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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the values that music educators apply to the selection of wind band literature. Specifically, the study examined twelve elements of quality and suitability in the wind band field that influence the selection of literature. Participants were selected from educators teaching middle school, high school, or both in the state of Florida during the 2004-2005 academic year.

Participants (n = 237) were grouped by level of education, level of instruction, and total years taught to determine which elements influence the selection of literature. Twelve elements, including six elements of quality and six elements of suitability, were selected for their relevance to determine appropriate performance literature including instrumentation, the experience level of an ensemble, utilitarian purposes, and external influences.

Data were collected in an online survey. The Survey on the Selection of Wind Literature had four sections. The first section was the rating of the twelve objective elements on an individual basis measuring their importance in the selection process using a Likert-type scale. The second section was the ranking of the twelve elements considered as a group to determine their overall relative importance in the selection process. The third section posed multiple demographic questions. The final section consisted of three optional and anonymous open-ended questions.

In both the rating and ranking sections, three elements of suitability, experience level of ensemble, instrumentation of your ensemble, and amount of available rehearsal time, in that order, were most important to literature selection across all analyses of the data. In general, the elements of suitability were rated and ranked consistently higher than the elements of quality. The results of the study suggest that elements of suitability are considered more important than elements of quality when selecting literature to be performed by school ensembles.

Recommendations for future research and implications for music education are discussed.
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Many conductors and music educators agree that the selection of appropriate music for school-band ensembles is a critical part of the wind band curriculum. Battisti (1972) stated, “We hurt music and our students when we fail to use the very best literature (p.30).” There are numerous books, journals, and articles that list, rank and suggest how to identify appropriate literature. However, the term *appropriate* is not clearly defined.

The term *appropriate* is often used by conductors in reference to the process of selecting music literature. The term is used to indicate what *should be* rather than what is. The music *should be* appropriate to the instrumentation of the ensemble, *should be* appropriate to the experience and ability level of the ensemble, and *should be* appropriate for festival standards. Also of importance are the notions that an audience could be entertained, or that students might have an aesthetic experience. The term *appropriate* can be defined in numerous ways.

The definition of literature’s *appropriateness* is important to the conductor because of its effect on the selection process. How a conductor perceives *appropriateness* will have numerous ramifications on curriculum and instruction. For example, if wind band conductors select literature based solely on state or national music recommendation lists, then the selection process becomes narrowly focused. Such lists may act as a starting point, but clearly more widely based criteria should be utilized.

The word *appropriate* is something that is used with a distinctly subjective understanding. Numerous questions may be considered in this regard. What *is* appropriate literature? Is the literature *suitable* for a particular student, school, or ensemble? Is it music *appropriate* for achieving a particular end? Are compositions meant for, or adaptable to, a specific occasion or use? Can literature lists be standardized? Are these factors universal or particular to specific situations?

Benstein (1992) stated, “The repertoire you select establishes the band’s course of study. Just as the English teacher includes certain authors, books, and literary devices, the
conductor selects compositions that will teach specific concepts and fulfill musical goals” (p. 38). Does this same standard exist in music education? Reading and discussing outstanding literature has long been considered the mark of an educated person, and certain authors and their works have been recognized as the basis of any world literature curriculum such as Sophocles, Dante, and Shakespeare.

**Quality and Suitability**

Music educators are faced with the task of balancing *quality* and *suitability* during the process of selecting literature. The process is often a source of confusion. A composition that is regarded as *quality* literature is not always a *suitable* composition for an ensemble. For example, Hindemith’s *Symphony in B-flat* is considered by many professionals in the wind band field to be a work of the highest *quality*. However, issuing this masterwork to a beginning middle or high school band may not be *suitable* for those players to achieve that level of *quality* required by Hindemith’s composition.

The opposite can also be true. A composition that is deemed *suitable* for wind band is not always a composition of *quality*. Several compositions that have been created for educational or instructional purposes may not be considered works of *quality* because of their limited use of musical elements. For example, the compositions in a band method book may be *suitable* to learn how to play durations of notes, but these works lack musical elements that would characterize the work as one of *quality*.

In the examples above, *suitability* was defined by the ensemble’s level of experience. An advanced high school or college-level ensemble may have the *suitable* players to perform Hindemith’s *Symphony in B-flat* at the appropriate level of *quality* demanded by the work. However, these ensembles may have the experienced players, but may lack the instrumentation or rehearsal time necessary and thus the piece becomes *unsuitable* for that ensemble, but the work itself does not lose its properties of *quality*.

In this sense, the properties of *quality* are defined by the composition itself. As music educators, the challenge is to determine what those properties are, and how to identify them in familiar and unfamiliar compositions. Once a level of *quality* is
established, the wind band director should then determine the work’s suitability for the students they are teaching.

**Need for Study**

A need exists to refine and define definitions for quality and suitable literature. Musicians might casually agree that the two terms share many components, but in practice a distinction does exist. Does suitable mean educational or teachable? Does quality mean the best or good enough?

Williams (1998) surveyed high school Florida band directors on wind band literature that is available for performance in an adjudicated festival environment. They were asked to rate the elements of why the work was selected and its importance to being selected. Williams’ results “from the survey indicate that elements with the highest indicators of importance are musical quality, educational value, appropriateness for the musical abilities of the ensemble, director preference, and appropriateness for the technical abilities of the ensemble. Survey elements concerning student preference, solo opportunities, suggested by colleague, rating potential, and previous performance experience” (p. 84) had low mean scores.

The existing literature suggests that it is the responsibility of the conductor to select wind band literature that demonstrates musical quality, and at the same time, does not exceed the technical and musical abilities of the ensemble, and create an educational value for the ensemble. This suggests that the conductor must know a large portion of existing wind literature, and must be aware of the new compositions created for the ensemble.

Widespread growth of wind band compositions has produced a renewed emphasis on this selection process. Academic courses are offered in wind literature and score study, but often these courses are not a required part of the degree program due to the number of other required courses. An examination of instrumental methods and pedagogical literature failed to reveal standard criteria for either quality or suitable literature in the wind band field. Therefore, it seems relevant and important to attempt to address issues related to suitable and quality elements of literature.
Statement of Purpose

The goal of the present study is to survey a population of current band directors stratified into three groups: (1) level of education; (2) level of instruction; and (3) total years of career experience to find what objective elements influence the selection of literature. Twelve elements, six elements of quality and six elements of suitability, were selected from prior research. To accomplish this task, an online survey was created to facilitate the collection of data from the participants.

Research Questions

The following research questions were investigated in the survey:

Research Question #1: Are there differences in which elements influence the selection of literature between participants?

Research Question #2: Are there differences in which elements influence the selection of literature between those band directors who have earned a bachelors and those with a graduate degree (Masters, DMA, or PhD)?

Research Question #3: Are there differences in which elements influence the selection of literature between those band directors who are employed at a high school, middle school, or both?

Research Question #4: Are there differences in which elements influence the selection of literature between those band directors who taught in the profession for a maximum of six years, between seven and sixteen years, or seventeen or more years?

Limitations

Participants for the present study included the 2004-2005 membership database of the Florida Bandmasters Association. The list included existing FBA members teaching middle school, high school, or both levels in the state of Florida. Participants for the present study were limited to those members who had functional or active email accounts, and could access the online survey through an Internet browser.
The present study was designed as an initial investigation into the values that affect the literature selection process. The survey was conducted as a non-experimental design with no control group. As such, generalizations to the larger population should be made only with extreme caution.

**Definitions**

The term *suitable* (or *suitability*) refers to pedagogical functionality of music education within the public school band or instrumental environment.

The term *quality* refers to the structural components in a musical composition.

The term *appropriate* (or *appropriateness*) refers to the application of individual values by instrumental music conductors in the process of selecting literature for educational and performance purposes in an academic setting.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Appropriateness of music literature is determined by subjective perceptions. These perceptions are based on an individual’s knowledge of, and experience with, available material. Other disciplines, such as English, have established different methods of determining the appropriateness of literature using more objective techniques.

