Democratic Approaches for the Choral Ensemble: Repertoire Choice and Rehearsal Design

ROBERT C. JORDAN

Robert C. Jordan is a course instructor in music education and applied music instructor in organ and voice at Teachers College, Columbia University. The author previously conducted middle and high school choir and band for twenty-one years in Michigan public schools.

Early in my teaching career, a mentor offered me some advice that would radically change and eventually distinguish my pedagogy. He encouraged me to choose repertoire *with* students instead of *for* students. Now, my mentor was a very successful choral music educator and a trusted advisor, but his proposition seemed strange. When I was a student, conductors selected their concert programs, and the idea of offering my input to my conductors seems unimaginable. So, why did I take this mentor's advice? Essentially, because I was burning out. My wick blazed brightly at the beginning of my career, but the fire was all-consuming.

In hindsight, I see that my exhaustion was fueled in large part by my controlling personality hidden (or so I thought) within a teacher-centered and autocratic convention. I was on track to join the many novice teachers who quit within their first five years.[1] I see now that my need for regulating every aspect of the classroom was denying students experiences that reflected their backgrounds and interests as well as their investment in the rehearsal process. I needed to try something different, so I took my mentor's advice and ran with it. Seventeen years later, my middle and high school students—over 500 students in nine choirs—were choosing all their performance repertoire and designing their own rehearsal processes. I view this transformation to student-led repertoire selection as pivotal to my formation as a conductor and music educator, and yet in looking back, I was really challenged with the task of how to begin.

Certainly, choosing repertoire with students could be an important part of a culturally responsive choral practice, but I had only one model. Why did I trust this mentor, I wonder? These students did not instinctively know how to collaboratively choose repertoire. They were not accustomed to teachers asking them to make meaningful choices that affected their instructional experiences. I mean, should *they* trust *me*? It turns out, they were very keen to try.

They presented their repertoire suggestions including their considerations of how the music might match our skill level and diversify our programming (see "Applying Repertoire Selection Criteria" below for more details for guiding students in choosing repertoire). I was beginning

to learn that dialogues like these are an important part of how teachers "make ethical decisions about what is taught and learned in schools."[2] Yet in the beginning, I was an inexperienced facilitator of dialogue, and students were unsure about how to participate. Some of the approaches I tried seemed to draw students into participation, while others created distance between us. We started slowly with supports tailored to their musical experience and my familiarity with democratic classroom methodologies such as small or large group discussions, deliberative forums, and strategies that build consensus. In the end, I found that my most successful strategies evolved slowly, responding naturally to each school year's new community of students.[3]

My mentor's suggestion to choose repertoire with students came at a time when music educators were beginning to think carefully about what it means to be culturally responsive, and authors including Vanessa L. Bond,[4] Julia Shaw,[5] and Tiffany Walker[6] have since described what cultural responsivity might look like in the choral classroom. Simon Hill added significantly to this discussion in the February 2021 issue of the *Choral Journal* by considering critical pedagogy's potential to transform choral music education.[7] He presented three problems that "serve as broad examples that may be encountered by most choirs…viewed through the primary lens of a key component of critical pedagogy[8] to examine in greater detail how each component can be applied."[9] But Hill cautioned, "How one choir practices critical pedagogy may not look the same as another choir."[10]

With this in mind, I would like to add to this conversation with two practical strategies addressing two of the problems identified by Hill: repertoire and programming, and the hierarchical structure of conductor and singer. My strategies were shaped through my own engagement with critical pedagogy, and as such, they represent specific understandings played out in one classroom and are therefore not generalizable. But by sharing them openly, I hope to add to other teachers' stories of commitment to critical and culturally responsive pedagogies. When combined, these stories may encourage others to consider critical pedagogy's potential to transform their practice. By describing some of my most reliable strategies in this article, I suggest that we can not only develop our cultural responsivity but also our students' understanding of democratic procedures.

Sharing Power When Choosing Repertoire

When students and I engaged critically with repertoire choice, we learned more about each other, relationships were strengthened, and student engagement flourished. At first, students were unfamiliar with democratic classroom practices in the choral setting, let alone issues of power like "The [music] teacher's ability to determine the repertoire used contributes to the notion of implicit power."[11] In a democratic music classroom, critical thinking might mean "reaching a 'good judgment,' one that is based on criteria and debated in a community of inquiry toward a common understanding with the possibility of compromise."[12] When we choose repertoire with our students, informed debate guided by criteria is a great place to start, but who determines the criteria?

