experience with” (singer #80). Singer #73 implied the experience was not only new, but one the singer had been hoping to find:

Oh my goodness! This was one of the most amazing experiences I have EVER had!!! I grew up in a religion that didn't sing so openly…it was so FREE-ING to sing to the Lord the way I've ALWAYS felt should be!!!

Nearly one fourth of respondents indicated they felt the event had resulted in them learning something new or being able to improve on a specific skill. Some participants referred to this in broad terms by indicating the event served in “advancing…singing skills” (singer #23) and “learning new literature and style” (singer #68). Other singers indicated the repertoire selected required them to learn the music in a manner less familiar, and therefore provided an opportunity for “improved sightreading” (singer #20) or, “learning and singing by rote” (singer #15). Likewise, multiple singers denoted educational benefits related to singing music of another culture, represented by singer #30, who wrote, “I enjoy the different pieces we sang and learning the manners in which they should be sung,” and singer #17, who wrote the event provided the
opportunity for “understanding better technique of singing another culture’s music.” Singer #21 wrote that the event resulted in “having a better understanding of how others express their faith.”

Several participants reported educational value resulting from observations of event conductors, indicating they experienced “new kinds of conducting” (singer #13) or were “exposed…to other types of leading/conducting/teaching” (singer #21).

Theme 3: Personal Enjoyment

Nearly one fourth of the respondents conveyed that they had an enjoyable experience. Those who were general in their comments used phrases such as “loved it!” (singer #5), “joyous experience” (singer #51), and “had a great time” (singer #35). Others were more specific, such as singer #13 who wrote about a particular conductor: “It was a joy to sing with the conductor of Perfect Praise.” One participant suggested the experience influenced a future change of behavior: “Wow that music was SO fun. I really want to start singing regularly in a choir again” (singer #28).

The most commonly cited reason for the event being enjoyable was the variety of music. This sentiment was communicated in statements such as “I enjoyed singing different styles of music” (singer #57) and “[a positive aspect was the] diversity of the music chosen.” Singer #55 wrote, “It was fun to share music that is not indigenous to my own background.” Singer #2 indicated an enjoyment of both the diverse selections and variety of conductors, and wrote, “I loved the variety of music and that each piece was led by a different conductor.”

Some singers’ personal enjoyment appeared to be associated with a personal spiritual or religious experience, with respondents using phrases such as “renewing my faith” (singer #1), “spiritually uplifting” (singer #14), and “I felt moved…I felt liberated to praise the Lord in this space” (singer #86). Singer #58 wrote, “I came looking for spiritual fulfillment and found it.”
Other respondents did not use as specific of spiritual terminology, with one singer referring to the experience as “very inspirational” (singer #27) and another writing that the event was “a wonderful opportunity to share something very personal” (singer #3).

A few participants did not find the experience entirely enjoyable. Singer #59 wrote, “I am uncomfortable ‘performing’ before an ‘audience’ in the context of worship. This [event] clashes with my understanding of worship.” In a related comment, singer #63 suggested there might be confusion regarding how those who attended the event were to respond, writing, “I think it’d be good to explain to attendees the background of how the ensemble came together and what role the audience is to play.”

Another respondent shared an account of an interaction with another person, providing evidence that both individuals were impacted negatively:

There was a woman in my section that was quite rude to me during practice in the morning. She didn't show up for the evening performance so I guess she dropped out. Guess she was just having a bad day. She said my perfume was too strong and she couldn't sit next to me so she moved to another row. No one has ever told me my fragrance was too strong in my whole life - until her. She must be very sensitive to smells (singer #83).

**Theme 4: Expressed Desire for Event to Continue**

Nearly 20% of respondents indicated a desire to see the event continue in the future, writing phrases such as, “hope this continues for many years!” (singer #27) and “continue this please” (singer #25). Singer #21 was more specific and stated, “This was a very worthwhile, educational, fun, and important experience to have. Thank you and keep it up!” One respondent
was especially emphatic and wrote, “I want to do this more! I feel it is such an important and needful activity. More! More! MORE!” (singer #42).

Five respondents expressed a willingness to help out with future events. Singer #15 indicated she “would enjoy working next year in helping to organize the event.” Singer #70 made an even stronger statement: “I’m going to make sure it continues and happens elsewhere!”

Multiple choir directors who sang in the choir volunteered to encourage more members of their ensemble to participate in future events, represented by singer #66 who wrote, “I want to do it again and will strongly encourage my choir to come (even more so than this year)!”

Theme 5: Criticism of Event Philosophy and Schedule

There was widespread perception that more rehearsal was needed to learn the music adequately for the event, with nearly one third of respondents expressing this sentiment. There were a wide range of responses communicating this feeling, from singer #45 who wrote, “A little more practice might have been nice” to singer #68’s perception of there being “very little preparation for performance” and singer #38’s proposal that there “should have been at least 2 rehearsals.” Some responses implied a sense of being neglected on the basis of music reading ability, such as singer #36, who indicated frustration about “not allowing practice for people who don’t read music.” Singer #86 did not express that the music wasn’t learned, but voiced disappointment over “not having enough time to memorize the music and sing out of the score.” Singer #59 expressed the musical preparation in terms of worship: “Musical standard too low. If music is an offering to God, it should be the best – regardless of genre.”

Only a few singers expressed feelings on the other end of the spectrum. For instance, singer #66 differed with #59 and wrote, “What is important to me is that whatever style is sung it should be done WELL, and today’s rehearsal/concert did that!” Singer #27 was impacted by
“seeing what could be accomplished in just a few hours” and singer #61 appreciated that “the music was not ‘brow beaten’” and felt that singers “were allowed to enjoy the event.” Overall, however, those who expressed the need for more rehearsal far outnumbered those who thought the rehearsal time was adequate.

Though many participants indicated a sense of community and social bonding, very few offered evidence that this took place through non-musical social exchanges with people during the event. Besides a brief greeting period at the onset of the rehearsal, there was no time for social interactions built into the rehearsal or performance schedule. Only one participant described face-to-face social interactions, indicating that she was able to talk “to the wonderful people on either side of me” (Singer #33). In contrast, many more respondents indicated that they found it challenging to find time to interact with other people, with singers writing, “It was hard to talk to everyone” (singer #7) and “the pace of rehearsal was so efficient that it was hard to socialize” (singer #35). Several singers expressed the lack of opportunities to socialize as negative, disappointed “there wasn’t food provided or a social event for choir members to meet outside of the choir stand” (singer #8). Singer #63 wrote, “I think fellowshipping should be a stronger theme. Perhaps a lunch after can help foster a feeling of reaching across racial/ethnic lines [with] other [people].”

Other negative comments were typically related to the event’s organization and logistical issues. Some indicated the rehearsal was “too long” (singer #4) and singer #76 wrote, “The 3-hour rehearsal left me quite hoarse vocally.” Additional singers communicated frustration related to the seating arrangements and not “being able to see the conductors” (singer #30), and confusion of when to stand or sit. Several singers wrote the temperature was uncomfortable, represented by singer #61 who wrote, “[it was] too hot in the sanctuary.”
Theme 6: Disappointment Over Attendance

Approximately one in ten respondents commented negatively on the amount of people who attended the event. The disappointment over attendance was represented by statements such as, “wish more audience to share the experience” (singer #27), and “sorry there were not more in the congregation” (singer #24). Several singers expressed more should have been done to publicize the event, represented by statements such as “concert needs to be advertised more” (singer #85) and “gotta get more publicity” (singer #28).

Summary of Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate choir member perceptions of the presence of intergroup contact conditions and to document stated levels of social cohesion related to the performance of each musical selection. This study also documented reasons singers were motivated to participate in a choral festival designed to bring together salient racial/ethnic groups. Finally, the study documented themes emerging from responses to open-ended qualitative questions.

Analysis of demographic data indicated participants were predominately female and White/Caucasian, but with greater diversity in terms age group representation. Nearly one third of participants identified as choir directors. In terms of perceiving the presence of intergroup contact conditions, quantitative data suggested that participants perceived the presence of common goals, cooperation, and equal status more than they perceived the presence of institutional support and friendship potential. These trends held steady across demographic lines.

Related to perceived levels of social cohesion during the performance of each musical selection, quantitative data indicated that music identified as African American was perceived as creating the most social cohesion, followed by music identified as being shared by both
traditions, and then by music identified as European American. Three of the top four rated selections were African American Contemporary Gospel selections. When viewed in terms of demographic area, several trends emerged. Black/African American respondents scored all but one selection, and each of the three music tradition categories, higher than White/Caucasian singers; female singers scored all selections and categories higher than male singers; older singers indicated higher scores than younger singers; and non-choir director participants indicated higher scores than singers who identified as choir directors.

Qualitative data provided a variety of stated reasons why singers participated in the event, with the most prevalent categories including enjoyment of singing, community-building, type of music, general enjoyment, support of organizers, previous experience, and a religious/spiritual experience. Six themes emerged from qualitative responses to the four free-response questions: formation of a community comprised of diverse peoples, exposure to something new, personal enjoyment, expressed desire for event to continue, criticism of event philosophy and schedule, and disappointment over attendance.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate perceptions of choir members who participated in a one-day choral festival designed to bring together salient racial/ethnic social groups. Specifically, this study documented: (a) singers’ perceptions of intergroup contact conditions (equal status, cooperation, common goals, institutional support, and friendship potential) in a choral setting; (b) singers’ perceptions of the relation between individual performed music selections and sense of group social cohesion; (c) singers’ stated motivation for participation in an intergroup choral event; and (d) additional singer perceptions found in responses to open-ended questions.

As a largely exploratory study of singers’ perceptions in a specific setting, this investigation made no attempt to gain insight that would generalize beyond the sample studied. Rather, this study sought to contribute to intergroup contact research in a choral music setting and serve as a stimulus for future research, including the development of a survey tool.

Because the researcher was also one of the co-organizers and conductors of the event, there is a possibility that participants had preconceived positive or negative feelings about the research prior to the completion of surveys. As a result, responses might have been impacted.

A second noteworthy limitation relates to the lack of racial/ethnic diversity of the sample. The preponderance of choristers who identified as White/Caucasian made it challenging for people of this group to come into contact with those of a different race/ethnicity, a problematic feature of a study with the primary goal of measuring perceptions of people in an intergroup contact setting.
Finally, the qualitative free-response questions were not entirely open-ended because they were preceded in the survey by quantitative questions concerning intergroup contact conditions and sense of group social cohesion in relation to repertoire. Although some themes emerged from qualitative data that were unrelated to the quantitative questions, there was likely an order effect present.