The Selection of English Literature

English literature has a long tradition of established approaches for selecting literature. English teachers determine curriculum, like their counterparts in music, through the selection of specific literature for study. By examining the process of selection established by those teaching English literature, music educators may find similarities and differences.

One method is to use various evaluated literature lists. These lists have been approved and/or ranked by a body of experts for various levels of reading depending on different factors. In 1997, the California State Board of Education approved new English-Language Arts Content Standards. In that same year, the California public schools adopted Recommended Literature: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve, finding the text to be important in the consideration and selection of the titles. Recommended Literature: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve is a resource for supplemental English-language arts instructional materials that teachers can use to extend and deepen students’ understanding and facility with a wide range of English-language arts standards. The recommended titles reflect the quality and the complexity of the types of material students should be reading at school and outside of class according to the English-Language Arts Content Standards of California. For example, the quality and the complexity of the recommended titles for Kindergarteners have the following criteria:
(1) Word Analysis, Fluency, and Systematic Vocabulary Development

Students know about letters, words, and sounds. They apply this knowledge to read simple sentences.

(a) Concepts About Print
1. Identify the front cover, back cover, and title page of a book.
2. Follow words from left to right and from top to bottom on the printed page.
3. Understand that printed materials provide information.
4. Recognize that sentences in print are made up of separate words.
5. Distinguish letters from words.
6. Recognize and name all uppercase and lowercase letters of the alphabet.

(b) Phonemic Awareness
1. Track (move sequentially from sound to sound) and represent the number, sameness/difference, and order of two and three isolated phonemes (e.g., /f, s, th/, /j, d, j/).
2. Track (move sequentially from sound to sound) and represent changes in simple syllables and words with two and three sounds as one sound is added, substituted, omitted, shifted, or repeated (e.g., vowel-consonant, consonant-vowel, or consonant-vowel-consonant).
3. Blend vowel-consonant sounds orally to make words or syllables.
4. Identify and produce rhyming words in response to an oral prompt.
5. Distinguish orally stated one-syllable words and separate into beginning or ending sounds.
6. Track auditorily each word in a sentence and each syllable in a word.
7. Count the number of sounds in syllables and syllables in words.

(c) Decoding and Word Recognition
1. Match all consonant and short-vowel sounds to appropriate letters.
2. Read simple one-syllable and high frequency words (i.e., sight words).
3. Understand that as letters of words change, so do the sounds (i.e., the alphabetic principle).

(d) Vocabulary and Concept Development
1. Identify and sort common words in basic categories (e.g., colors, shapes, foods).
2. Describe common objects and events in both general and specific language (California Department of Education, 1996).
(2) Reading Comprehension

Students identify the basic facts and ideas in what they have read, heard, or viewed. They use comprehension strategies such as generating and responding to questions, comparing new information to what is already known, etc. The selections in *Recommended Readings in Literature, Kindergarten Through Grade Eight* (California Department of Education, 1996) illustrate the quality and complexity of the materials to be read by students.

(a) Structural Features of Informational Materials
1. Locate the title, table of contents, name of author, and name of illustrator.

(b) Comprehension and Analysis of Grade-Level-Appropriate Text
1. Use pictures and context to make predictions about story content.
2. Connect to life experiences the information and events in texts.
3. Retell familiar stories.
4. Ask and answer questions about essential elements of a text.

(3) Literary Response and Analysis

Students listen and then respond to stories based on well-known characters, themes, plots, and settings. The selections in *Recommended Readings in Literature, Kindergarten Through Grade Eight* (California Department of Education, 1996) illustrate the quality and complexity of the materials to be read by students.

(a) Narrative Analysis of Grade-Level-Appropriate Text
1. Distinguish fantasy from realistic text.
2. Identify types of everyday print materials (e.g., storybooks, poems, newspapers, signs, labels).
3. Identify characters, settings, and important events.

These recommended titles of literature are intended for use by teachers, library media teachers, public librarians, parents, and students. At every grade level, the reading comprehension strand of the English-Language Arts Content Standards calls for students to read and understand grade-level-appropriate material and, by the end of high school, to reach the specific goal of reading two million words annually on their own (California Department of Education, 1996).

Another method of selecting literature is based on specific pedagogical systems. For example, the Norton Anthology of English Literature: Norton Topics Online (2005)
offers twenty-eight topics ranging from the Middle Ages to the 20th Century for study and discussion as their primary teaching approach to literature selection.

Some educators are trained in the Reading Recovery method (Reading Recovery Council of North America, 2004). They are educated to understand and administer the Reading Recovery Book List as apart of their pedagogy. Books on the Reading Recovery Book List are organized along a continuum of 20 levels, ranging in complexity from simple texts to stories similar to those found in first and beginning second grade readers.

Each book that was reviewed for possible inclusion on the 2004 Book List (Reading Recovery Council of North America) was evaluated to see how well the book supports strategic development. Some of the questions posed by the reviewers were:

- Does it have appropriate text features for particular levels?
- Can the child engage in problem-solving and practice fluent reading?
- Does it represent ethnic, cultural and language diversity?
- Does it have a storyline that is of interest to children?
- Does it have quality illustrations?
- Is the book itself constructed using quality materials?

In addition to the methods for pre-teacher education, there are associations designed to help current teachers with the selection of literature. An example would be the Strategic Literacy Initiative at WestEd in Oakland, California. In 1995, a multi-year professional development effort was initiated to support middle and high school teachers by designing and studying the impact of literacy-focused professional development materials and processes.

The center of professional development for the Strategic Literacy Network is a guided and carefully structured inquiry process built around what is known as literacy learning cases (SLI at WestEd, 1995). The cases consist of video and text-based interviews of students. These literacy-learning cases provide an in-depth perspective into student reading and reasoning that is useful given the high student-to-teacher ratios in most public secondary schools. These cases not only provide teachers with insight into students' reading errors and challenges, but also provide a closer look at the strengths and theories about reading that students use to make sense of selected texts.
By analyzing the reading strategies and strengths of students, teachers are able to generate ideas to help students understand the texts assigned in school. Across the varied cases, teachers have the opportunity to observe that students approach and read different texts quite differently, that reading is situational, and that students' reading of one text will not demonstrate the full range of reading strategies and skills they may actually have at their disposal (SLI at WestEd, 1995).

This approach is called generative professional development (SLI at WestEd, 1995) and is designed to: (1) inform, and potentially transform, teachers' basic conceptions of and approaches to teaching reading in their discipline, (2) provide teachers with practical, immediately useful strategies for classroom application, and (3) support and enable teachers to generate classroom implementation, assessment, reflection, and refinement of classroom practice.

Another method of selecting literature is to check readability. Readability (Johnson, 1998) refers to all the factors that affect success in reading and understanding a specific text. These factors include interest and motivation of the reader, legibility of the print and any illustrations, and the complexity of words and sentences in relation to the reading ability of the reader. There are four main methods of objective readability assessment.

The first is the Question & Answer technique (Johnson, 1998). Pupils of different ages are given a text to read. They are then questioned to assess the level of comprehension and hence determine the reading age. This is can be impractical for practicing teachers due to the amount of time it takes to evaluate the students properly. Professional development organizations, such as the Strategic Literacy Initiative, are accommodating in this type of readability assessment.

The second is sentence completion known as the Cloze technique (Johnson, 1998). This method is student specific and time-consuming. The Cloze Technique is a good indicator of a particular student’s likely performance with a particular book, analyzing the textbook against the individual student.

The procedure starts with three passages selected of at least 100 words each. The selections should be from near the front of the book, near the middle of the book, and near the back of the book. The three passages are transferred to a word processing
application to insure the word count totals. For each passage, every fifth word must be
counted and boldfaced. This becomes the “key” for the three passages.