I decided to choose a given set of criteria and then guide students in a discovery of what criteria they would like to keep, develop, add, or remove. I hesitate to prescribe a fixed set of criteria, knowing that others' teaching contexts will invariably be different than mine. Instead, I offer a description of my own starting place as a choral teacher striving toward democratic ends.

Designing Repertoire Selection Criteria

Julia Shaw used principles of culturally responsive teaching to generate criteria for repertoire selection by posing a set of questions for ensemble directors.[13] Students and I adapted questions from Shaw (the first four Program Criteria below) and then co-created others that worked for us.

Program Criteria that Impact Student Growth

Does this music:

• build upon students' prior experiences?

• capitalize on students' cultural knowledge?

• allow students to experience through their preferred learning styles?

- showcase students' culturally informed performance styles?

- contribute something new to the ensemble's performance set?

- provide challenge and opportunities for growth?

- align with student-selected concert themes?

Compositional Criteria of the Repertoire

Is this piece appropriate in terms of:

- voicing/instrumentation?

- range/tessitura?

- technical/conceptual complexity?

- duration/length?

- lyrics/languages?

- notational systems?

- available instructional time?

Applying Repertoire Selection Criteria

Repertoire selection has driven ensemble-based pedagogies in the past, and regardless of the approach, choices are always rooted in what music to include or exclude. To help students begin their own search for repertoire, I demonstrated how to use music publisher web-based resources—i.e., online perusal scores and recordings. It was important to engage students in conversations about how these resources imply a chosen canon—primarily western art music. Discussing whose music is included (and excluded, and by whom) prompted the search for publishers that represent composers marginalized by race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, ability, and so on. Later, I asked students

to select music and share links to their repertoire suggestions. Before reviewing their recommendations as a class, I modeled how students can listen to opposing viewpoints with the intention to understand by following the lead of Nicholas M. Michelli and Tina Jacobowitz, who suggest that students can be shown how to "respond to differing points of view by explaining one's position and listening to understand other positions."[14] Nicholas M. Michelli and Tina Jacobowitz state:

> Learning to give valid reasons and support for our positions is an important intellectual skill and central to our role in a democratic society. Responding to other points of view does not mean abandoning one's own view, if arguments for it can stand up in a community of inquiry. One frequent outcome… is compromise, an essential piece of democratic living.[15]

Students shared how their repertoire suggestion might develop the choir's musical experience. They instinctively moved beyond our selection criteria and described how particular compositions enriched their consideration of culture, social justice, and community music making.

I was able to engage with this process while still prescribing some of the repertoire for our choirs. After all, simply listening to a recording of a potential piece of music does not always reveal to students the potential enjoyment that can be found when learning and performing the piece. Still, part of the process outlined here moves beyond prescription and invites us (teachers and ensemble conductors) to suggest our own thoughtful arguments when recommending repertoire for our students' consideration. I was obliged to deeply consider whether my repertoire proposals were based solely on my extensive training in the Western European classical musical tradition or confined to the music in our school's choral music library—purchased by me and my predecessors, who like me were White and middle class.

What About Festivals?

Some performance opportunities such as choral festivals sponsored by state music associations prescribe repertoire or styles. Pieces chosen for such festival repertoire lists are not immune from an open-ended discussion of musical merits, shortfalls, and suitability. I echo my earlier suggestion that reflecting on whose music is included in (and excluded from) these repertoire lists is important. This reflection could in-

clude sharing composer biographies and photographs along with an examination of time periods, contextual analyses (historical, social, and cultural), musical styles, and textual clues (including languages). Before singing in district and state choral festivals, I found it helpful to lead students, all of whom familiar with these types of events, in a discovery of the benefits and costs of participation given the prescriptive repertoire and implied exclusions.

Students felt that positive outcomes—educative feedback from respected adjudicators via critical commentary and clinic sessions, performance opportunities in exceptional acoustics, and opportunities to hear and form relationships with other choirs from across the state—overshadowed the limitations—dress code requirements that privileged affluence and required repertoire representing mostly Western European and American (predominantly White) composers.