**Demographic Findings**

The nearly 3-to-1 ratio of White/Caucasian to Black/African American participants not only resulted in a smaller sample size of the Black/African American singers, but also likely made it challenging for White/Caucasian participants to have contact with individuals across racial/ethnic lines. Despite the demographic findings, qualitative data indicated many singers perceived the choir as diverse, with no participant referencing a lack of racial/ethnic diversity. This finding is notable, given Pettigrew and Tropp’s (2011) proposal that participant subjective perceptions are more crucial than objective measures of the intergroup contact setting. In addition to research seeking to understand why people participate in intergroup choral events, future investigations might explore why people chose not to participate.

The gender imbalance of more female singers than male was also notable, though perhaps less surprising, and consistent with existing research in choral settings (Clift et al., 2010c; Hanley, 1998; Kennedy, 2002; van der Vat-Chromy, 2010; Wilson, 2011). Average participant age was 45.05 years ($SD = 18.90$), and the range was 18 years to 78 years. Nearly equal representation from three age groups (Table 3) was likely a reflection of the pool of singers from which participants were recruited, which included church, college, and community choirs. Even if race/ethnicity was the focus of the event planning and survey questions, demographic data indicated that this was truly an intergenerational event, an aspect noted in several participants’
qualitative responses. With the exception of the four singers who indicated they were required to attend by their director, participation in the choir was voluntary. The evident appeal of this festival across age groups, together with findings by Bowers (1998), Conway and Hodgman (2008), Darrow et al. (1994), and Harris and Caporella (2014) suggest that choral music activity provides fertile ground for the study of intergenerational contact.

A final demographic topic of interest is that nearly one third of participants identified as current or former choir directors. Even though nine directors were recruited specifically to conduct selections in the event, 20 additional choir directors participated in the choir on their own accord. Assuming they had musical training beyond that of a typical singer, the presence of 29 choir directors within the choral ensemble likely impacted the overall music accomplishment. Future research may seek to determine if the high percentage of choral directors was unique to this setting or if singers with choir leadership experience have an inclination to participate in events such as the one investigated in the current study.

**Discussion of Research Question 1**

*To what extent do choral singers perceive the presence of intergroup contact conditions (equal status, cooperation, common goals, institutional support, and friendship potential) during a one-day choral festival designed to bring together salient racial/ethnic groups?*

Category grand means for three of the five conditions measured – equal status, cooperation, and common goals – all scored above 6 on a 7-point scale. This finding remained consistent across all demographic areas analyzed, and suggests participants perceived the presence of these three conditions. At minimum, results indicated the presence of equal status, cooperation, and common goals were perceived stronger than institutional support and friendship
potential. The perception of equal status is notable, given the particular challenge of satisfying this condition in intergroup contact settings (Hodson & Hewstone, 2013).

Analysis of individual questions indicated the strongest response to question 7, “Overall, people from other ethnic/racial groups made it difficult for the choir to succeed.” The 86 people who responded to the statement displayed near unanimity of strong disagreement ($M = 1.09$, $SD = 0.48$). Question 7 also resulted in the greatest consensus between Black/African American ($M = 1.04$, $SD = .20$) and White/Caucasian participants ($M = 1.09$, $SD = .53$). Participants either felt strongly that the presence of “others” did not inhibit the accomplishment of the choir or, if there were negative feelings, participants were hesitant to indicate so on the survey. The latter possibility is worthy of some speculation in light of mean scores for question 11, “Overall, the choir was more successful at performing the music because there were singers from more than one ethnic/racial group,” which was intended to serve as the positively worded corresponding question to question 7. Scores for question 11 were nearly an entire point ($M = 6.04$, $SD = 1.39$) less strong, ranking it 9 of 12 in terms of the questions measuring perceived conditions. The lower mean for question 11 does not necessarily suggest singers perceived diversity as a hindrance to success, given that when the mean for question 7 is inverted, questions 7 and 11 have means of 6.91 and 6.04, respectively, out of 7. Yet, the difference between the two suggests participants interpreted the questions differently because of the way they were worded, possibly responding more strongly due to the negative wording of question 7, a finding consistent with Davies et al. (2013) claim that people “see negative attitudes towards outgroups as inappropriate and even evil” (p. 202).

Question 1, “During today’s rehearsal and festival, participants demonstrated cooperation” and question 5, “Participants demonstrated teamwork during today’s rehearsal
and festival” also elicited strong responses with means that ranked 2nd and 4th, respectively. Black/African American participants’ indication of perceived cooperation was especially strong (mean = 6.95, SD = 0.20). This score appears to oppose the result of question 9, “The atmosphere during today’s event was competitive,” which had a mean score among Black/African American participants of 2.17 (SD = 2.18), especially if cooperation and competition are viewed as opposites (Pettigrew, 1998). Further analysis revealed only three Black/African American singers indicated strong agreement that the event was competitive while there was general consensus among the rest in this category that the event did not have a competitive atmosphere. Qualitative responses for all three individuals were entirely positive and provided no explanation for their perception of a competitive atmosphere. These findings suggest that either respondents did not feel comfortable elaborating on their responses or that the question may have been poorly worded or confusing. If the latter is the case, this highlights the need to exercise caution when attempting to draw any conclusions from a small sample size.

Overall, the perception of the presence of contact conditions appeared to coincide with the effort made by the co-organizers to achieve them. In terms of equal status, and in accordance with existing scholarship (Christerson, Edwards, & Emerson, 2005, p. 159; Platow, Reicher, & Haslam, 2009; K. Preist & Priest, 2007), co-organizers selected repertoire and recruited choral conducting leadership that represented the different musical traditions and racial/ethnic diversity in the choir. The event was also held in an African American church after being held in a European American Church the previous year (Kuchenbrandt et al., 2014).

In terms of cooperation, it was assumed that each music selection or the associated learning style (i.e., learning by ear or learning with music in hand) would be familiar to some in the choir, but not others. The small amount of rehearsal time, it was thought, would necessitate
each group relying on the other and acting as a team in order for the choir to succeed. However, the many negative qualitative responses referring to the lack of preparation and rehearsal time suggests this strategy was problematic. Yet, the overall relationship between the indicated high level of perceived cooperation and widespread frustration over lack of rehearsal is unclear. It remains possible that a singer could be frustrated with individual level of preparation, but at the same time perceived cooperation resulting from others providing musical leadership. In future events, organizers might be able to accommodate singers desiring more rehearsal time as well as those who appreciate the small time commitment by offering optional rehearsals in the weeks leading up to the day of the festival.

The condition of having common goals, it was assumed, would be present because the festival would culminate in a public performance, a strategy Harris and Caporella (2014) found successful. Although this study did not investigate why participants perceived each condition, the high scores for the perceived presence of a common goal suggests this approach was effective in the current study. Sports teams have been identified as the “prime example” (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011, p. 62) setting for common goals in intergroup contact (Chu & Griffey, 1985; Kearney, 2007). However, the accessibility and popularity (Chorus America, 2009) of singing in a choir lends itself well as an activity that can realistically challenge many social barriers, including race, ethnicity, gender, age, homelessness, mental disability, physical disability, sexual orientation, political affiliation, and socio-economic status, and address multiple barriers simultaneously. Evidence of common goals in this study and others involving choirs (Bailey & Davidson, 2005; M. Cohen, 2012; Harris & Caporella, 2014; Parker, 2014) indicate that singing in a group may provide another ideal example of diverse peoples working together for a common purpose.
The lower scores for the conditions of institutional support and friendship potential also seemed to reflect effort made to attain them. Though authority figures and leaders, such as some choir directors, pastors and professors were made aware of the event, there was little notable publicity and no government officials or other community leaders not already directly involved with the event were contacted in the effort to gain their endorsement or support. The finding that the youngest age group perceived the presence of institutional support at a higher level might be a reflection that younger people have more authority figures, such as teachers, professors, and choir directors in their day-to-day lives. The presence of this condition might be facilitated in future events through increased publicity, a campaign to involve more worship leaders, and personal invitations to government officials and other community leaders.

Lower friendship potential scores were likely a result of the choral festival taking place in one day and the lack of time scheduled during the event for participants to interact and establish relationships. Rehearsal time was kept to a minimum in an attempt to draw more people to the event and to necessitate cooperation in order to perform the music successfully. The tight schedule compounded the already challenging task of establishing friendships in a single day, given that non-superficial relationships typically require extensive and frequent interaction between people over a long period of time (Tropp, 2008). Hence, it is remarkable that some participants stated that they were able establish new relationships during the short amount of time together. The indication that Black African/American participants were able to establish more relational connections with White/Caucasian participants might be a reflection of the nearly 1-to-3 ratio of members of former group to the latter.

The frustration with the lack of opportunity to interact socially expressed through qualitative data can be interpreted as a promising finding in the sense that there was an expressed
desire to interact with others. Plans for future one-day festivals might include a meal or fellowship time, a side project that could potentially involve members from multiple social groups who would have to cooperate in order to achieve the goal of providing food for the choir.

**Discussion of Quantitative Research Question 2**

*Did choral singers perceive different levels of group social cohesion in relation to each musical selection performed during the event?*

Participant indications that greater social cohesion resulted from music categorized as African American makes it tempting to conclude that African American music brings about a greater sense of group social cohesion than European American music. Caution should be observed, however, given the subjective nature of assigning music into categories and the small sample size for each category (n = 4). Nonetheless, the trends here regarding repertoire are worthy of further study.

Hawn’s (2003) analysis of congregational song musical structures supports the results found in this study (see Figure 3). Hawn (2003) proposed that congregational song fits into one of three structures—sequential, refrain, or cyclic—and that a piece of music from each structure functions differently. For instance, sequential structures are characterized as “strophic,” “literate oriented,” have a “predictable performance time,” and are “content oriented” (p. 128). Conversely, cyclic structures are characterized as “movement oriented,” “ear oriented,” represent an “oral tradition,” and are “community oriented” [emphasis added] (p. 128). This model does not fit the music selections of current study perfectly since “I Dream a World” and “The Heavens are Telling” were probably never intended to be sung by a congregation. Yet, given Hawn’s (2003) criteria, each of these selections are easily categorized as sequential. When the selections are assigned a category, five of the top six ranked pieces in terms of social cohesion are cyclic.
Figure 3. *Spectrum of Congregational Song Structures* (Hawn, 2003, p. 128). Adapted and used with permission (see Appendix I).
and five of the bottom six selections are sequential (see Table 22). Only two selections do not fit the pattern. “It is Well with My Soul,” especially given the way in which it was sung for the event studied, including use of the refrain between each stanza, has characteristics of all three structures, and its ranking may not be all that surprising according to Hawn’s (2003) model. The ranking for “Siyahamba,” however, is less easily explained using Hawn’s (2003) model.