Replacing the boldfaced words with an underline, select another student who is in
the same grade level in which the textbook is used. Allow the newly selected student to
answer the blank spaces where the boldface words used to be. Accepting any synonyms
or words that mean essentially the same as correct, use following formula to rate the
student’s performance:

Percent = Number Correct divided by 20
Rating : 0 – 30 Percent equal Frustration Level
         31 – 49 Percent equal Instructional Level
         50 Percent and over equal Independent Level

The third is a comparison of text against a standard word list. The percentage of
words not included in a word list is determined and the reading age calculated from this.
Well-known examples are the Dale-Chall and Spache tests (Johnson, 1998).

The Spache Formula (Johnson, 1998) assesses the difficulty of a passage by first
computing two different values from the text. The first measure is the average number of
words per sentence that is calculated by dividing the total number of words in the passage
by the total number of sentences in the passage. The second measure used by the Spache
Formula is the percent of words in the passage not found on the Spache Revised Word
List. These values are placed into a formula to compute the Spache Readability Index for
the sample passage.

Like the Spache, the Dale-Chall Formula (Johnson, 1998) assesses the difficulty
of a passage by first computing two different values from the text. The first measure is
the average number of words per sentence that is calculated by dividing the total number
of words in the passage by the total number of sentences in the passage. The second
measure used by the Dale-Chall is the percent of words in the passage not found on the
Dale Word List. A formula computes a raw score. A raw score to grade equivalent
conversion chart is consulted to come up with a grade equivalent reading score.

The fourth uses calculations involving the sentence length and number of
syllables. These objective measures of readability are now widely used. They are
formulae (or graphs) that are based on an enormous amount of research evidence. A
readability formula predicts the reading level of the text. This is expressed as a chronological age and is accurate to about one year. The reading level (reading age) predicted indicates that an average reader of that age could comprehend the text. There are well over 200 such tests including Fry’s *Elementary Reading Instruction* (Johnson, 1998).

Edward Fry, formerly of the Rutgers University Reading Center, created one of the most widely used, and easy-to-use readability graphs for educators. Randomly selecting three 100-word passages from a book or an article, Fry plots the average number of syllables and the average number of sentences per 100 words on his *Working Readability Graph* (Johnson, 1998) where the two lines intersect. The area where the point is plotted determines the approximate grade level. If a great deal of variability is found, putting more sample counts into the average is desirable.

**Music Literature Resources**

Wind band conductors rely on a variety of sources to identify what literature to select. Fred (1981) compiled a “valuable bibliography of selected references in the field of band literature” that can be used in the selection process. In many states, conductors can choose literature from a listing of accepted literature to be performed for various district and state festivals. These lists are continuously changing based on the emergence of new literature and the editing of the existing list usually through the efforts of an elected committee. Wind band organizations have created wind literature lists to assist band directors.

The fourth edition of *The National Band Association’s Selective Music List for Bands* (1997) is the third revision since the creation of the list in 1980. This present edition includes specific objectives not addressed in previous editions. The first objective was to amend the previous list by having both the eight member NBA Selective Music List Committee and an *ad hoc* committee, composed of forty-three band directors across various teaching levels, identify any compositions unknown to any of these musicians. Fifty-eight works, not recognized by at least one member of this group, were deleted from the previous list.
The NBA Selective Music List Committee accomplished four other objectives. These were: (1) to delete old transcriptions that no longer represented the best of the composer or arranger, (2) to add new music representing the best of the material published since the second revision in 1990, (3) to update the lists of all winners of the various band music composition contest (whether or not the music has been published), and (4) to make corrections to the second revision as deemed necessary by the committee and the editor.

In all three revisions of *Selective Music List for Bands* (1997), the criteria for inclusion and grading of the compositions remained constant. The list includes no concert marches except a very few major works, solos with accompaniment, or rental music unless from the composition contest list. Several compositions were not included because they were considered for wind ensemble instrumentation, or one on a part. All music was recognized by at least one member of the committee and all music added was deemed “worthy of being placed on a concert with sound educational goals” by more than half. All music exists in commercial or published fashion whether in or out of print.

The grading scale used for the NBA Selective List pertains to the technical difficulty of the music only and no other musical considerations. According to the NBA, technical factors are paramount in the selection of music stating, “bands with modest technical ability are capable of playing with excellent style and musicality, but cannot play music which is above their collective technical capability.” The NBA also views the grading of literature as much less subjective when style and musicality are not added in as factors. The NBA Selective Music List for Band grading scale is as follows:

- Grade 2: Technically playable by advanced grade school and “typical” good junior high school bands.
- Grade 3: Technically playable by “typical” good high school bands.
- Grade 4: Technically playable by an advanced high school band, and readily playable by college bands.
- Grade 5: Technically playable by experienced university bands with full instrumentation and the finest high school bands.
- Grade 6: Technically difficult in some or all parts for the very finest high school, university, and professional bands.

The NBA Selective List grading scale is analogous to many state lists. A common problem among grading scales is the subjective definitions of the terminology.
used to define the various grades. Words such as typical, good, advanced, experienced, etc., are vague when used to define an ensemble’s ability. Even though the NBA is specific in declaring that the grading scale is intended solely for the technical difficulty of various compositions, the fact remains that the clarity of those divisions is subjective at best.

Ferrin (1987) suggested that wind band directors should consult the following publications listing available wind literature that has been recommended by established leaders in the profession:

1) Wind Ensemble/Band Repertoire (Wallace & Corporon, 1984) was created as a reference to acquire various wind band works. In the preface, a statement is presented to explain the context of the doctrine that defined the creation of the text, “The music contained within the Wind Ensemble/Band Repertoire text should be representative of the literature which most often would be played by fine high school, college, university, community, and professional groups who seek to study and perform artistic and challenging works of a serious nature.” Wallace stated, “It is our hope that this collection will serve the professional in locating and obtaining the vast amount of quality literature which is available” (p.1).

Each entry within Wind Ensemble/Band Repertoire includes composer, full title, instrumentation, and publisher availability. Composers are listed alphabetically by last name. There are three sections to the collection and they are:

Section I – Wind Ensemble / Band
Literature for ensembles consisting totally or primarily of wind and percussion instruments, ranging in size from 6 to (approx.) 65 players.

Section II – Instrumental Solo and Wind Ensemble / Band
Literature for ensembles consisting totally or primarily of wind and percussion instruments which serve to accompany any type of instrumental solo.

Section III – Voice and Wind Ensemble / Band
Literature for ensembles consisting totally or primarily of wind and percussion instruments which include: Narrator/Speaker, vocal solo or vocal soli, chorus, and opera.
The authors specify that the term “band” represents a large instrumentation with multiple players on a part. In contrast, wind ensemble would have fewer total performers and mainly one player per part.

The preface concludes with this paragraph:

It is our belief that the value of any ensemble is directly related to the quality and quantity of its literature. It is comforting to know that in the case of music for Wind Ensemble and Band, our future has been secured by a great many composers who have given their very best to our repertoire. We would like to encourage your on-going involvement in expanding and cataloguing that which lies at the heart of our continued growth, quality literature.

Wind Ensemble/Band Repertoire never defines the term quality other than to imply that the works listed within the text are of quality. The authors stated that the focus is on literature that has been difficult to find and on works that have come to be accepted as standard repertoire. The authors do not define nor indicate standard literature except that if the work is included in the text then “…we know enough about the work to feel that it fits the guideline stated above (difficult to find or standard repertoire) or we feel that the work may be worthy of further investigation.”

2) Norman E. Smith and associates created a series of resource books (1986, 1989, 1993, 2000) that are widely used as a primary source of information about composers and compositions of wind band literature. The purpose of these books was to provide a comprehensive foundation about band music and composers. Smith wrote Band Music Notes (with Albert Stoutamire) in 1977 before retiring in 1978 to devote full time to a two-year revision of the book and a six-year period to research and write March Music Notes. In 1993, he compiled March Music Melodies. After ten years of full-time research, he completed the writing for Program Notes for Band in 1998.

March Music Notes has 380 biographies and program notes on 637 marches of the last three centuries. This book offers reference materials to those specifically interested in marches.