After these strengths and weaknesses were debated and ultimately accepted, students and I developed solutions for our concerns. For example, the school provided uniforms free of charge that affirmed all students' gender expressions, and the Eurocentric classical repertoire chosen for festival was complemented with a variety of musics throughout the rest of our programming year.[16] I openly shared the festival repertoire lists with students and explained how the music was chosen and classified. Our state organization required ensembles to sight-read at the difficulty level of their performance repertoire, so we had meaningful discussions about what was best for the ensemble. Ultimately, I invited students to listen to the repertoire in that category and suggest titles for consideration.

Sharing Classroom Power: Dialogue and Consensus

Naturally, teachers cannot relinquish all their power because they still have the positional authority as evaluators;[17] however, choosing repertoire with our students can facilitate an improved balance of power. With guidance, students can practice democratic repertoire selection and, if they choose to, share their cultural backgrounds in the process. Hill reminds us:

> It should never be assumed that a person of a certain demographic will feel seen or heard by singing a piece of music from that demographic. Praxis—in this case the choice to program music from a

particular demographic within the choir—should always be informed by meaningful dialogue.[18]

Ideally, we could choose all repertoire this way, but those who are less familiar with this process may decide to begin slowly, perhaps with just one student-selected piece per concert. Regardless of how a particular community chooses to begin this work, the critical dialogue between teacher and students is a powerful and rich opportunity for growth, yet dialogue for dialogue's sake does not provide a fail-safe course to a more democratic or culturally responsive classroom. Randall Allsup and Heidi Westerlund highlight a potential problem:

> Dialogue, after all, is not inevitably moral in and of itself, and the differing solutions that arise from a given classroom discussion can result in a laissez-faire practice of music teaching and learning where [say] representation of difference is proxy for multicultural virtue; or where "voice" is just that—the hearing of another's voice, rather than the receiving of something otherwise unknown and unconsidered.[19]

The manner in which students come to a consensus is also potentially problematic. For instance, a majority vote is fast but privileges…well, the majority. In our classroom, we often began with as many as thirty suggested songs to consider. In each round of discussion, we attempted to reduce our selections by half through critical discourse until we reached the desired number of pieces for the concert program. As the adult in the room, it was necessary for me to do my best to create an environment where students could feel represented. However, even though I work to acknowledge them, I am limited by my own privilege and background.

One possible solution: as the class engages in discussion, ask willing students to assist as ombudspersons, watching for evidence that student voices are being silenced or dismissed. By alternating this role among ensemble members (I emphasize again, among those who are comfortable with this responsibility), an attempt—although imperfect—can be made for all voices to be heard. No one method for reaching consensus will work for all situations, so I encourage the consideration of methods that balance who makes the final decision with procedures that involve all students in the process.

Do I Have Time for This?

Before moving on, I should acknowledge a potential criticism of the strategies discussed so far. When presented with a new instructional approach, I remembering saying, "I don't have time for this! There's already too much content and too little time; our concerts must take priority." Some ensemble directors may resonate with this statement, but after I tried the power sharing strategies above (and especially those below), I realized we could energize our rehearsal time for improved musical learning while engaging with critical pedagogy. In other words, our limited instructional time made democratic practice crucial for increasing musical outcomes while striving toward cultural responsivity—although, the latter is arguably far more important than concert readiness. To demonstrate, I will next highlight democratic procedures that improved our listening and performance skills for more efficient and engaging rehearsals, creative and responsive performances, and stronger, long-lasting interpersonal relationships.

Sharing Power When Choosing How Repertoire is Performed

When I saw the positive impact that student-driven repertoire selection had on our classes—students sharing their opinions and cultural backgrounds, listening to their peers, and working together to find consensus—I began to wonder about other ways I might share power with students, thus developing an even stronger learning community. If students deserved a voice in repertoire choice, why not also the responsibilities (power) of artistic interpretation and co-designing of the daily rehearsal process? In this section, I will introduce a second democratic approach for the choral ensemble, potentially more difficult to visualize than the first. Consequently, I will start by presenting the framework that helped students begin this work.