Table 22:
Musical Selection Social Cohesion Ranking and Assigned Musical Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Musical Structure (based on Hawn, 2003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Every Praise is To Our God</td>
<td>Cyclic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is Well with My soul</td>
<td>Refrain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Perfect Praise</td>
<td>Cyclic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oh Give Thanks</td>
<td>Cyclic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>God Welcomes All</td>
<td>Cyclic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My Lord What a Morning</td>
<td>Cyclic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I Dream a World</td>
<td>Sequential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Praise to the Lord, the Almighty</td>
<td>Sequential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Prayer for Peace</td>
<td>Sequential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Siyahamba (We are Marching)</td>
<td>Cyclic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Heavens are Telling</td>
<td>Sequential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>For All the Saints</td>
<td>Sequential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Organ Postlude: Fantasia in G Major</td>
<td>(not applicable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible variables beyond (but sometimes related to) musical structure at work to make one piece of music seem more community oriented than another are also worthy of speculation. The impact of singing without holding music, rhythm and syncopation, physical movement, singing in harmony, venue acoustics, size of audience in relation to size of venue, and conductor influence, may have potentially impacted the results in this study.
Singing without looking at the musical score might have allowed for increased social interaction via eye contact between choristers, the conductor, and the audience during performance. Positive nonverbal feedback, such as observed singer #11, who was impacted by “seeing smiles on the congregation’s faces” would have been difficult had the singer been focusing on the music and not looking out at the audience. Given the importance of nonverbal expressions when communicating attitude (Castelli, Carraro, Pavan, Murelli, & Carraro, 2012; Mehrabian & Ferris, 1967), being able to have one’s “head out of the score” may increase the opportunity for receiving smiles and other forms of socially affirming communication. Of course, if the nonverbal communication offered by others is perceived as negative, the opposite impact is likely. The three selections sung without scores in this study were ranked 1, 4, and 5 for their social cohesiveness. The two lowest ranking choir selections each had elements that may have inhibited memorization. “For All the Saints” had the longest text and “The Heavens are Telling” was perhaps the most complex in terms of individual voice part independence.

Rhythmic elements present in some selections might have also impacted results. The three Gospel selections, which were ranked 1, 3, and 4, were highly syncopated, accompanied by drum set, and included corresponding dance/body movement by members of the choir and some in the audience. Evidence that these elements were effective would support McNeill’s (1995) and Wiltermuth and Heath’s (2009) suggestion that physical synchrony, or “muscular bonding,” (McNeill, p. 1) fosters group social cohesion. Furthermore, the researcher’s anecdotal perception that “For all the Saints” had the most rhythmic problems of all the selections, an issue addressed by singer #74, “‘For All the Saints’…‘Cohesion’ isn’t possible when folks are wondering when to start singing,” may help explain the hymn’s low ranking.
Singing in harmony may have also impacted results. The top seven ranked selections all had substantial four-part harmony and three of the five lowest scoring sung selections involved little or no singing in harmony. Evidence that harmony resulted in the perception of group social cohesion would support research by Faulkner and Davidson (2006), Parker (2014), and Silber (2005).

Results from this study suggest that the singing of prosocial/community-building texts was less impactful than other variables. The four texts with prosocial themes, “God Welcomes All,” “I Dream a World,” “Prayer for Peace,” and “We are Marching” ranked 5, 7, 9, and 10, respectively. John Bell’s “God Welcomes All” text began with the phrase, “God welcomes all, strangers and friends” (Bell, 2008). The Langston Hughes text in “I Dream a World” spoke of a world “where black or white / Whatever race you be, / Will share the bounties of the earth / And every man is free” (Hughes, 2006). “Prayer for Peace” functioned as prayer, “O God of Love, O King of peace, / Make wars throughout the world to cease” (Baker, 1861). “Siyahamba” began with “We are marching in the light of God” [emphasis added]. It must be noted that these texts were not brought to the attention to the choristers during the rehearsal, and it is possible the lyrics were sung without comprehension or any emotional attachment. If texts had little or no bearing on group social cohesion, this finding would differ with Greitemeyer (2009a), who provided evidence linking prosocial lyrics to prosocial attitudes and behaviors. However, unlike Greitemeyer’s (2009a) research, the songs in this study that were not overtly prosocial were not explicitly anti-social either, and did not contain aggressive lyrics. Rather the top four scoring texts in this study could be categorized as general praise and thanksgiving to God (“Every Praise is to Our God,” “Perfect Praise,” “Oh Give Thanks”) or hope and deliverance from earthly trials (“It is Well with My Soul”).
The acoustical properties of the performance space may have also impacted results. Some scholars have argued that congregational singing is impacted by a room’s acoustics (Fleisher, 1991; Westermeyer, 1997) and that “hard surfaces in and around the assembly enhance the quality of the ordinary voice so that the singer is encouraged to participate” (Fleisher, p. 11). This phenomenon, which might also be at work when one sings in the shower, has not been the topic of empirical study, yet might explain why congregational hymns scored low in terms of social cohesion. Acoustical properties of the venue for the current study were not measured, but pews were covered with cushions and the entire sanctuary floor was carpeted. The worship space seemed to be designed for amplified rather than acoustic sound production. Perhaps the two congregational hymns that ranked 8 and 12, respectively, would have been perceived as more community building if they were sung in a more reverberant acoustical space, with the assumption provided by Fleisher (1991) that more people would have participated. The possibility that a single venue’s acoustics might favor one tradition’s music over the other gives further reason to consider the location where multicultural, intergroup contact occurs, a variable Kuchenbrandt et al. (2014) found important.

A related topic concerns the ratio between the size of the venue and audience. This may have also impacted results, especially during selections where the audience/congregation was encouraged to participate. The church had seating capacity of over 900, but approximately 100 audience members attended the event. Qualitative data indicated that numerous singers perceived the audience to be small and were disappointed with audience turnout. Perhaps a venue closer to or at full capacity would have impacted the sense of group, especially during the congregational hymns.
Though not a focus of this study, each conductor’s ability to provide effective musical and social leadership while on the podium likely impacted the sense of social cohesion for each selection. This view was stated by one singer, who wrote, “The sense of social cohesion was positively and negatively affected not only by the musical selections but also by the conductor leading them” (singer #2). Such findings would support related research on the impact of choral conductor magnitude (Yarborough, 1975) and effective intergroup leadership (Pittinsky, 2009).

The low score of the organ postlude in comparison to the sung musical selections supports research that active music making has a stronger relationship to socially cohesive behaviors than passive music experiences (Anshel & Kipper, 1988; Kreutz et al., 2004; Kuhn, 2002). Of all the mean differences per music selection analyzed by demographic group, no difference was greater than the one between the 60-79 age group and the 18-39 age group in terms of how the organ postlude was perceived.

Finally, in an unanticipated result of this study, Black/African American, female, and older singers all perceived higher levels of social cohesion per music selection than White/Caucasian, male, and younger singers. It is especially notable that Black/African American singer ratings of music categorized as European American were higher than White/Caucasian ratings of music from the same category. Overall, these results suggest that one’s race, ethnicity, gender, and age impact how music is experienced and that social groups marginalized in a given society might perceive singing in a group as a more of a social experience than their demographic counterparts. If so, these findings would be consistent with research by Bailey and Davidson (2005).
Discussion of Research Question 3

What motivated singers to participate voluntarily in a choir purposefully comprised of members of salient social groups?

Singer motivation to participate was a topic of interest in this study due to the challenge of establishing intergroup contact (Davies et al., 2013; Halualani, Chitgopekar, Morrison, & Dodge, 2004; Vorauer & Kumhyr, 2001; West, Shelton, & Trail, 2009), especially in the southern United States, a region noted for its history of racial segregation (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011, p. 214). Qualitative responses indicated people participated in the festival for musical and social reasons, and some for some singers, a combination of the two. The finding that “enjoyment of singing” was the most common reason is consistent with much of the existing literature on the topic (Bell, 2004; Buchanan, 1998; Chorus America, 2003; Clift 2010; Holmquist, 1995; McCrary, 2001; Mills, 2008; Neil, 1998; Saunders, 2005; Sichivitsa, 2003; Wilson, 2011), including Robertson’s (2010) study of a choir formed for the purpose of improving attitudes between groups. Findings that singers in the current study were motivated by the music style or genre, community building, and religious/spiritual fulfillment support research by McCrary (2001), who investigated reasons why students remained in a collegiate gospel choir. Together, data from the current study and McCrary’s (2001) suggest that people participate in settings involving Gospel music for different reasons than those that involve only “traditional” choral music.

The participants attracted to choir member diversity and community building aspects likely already held pluralistic views, and would not benefit from the potential prejudice reducing effect of intergroup contact (Patel, Kunze, and Silverman 2009; Pettigrew, 1998) However, the indication that many were drawn to the event for musical reasons allows for speculation that
prejudiced individuals might be drawn to intergroup contact (Crisp & Turner, 2013) in a choral setting because they enjoy singing or want to sing a certain style of music.

**Discussion of Research Question 4**

*What themes emerged from answers to open-ended survey questions regarding singer perceptions during the event?*

Qualitative responses related to the perception of the group as racially/ethnically diverse either supports or conflicts with the demographic data, depending on one’s definition of a diverse group. If using a standard of near 50-50 participation from two racial/ethnic groups, the choir was not diverse. If relying on DeYoung et al.’s (2003) definition of a “mixed” church congregation, where the majority race is less than 80% of the total membership, the choir was diverse. In the end, determining diversity through objective measures might not be as important to successful intergroup contact as participant perceptions of diversity (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011, pp. 73-74), which, according to participant qualitative data in this study, was strong.

Consistent with Busch and Gick (2012), participants perceived social gains and a sense of community despite limited time provided for interaction between choir members. This finding suggests the activity of singing in a group builds community on its own, and supports research by Faulkner and Davidson (2006), Parker (2014), and Silber (2005).

Qualitative statements related to sense of community, cooperation, togetherness, and fellowship coincide with the quantitative data regarding intergroup contact conditions in terms of cooperation, equal status, and common goals across racial/ethnic lines. When inequality was perceived, it was related to ability (untrained vs. trained singers), a finding consistent with Robertson (2010), or the disproportionate representation of singers from one university. Organizers of community choral festivals might want to take this finding into account, especially
when considering the recruitment and use of trained singers in the choir to help ensure the
group’s musical success.

The indication that participants enjoyed being exposed to new types of music, singing, and expressing one’s faith, suggests the process of deprovincialization at work. People who experienced something new potentially benefited from gaining a broader view (Pettigrew, 1997) of what and how “others” sing and use music in worship settings. This finding supports research linking multicultural activities to deprovincialization (Hodson et al., 2013) and openness (Leung et al., 2008).

Data indicating participants were exposed to and learned something new about another group provides evidence of the prejudice reducing, mediating factor of increased intergroup knowledge (Allport, 1954; Dovidio et al., 2003, Pettigrew, 1998). Existence of this mediating factor has been shown to undermine stereotypes (Kawakami, Dovidio, Moll, Hermsen, & Russin, 2000), inform people how to interact in future intergroup contact, and increase intercultural awareness and sensitivity (Dovidio et al., 2003). Qualitative data from the current study provides little or no evidence of the additional mediating factors of reduced intergroup anxiety and increased empathy and trust.