March Music Melodies, published in 1993, is a companion book to the internationally known March Music Notes (that is included in Program Notes for Band). The book includes complete first cornet parts for 635 concert marches collected during a ten-year period from more than a dozen nations. It is designed as a guide for band
directors, a reference for record collectors and band literature students, and a practical addition to the literature available for cornet/trumpet players and other instrumentalists.

*Program Notes for Band* (2000), the successor to *Band Music Notes*, has over 400 composers, over 1600 program notes, and 500 sketches of composers and arrangers, including 450 revised entries from Norman's previous books along with over 150 additional composers and over 500 additional works. In the 700 biographies the reader will find a summary of information on well-known composers as well as material on the lives of many others that has never been published (at the time of publication). Over 2,000 program notes include reason for the title, dedications, historical events of the time, and circumstances relating to premier performances. It should be noted that there are numerous errors of fact written within the various program notes.

It is important to note that these books were created from the idea that there was not a central resource for information on wind band composers and compositions. For example, the selected works to be reviewed in *Band Music Notes* were the result of a nationwide poll conducted by correspondence with over 200 “outstanding” school, university, service, and professional band conductors. The criterion presented to the polled musicians was to list “ten of their favorite band works selected from any time period or classification” and to send band concert programs from the last five years (1985 – 1989). Performance frequency and commonly-known works prevail in this listing.

Although the primary purpose was to provide programs notes for conductors of wind band ensembles, *Program Notes for Band* classifies compositions on a grading scale of 1 through 6 where 1 represents “very easy” and 6 represents “very difficult”. The grade is an estimate of the level of difficulty. Most of the grades were determined by “knowledgeable and experienced musicians who conducted the work” while some were estimated by Smith listening to a recording or examining the solo cornet part. *Program Notes for Band* does not classify the compositions on any scale of quality.

3) *Best Music for Young Band* (Drovak, Taggart & Schmalz, 1986) reviews music covering grades I, II, & III representing the lower half of a I through IV grading system. Grade I specifically refers to compositions that stress basic rhythms, restricted ranges, homophonic texture with ample double and tutti scoring. Grade II suggests a composition with expanding ranges, intermediate rhythms, syncopation, changing meters and fluent
technique. Grade III implies challenging rhythms, free use of syncopation, solo and sectional scoring, independence of parts, diverse instrumentation, some extreme ranges, and developed technique. The music reviews are listed alphabetically by composer in three major categories:

- **PART I - Concert/Festival Works for Young Band.**
- **PART II - Concert Marches for Young Band.**
- **PART III - Concert/Festival Works for Young Wind Ensemble.**

Each review includes grade level, performance time, publisher, and several descriptive sentences that characterize the work. This resource is directed towards the beginning band director.

The catalogue identifies band works composed with a high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit as determined by the authors. Neither craftsmanship nor artistic merit are defined, however it is stressed that the selected compositions have a variety of musical concepts such as key and meter changes, various articulation and harmonic styles, and textures and orchestrations that encourage musical independence of individuals and sections.

4) *Blueprint for Band* (Garofalo, 1983) provides band directors a curriculum guide for teaching comprehensive musicianship within the concert band. In Chapter 3, Garofalo states, “the critical factor in building a comprehensive musicianship program is the selection of a qualitative body of literature for performance and study. In the performing ensemble, the repertoire represents the foundation of the curriculum” (p.28). He continues by illustrating three primary categories that the band director should focus on when selecting literature: (1) structural elements, (2) historical context, and (3) skills development. Structural elements have to do with the composer’s proficiency and ability within the composition. Historical context refers to the consideration of the board spectrum of works and styles one should be aware of when selecting literature. Skill development is the progress the performers will have with the rehearsal and performance of the work. Garofalo recognizes that there are many “secondary” considerations such as audience appeal, student interests, and other functional and practical concerns, but he recommends focusing on the three primary categories.
Garofalo provides a method of selecting new music for performance. First, directors should keep a list of unfamiliar works. From this list, comprise a smaller list of works to study for the upcoming concert season. Using the provided “Evaluative Criteria Form for Selecting New Music” that utilizes the three primary categories, and recordings (when possible), determine the literature’s worth. 

Blueprint for Band provides band directors a list of selected repertoire, including a graded list for concert band. According to Garofalo, “only original band music by master composers is listed under 20\textsuperscript{th} Century, Romantic, and Classical periods.” The grading system is: M = Medium; MD = Medium Difficult; D = Difficult. There are no specified criteria as to what makes a composition “M”, “MD”, or “D”. However, it is stated that, “generally, this system parallels the standard festival grading system developed by the National Interscholastic Music activities Commission of the Music Educators National Conference” (p.110). The National Interscholastic Music Activities Commission (NIMAC) is an auxiliary component of MENC began to publish a selective music list that was to be used at the state level in 1952. The Commission was dissolved in 1968, however, since contest and festival were increasingly controlled by other state of regional organizations.

5) In 1996, Blocher, Cramer, Corporon, Lautenheiser, Lisk, and Miles created Teaching Music through Performance in Band. Presently in five volumes, these books take a logical step in the effort to assist the wind conductor as a “Teacher Resource Guide…designed to assist the director in providing a balanced, comprehensive, and sequential program of instruction while preparing for performance” (p. 33). More than a mere suggested list, these volumes go into detail on the criteria determined as important to the study and selection of each composition. Each composition is labeled a grade developed by the National Band Association and is analyzed by nine units including composer, composition (origin), historical perspective, technical perspective, stylistic considerations, musical elements, form and structure, suggested listening, and additional references and resources.

Cramer (1996) stated, “Just for a moment we should consider the age-old question, what comprises music of artistic merit? One must conclude the music must characterize itself by having special effectiveness or is set apart by qualitative depth and
must stand on its own” (p.8). The criteria used to evaluate literature in *Teaching Music through Performance in Band* was obtained from the application of seven questions:

1. Does the music have a well-conceived formal structure?
2. Does the music have creative melodies and counterlines?
3. Does the music have harmonic imagination?
4. Does the music have rhythmic vitality?
5. Does the music have contrast in all musical elements?
6. Does the music have scoring which best represents the full potential for beautiful tone and timbre?
7. Does the music have an emotional impact (p.8)?

**The Selection Process**

Music and Literature are alike in that they are arts presented through the sense of hearing, having their development in time, and requiring a good memory for comprehension. Brown (1948) stated that both subjects, Music and Literature, are “presented to the intellect and the emotions by means of sound; the principal difference being that musical sound is used only for itself and the sound of literature has an external significance” (p.15).

The use of literature has benefits beyond the boundaries of the classroom. Through the integration of quality literature selections into content area lessons, teachers can enrich their students’ understanding and create an atmosphere for inquiry and discussions. When literature selections are integrated into the content areas of the curriculum, students can begin to make historical and scholarly connections and gain a deeper understanding of the subject matter, specific concepts, or certain time periods. As children are engaged with quality literature, they have an opportunity to develop a greater awareness of substance and subject. Zoltan Kodaly once stated, “Children should be taught with only the most musically valuable material. For the young, only the best is good enough. They should be led to masterpieces by means of masterpieces” (cited in Prentice, p. 55, 1986). But despite this seemingly simple concept, a paradox exists related
to music of high value (*quality*) and music for teaching or performance purposes (*suitable*).

The selection of music is critical to the education of students in performance ensembles. The literature selected becomes the foundation of the curriculum applied to educational and musical goals. What makes the selection of music a complex issue is finding a balance between music that will influence the heart and music that will have an effect on the mind. Gilbert (1993) stated, “Wind conductors who concern themselves with finding performance literature of the highest quality know that their searches can be fruitful or frustrating. Obtaining reliable information about quality wind works can be difficult for a number of reasons, including infrequent performance of the work, score availability, and the unavailability of first-quality professional level recordings (p.1).” These selection difficulties require that the conductor understand the subjective and objective possibilities of each piece, and how to utilize these in rehearsals and performances.