Adapting a Festival Performance Rubric When Creating Performance Criteria

Our state music association's performance rubric criteria (i.e., tone quality, pitch, rhythm, diction, interpretation, etc.) shaped the scaffolding that helped students make interpretive choices and design rehearsal processes for reaching their goals. As before, students discussed what criteria to keep, develop, add, or remove. Once performance criteria were chosen, we created visual icons for each with poster board, bulletin board displays, digital post-it notes, or a set of index cards. If each student has their own set, the latter could be used as a nonverbal, formative feedback tool during rehearsal. Another tech-savvy version of this formative assessment might invite students, alone or in pairs, to engage with rehearsal criteria using anonymous, web-based platforms (e.g., Poll Everywhere, Socrative, and Survey Monkey) via their mobile devices.

When applying the performance criteria to their own performance, students in our choirs were often overly-self-deprecating, and their comments sometimes blurred the line between humor and "trash-talk." Harsh criticism of musical performance is an occasionally celebrated part of reality television and perhaps goes a long way toward presenting denigration as entertainment. Whatever the cause, students' critiques were not always constructive and could stop our rehearsal process in its tracks. In response, I decided to model how to critically apply performance criteria to our music making by practicing with an unknown ensemble's recording, and fortunately, their critiques became more substantive and less mean-spirited.

During and after listening to the unknown recording, students began to use the visual icons they created to organize and present their critique. In order to narrow the focus, I asked them to identify two criteria that were successfully achieved and two that needed refinement. Students can share their opinions *en masse* using their performance criteria icons or web-based platforms. Beginning first with the successes, students took turns sharing the reasoning behind their choices.

In our largest choirs, we did not always have time to hear from every student each time we went through this process. In these cases, we developed ways to make sure each person had an opportunity to share at least once per class. After we surveyed what was challenging the choir, we narrowed the group's opinions to just one or two challenges to address as a group. Listening to anonymous recordings, especially those of our repertoire, exposed students to new interpretive choices they had not before considered. Because of this unexpected dividend, we continued to listen to recordings of unknown ensembles throughout our rehearsal process. This practice kept our interpretive palates fresh and evolving and was enriched by intentionally seeking out recordings by ensembles that were both more

and less experienced than our choir.

I added a few additional steps when we applied performance criteria to our own performance recordings. I helped students learn a portion of their repertoire in ways that best suited their learning and engagement styles as well as the authentic transmission and performance styles of the repertoire: aural, oral, notational, etc.[20] Jacqueline Kelly-McHale augments this discussion:

> A culturally responsive music educator should approach music with the understanding of its context and history. However, it should also be understood that replication is not necessarily responsive. Recreating with the understanding of the song as representative of a culture opens up a democratic space as well as a culturally responsive one.[21]

After learning a section of the piece, we recorded our performance and listened as a group. After celebrating their successes, we discussed how to address the two challenges they identified. Depending on students' independence in this regard, we either co-created new strategies to address these challenges or used a more teacher-directed approach. For example, if tone quality or rhythm was a challenge, we applied the techniques, well-established in our rehearsal strategies, that were best suited to the challenge. If students did not know how to approach the challenge, I provided more support.

Afterward, we re-recorded the revised portion, listened, and determined if any improvements were noticed, then repeated the process until the group was satisfied. We may have gone through this process five to ten times an hour depending on the length of the recorded sections. When we applied this process to our rehearsals in an honest and committed way, we experienced many positive outcomes—a stronger relationship as collaborators, familiarity with democratic classroom practices, and improved opportunities for student voices to be heard—all while maintaining conventional successes like a well-developed performance schedule, high marks at choral festivals, and growing enrollment. I want to highlight that when this iterative process became an integrated part of our music making, students could adjust their performance in the moment, responding to their peers, director, and accompanist while adjusting for unforeseen factors like performance errors, unfamiliar acoustics, and audience disruptions.

De-privileging my own power as a conductor has been

a conscious, evolving process over the course of my seventeen years of teaching public-school choral music. Although I remained true to my commitment to choose all of our repertoire democratically, I sometimes neglected our collaborative rehearsal approach. It can be easy for music teachers (like me) to allow previous patterns of controlling the rehearsal to creep back into our practice. I allowed us to slip from five recordings an hour to four, three, two, one, zero. I acknowledge my teacher power when I say "I allowed." My power allowed me to permit a decay in our work that students did not challenge. Afterall, they trusted me. They did not question me when I allowed the rehearsal power to slip from their hands back into my own. Of course, when used in moderation, teacher-directed instruction can be useful if the teacher's behaviors model ways of learning. But my relapse cost us some of our new-found musical growth and did nothing to relieve the fatigue that caused my slacking. After acknowledging my slip, we began the work again, but rebuilding what was lost reminded me that it is often easier to persevere than start over.