Qualitative data provided a clear indication that the attempt to necessitate cooperation through limited rehearsal time resulted in many participants feeling inadequately prepared for the performance. Though it is unclear if this feeling of unpreparedness impacted the sense of cooperation, there is little doubt that the lack of rehearsal time was viewed as a negative aspect. The multiple responses that offered a conflicting perception of adequate preparation and even an appreciation for not having more rehearsal provides additional data the choir was comprised of singers with a variety of ability levels and expectations.
Recommendations for Further Research

• Continue to explore the ways in which intergroup contact conditions, especially those seemingly more difficult to attain, such as equal status, institutional support, and friendship potential can be fostered in the choral setting.

• Examine the effect of variables on social cohesion in music making, including nonverbal communicators, such as eye contact, dance, and clapping; musical elements, such as rhythm, tempo, harmony, structure, and sequential versus cyclic structures; the influence of prosocial texts; venue acoustics; audience/choir member proportion to size of venue; and impact of the conductor or leader.

• Continue to perform interdisciplinary research (Gick, 2011) that combines knowledge from social psychology, music therapy, music in worship, and music education fields of study.

• Perform longitudinal studies (Pettigrew, 2008, p. 287-288) that investigate the impact of an annual choral festival on a community over the course of years and decades.

• Continue to improve a survey instrument.

• Perform before-and-after studies that seek to measure the effect of music by measuring implied prejudice levels.

• Expand research to include other forms of participatory art, such as collective instrumental music, dance, and visual art activities.

• Continue to work to better understand minority group perception of dominant cultural values in terms of music and how that relationship might impact events such as the one studied here.
Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to investigate perceptions of choir members who participated in a one-day choral festival designed to bring together salient racial/ethnic social groups. Just as intergroup contact theory researchers make no claim that contact between groups will serve as a panacea to solve all social problems (Hewstone, 2003; Hodson & Hewstone, 2013; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008, 2011, p. 216), the researcher of this study makes no claim that a one-day choral festival eliminated prejudicial attitudes of all participants through the power of music. Yet, given the indications that many participants viewed this event as a positive social experience, stated a desire for increased social interaction, and requested the event continue in the future, it seems that choral events such as the one studied here provide a promising setting for the study of meaningful intergroup contact (Davies et al., 2012; Halualnai et al., 2004; Vorauer & Kumhyr, 2001; West et al., 2009).

In terms of social cohesion, data from this study suggested the power of music may lie in its ability to foster cooperation, common goals, and equal status among diverse peoples. The perceived presence of these three conditions, combined with the prospect that friendship potential and institutional support could be achieved if appropriate measures are taken, suggests choir as a setting where peace and social harmony can exist. Even if those attracted to multicultural events have been “converted” to having positive intergroup attitudes, and events such as the one studied here are in essence, “preaching to the choir,” there remains hope that ideal intergroup relations possible in choir can offer an example to the outside world:

The preacher-choir analogy actually works well to illustrate what is needed to expand a vision of peace and harmony. The first thing that a good preacher does is to preach to the choir an inspirational song, a song that articulates a vision of the
world as it could be. Second, a preacher makes sure that the choir learns the song – not only hears it but also internalizes it and sings it to others. Third, a good preacher trains all members of the choir to be themselves preachers and sends those choir members out in to the world to start their own choirs as choir directors. In other words, the key to our strategy is to convince the existing members of the choir that they are not only participants but also producers. They amplify the sound of the vision, and they expand the audience of the movement (Patel et al., 2009, p. 241).
APPENDIX A

HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL MEMORANDUM
AND INFORMED CONSENT FORM

The Human Subjects Approval Memorandum and approved Informed Consent Form are included on the following pages.
APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 01/21/2015
To: Ryan Luhrs <rrl>
Address: 
Dept.: MUSIC SCHOOL
From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair
Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
Singer Perceptions in Intergroup Contact

The application that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Expedited per 45 CFR § 46.110(7) and has been approved by an expedited review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which may be required.

If you submitted a proposed consent form with your application, the approved stamped consent form is attached to this approval notice. Only the stamped version of the consent form may be used in recruiting research subjects.

If the project has not been completed by 01/20/2016 you must request a renewal of approval for continuation of the project. As a courtesy, a renewal notice will be sent to you prior to your expiration date; however, it is your responsibility as the Principal Investigator to timely request renewal of your approval from the Committee.

You are advised that any change in protocol for this project must be reviewed and approved by the Committee prior to implementation of the proposed change in the protocol. A protocol change/amendment form is required to be submitted for approval by the Committee. In addition, federal regulations require that the Principal Investigator promptly report, in writing any unanticipated problems or adverse events involving risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protection. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: Kevin Fenton <kfenton@fsu.edu>, Advisor
HSC No. 2014.14441
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Hello, my name is Ryan Luhrs and I am a PhD student in Choral Music Education at Florida State University. I am investigating the perceptions of people who participate in choral events involving diverse ethnic/racial groups. Because you are taking part in such an event, you are invited to participate in the study by completing a brief survey that asks about your experience today. The survey will ask for demographic information and contains 15 Lickert-scale questions and 5 open-ended short answer questions. It should take 10-15 minutes to complete.

Your participation is completely voluntary, anonymous, and can end at any time. There is no penalty to you if you choose not to participate or a reward if you do participate.

There are no anticipated risks with the exception that you might come across a question that makes you uncomfortable. You do not have to answer any question that makes you uncomfortable.

Your participation in the study will help us better understand individual experiences of those who take part in events such as this one. If you have any questions, you may contact the people/offices listed on the bottom of the consent form.

Thank you!

--

I have read and understand this form and consent to participate in this study.

____________________________________________________________________  ______________________________________________________________________
Name                                      Date

Ryan Luhrs
Ph.D. Candidate in Choral Music Education
Primary Investigator

Dr. Kevin Fenton
Primary Investigator’s Major Professor
Professor of Music
Florida State University
College of Music

Human Subjects Office
2010 Levy Avenue
Suite 276-C
Tallahassee, FL 3206-2
(850) 644-7900
humansubjects@fsu.edu
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PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH FROM HOSTING VENUE

From: Boyd, Brandon  
Sent: Sunday, January 18, 2015 8:45 AM  
To: Luhrs, Ryan  
Subject: Permission

Hello Mr. Ryan Luhrs,

We are quite appreciative for this effort to take place at AME Church. With no reservation, we are honored to grant you permission to administer a survey at the end of the event in February.

Thanks for letting me know.

Brandon Boyd, Director of Music  
AME Church
APPENDIX C

SCRIPT USED TO INTRODUCE RESEARCH

[Announced by researcher to choir at the beginning of the event]

As part of today's event, you will be invited to participate in research. There will be an opportunity to fill out a brief survey at the end of this rehearsal and then another, slightly longer one, at the end of the festival this evening while Paul is playing an organ postlude. Just know that we're not holding this event so that we can do research; we'd do it anyway. Given that this is kind of a unique thing, we'd really like to hear about your individual experience. I will talk more about the surveys at the end of the rehearsal.

[Announced by researcher to choir at the conclusion of the rehearsal]

At this point, I'm going to invite you to take a look at the survey that was on your chair as you arrived. Raise your hand if you are missing one and someone will pass it out. I ask that you not fill anything out yet, just to be sure you understand what to do. First of all, take a look at the consent form and I will read it out loud to you.

[rsearcher read consent form]

Be sure to include a four-digit number (not 1234) that you can remember, because you will use this number again tonight for the second survey.

The second survey will be on your chair when you arrive tonight. Please don't fill out the first section until the end of the performance. The survey will ask you to agree or disagree with a series of questions, but also ask you to rate your sense of social cohesion / togetherness / community during each piece. You are welcome to fill that portion of the survey out as we sing each selection or at the end of the program -- whatever you're most comfortable with and will be the least distracting to your experience. Finally, since I'm both an organizer, conductor, and a researcher in this setting, you've met me and may have either a negative or positive impression of me that could potentially impact the responses. Therefore, I ask you to give answers that are honest to your experience. Truthful and candid responses will be the most helpful as we try to better understand your individual perceptions and feelings in an event like this.
APPENDIX E

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The survey instrument is included on the following pages.
Section One: Demographic Information

Please write the last four digits of your phone number or other unique four digit number you can remember. 

Please circle: Male Female

Age: __________

Please circle the racial/ethnic group with which you identify. In addition to indicating the general category, you are invited to also indicate a more specific racial/ethnic identity in the space to the right if you prefer.

1. Black/African American  4. Asian
2. White/Caucasian    5. Other: __________________________
3. Hispanic/Latino

Please circle your religious affiliation. In addition to indicating the general category, you are invited to also indicate a more specific category in the space to the right if you prefer.

1. Christian    4. No religious affiliation
2. Jewish    5. Other: __________________________
3. Muslim

Did you participate in last year’s Joining in Song event at Presbyterian Church? Yes No

Check all that apply.

_____ I am member of a church choir    _____ I am or have been a choir director
_____ I am a member of a community chorus    _____ I have been paid to sing in a choir one or more times in my life
_____ I am a member of a college or high school choir    _____ I am currently NOT a member of any choir
_____ I am a high school student    _____ This is my first time singing in a choir
_____ I am college student

Section Two

How did you first hear about this event? Check the one line that had the most to do with you being here today.

_____ I was invited by a friend or acquaintance.
_____ My choir director told me about it. (Check here if your choir director is one of the organizers)
_____ One of the event organizers visited our choir and invited us to participate.
_____ I received an email or Facebook invite from one of the organizers.
_____ Other ________________________________

Why did you choose to participate in this event?

________________________________________

________________________________________
Section One: Circle the number that best indicates how you feel about the following statements (1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree; 4 = you are neutral and neither disagree nor agree with the statement).