Numerous music educators maintain the importance of choosing quality literature (Baker, 1997; Black, 1986; Dancz, 1964; De Young, 1977; Hughes, 1990; McBeth, 1989; Reames, 1995; Rosene, 1981; Spradling, 1983), but criteria for evaluation is inconsistent and subjective at best. If the selection of quality literature is to be the basis of music education, then Leonard Meyer’s (1956) philosophical question, “What makes music great?” is an important consideration in the discovery of the value of music.

The determination of quality is composed of both subjective and objective characteristics. Composer Elliot Del Borgo (1988) acknowledges that music quality is difficult to quantify or define, but he proposes that one can make objective judgments regarding how composers deal with musical phenomena in their compositions. “How well a composer balances variety and repetition to bind together the elements of a composition can be a good indicator of quality” (p.24). Musical structures and perceived emotions that compose a quality piece of literature are difficult to establish.

Defining appropriateness of music can become a confusing issue for band directors as the lines are blurred between music that is *quality* and music that is *suitable*. The term *suitable* can cover several aspects of wind band performance. *Suitable* literature for a festival or contest could mean music that has been designated to fit into a grade that
represents the technical difficulty of the work or the size of a band or school. Literature composed for a specific purpose such as a celebration, holiday, ceremony or any multitude of reasons can be appropriate if it is selected for those particular intentions. Some educational literature is designed specifically for beginners to focus on the essentials of music performance. Studies, etudes, scales, and excerpts are suitable for students to learn the particular technical aspects of their instrument. Suitability of literature can extend well beyond the debate of whether or not a composition is of high artistic quality. Sometimes the most practical considerations come into play. Williamson (1992) stated, “if the music is for young players, it is also a good idea to check the weight and grade of paper. When you consider the strange places students carry and store music, durability springs to the forefront. Will the parts be so worn after just one concert that you want to use this music again” (p.50)?

Suitable music is often the antithesis of music of high quality. The music can be quality, but it can also be suitable and visa versa. It can also be both. Menghini (1999) states, “some works should be chosen to teach specific musical skills, style and concepts. Other works might be chosen from a list of required repertoire for an event or to suit the taste of the director, but (ultimately) music should be selected to improve the band curriculum” (p.28). Finding a balance between suitability and artistic quality is one of the largest challenges facing band directors in the selection of literature process.

The Selection of Music Literature

Reynolds (2000) stated, “If you believe that a music education means much more than the improvement of technical skills, then the quality of the music played will be essential to the education of your students” (p.32). De Young (1977) stated, “For performing wind groups, the literature is the most important aspect of the curriculum. The quality and selection of which are among the most critical decisions the band director makes” (p. 26). Reynolds (2000) continued, “English literature classes do not select reading material based upon the desires of the students, but rather on the inherent value of the literature to be read. Music classes should be no different” (p. 33).
Whitwell (1965) said, “In America, the school band is the only musical medium which is supported nationwide by the government. It is the only musical medium in America that does not live in constant fear of the box office. It alone is free to perform the music of its choice” (p. 39). Mark (1982) indicates that teaching music for aesthetic development has been the focus of music education philosophy since the mid 20th century and that alone should be the compelling reason to evaluate the music quality of literature selected for performance.

The selection process is a central point of discussion for conductors and music educators. Casey (1991) interviewed over 130 music educators and determined that an important source of information to help expand our collective knowledge of appropriate literature for band is the experience and knowledge of colleagues and experts in the field. Thompson (1998) stated, “A combination of sharing ideas with other directors and listening to new pieces is the most effective method I have found to identify good repertoire” (p. 11).

Mistak (1983) investigated student preference in the selection of literature. The aspects of a composition that held the students’ attention during rehearsals was examined. Mistak concluded that soli passages throughout various sections and interesting parts other than the melody would hold student interest.

Floyd (1991) noted the challenges of the band director, “I realize that by the time one pauses to ponder the possible selections that might be appropriate for a particular group and a specific performance, much energy has been drained by fund raising, marching season, festival auditions, an endless string of busy Saturdays, and the documentation of lesson plans. Yet every band director must recognize music selection as one of the most important decisions to be made in a school year” (p.5). Directors should develop a foundation to use in the selection processes.

Reynolds (2000) said, “Often music educators get confused (I know I did in my early years) and develop the quality of the ensemble and its standing in the community and in the profession at the expense of the music education of the students. When this happens, the choice of music will be based on making the ensemble sound good rather than on the musical value of the works.” (p. 32-33). We must remember that the focus of selecting quality literature is to ensure the quality of education of our students first and
foremost. The quality of performance should be a result of this selection process and the quality education of the students.

For the director to gain experience with a composition or compositions, one should develop score study. Simply hearing a work or picking one off a recommended list does not give the conductor the required experience. In the preface of the Guide to Score Study for the Wind Band Conductor by Battisti and Garofalo (1990), Battisti stated, “…a conductor should feel some sense of responsibility for maintaining and even advancing the quality of the literature that is performed by wind bands and ensembles.” Garofalo added, “In this regard, the selection of quality performance literature encompassing all genres of music is extremely important.”

This idea of having and using a core of literature as a means of selection is a frequently found concept. Miles (1997) illustrated several models on how to select music literature. All of the different methods are based on having a core of quality music literature to either select from or cycle within other selected literature. In 1972, Feldsher purposed a list of core music for young band directors. He acknowledged that he “rehearsed and performed each of the pieces on this list” (p.64). Olson (1982) surveyed nineteen well-known wind ensemble conductors for the superior repertoire of the wind medium. His goal was to find the core repertoire that was defined as “historically representative, of artistic merit, and of a manageable number for the user” (p.11). Hughes (1990) found that “in a significant portion of the survey (high school wind) conductors articulated their core repertoire, implying that there is a body of literature that they believe students should study” (p.61).

It is suggested that developing a core of literature facilitates the selection process. Hunsberger (1984) advocated developing a sense of repertoire by learning certain “cornerstone compositions” (p.39). Ripley (1995) suggested, “To keep a file of quality music – pieces you know and ‘would love to do sometime,’ or those you have heard about but haven’t had a chance to look into yet. This list can come from the many lists of quality music now available or gathered by your attendance at concerts, listening to recordings, etc.” (p.15). Thompson (1998) believed that “it is important to return to certain pieces periodically because a director knows more about how to conduct and interpret a work each time” (p.12). Reynolds (2000) stated, “Lists can simplify the
process of selecting repertoire. Create one list of the core repertoire selections for your ensemble level and another of the core repertoire works for your medium” (p. 32). When asked how a band conductor can select the best band literature, Paynter (1990) stated, “If you can fill yourself with good music, repertoire takes care of itself, because you can then compare a new publication with the music that is already inside you. You’ll quickly reject works that are lacking the artistic merit of the music you know and love; but you’ll also be able to recognize intrinsic assets and accept them long enough to judge a new work more thoroughly” (p.6).

Quality of Literature

The wind band idiom has enjoyed quality literature since its inception. The seventeenth century is often credited with the true heritage of wind chamber performance known as Harmoniemusik. Composers such as Gabrieli, Lully, and Purcell composed for these small wind groups. Whitwell (1985) stated, “The emergence of the Harmoniemusik… would develop not only into an enormous and important literature of its own during the Classic Period, but would form the wind choir of the Classic orchestra and the nucleus of all later military bands” (p. 111). Baker (1997) maintained this belief, “From the emergence of Harmoniemusik through today’s contemporary creations, the chamber idiom has proved an abundance of quality wind literature” (p. 1).

In the 18th Century, Krommer, Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven all composed literature for wind octets in and around Vienna. Battisti (2002) identified that this repertoire includes original wind works and concerti for various instruments with wind ensemble accompaniment” (p. 4). Whitwell (1969) stated that this period is “unique in wind history…these ensembles existed primarily to perform concerts and served no functional, military or entertainment purpose. This is rare in any period of wind music, but especially so in the eighteenth century” (p. 33).