Conclusion:
How Did This Affect Students and My Practice?

When I began to incorporate these democratic strategies into our choir rehearsals, I found that students participated in more conversations, voiced more opinions, and shared more about their identities and backgrounds. They used their developed listening skills to inform their performance in the moment in rehearsals, concerts, improvisations, and informal creative spaces inside and outside of school. The class time devoted to meaningful democratic practice helped students learn repertoire faster with longer retention. They generated their own refinement strategies and required fewer teacher-directed solutions toward independent, life-long music making. As we engaged in this work, students connected these positive outcomes—collaboration, cultural responsivity, democratic practice, engagement, and problem-solving—to other disciplines and settings.

Before closing, I want to acknowledge something that may still seem unlikely or even impossible. One might presume that our performance quality decayed when our rehearsals shifted from a teacher-directed to a more student-directed approach. But our performances and holistic musicianship *improved* because we had meaningfully integrated these approaches into our classroom procedures.

These kinds of changes take time, but even early on, we started seeing positive outcomes, and sharing the work made our time together more enjoyable. I am not sure if students were motivated to practice their choral repertoire outside of class any more than they did before we adopted these democratic approaches, but I do know that by changing our pedagogy over time, we accomplished more and more in each rehearsal.

Naturally, these are my own perceptions, so for an external perspective, I can share a few anecdotes and festival evaluations that speak to our instructional efficiency and performance qualities when these democratic approaches were fully integrated into our routines. For me, choral festival adjudications provide only a partial assessment of a choir's performance, but I include them here because they represent an evaluation with which many readers of this journal are likely familiar.

During my last year of secondary choir teaching in Michigan, one of our un-auditioned, extra-curricular high school ensembles performed at district choral festival in the most difficult repertoire category after rehearsing only one hour a week for eight weeks.[22] This choir, representing grades 9–12 and a wide range of musical experience, received high marks including one perfect score. In another example, our auditioned, curricular advanced mixed ensemble learned Will Todd's *Mass in Blue*, a challenging large work, during a short, six-week rehearsal cycle that included other repertoire in addition to the *Mass*.[23] This choir also attended district choral festival in the most difficult repertoire category and received high marks and one perfect score.[24] Now, it should also be stressed that the students learning the *Mass* were mainly juniors and seniors who had been in our choirs for many years, so I admit that this sort of independent and democratic choral learning does not happen overnight, but for our choirs, it was possible when these approaches were imbedded into the curriculum meaningfully and over time.

So, how did we reach these milestones while sharing power in the classroom? I knew that students had different degrees of readiness for the democratic approaches I have described in this article; each choir needed a different balance between teacher-directed and student-directed approaches. I, too, needed time to adjust to a new instructional balance of power, but my comfort and competence improved as I became a more experienced facilitator. Earlier, I suggested that someone new to student-led repertoire selection might begin with only one student-selected piece

per concert program. Similarly, with democratic rehearsal strategies, we can choose to begin slowly and allow our comfort—our students' and our own—to develop naturally. I believe that the approaches described here have the inherent potential to improve the quality of our music making. In a democratic ensemble-based context, this potential arises from students' developing musicianship, self-actualization, and engagement with repertoire that they were empowered to choose and interpret in ways that are relevant and meaningful.

If the ideas presented above work well for the members and conductor of a choral ensemble, there are three important considerations to keep in mind. First, "before dialogue can become a method whose means and ends are ethically organized…diversity needs to be understood as a moral good whose ideals guide the practice of teaching."[25] Second, it will be necessary to re-evaluate selection and performance criteria with students regularly in order to remain culturally responsive. Third, creating a trusting learning community takes time and small steps. The ideas discussed in this article may work differently for others, but reflecting on these strategies may generate original ideas for designing classroom procedures that are more democratic and culturally responsive, leading to new pedagogical stories for us to share. When teachers acknowledge and share power with *all* of their students, both can be transformed, and their students' may see themselves better represented in music curricula in authentic and meaningful ways. CT

NOTES

[1] Karen J. DeAngelis and Jennifer B. Presley, "Toward a More Nuanced Understanding of New Teacher Attrition," *Education and Urban Society* 43, no. 5 (September 2011): 598–626, https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124510380724.