1. During today’s rehearsal and festival, participants demonstrated cooperation.
   - 1 strongly DISAGREE
   - 2 neutral
   - 3 strongly AGREE

2. There was a sense of shared, common goals among participants in this event.
   - 1 strongly DISAGREE
   - 2 neutral
   - 3 strongly AGREE

3. During today’s activities, it seemed like one racial/ethnic group was more important than the other.
   - 1 strongly DISAGREE
   - 2 neutral
   - 3 strongly AGREE

4. At least one pastor, professor, or teacher I know was aware of and supportive of this event.
   - 1 strongly DISAGREE
   - 2 neutral
   - 3 strongly AGREE

5. Participants demonstrated teamwork during today’s rehearsal and festival.
   - 1 strongly DISAGREE
   - 2 neutral
   - 3 strongly AGREE

6. I met someone of another race/ethnicity today with whom I exchanged contact information and/or became friends on social media (Facebook, for example).
   - 1 strongly DISAGREE
   - 2 neutral
   - 3 strongly AGREE

7. Overall, people from other ethnic/racial groups made it difficult for the choir to succeed.
   - 1 strongly DISAGREE
   - 2 neutral
   - 3 strongly AGREE
8. In everyday life, I feel that people of my racial/ethnic group are treated as equals to people of other racial/ethnic groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISAGREE | AGREE

9. The atmosphere during today’s event was competitive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISAGREE | AGREE

10. Government officials and other community leaders were aware and supportive of this event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISAGREE | AGREE

11. Overall, the choir was more successful at performing the music because there were singers from more than one ethnic/racial group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISAGREE | AGREE

12. During today’s activities, I felt that my racial/ethnic group was of equal status with other racial/ethnic groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISAGREE | AGREE

13. I met someone of another race/ethnicity today with whom I think I will become friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISAGREE | AGREE
Section Two: Please circle the number that indicates the amount of social cohesion / “togetherness” / community you experienced during each musical selection from today’s event. THIS IS NOT AN INDICATION OF HOW WELL YOU THINK THE CHOIR PERFORMED MUSICALLY. (1 = Weak sense of social cohesion / “togetherness” / community and 7 = Strong sense of social cohesion / “togetherness”/ community; 4 = neutral)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Musical Selection</th>
<th>WEAK social cohesion “togetherness” community</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>STRONG social cohesion “togetherness” community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siyahamba / We are Marching</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise to the Lord</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heavens are Telling</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God Welcomes All</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Dream a World</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is Well with My Soul</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect Praise</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Give Thanks (sharing of peace)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Pulse of the Morning / with My Lord What a Morning</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For All the Saints</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer for Peace</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Praise is To Our God</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ Postlude</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Section Four: Short Answer
Directions: Please complete the following statements about your experience in the Joining in Song event. Please leave no answer empty. If the question does not pertain to you or if you choose not to answer it, please enter “N/A” or “no impact.”

1. Participation in the Joining Song II event has impacted me in terms of:
2. The most **negative** aspect of today’s event was:

3. The most **positive** aspect of today’s event was:

4. Any other information you want to share:
APPENDIX F

RATIONALE FOR REPERTOIRE INCLUSION IN PROGRAM AND TRADITION CATEGORY

Rationale for Inclusion in Program

In addition to the effort to represent familiar worship and music traditions of diverse choir member participants, additional aspects of each selection were considered, including tempo, congregational involvement, accessibility, text, accompaniment, and relation to pieces around it in the program. These elements are considered below in respect to each selection performed during the choral festival. The two co-organizers collaborated to produce the information below.

Siyahamba (We are Marching) – trad. South African

This piece was included because of its accessibility and assumed familiarity across various worship traditions and cultures. We assumed English-speaking singers could overcome the challenge of singing in Zulu since the song has few words, and overall, the text was repetitive. “Siyahamba” also afforded the opportunity to perform a call-and-response-like selection. To this end, we arranged the piece for a soloist to sing the first line and the choir respond with the rest of each stanza, in harmony. The English text, “We are marching” implied both a sense of community in the word “we” and in the marching (Hawn, 2005). The work was to open the program and be sung without accompaniment, except for a djembe.

Praise to the Lord, the Almighty

We included this congregational hymn because of its assumed familiarity across denominations where traditional hymns are sung. The text fit in with the theme of general praise
and the music lent itself to being accompanied by organ and brass instruments. We hoped the instrumentation, tempo, text, accessibility, and overall potential for robust singing would help the piece function as a “festive” opening congregational hymn.

**The Heavens are Telling (from *The Creation*) – Haydn**

We included this piece for a number of reasons that made it unique when compared to the rest of the repertoire. First, it was written by Franz Haydn for the oratorio *The Creation* and was the only piece that we classified as representing a “masterwork,” from the “classical” music tradition. Second, this relatively complex, polyphonic piece was likely too challenging for the average church choir and including it here, it was thought, would give some participants the opportunity to sing a selection they might not sing otherwise. Furthermore, learning the piece would require singers to already know pitches in advance or be able to read music at a high level. Despite its complexity and the potential risk for not having adequate rehearsal time, we hoped there would enough people in each section who were either familiar with the piece or read music well to provide leadership. Finally, access to the work on Choral Music Public Domain Library (CPDL) made the work available to us at no cost.

**God Welcomes All – Bell**

This congregational piece was included largely due to the nature of its text, harmony, and novelty. The short text by John Bell, which consists of “God welcomes all, strangers and friends. / God’s love is strong and it never ends” (Bell, 2008), was considered fitting for the overall theme of the event. It was also more inclusive in the sense that it did not using any gender-specific for God. Furthermore, the use of this piece in the performance would allow a conductor to interact with the congregation verbally and nonverbally and encourage participation in an unforced, natural manner. “God Welcomes All” would also be the only non-Gospel piece to be
taught entirely by rote. For purposes of the study, it would afford the opportunity to compare it to
others, given that it shared characteristics with other African American music in the program, but
would probably be unfamiliar to the majority of participants.

**I Dream a World – Thomas**

We included this choral piece primarily for its accessibility and how the message of the
text fit in with the theme of the event. Furthermore, the text was not overtly sacred, which set it
apart from all the other choir selections and hymns on the program. The organizers also had
access to nearly 200 copies of the piece without having to purchase music.

**It is Well with My Soul**

This congregational hymn was included because its assumed familiarity in a variety of
traditions across racial/ethnic lines. The organizers also perceived it as being successful when it
was included as part of the previous year’s program.

**Oh Give Thanks – McAllister**

We selected this African American Contemporary Gospel piece to be sung during the
sharing of the peace/greeting time, when choir members would go out into the congregation and
interact with those in attendance. It was assumed to well known and popular in many African
American churches. Further, the work was not to be rehearsed and no music or lyrics were going
to be provided with the intention that those familiar with the song, especially some who might
not read music, would provide musical leadership. Though the rhythms are probably the most
complex element of this song, the combination of capable instrumental leadership and the
repetitive structure of the piece, it was thought, would make the song easy to learn quickly.
Furthermore, regardless of how comfortable one became with learning the notes and words, it
was assumed choir members and audience members could participate through physical movement, such as swaying, rocking, and clapping.

**Perfect Praise – Moore**

This African American Contemporary Gospel piece was included because of its widespread familiarity in churches that sing this style of music and its repetitive structure, which would make it more accessible to those singing the piece for the first time. Though sheet music would be provided, it was assumed that many in the choir could sing all or most of the song from memory during the performance. As with the other African American Contemporary Gospel pieces on the program, it was also assumed that this style of music would lend itself to participation through physical movement, such as swaying and rocking, a feature that would allow choir members and audience members to participate more fully in the experience.

**My Lord What a Morning – trad. Spiritual**

This African American spiritual served as a musical accompaniment to the reading of Maya Angelou’s poem “On the Pulse of the Morning.” The refrain was hummed by the choir, which alternated with a solo French horn playing each verse, sometimes with improvisational elements included. At the conclusion of the poem, the choir was to switch from a “hum” to the text, which was selected because of its relationship to the text of the poem and ends with, “Good morning!” (Angelou, 1993). This spiritual was paired with the Angelou poem because of the relationship between the two texts. The simplicity of refrain and its familiarity across cultures also made it highly accessible.

**For All the Saints**

This congregational hymn was selected in the effort to include another traditional hymn from the European American tradition that would contrast in dynamic level and overall affect.
from the slower, softer selections that it would precede and follow. Also, seven-stanza hymns are often shortened or not sung in some worship services due to time constraints, so this event was the opportunity to sing the hymn in its entirety. Furthermore, the theme of the hymn text (See appendix G), focuses themes related to dying and heaven, was intended to pay homage to Maya Angelou, the poet featured in the previous selection, who had passed away during the year prior to this event. It was also assumed the hymn was widely known in congregations that sing Western European hymnody on a regular basis and another opportunity to include brass instrumentalists who had been hired for the event.

**Prayer for Peace – Cherwien**

We selected this choir piece largely because of its accessibility. The primary melody is a hymn tune and we assumed it would be immediately accessible. Essentially, the work is unison or two-part textures. Furthermore, the text focusing on the theme of peace seemed to fit the overall theme of the event (See Appendix G).

**Every Praise is to Our God – Bratton and Walker**

This piece was included because of its accessibility, familiarity, and its perceived success by the organizers in the previous year’s event. It was assumed that many in attendance, even people from churches that do not sing Gospel music on a regular basis, would be familiar with the song, which help make it a fast learn and more time could be devoted to other pieces on the program. As with the other African American Contemporary Gospel pieces on the program, it was assumed that this style of music would lend itself to participation through physical movement, such as swaying and rocking, an feature that would allow choir members and audience members to participate more fully in the experience.
Organ Postlude: Fantasia in G Major – J.S. Bach

The organist for the event, who was encouraged by the organizers to select something upbeat and “festive” that would take about five minutes to perform, selected this piece. A postlude is a common conclusion in Christian worship services where a pipe organ is used regularly. Furthermore, it was assumed that choir participants might leave the choir loft without completing the surveys if nothing happened after the final choir selection. The choir did not sing during the organ postlude, but the piece was included on the final surveys as one of the selections evaluated for sense of group social cohesion, providing evidence if there was any difference between participatory and passive music activity and perceived sense of social cohesion.

Rationale for Indicated Tradition Category

We sought to represent the two primary racial/ethnic groups and associated Christian worship traditions in the event through repertoire selection. It was predetermined that there would be 12 sung selections, four from each of the two traditions and four that were considered shared. The selections were not categorized only by their origins, but also on their level of familiarity within each tradition. Familiarity encompassed not only having experience singing or hearing a specific piece of music, but also included being acquainted with the way it would be taught. We acknowledge these labels and categories often inadequate and that this process is subjective.

Siyahamba [We are Marching] (shared)

“Siyahamba” was classified as being shared by both traditions. Although the freedom song originated in South Africa, it has been adopted in many worshiping communities around the Christian world (Hawn, 2005), making its way into multiple mainline denomination hymnals.
There was an assumption that the majority of participants, regardless of race/ethnicity or worship tradition, would be familiar and identify with this piece.

**Praise to the Lord (European American)**

We included this congregational hymn in the European American category because it originated as a German chorale and has been in use in European and North American hymn-singing congregations for over a century.

**The Heavens are Telling (European American)**

This piece by Franz Haydn originates from the Western European Classical music tradition. Perhaps the psalm-based, short, repetitive text and pseudo call-and-response-like interaction between the trio of soloists and choir could be considered characteristic of another tradition, but the overall structure, rhythm, polyphony, harmonic vocabulary all placed it firmly in the European American category for purposes of this study.

**God Welcomes All (Shared)**

This song originated in South Africa and was transcribed by John Bell of the Iona Community in Scotland. We categorized it as shared by both traditions because it was assumed to be unfamiliar to those from the African American tradition, but would be taught entirely by ear, and was short, syncopated, and highly repetitive—all aspects choral singing and music familiar to those from the African American tradition.