It is believed that the modern wind band originated with the French National Guard Band under the guidance of Benard Serrette after the French Revolution circa 1800. This ensemble had excellent composers such as Cherubini, Gossec, Catel, and Mehul write specifically for this organization. In Prussia, Wilhelm Wieprecht formulated
influential suggestions concerning instrumentation and section proportions of bands in 1860. During the 1800s, many quality wind band compositions were created in Europe including Mendelssohn’s *Overture for Wind Band, Op. 24* (1839), Berlioz’s *Grand Symphonie Funèbre et Triomphale* (1830), Wagner’s *Trauersinfonie* (1844), Dvorák’s *Serenade in d minor, Op. 44* (1878), Gounod’s *Petite Symphonie* (1883), Strauss’ *Serenade in E-flat, Op. 7* (1881) and his *Suite in B-flat* in 1884.

From 1880 to 1930, the American Professional Band became an important part of culture in the United States. John Philip Sousa (1854 – 1932) conducted and established the most prominent of these professional bands. The music performed by bands during the first quarter of the 20th century consisted primarily of transcriptions of orchestral literature and marches.

The first important 20th century original work for wind band was *First Suite in E-flat for Military Band* (1909) by English composer, Gustav Holst. Battisti (1995) indicated that the works of Holst, Ralph Vaughan Williams, and Gordon Jacob, known as the “British Military Band Classics,” were a new style of band composition, one that achieved a perfect balance between musical content and performing medium (p. 3). At this time, the quantity of quality wind band literature began to swell with composers, such as Grainger, Ives, Respighi, Schoenberg, Schmitt, and Stravinsky, all contributing masterworks to the band repertoire.

Another period of growth in wind literature occurred between 1945 and 1959 when composers such as Milhaud, Gould, Bennett, Hindemith, Mennin, Persichetti, Schuman, and Clifton Williams composed for the genre. During this growth period, Frederick Fennell founded the Eastman Wind Ensemble in 1952 and sent out approximately 400 letters to composers illuminating this new ensemble and its plans. Many composers responded including Grainger, Persichetti and Ralph Vaughan Williams. Battisti (1995) stated, “Fennell believed there was a genuine need for another wind instrument organization which would combine the appropriate features of the symphony orchestra, military band and concert band with regard to performance, composition and music education” (p.15). Also during the 50’s, Robert Boudreau founded the American Wind Symphony Orchestra based on the wind and percussion sections of a symphony orchestra. Boudreau’s ensemble, like Fennell’s, premiered many
new wind works, many of which were from international composers broadening the wind repertoire. Given the relatively brief history of the wind band, it is clear that quality composers have created original wind literature of value since wind instruments have performed in concert.

Between 1961 and 1966, Holvik surveyed 111 CBDNA members from all types of colleges and universities to find if there was an emerging band repertoire. He concluded that he was “of the opinion that this sort of survey should be made at regular intervals. In time, the quality of the works available to and performed by our bands certainly will improve” (1970, p.19).

In 1966, Barresi compiled a “categorized, rated, and reviewed list of musical compositions appropriate for junior and senior high school bands. The compositions were reviewed and analyzed on the basis of selected criteria…including range, meter, notation, printing, key signature, key signature changes, tessitura, chromatic problems, harmonic difficulties, and technical difficulties” (p.21). He found that out of more than 500 compositions, only 60 were accepted on the basis of the selected criteria. However, Barresi stated, “A musical composition is more than the sum of its parts and that rating of technical aspects of a piece will not suffice for judging the aesthetics of a band selection; however, such devices may and should help the band director to select his compositions for the band more intelligently and with less trial and error” (p.22). There are many models for this type of evaluation that give specific criteria for assessing the technical demands of a composition (Black, 1986; Bullock, 1981; Casey, 1991; Dancz, 1964; Del Borgo, 1988; Duskin, 1972; Feldsher, 1972; Welker, 1988).

Berry (1975) chronicled the compositions that had the highest frequency of performance by the high schools and colleges of Iowa and Nebraska from 1968 to 1972. Often the frequency of performance of a composition is viewed as another indicator of quality of music. Welker (1988) created a list that “should be a part of the well-prepared band director’s repertoire” presenting twenty-five of “the best-known and most frequently played pieces from the repertoire for high school and college bands” (p.77).

Music educator and composer Del Borgo (1988) searched for fresh ideas, harmonic material, dramatic shape, coherent ideas, and natural transitions as the elements of musical quality in compositions. “It is the combination of all these elements that gives
a composition its aesthetic impact” (p.26). One can make objective judgments concerning how composers deal with parameters in their composition, however the quality of music is still difficult to quantify or define.

Lists attempting to define quality have been created across the profession. For example, there are the state lists of Texas, Florida, and Virginia among others from which directors are required to select music to be performed, as well as the recommended lists from governing bodies such as the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) and the National Bands Association.

Ostling (1979) conducted a study at the University of Iowa to evaluate band literature solely on the basis of serious artistic merit. The intent was to establish a basic or “standard” repertoire for the wind band. Ostling developed basic principles to evaluate the quality of compositions. Some of the areas covered by these principles were: (1) balanced between repetition and contrast, (2) musical form, (3) craftsmanship in orchestration, (4) consistent quality and style, and (5) imaginative development (p. 20). The problem posed by the study required: (1) the development of an appropriate ensemble definition, and criteria for types of compositions to be evaluated, (2) a list of criteria for judging compositions in terms of serious artistic merit, (3) a collection of titles and a procedure for selecting evaluators, and (4) developing a rating scale for use in determining musical quality. The criterion for Ostling’s evaluation was acquired from music theory and orchestration books, articles, journals, dissertations, and books on music literature, and “discussions with eminent conductors concerning their own criteria for judging musical quality” (p.20). The result of Ostling’s survey is a list of wind band literature deemed outstanding in musical quality by twenty of the nation’s exemplary wind conductors.

Gilbert (1993) replicated Ostling’s original study to see what changes had occurred in the intervening years, and what new pieces now would be considered significant. One difference between the two studies was the evaluators, although five of the original twenty were available: Frank Battisti, Donald Hunsberger, John Paynter, H. Robert Reynolds, Richard Strange, and David Whitwell. Gilbert found that many of the original compositions that earned high ratings were also rated high in the replication, but the evaluators identified more than twice as many compositions as “significant works of
serious artistic merit” (p. 8) in the new study. Of the 191 identified as having serious artistic merit, 73 were common to all twenty of the evaluators.

As in the Ostling study, Gilbert suggests that these 73 common works of serious artistic merit could form a basis of literature to be used by wind band conductors (Appendix A). He proposed two approaches to utilize the suggested list. The first is for wind conductors to choose the best-known composers because the likelihood of finding recordings of these works is higher. The second method is to consider the literature chronologically. In this way, one could see the development of wind band works harmonically and structurally.

**Appropriateness of Literature**

The director must make critical judgments about the composition, its musical and technical demands, as well as the opportunities the composition provides for the technical and musical growth of the ensemble. Burnsed (1987) suggested that the band director select music that both students and conductor like, that is appropriate for the technical skill and instrumentation of the ensemble, and that can be interpreted emotionally.

Directors must differentiate between these elements to ascertain a goodness-of-fit of the composition to the conductor’s ensemble, and the director must finally accept the responsibility of choosing. Prentice (1986) concentrated on the selection of literature for young bands. She suggested that directors pose goodness-of-fit questions such as, “Does the composition fit the ensemble?” and “Does the selection show musicianship and expression as well as technique” (p.55-56)?

Directors should select literature that does not exceed the technical or musical capabilities of the ensemble. Duke & Madsen (1991) stated, “Since increasing the probability of success in a structured learning situation increases opportunities for teachers to provide approving feedback and other rewards, learning sequences that are designed to maximize the probability of student success throughout the learning process would seem to be particularly beneficial in relation to complex motor skills such as music performance” (p. 1).
In an article entitled, *Why Not Purchase Quality Music for Your Bands*, Paul Rosene (1981) suggested, “…that the next time you plan to purchase music for your band, you ask yourself the following questions. If you mainly plan to offer a high quality music experience with depth for you band members, you must answer yes to each (p.96):

1. Does my band really need this piece?
2. Will the musical composition last?
3. Does the arrangement offer both technical and musical challenges?
4. Does the music offer valuable training material for the enhancement for my students’ musical education?
5. Is the composition scored sensibly for instrumentation other than my present distribution?
6. Does the music provide a challenge for my best students?
7. Will the music motivate the weaker players in the band?
8. Do all of the above justify the cost?