[2] Randall Allsup and Heidi Westerlund, "Methods and Situational Ethics in Music Education," *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 11, no. 1 (March 2012): 141, accessed January 25, 2021, http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/AllsupWesterlund11_1.pdf.

[3] I use the pronoun "my" instead of "our" (my students' and mine) because I am the pedagogue who was planning the strategies, even though they were intended to be student-centered.

[4] Vanessa L. Bond, "Culturally Responsive Teaching in the

Choral Classroom," *Choral Journal* 55, no. 2 (September 2014): 8–15, https://www.jstor.org/stable/43917026.

⁵ Julia Shaw, "The Skin We Sing: Culturally Responsive Choral Music Education," *Music Educators Journal* 98, no. 4 (June 2012): 75–81, https://doi.org/10.1177% 2F0027432112443561.

⁶ Tiffany Walker, "Repertoire & Resources World Musics and Cultures Addressing Contextual Information in Multicultural Choral Repertoire," *Choral Journal* 61, no. 4 (November 2020): 57–61, https://acda-publications.s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com/CJ/November2020/WalkerNov20.pdf.

⁷ Simon Hill, "Critical Pedagogy and the Choir," *Choral Journal* 61, no. 7 (February 2021): 6–11.

⁸ Critical pedagogy is an educational philosophy that equates social justice and democracy with teaching and learning. For more information, see Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed: 50th Anniversary Edition,* trans. Myra Bergman Ramos (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2018).

⁹ Hill, "Critical Pedagogy and the Choir," 8.

¹⁰ Ibid., 10.

¹¹ Jacqueline Kelly-McHale, "Democracy, Canon, and Culturally Responsive Teaching: Blurring the Edges in the Music Classroom," in *Giving Voice to Democracy in Music Education: Diversity and Social Justice,* ed. Lisa C. Delorenzo (New York: Routledge, 2016), 219.

¹² Nicholas M. Michelli and Tina Jacobowitz, "Why Do We Educate in a Democracy?: Implications for Music Education," in *Giving Voice to Democracy in Music Education: Diversity and Social Justice,* ed. Lisa C. Delorenzo (New York: Routledge, 2016), 43.

¹³ Shaw, "Skin We Sing," 76.

¹⁴ Michelli and Jacobowitz, "Why Do We Educate," 42.

¹⁵ Ibid., 42.

¹⁶ To take it one step further toward social justice, student letters that question the merits of problematic repertoire could be written to the festival's repertoire selection committee.

¹⁷ Stephen D. Brookfield, *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher,* 2nd ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2017), 15–36; Patricia Cranton, *Understanding and Promoting Transformative Learning: A Guide to Theory and Practice,* 3rd ed. (Sterling, VA, Stylus Publishing, 2016), 84–87.

¹⁸ Hill, "Critical Pedagogy and the Choir," 8.

¹⁹ Allsup and Westerlund, "Methods and Situational Ethics," 142.

²⁰ Shaw, "Skin We Sing," 77–78.

²¹ Kelly-McHale, "Democracy, Canon, and Culturally Responsive Teaching," 227.

²² For more context on the musical difficulty referred to here, this ensemble selected and performed *Prayer of the Children,* words and music by Kurt Bestor, arranged by Andrea S. Klouse, published by Alfred Music Publishing; and *When Music Sounds,* words and music by Victor C. Johnson, published by Hal Leonard Corporation.

²³ Will Todd's *Mass in Blue* is published by Oxford University Press.

²⁴ For more context on the musical difficulty referred to here, this ensemble selected and performed *Lamentations of Jeremiah,* music by Z. Randall Stroope, published by Alliance Music Publications, Inc.; and *Ave Maria (Angelus Domini),* music by Franz Biebl, published by Hinshaw Music, Inc.

²⁵ Allsup and Westerlund, "Methods and Situational Ethics," 142.