**I Dream a World (Shared)**

This piece was included in the shared category because it had features of both traditions. In addition to being written by an African American composer, the text was by Langston Hughes, a prominent African American poet who made substantial contributions to the Harlem Renaissance. Musically, however, the work was through composed, text driven, and used a
harmonic and rhythmic vocabulary largely consistent with Western European compositional principles.

**It is Well With My Soul (Shared)**

This hymn and tune were written by European Americans, but the hymn was included in the shared category because it has been adopted across many Christian denominations, transcending race/ethnicity. It was also treated musically in a manner that honored both traditions. The first two verses were sung by soloists and accompanied by the piano with improvisatory elements, such as a lack of a strict tempo and departures from the original melody. Verses three and four were maintained a strict tempo, were sung by the congregation and accompanied by organ and brass instruments.

**Oh Give Thanks (African American)**

This song was composed by an African American songwriter and considered a standard in the African American Contemporary Gospel style, and it was assumed that it would be widely known among church goers who sing Gospel music on a regular basis. The syncopated rhythms, articulations, repetitive structure and text, texture layering, and piano and drum set accompaniment—all idiomatic features of Praise and Worship songs being used in African American churches across the United States—led us to categorize this selection as African American.

**Perfect Praise (African American)**

As with “Oh Give Thanks,” this song was composed by an African American songwriter and considered a standard in the African American Contemporary Gospel style. The syncopated rhythms, articulations, repetitive structure and text, texture layering, and piano and drum set
accompaniment are all idiomatic features of Praise and Worship songs being used in African American churches across the United States.

**My Lord What a Morning (African American)**

This piece is an African American spiritual. Even though it is also widely known in churches outside the African American tradition, we included in the African American category for this program because it was paired with a poem written by Maya Angelou, a prominent African American poet. It was performed without a predetermined length or set amount of repetitions and the choir members were encouraged to improvise harmonies as the refrain was sung.

**For All the Saints (European American)**

This congregational hymn originated from Western Europe. The hymn tune *SINE NOMINE* was written by the English composer Ralph Vaughan Williams for the 1906 English Hymnal. William How, an English hymn writer, wrote the hymn text. Though there is a re-occurring refrain after each stanza, the hymn is based primarily on lengthy text that does not repeat. The hymn also contains few instances of syncopation, and is usually accompanied by organ or piano—all reasons we included it in the European American category.

**Prayer for Peace (European American)**

This piece was written by a Lutheran American composer, and musically, the piece’s basis is a simple hymn tune. The text was written by the English hymn writer Henry Baker. Further European American influence includes the lack of syncopated rhythms and use of organ accompaniment.
Every Praise is to Our God (African American)

This Contemporary African American Gospel piece was written recently by Hezekiah Walker and John Bratton. Repetition, frequent key changes, syncopation, call-and-response like interaction between soloist and choir, and accompaniment by piano and drums all help classify this piece in the African American category.

Organ Postlude: Fantasy in G Major (European American)

This organ solo was written German composer J.S. Bach. Though perhaps improvisatory in nature, current performance practice indicates the score should be followed in performance. The piece is through-composed, has little syncopation, and is performed on a pipe organ.
APPENDIX G

REPERTOIRE TEXTS

Siyahamba (We are Marching) – South African traditional
(verse one sung in Zulu; verse two is a translation of verse one)

1. Siyahamba ekukhanyeni kwenkhos
2. We are marching in the light of God
3. We are singing in the light of God
4. We are moving in the Spirit of God

Praise to the Lord, the Almighty
1. Praise to the Lord, the Almighty, the King of creation!
   O my soul, praise him, for he is your health and salvation!
   Come, all who hear; now to his temple draw near, join me in glad adoration.

2. Praise to the Lord, above all things so wondrously reigning;
   sheltering you under his wings, and so gently sustaining!
   Have you not seen all that is needful has been sent by his gracious ordaining?

3. Praise to the Lord, who will prosper your work and defend you;
   surely his goodness and mercy shall daily attend you.
   Ponder anew what the Almighty can do, if with his love he befriends you.

4. Praise to the Lord! O let all that is in me adore him!
   All that has life and breath, come now with praises before him.
   Let the Amen sound from his people again; gladly forever adore him.
   -Joachim Neander (1680)
   -translated by Catherine Winkworth (1863)
   -text in public domain

The Heavens are Telling (The Creation) – F. Haydn

The heavens are telling the glory of God,
The wonder of his work displays the firmament;

The day that is coming speaks to the day,
The night that is gone to following night.

In all the lands resounds the word,
Never unperceived, ever understood.
   -from Psalm 19
   -text in public domain
God Welcomes All – John Bell
  God welcomes all, strangers and friends.
  God’s love is strong and it never ends.
  -John L. Bell (2008)
  © 2008 WGRG, Iona Community (admin. GIA publications), used by permission

I Dream a World
(text not included due to copyright restrictions)

It is Well with My Soul
1. When peace like a river attendeth my way,
   when sorrows like sea billows roll;
   whatever my lot, thou hast taught me to say,
   "It is well, it is well with my soul."

Refrain
  It is well with my soul;
  it is well, it is well with my soul.

2. Though Satan should buffet, though trials should come,
   let this blest assurance control:
   that Christ has regarded my helpless estate,
   and has shed his own blood for my soul. Refrain

3. My sin oh, the bliss of this glorious thought!
   my sin, not in part, but the whole,
   is nailed to the cross, and I bear it no more;
   praise the Lord, praise the Lord, O my soul! Refrain

4. O Lord, haste the day when my faith shall be sight,
   the clouds be rolled back as a scroll;
   the trump shall resound and the Lord shall descend;
   even so, it is well with my soul. Refrain
   -Horatio Gates Spafford (1873)
   -text in public domain

Oh Give Thanks Unto the Lord – Judith McAllister
(text not included due to copyright restrictions)

Perfect Praise – Brenda Moore
(text not included due to copyright restrictions)
My Lord what a Morning – trad. Spiritual
My Lord, what a morning; my Lord, what a morning;
Oh, my Lord, what a morning, when the stars begin to fall.
   -trad. Spiritual
   -text in public domain

For All the Saints
1. For all the saints, who from their labors rest,
   Who Thee by faith before the world confessed,
   Thy Name, O Jesus, be forever blessed.
   Alleluia, Alleluia!

2. Thou wast their Rock, their Fortress and their Might;
   Thou, Lord, their Captain in the well fought fight;
   Thou, in the darkness drear, their one true Light.
   Alleluia, Alleluia!

3. O blest communion, fellowship divine!
   We feebly struggle, they in glory shine;
   All are one in Thee, for all are Thine.
   Alleluia, Alleluia!

4. O may Thy soldiers, faithful, true and bold,
   Fight as the saints who nobly fought of old,
   And win with them the victor’s crown of gold.
   Alleluia, Alleluia!

5. And when the strife is fierce, the warfare long,
   Steals on the ear the distant triumph song,
   And hearts are brave, again, and arms are strong.
   Alleluia, Alleluia!

6. The golden evening brightens in the west;
   Soon, soon to faithful warriors comes their rest;
   Sweet is the calm of paradise the blessed.
   Alleluia, Alleluia!

7. But lo! there breaks a yet more glorious day;
   The saints triumphant rise in bright array;
   The King of glory passes on His way.
   Alleluia, Alleluia!

8. From earth’s wide bounds, from ocean’s farthest coast,
   Through gates of pearl streams in the countless host,
   And singing to Father, Son and Holy Ghost:
   Alleluia, Alleluia!

   -William H. How (1864)
   -text in public domain
Prayer for Peace – David Cherwien
1. O God of love, O King of peace,
   Make wars throughout the world to cease;
   The wrath of sinful man restrain;
   Give peace, O God, give peace again.

2. Remember, Lord, Thy works of old,
   The wonders that our fathers told;
   Remember not our sin's dark stain,
   Give peace, O God, give peace again.

3. Whom shall we trust but Thee, O Lord?
   Where rest but on Thy faithful word?
   None ever called on Thee in vain,
   Give peace, O God, give peace again.
   -Henry Baker (1861)
   -text in public domain

Every Praise is To our God – John Bratton and Hezekiah Walker
(text not included due to copyright restrictions)
Each singer’s number is indicated in boldface. Portions of responses that identify specific individuals or institutions have been altered are enclosed in [ ]. Responses correspond with the questions directly below this statement, and not with question numbers on the survey.

1. Why did you choose to participate in this event?
2. Participation in this event has impacted me in terms of:
3. The most negative aspect of today’s event was:
4. The most positive aspect of today’s event was:
5. Any other information you want to share:

1. I love to sing with others and praise the Lord
2. Renewing my faith
3. Being unsure of some of my parts
4. Singing with all the wonderful voices
5. n/a

2.
1. I chose to participate in this event because I would do ANYTHING for [one of the co-organizers]
2. n/a
3. n/a
4. I loved the variety of music and that each piece was led by a different conductor.
5. The sense of social cohesion was positively and negatively affected not only by the musical selections but also by the conductor leading them.

3.
1. The opportunity to sing w/ a large multi-cultural choir
   Comments: A wonderful opportunity to share something very personal and typically very segregated
2. Very inspiring. Too little time to form bonds - however may be a start
3. Perhaps a missed opportunity to meet
4. The sharing of musical traditions
5. n/a

4.
1. Love to sing
   Comments: not enough light to see, hot in choir loft
2. n/a
3. too long
4. wonderful music
5. very good song leaders! Wonderful organ postlude!

5.
1. To support [one of the co-organizers]; to enjoy singing in a diverse choir
2. sight reading
3. Not vigorously promoted; Attendance could have been better
4. Diversity in the music chosen
5. Loved it!
6. 
1. Because one of the organizers is my colleague and I want to support him. It was also a ton of fun last year
2. I look forward to it each year now. I have enjoyed meeting and singing with new and old friends.
3. n/a
4. Every Praise and seeing my friends in the audience
5. Just a big Thank You!

7. 
1. I love singing to the Lord and meeting new people :)
2. A refreshed outlook and a connection into the [city event took place] community outside of [a particular university]
3. The large group had trouble staying on 1 page and it was hard to talk to everyone.
4. The amount and diversity in the group with a common goal and purpose in worship of God
5. Nope, just thanks for hosting the event, I loved it

8. 
1. n/a
2. n/a
3. That there wasn't food provided or a social event for choir members to meet outside of the choir stand
4. Singing :) and that the event was in one day :) :)
5. Nope it was a good time, though I think there could've been more communication with the [particular university's] Gospel Choir. Apparently there was and email sent out to the other choir members that [particular university]GC did not receive.

9. 
1. Love to sing
   Comments: wonderful
2. n/a
3. none
4. unity
5. more events like this

10. 
1. I enjoy singing with diverse groups of people and I wanted to support [both co-organizers]
2. Becoming aware of how other's worship services are
3. Little rehearsal
4. All the different styles of music and all the different conductors
5. Thank you [co-organizers]!