Prentice (1986) recommended asking the following questions (that) will help appraise literature one is considering adding to a music library:

1. Does the composition fit the ensemble?
2. Can I teach and conduct this piece?
3. Does the selection show musicianship and expression as well as technique?
4. Will the composition be musically satisfying (p. 55-56)?

Prentice and Rosene begin to evaluate appropriateness of literature in objective terms. Both mention that the music should *fit the ensemble*. This goodness-of-fit as a standard measure is a measure of appropriateness. When selecting music for performance, Jorgensen (1992) also suggested to “Stay within the ability level of the band. Challenge the players, but do not choose works that are totally beyond their grasp” (p. 33).

Terrasi (1998) interviewed Gary Green who described the experience he had commissioning a new piece from composer Michael Colgrass. “I asked Colgrass if he would write a piece for the University of Miami, he asked what type of piece I would like. Rather than offering ideas, I suggested he visit the university and learn how the ensemble played. From that visit came the piece, and it captures the sound of our ensemble perfectly. The work has a transparent texture and each part can be heard
clearly, even in the loud sections” (p.14). The criterion of texture can be another factor in determining appropriateness. A clear texture can allow each student the opportunity to hear more and develop his or her mind’s ear. Green also stated, “I try to choose compositions for school ensembles that are scored for clarity, so each part stands out. If every part is fortissimo throughout a piece, students cannot hear themselves and will not improve. Compositions should help students discover more about themselves as musicians…” (p.14).

Robinson (1995) stated that one of the most difficult tasks facing band directors at any level is that of choosing appropriate music for their groups (p. 10). When Ellis (1997) asked if he could identify specific criteria in the selection of music for a concert, wind conductor Kenneth Bloomquist responded, “It has to be good music, or good for the ensemble to play, or has terrific audience appeal. Another consideration is whether a piece will sustain the interest of students over the course of several rehearsals. The ability of the ensemble is also an important factor when selecting compositions” (p. 12). Indeed, the ensembles’ ability, size, and instrumentation have no bearing on quality of music, but on the quality of the performance of that music. However, factors such as ability, size, audience recognition, and student interest, do influence the appropriateness of music literature.

**Summary**

As documented in this review of literature, prior pedagogues have established that numerous factors determine appropriate literature including instrumentation, the experience level of an ensemble, utilitarian purposes, and external influences. Prior authorities have also established multiple factors in determining quality such as criteria for assessing the technical demands of a composition, form, and other musical phenomenon. Historic perspective also indicates that quality literature does exist and is recognizable by contemporary musicians and music educators. These variables have been incorporated into the current study.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

This study explored the values used by music educators to select wind band literature. A survey was created to examine the elements of quality and suitable literature among public school instrumental music teachers. Since quality and suitability are highly subjective, it was necessary to establish specific criteria for the terms quality and suitable relevant to the task of teaching instrumental music in the public schools.

Participants

Participants were selected from the membership of the 2004-2005 Florida Bandmasters Association (FBA). The Executive Director of FBA authorized use of the membership list. The list included FBA members teaching middle school, high school, or both in the state of Florida during the 2004-2005 academic year.

The entire 2004-2005 FBA membership list included 1073 members, but 71 names were eliminated due to incomplete demographic information. The original email requesting participation (Appendix A) was first sent on April 27, 2005 to the remaining 1002 addresses. After the initial mailing, 96 accounts were discovered to be inactive. They were eliminated from subsequent mailings producing a total of 908 potential participants.

A second reminder email was sent one week later on May 4, 2005, and a third (final) reminder email was sent one week after the second on May 11, 2005. The texts of all three email correspondents are included in Appendix A.

All FBA members who received the email were invited to participate, however, only those respondents who completed the first three categories of the online survey were used for data collecting. The first three categories had to be completed to ensure consistent data collection. Additionally, incomplete responses were deleted. At the conclusion of the data collection period, 237 respondents, or 26.1% ($n = 908$), completed the survey as requested.
Identifying Elements of Quality

As established in the review of literature, many elements have been considered important to both quality and suitability. Of the many possible elements, twelve elements, six designated for quality and six designated for suitability, were selected for the current study.

The elements of quality were derived from compositional fundamentals. In The Study of Form, Spencer (1994) cites eleven structural phenomena (cadence, tonality, tempo, meter, rhythm, dynamics, density, timbre, register, texture, and motive; structural units such as section, period, and phrase groups; and structural functions such as expository and developmental) as a way to discover the organization of any piece of music from the perception of audible musical events. These elements were chosen because of their relation to quality. In an effort to simplify the survey, these elements were condensed and combined to create six elements of quality. Spencer reviewed and approved the condensed list. For purposes of this study, the elements of quality were defined as:

1. **Form of a Composition (includes Cadence / Motive / Style)**
   This category contained the organization and interaction of a number of discrete musical events known as form. The return of a prominent melodic or rhythmic event known as motive and cadence that is the point of relative cession of musical activity such as harmony, melody, or rhythm are also included. Other concepts integrated in this category are phrasing, style, and character.

2. **Tonality of a Composition (includes Texture / Density)**
   This category included the use of key and modes, melody and harmony, orchestration, chromaticism, and how the sounds relate to one another vertically and horizontally. It also encompassed the changes in rhythmic and melodic relationships, melodically or vertically, known as texture, and the amount of musical space filled, either harmonically or horizontally, known as density.

3. **Timbre / Register of Instruments (includes Balance / Blend / Intonation)**
   This category incorporated the timbre or tone color of sound that allows the ear to distinguish between one instrument and another, or between one group of instruments
and another. It also included register, which is the range (tessitura) in which musical events occur. Other concepts integrated into this category are balance, blend, and intonation.

(4) Tempo / Meter of a Composition

This category included the changes in the speed of the beat(s) known as tempo as well as the beats and subdivisions, the organization of subdivisions within beats, or of beats within measures known as meter.

(5) Rhythm used in a Composition

This category comprised the changes in note values not counting changes in tempo or meter. This is known as rhythm.

(6) Dynamics used within a Composition

This category included the loud and soft changes in volume known as dynamics.

Identifying Elements of Suitability

Prior pedagogues have suggested that numerous elements influence suitable literature. These include instrumentation, the experience level of an ensemble, utilitarian purposes, and external influences. Six elements of suitability were identified for the current study. Those elements of suitability (or pedagogical functionality) were defined as:

(1) Instrumentation of your Ensemble

This category included access to instruments, having instruments that function properly, and having a given number of players and instruments to perform all of the required parts.

(2) Experience Level of Ensemble

This category addressed the age of the musical ensemble, such as middle or high, 7th grade only, etc. It also covered the prior experience of individual players and their current ability level (i.e. beginner, intermediate, advanced, etc.)

(3) Amount of Available Rehearsal Time

This category covered the amount of time available for rehearsal prior to the performance of a composition. This also included in-school and out-of-school rehearsals.
(4) Utilitarian Concerns

This category encompassed specific events such as holidays or celebrations, and other events such as civic, ceremonial, pageantry or other special proceedings.

(5) Familiarity / Preeminence (Composer / Composition)

This category covered both the familiarity of the composer and/or the composition. The familiarity could have been from prior performances, hearings, recordings, or personal experience. This category also included the distinction and preeminence a composer or composition may have, such as Stravinsky or Holst’s First Suite in E flat.

(6) Outside Influences

This category included reference and/or recommendations of particular compositions from a source other than the first person experience. This may include state or national select music lists (i.e., Florida Bandmasters Association or National Band Association) or may have included references from conductors, professors and colleagues.

