

## Call for Proposals – Special Issue

### International Journal of Research in Choral Singing

The IJRCS seeks proposals for a special issue titled “Profiles in Choral Singing” or “Place-Based Choral Music-Making.” The special issue will contain 5-6 articles each describing a unique case of choral singing around the world. Articles will be published in the “short-form” of 10 pages double-spaced, not including references and may contain up to one image. Collaborations between practitioners (choir directors) and writers (researchers) are encouraged, particularly when such a collaboration produces a manuscript which might not otherwise be feasible. Submissions may describe the work of other people in other settings, or they may describe one’s own work in a particular place and time in the present or past. The timeline for submission to [ijrcs@gmail.com](mailto:ijrcs@gmail.com) will be:

Proposals due: August 1, 2026

Authors notified of acceptance: September 15, 2026

Manuscript due for editorial board review: December 15, 2026

Feedback to authors: January 15, 2027

Final draft submission due: February 15, 2027

Beyond the criteria above, submissions should otherwise adhere to the journal’s general submission [guidelines](#) and must not be under current consideration or previously published at another journal. The format of the proposal and final manuscripts, if accepted, should include a description of the locale, the founding and subsequent successes and challenges, leadership structure, pedagogy, performance structures, and choir membership. Proposals may or may not cite specific ethnographic or historical research methods. Critical Incidence Analysis may be useful for extended reflection on the setting. Proposals will be evaluated using the attached rubric.

#### 2026 EDITORIAL BOARD

Rebecca Atkins – University of Georgia (USA)

Cara Bernard – University of Connecticut (USA)

Melissa C. Brunkan – University of Oregon (USA)

Kelly Bylica – Boston University (USA)

Alfonso Jesús Elorriaga Llor – Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain)

Jason Goopy – Edith Cowan University (Australia)

Melissa L. Grady – The University of Kansas (USA)

Rhonda Hackworth – University of Mississippi (USA)

Jamey Kelley – University of North Texas (USA)

Marci L. Major – West Chester University (USA)

Stephen A. Paparo – University of Massachusetts Amherst (USA)

Antonis Ververis – University of Ioannina (Greece)

Justin J. West – University of Texas at Austin (USA)

Motje Wolf – Editor-Elect and 2026 SRCS Program Chair, De Montfort University (England)



## Rubric for Evaluating Abstract Submissions

2027 Special Issue, International Journal of Research in Choral Singing (IJRCS)

Each abstract is evaluated on a 20-point scale across the five criteria below. Suggested scoring: 4 = Excellent | 3 = Strong | 2 = Adequate | 1 = Weak | 0 = Not Evident

---

### 1. Relevance to the Special Issue: \_\_\_\_ points

Evaluates the degree to which the abstract aligns with the theme of *place-based or underrepresented cases of choral singing around the world*.

- **4** – Clearly presents a distinctive case of choral singing; strongly reflects global, cultural, or context-specific significance.
  - **3** – Shows good relevance with a reasonably clear connection to unique or culturally situated choral practice.
  - **2** – Topic is loosely relevant; “special case” aspect is implied more than articulated.
  - **1** – Only marginally relevant to choral practice or global/cultural contexts.
  - **0** – Not relevant to the theme.
- 

### 2. Clarity and Coherence of the Proposal: \_\_\_\_ points

Evaluates the clarity of the argument, purpose, and scope for a short-form article (10 pages max).

- **4** – Abstract is exceptionally clear, logically structured, and well-focused; objectives and anticipated contributions are explicit.
  - **3** – Mostly clear and coherent; minor questions about framing or structure.
  - **2** – Understandable but unfocused, incomplete, or vague in key areas.
  - **1** – Unclear, disorganized, or difficult to follow.
  - **0** – Lacks meaningful clarity or structure.
- 

### 3. Contribution to Knowledge or Practice: \_\_\_\_ points

Evaluates the significance of the proposed article for research, teaching, or practice in choral singing.

- **4** – Offers a compelling new insight, underexamined case, or innovative practice with clear value to the field.
  - **3** – Promises a solid contribution with reasonably original or useful insights.
  - **2** – Contribution is modest or common within existing literature.
  - **1** – Contribution is minimal or unclear.
  - **0** – No identifiable contribution.
-

#### **4. Methodological or Reflective Soundness: \_\_\_\_ points**

Evaluates the strength of the approach—whether ethnographic, historical, descriptive, practice-based, or analytical.

- **4** – Clearly describes an appropriate and feasible approach for a short-form scholarly article; methods or descriptive strategies are sound and realistic.
  - **3** – Approach is generally appropriate, though details may be limited.
  - **2** – Methodology or descriptive plan lacks detail, coherence, or feasibility.
  - **1** – Approach is poorly defined or unsuitable.
  - **0** – No discernible approach.
- 

#### **5. Collaboration, Context, and Authenticity: \_\_\_\_ points**

Evaluates the degree to which the abstract reflects depth of contextual understanding, practitioner–researcher collaboration (if applicable), and respect for the community described.

- **4** – Demonstrates strong grounding in context; collaboration between practitioners and researchers is evident or intentionally addressed; reflects ethical, authentic engagement.
  - **3** – Shows good contextual grounding and/or hints at collaboration or authentic connection.
  - **2** – Context is mentioned but could be better developed; collaboration unclear or absent.
  - **1** – Minimal contextual depth or evidence of practitioner involvement where appropriate.
  - **0** – No attention to context or collaboration.
- 

#### **Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_ Points**

**17–20:** Highly competitive; strong fit for the issue.

**13–16:** Competitive; consider with revisions or further clarification.

**9–12:** Possibly appropriate but requires significant development.

**0–8:** Not suitable for this special issue.