11. 
1. It sounded like a very fun experience when it was presented to me
2. It was great to be a part of such a huge choir and seeing smiles on the congregation's faces
3. Learning the music on the spot and not being 100% confident on them.
4. Singing with other who love Christ
5. Super fun/different experience.

12. 
1. it seemed like a great experience and the [particular university] Gospel Choir was required to come
2. Togetherness, musicality, and being able to share such a wonderful experience with other people
3. Nothing, this was an entirely positive environment
4. Everyone donating their time and efforts to be here, sing, and enjoy God's word.
5. n/a

13. 
1. People in our choir recommended it
Comments: Everything in my view depended on preparation, clarity of conducting and energy and skill of our conductors
2. Learning new music and experiencing new kinds of conducting
3. A couple conductors did not prepare well
4. The conductor of Perfect Praise and Every Praise. It was a joy to sing with the conductor of Perfect Praise.
5. I appreciated the efforts of all the music students who worked so hard!

14.
1. love the Music and the Fellowship
2. Spiritually uplifting
3. n/a
4. Fellowship
5. n/a

15.
1. it is the best vehicle for community involvement
2. Learning and Singing by Rote. Movement to the Rhythmic aspects of the selections
3. Being able to hear various sections when at full power. Balance of instruments w/ Maya Angelou's voice -- words lost (pity)
4. Singing and rehearsing under various conductors
5. Would enjoy working next year in helping to organize the event

16.
1. Unity in this community
2. Another opportunity to expand cultural horizons
3. None
4. Enthusiasm and Love for God
5. n/a

17.
1. It was such a positive event last year: a very moving, learning and ecumenical experience
2. A time of enjoyment in singing with a talented diverse group of singers and conductors; understanding better technique of singing another culture's music
3. Conductors forgot to give us directions ("sit")
4. Singing Gospel Music
5. If we could have a social (everyone bring a snack/drink) time (maybe right after rehearsal) it would give opportunity to meet others

18.
1. So enjoyed the Unity experience, was interested in having another opportunity to sing with a diverse choir
Comments: Think all were cohesive
2. exposure to a variety of music with diverse singers for self and family
3. Really did not meet other singers, but still was very positive
4. Variety of music, great energy and diverse group
5. n/a

19.
1. I love music and it would be a great to sing and hear a variety
2. n/a
3. n/a
4. n/a
5. Do this more than (once) a year! It was GREAT!

20.
1. Enjoyed the musical selections and directors last year. I am missing the 5pm confirmation Mass and Bishop's visit because I think this is so important. My choir director at my church gave me her blessing kind of LOL :)
Comments: Thank you -- I love this massed choir event! :)
2. Personal joy, improved sight reading and choral pedagogy.
3. none
4. Location, parking
5. I'd be willing to bring refreshments next year. Congratulations [one of the co-organizers]!

21.
1. I am interested in learning new music in style that are less familiar to me. It will also great to meet new people
2. Having a better understanding of how others express their faith through music. It has also exposed me to other types of leading/conducting/teaching
3. The fact that rehearsal of some pieces was sometimes rushed
4. Having a fun, new experience with mostly strangers.
5. This was a very worthwhile, educational, fun, and important experience to have. Thank you and keep it up!

22.
1. An opportunity to sing praises
2. Enjoying choral music even more than before
3. Could have had a little more rehearsal -- entrances, seating/standing, etc.
4. Opportunity to sing NEW types of music
5. Would love to learn more about how traditional church music evolves into modern gospel music.

23.
1. To help [both co-organizers] -- I love to sing :)
2. Advancing my singing skills
3. It was all great!!
4. The cohesiveness
5. Keep up the great work. I wish we could do another concert. :)

24.
1. For fun / to support [one of the co-organizers] to sing w/ a unique group of singers
2. Learning new music / enjoying singing w/ new people / working with a variety of directors / learning that this kind of experience could be a dissertation topic
3. Seating arrangements (minor issue) / more people in congregation would have been nice!
4. n/a
5. Could leaders provide advertising materials to local churches e.g. script Newsletter information/poster a month ahead etc. press releases / Would it be possible to have even 30 mins of punch and cookies together? It would give even more foundation for relationships, etc. (or maybe you want the music to do it all?...)

25.
1. Wanted to experience singing new music and meet new people
2. Community and friendship
3. Wasn't long enough!
4. Made new friends and learned new music
5. Continue this please! It's an amazing event!

26.
1. I had a great experience last year
2. Bringing various ethnic groups and various ability groups together
3. not enough time to rehearse
4. The program was great!
5. The men and women who prepared us did a wonderful job of bringing cohesion to the group

27.
1. I love to sing; what a wonderful experience
2. Sharing music with others in the community that I've never sang with. Very Inspirational!
3. Only 1 day long. Do more. Wish more audience to share the experience.
4. Singing! Seeing what can be accomplished in just a few hours.
5. Awesome job! Hope this continues for many more years!

28.
1. Because I love to sing and was intrigued by the diverse music
2. Wow that music was SO fun. I really want to start regularly singing in a choir again.
3. There wasn't enough people in the audience :(
4. Everyone who was here LOVED it.
5. Gotta get more publicity - with other churches, schools, etc.

29.
1. Fun!
2. Reinforcing the joy of singing with others
3. none
4. Singing with others who thoroughly enjoy singing
5. Sing in such a "choir" is a pleasure because everyone truly "supports" everyone else, Acceptance of everyone's strengths and weaknesses.

30.
1. Have done this many times
2. I enjoy the different pieces of music we sang and learning the manners in which they should be sung
3. being able to see the conductors during the event
4. Singing praises with one accord
5. n/a

31.
1. For the opportunity to do a rehearsal and performance within one day
2. Comments: A translation of Siyahamba was not provided in rehearsal
3. Provided the opportunity to sing new choral music with a new and diverse group. This is something that I will encourage my church to join in next time.
4. The pace of learning required to perform well.
5. The pace of learning required to perform at all
6. This is a great way to introduce forms of worship to the greater [city where event took place] community. Especially so if more churches are involved in further "[name of event]."

32.
1. n/a
2. n/a
3. n/a
4. n/a
5. n/a

33.
1. Because it was so much fun last year
2. I love singing with people I don't know
3. It was disorganized at times. Lots of people in the choir were late and it was disruptive. Needed more practice on some pieces
4. Talking to the wonderful people on either side of me
5. n/a

34.
1. Gave me a wonderful sense of Grace last year!! Thank You!! God is so Good!
2. It is such a community of faith -- How can you sing and not feel His power!
3. Nothing
4. Being with others in one community and singing with such Love and Grace
5. More please!

35.  
1. Seemed like a wonderful multi-cultural event  
Comments: Had a great time  
2. Everyone shares the joy in singing. The pace of rehearsal was so efficient that it was hard to socialize but I enjoyed help from my neighbors.  
3. n/a  
4. n/a  
5. n/a  

36.  
1. To have a different experience  
2. n/a  
3. Not allowing practice for people who don't read music  
4. Joining in song with people from other races/religions, etc.  
5. n/a  

37.  
1. Because I love singing and it is beautiful singing in larger choirs. It is a blessing and it is soulful.  
2. It uplifted my spirit  
3. n/a  
4. I got to sing new songs that I will share with the rest of the choir members  
5. We should do this more often  

38.  
1. I love to sing, especially with those who I've never sang before  
2. Getting to meet different people from all walks of life  
3. Should of have at least 2 rehearsals  
4. Getting to lift up the name of Jesus through song, sitting next to folks I've never met before  
5. Would've love to sing 'Amazing' by Ricky Dillard as the last song instead of "Every Praise" (since we sang it last year)  

39.  
1. For the new experience  
2. n/a  
3. none  
4. People of all race and join in singing different types of music  
5. n/a  

40.  
1. I love to sing in choirs  
2. n/a  
3. Lack of community turnout  
4. Variety of participants in choir, all colors, ages, professionals, etc.  
5. Just Keep Singing!! :)  

41.  
1. I thought that I would enjoy the experience  
2. Community  
3. none  
4. Everything  
5. I enjoyed it immensely!
42.
1. Because I feel a need to encourage all races to worship together -- it makes worship feel more meaningful
   Comments: I especially felt moved by "Perfect Praise." The cohesiveness and power of all the races was so
   compelling and I felt such a strong spirit of love and community.
2. I want to do this more! I feel it is such an important and needful activity. More! More! MORE!
3. n/a
4. n/a
5. n/a

43.
1. Experience last year
2. Community spirit, Christian spirit
3. Smaller congregation than hoped for
4. Great group music making
5. n/a

44.
1. Enjoy singing religious music
2. Renewing the Holy Spirit
3. none
4. Sing the Praise of God
5. Keep it up

45.
1. I love to sing. I think [one of the co-organizers] is pretty nifty and I strongly believe in faith, equality, & love of
   all mankind
   Comments: During the postlude, we were all busy "together" writing!
2. Reminding me how much music & song can bring people together
3. A little more practice might have been nice, but just about NOTHING!
4. All of it!
5. n/a

46.
1. Because I love congregational song!
2. Exposing me to other church community choirs and traditions, and showing me how to unite a group quickly and
   effectively through music.
3. When we rehearsed "For All the Saints" and there was a feeling of frustration between the two choirs. Also the
   separation of a "trained choir" and the larger group was not beneficial to the overall goal of equality.
4. When we finished learning "Every Praise" and the choir all clapped when we finished because we all had
   accomplished something together that was worshipful and beautiful.
5. n/a

47.
1. [one of the co-organizers] asked me to. I love him, [the other co-organizer] & church music of all kinds.
2. Realizing how limited we are when we are sanctioned off in our races denominations
3. Stuffy temp. in the room :)
4. Being together & singing
5. Loved it.

48.
1. To perform, plus it's cool to perform with diverse groups of people
2. I got to interact with different people
3. Not being together on some songs
4. Worship!
5. n/a
49.  
1. Have always wanted to sing with a Gospel Choir  
2. n/a  
3. n/a  
4. n/a  
5. n/a  

50.  
1. I love singing and Jesus and saying yes  
2. Unity of believers  
3. It was difficult to meet new people  
4. singing to the Lord with other believers from all over  
5. Thank you for putting on this event  

51.  
1. Joy  
2. Joyous experience  
3. None  
4. Everything  
5. Love singing that Gospel  

52.  
1. I enjoy singing in choirs singing diverse music  
2. Bring you to my day  
3. feeling more practice might have made for a better service.  
4. Glorious music! Loved the praise songs and the Haydyn and IWMS [It is Well]  
5. Keep doing this  

53.  
1. Ideas for a choir director of small church. Participated last year. Great experience for big group singing  
2. Experience of a group sing -- experience of diverse music  
3. The conductor and his attitude during rehearsal -- For All the Saints. Piece was great -- but he didn't get it.  
4. The unity of so many voices / reader of the reflection / Maya Angelou poem / Perfect Praise!  
5. The lively gospel tunes were enjoyed by all! White folk don't allow themselves to "let loose" and praise God w/ movement & clapping. Every Praise and It is Well w/ soul done last year/ How about Worthy is the lamb? Too bad not more audience.  

54.  
1. I love to sing diverse styles of music  
2. Energy, lots of energy  
3. Long practice  
4. Great music and cooperation  
5. Great day, thank you!!!  

55.  
1. It was so much fun last year. And [both co-organizers] are good people. And I like the concept  
2. It was fun to share music that is not indigenous to my own background  
3. not enough prep time  
4. singing fun music  
5. n/a  

56.  
1. Sister invited  
2. Learning music quicker than normal  
3. Speed of presentation of songs - not time for going over a few rough places  
4. the sound of the choir; meeting new people
5. great job!

57. 
1. I enjoy the music
2. I enjoyed singing different styles of music.
3. Very difficult to hear all vocal parts
4. We had fun
5. Do it again!

58. 
1. Spiritual fulfillment
2. I came looking for spiritual fulfillment and found it
3. It was warm during the performance
4. the music arrangements and the music selections
5. n/a

59. 
1. To support the cause of unity
2. Good day
3. Musical standard too low. If music is an offering to God, it should be the best-regardless of genre
4. Enjoyable exposure to diverse styles
5. I am uncomfortable "performing" before an "audience" in the context of worship. This clashes with my understanding of worship.

60. 
1. n/a
2. n/a
3. n/a
4. n/a
5. n/a

61. 
1. I love to sing. I wanted to support ecumenical events. I do my best to support [a particular university’s] graduate students of music/conducting
2. Confirming that more of us need to appreciate each other's music instead of criticizing it.
3. Too hot in the sanctuary
4. The music was not "brow beaten" we were allowed to enjoy the event
5. Bravo! Would love for you to present a condensed version of your dissertation to my church.

62. 
1. I heard from friends who came last year that it was a wonderful experience
Comments: Wonderful experience - hope to participate next year
2. Increased understanding of other ethnic traditions. All God's people are beautiful and can make beautiful music together!
3. n/a
4. Sharing music outside our tradition & being a part of a diverse group
5. n/a

63. 
1. I enjoyed the fellowship and challenge last year so much I wanted to do it again. Also I don't like saying no to [one of the co-organizers]
Comments: I think fellowshipping should be a stronger theme. Perhaps a lunch after can help foster a feeling of reaching across racial/ethnic lines w/ other ppl.
2. It is challenging because I don't know how to read music that well and I'm typically not familiar with the hymns.
This event is an opportunity to expand my horizons.
3. This rehearsal felt more rushed than last years
4. The warm smiles from everyone.
5. I also think it'd be good to explain to attendees the background of how the ensemble came together and what role the audience is expected to play / Increase promotion/publicity

64.
1. Enjoy singing in a group. This is a fun outing to do with my wife today!
2. Experienced a different type of singing and with a diverse group
3. I did not see any negatives
4. Learning many songs in a short time and being able to sing with and next to some very good singers. Also, enjoyed a sense of comradeship and fellowship.
5. Would love to sing again next year! Thought the leadership was outstanding. We all appreciate the tremendous work that they put into this program.

65.
1. Because my Gospel Choir ([particular university]) participated and I wanted to learn and sing gospel/hymns in one day for enjoyment
2. Meeting new people of a variation of ages and singing new music that I have never seen before but really liked
3. Having the chairs so close to each other made movement slightly restricting
4. the nice fellow singers & positive music
5. Every Praise to our God was my favorite song, great repertoire was picked for this occasion.

66.
1. I believe in the cause of coming together to sing. Plus, [one of the co-organizers] is a friend
2. I want to do it again and will strongly encourage my choir to come (even more so than this year)! / Increased respect of different traditions, especially musically. What is important to me is that whatever style is sung it should be done WELL, and today's rehearsal/concert did that!
3. Very little to say about negative stuff-the rehearsal went well with the exception of SINE NOMINE / wish more folks were in the congregation. Shouldn't fill out surveys during the organ postlude -- especially if it's BACH! :)
4. Pacing, director's positive attitude and encouragement, openness (more than 1, I know)
5. Kudos!!

67.
1. Because I love singing
2. n/a
3. n/a
4. n/a
5. n/a

68.
1. Opportunity to experience something new. Meet more people from the [city where event took place] community
2. Learning new literature & style
3. Very little preparation for performance
4. Singing Amazing music w/ a new community of people
5. Thanks for doing this!

69.
1. My gospel choir is pretty much all here
2. I was exposed to a wide range of music, and met people I wouldn't have otherwise interacted with
3. There were pieces that weren't as together as they could have been given more rehearsal time
4. This was so fun it didn't seem like 3 ours had passed
5. n/a

70.
1. It's important. It's something that doesn't happen in any other venue
2. I'm going to make sure it continues and happens elsewhere!
3. too much [particular university]
4. Cooperation and experience
5. n/a

71.  
1. I enjoy singing with diverse groups and learning new music
2. I hope we do it again next year.
3. n/a
4. The music; the conductors & the fellowship
5. Thank you!

72.  
1. I love to sing
2. n/a
3. n/a
4. Excellent
5. n/a

73.  
1. I love to sing…it's as simple as that; however, the bringing together of diversities and praising God is why I am here!! :) 
2. Oh my goodness! This was one of the most amazing experiences I have EVER had!!! I grew up in a religion that didn't sing so openly…it was so FREE-ING to sing to the Lord the way I've ALWAYS felt should be!!! :) 
3. I have nothing negative to share :) 
4. I enjoyed the spirit in which this whole choir experience was conducted. I felt only love and a oneness in purpose.
5. I can't wait until NEXT YEAR!! I am so heart happy!!! :)

74.  
1. Support an important community event
2. Singing music I wouldn't normally sing
3. n/a
4. Seeing the possibility of more unity in our community
5. n/a

75.  
1. Because I love to sing all kinds of music that makes people happy
   Comments: This was a wonderful experience! I missed the first one, but I'm so glad I made this year.
2. Meeting new people, sharpened my sight singing skills and brought a wonderful fellowship
3. I couldn't last longer!
4. Learning new music
5. Thank you [both co-organizers]! I enjoyed it all! Thank you for bringing The Heavens Are Telling back to my memory. Thank you for allowing me to hear the Rogers for the first time in 10 years.

76.  
1. I wanted to do it last year, but was unable to participate. I enjoy sing good church music of any style!
2. Having the opportunity to sing in a large choral ensemble; singing in styles with which I am less familiar (Gospel)
3. lack of adequate preparation of "For All the Saints" (which I love). "Cohesion" isn't possible when folks are wondering when to start singing!
4. Singing "Perfect Praise" was a treat!
5. The 3-hour rehearsal left me quite hoarse vocally. I really like the eclectic mix of good church music (hymns, anthems, sacred songs)

77.  
1. For the love of music and song, and the joy in bringing community together
2. Having the opportunity to meet new people and bring one voice to music in our community
3. n/a
80.  
1. I enjoy many kinds of choral music and feel this event will provide helpful experience for my future career as a music educator  
2. Helping me become more aware of other genres of religious music I don't have experience with  
3. n/a  
4. The sense of community between singers  
5. Please do it again next year!

81.  
1. I thought it would be a fun event  
2. I got exposure to all kinds of music; Loved it.  
3. n/a  
4. I will be attending several services across [city where event took place] due to the people I met.  
5. n/a

82.  
1. I was [pips] for special Christian music choir event & new people/direction, to enjoy & musicians who love the Lord  
2. n/a  
3. nothing  
4. Smiles, music, wonderful music & leadership  
5. was fun and Christ centered

83.  
1. I had the time, thought it would be fun, and I wanted to get more experience singing in front of people  
   Comments: I didn't notice any weakness in social cohesion in any of the selections. There was a strong sense of community overall  
2. I would do it again. Very enjoyable. The leaders were excellent. Great vocal workout.  
3. There was a woman in my section that was quite rude to me during practice in the morning. She didn't show up for the evening performance so I guess she dropped out. Guess she was just having a bad day. She said my perfume was too strong and she couldn't sit next to me so she moved to another row. No one has ever told me my fragrance was too strong in my whole life - until her. She must be very sensitive to smells.  
4. The leaders of the event were so enthusiastic and made you want to perform and have fun.  
5. Hope you do this every year.

84.  
1. Enjoy making music with others  
2. Look forward to doing this again next year
3. nothing
4. Singing many styles of music
5. n/a

85.
1. n/a
   Comments: Hold more concerts combining minorities and whites
2. 1. Singing in a "black" church; 2. Meeting African Americans
   3. Experiencing the many talents of instrumentalists and conductors
   4. Enjoying the involvement of the school of music with community singers :)
3. none
4. Singing in [name of church] AME Church
5. Concert needs to be advertised more. School of music and its wonderful organizers, please, continue holding concerts in minority churches including Muslim temples. Congratulations!

86.
1. I like to sing
2. I felt very moved by some of the Hymns in tonight's program. I fell liberated to praise the Lord in this space.
3. Not having enough time to memorize the music and sing out of the score
4. The spirit of compassion and "togetherness" with all in attendance.
5. I really enjoyed this experience. I hope to have the chance to do it again! Thank you.
Greetings Ryan,

How good to hear from you!

Thanks for your request. I am pleased to give you permission to reproduce this. I can't recall the chart in the Yale publication, but have attached the "official" one for your use.

All best,

Michael

C. Michael Hawn, D.M.A.
University Distinguished Professor of Church Music
Director, Sacred Music Program
Perkins School of Theology
Southern Methodist University
Dear Ryan,

Thank you for your message. On behalf of the Iona Community, in this instance GIA grants you permission on a gratis basis to reprint the text as described in your request in the email thread below in order to fulfill the requirements of your academic endeavor, provided you cite the author, publisher and copyright information appropriately in your dissertation.

This message may serve as a written record of your permission. Best wishes for your work.

Regards,
Kyle

Kyle Cothern
Associate Permissions Editor
GIA Publications, Inc.
7404 S. Mason Ave.
Chicago, IL 60638
phone: 708-496-3800 x49
fax: 708-496-3828
kylec@giamusic.com

On Mar 23, 2015, at 2:52 PM, Ryan Luhrs, ryanluhrs@yahoo.com wrote:

Hello:
I'm writing to request permission to include the two lines of text from John Bell's 'God Welcomes All' in the appendix of my PhD dissertation entitled: Singing for Social Harmony: Perceptions of Choral Singers During Intergroup Contact"

Can you provide any advice on how I should proceed?

Thank you,

Ryan Luhrs
Ph.D. Candidate in Conducting/Choral Music Education
Florida State University
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