A Survey on the Selection of Wind Literature

After the twelve objective elements were identified, an online survey was created to determine how public school band directors apply the various elements to the process of selecting wind band literature. The survey instrument was designed to: (1) determine individual values associated with each element, and (2) rank the relative importance of the twelve elements. Each element was rated to determine the relative strength of value to each participant. Hypothetically, all elements could have received the same score. The twelve elements were ranked against one another to force participants to place the elements in a priority order.

The online survey (Appendix B) was created with the computer application FileMaker Pro 7™. The FileMaker Pro 7™ server software allowed participants to select via mouse a provided link to access the survey. Some limitations in the survey were
discovered. The survey could only be recognized on Safari™ 1.1 (or higher) and Internet Explorer™ 5.1 (or higher) thus potentially limiting the number of participants. As both applications are readily available for free via the Internet, this limitation was determined to be minimal.

The survey on the selection of wind literature contained four sections. Once the participants elected to complete the survey, the program selected one of four randomly determined orders for the first section (rating).

The first section asked for the rating of each of the twelve elements individually. The participant viewed one element (with the complete definition) and was asked to rate each element’s importance in the selection of literature using a Likert-type scale. The Likert-type scale used a seven-point range with 7 representing very important and 1 signifying not very important. Each element was given its own independent rating with no comparison with the other elements.

The second section was the ranking of the twelve elements. The participants were asked to rank the elements against one another to determine their relative importance. All twelve elements were displayed without definition. Each element, when selected, opened a window that allowed the participant to chose what ranking that element receives on a scale of one to twelve with 1 being most important and 12 being least important. Unlike the rating section, each element could only receive one of twelve choices.

The third section posed several demographic questions. The demographic questions requested the following information:

- What is your level of instruction?
- What is your level of education?
- How many years have you taught in your career?
- How many years have you taught in your current level of instruction?
- In a two-week period, how many total minutes do you have for rehearsal?
- How many band concerts per academic year (on average) do you program?
- How many selections per concert (on average) do you program?
- How many selections per academic year (approximately) do you program?
Considering all sources (school, district, boosters, parents, etc.), what is your total estimated budget? (Not including travel & large purchases).
Considering your total estimated budget, how much of the budget is solely for literature?
How do you rate your current library?

The fourth and final section asked three open-ended questions (Appendix C). The questions were (1) how do you purchase music for the concert season? (2) How do you select literature to purchase? And (3) how do you select literature to perform?
Participation in this final section was optional.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the values that music educators apply to the selection of wind band literature. Specifically, the purpose was to examine twelve classified elements of quality and suitability in the wind band field that influence the selection of literature. Data were collected in an online survey. Participants (n = 237) were grouped by level of education, level of instruction, and total years taught in categories. Additional demographic information and open-ended questions were compiled included in the overall design. Responses to the open-ended questions are found in Appendix C and discussed in Chapter V.

Overall Demographics

Table 1 displays the distribution of the participants’ responses (n = 237) regarding the level of education and level of instruction data. The distribution of the level of education was reasonably even with approximately 56% of the responses earning a bachelors degree while roughly 44% continued their education to gain a masters, DMA, or PhD. The three divisions of the level of instruction, however, were not as evenly dispersed. The percentage of responses at the high school level, 44%, was almost mirrored with the middle school responses, 45%. However, those teachers who teach at both levels during the day equaled a much smaller percentage at 11%.
Table 1

*Distributions of Level of Education and Level of Instruction in Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Instruction</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average number of years participants \((n = 237)\) have taught is approximately thirteen years with a standard deviation of nearly ten years meaning that 68% or roughly 161 of the responses have taught between three and twenty-three years in their careers (see Table 2). The means was reduced slightly when the question was more specific to participants’ years taught at their current level of instruction. The average was almost ten years with a standard deviation of eight years meaning that approximately two-thirds of respondents have been in their present position between two and eighteen years.

Table 2

*Means, Range, and Standard Deviations of Responses to Years in Profession*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Questions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years in Career</td>
<td>12.8 yrs</td>
<td>1 – 41 yrs</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level of Instruction</td>
<td>9.8 yrs</td>
<td>1 – 35 yrs</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 presents the average amount of time (in minutes) that the participants \((n = 233)\) had to rehearse music within a 2-week period. The mean (537 minutes) indicates that in a 2-week period, or ten weekdays, participants have approximately 54 minutes per day to rehearse with their band.

Table 3

*Means, Range, and Standard Deviations of Total Rehearsal Minutes in a 2-Week Period*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>537 minutes</td>
<td>120 – 2,250 minutes</td>
<td>251.58</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 displays the number of concerts per academic year, the number of selections per concert, and the total number of selections per academic year. Participants \((n = 229)\) averaged nearly five concerts per academic year. The number of selections per concert had a mean response \((n = 223)\) of slightly above six. The total number of selections per academic year had a mean response \((n = 231)\) of approximately twenty-five. It should be noted that the question, “Total selections per academic year?” was presented as a separate question, and not calculated from the previous two questions. Also, the standard deviation \((SD = 16.65)\) was notably affected by the large range \((6 – 100)\) of the total number of selections per academic year. There were five respondents who declared they read 100 selections per academic year.
Table 4

*Means, Range, and Standard Deviations of Concerts and Selections per Academic Year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Questions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerts per academic year</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2 – 50</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selections per concert</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3 – 16</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total selections per academic year</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>6 – 100</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows the means and standard deviations of participants’ evaluation of their music libraries. Ratings of *Bad* were converted to the number 5, the lowest rating, and *good* ratings were changed to the number 1, the highest rating. The overall mean (*n* = 236) was 2.4 with a standard deviation of 1.1 signifying that the typical participant believed their library was above average.

Table 5

*Means and Standard Deviations of Responses’ Music Library Evaluation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Questions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Rating</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Library rating conversions: Bad = 5; Poor = 4; Average = 3; Fair = 2; Good = 1.
Table 6 illustrates that the total estimated budget \( n = 221 \) median was $12,000 per academic year. The median was reported due to the highly skewed distribution of responses. The total estimated budgets ranged from $125,000 to $300. The median for funds allocated specifically for literature \( n = 225 \) was approximately $1,500. Using medians of participants’ total estimated budget and budget for literature, the percentage of funds for literature is approximately 13% of the total reported budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total</td>
<td>$19,757</td>
<td>$300 - $125,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated for Literature</td>
<td>$2,365</td>
<td>$100 - $30,000</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rating section used a Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 to 7 where 1 represented the least and 7 the most important to the process of literature selection. In rating the importance of the elements, each one was to be rated individually without comparison to any other of the twelve elements.

Table 7 provides the overall means and standard deviations of the ratings results. The results are displayed (Figure 1) in descending order from the element with the highest mean to the lowest mean, or in other words, the element that was rated as the most important to the least important when selecting literature.
Table 7

*Overall Distribution of Ratings of the Twelve Elements in the Selection of Literature (n = 237)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Elements are presented from “Most Important” (7) to “Least Important” (1) based on the means across all groups.
Figure 1. Graph of the overall distribution of ratings of the twelve elements.

The element experience level of ensemble received the highest mean rating at 6.44 ($SD = .98$) while dynamics used within a composition received the lowest overall at 4.59 ($SD = 1.77$). Therefore, the overall ratings range was 1.85 with a average score of 5.43. It should be noted that as the means decreased from the element with the highest mean rating to the lowest mean rating, the standard deviation increased.

Table 8 presents the means and standard deviations of the ratings results between the Level of Education groupings. The two groups are those participants who earned a bachelor degree ($n = 134$) and those who earned a graduate degree ($n = 103$). The results are in descending order from the element with the highest mean, or the element that yielded the most importance rating, to the lowest mean, or the element that generated the least importance rating.
Table 8

*Distribution of Ratings of the Twelve Elements in the Selection of Literature between the Levels of Education Groupings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 8 (continued)

Graduate Degree \( (n = 103) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Elements are presented from “Most Important” (7) to “Least Important” (1) based on the means across all groups.
Table 8 displays similar trends among both of the level of education groupings. The first three elements, experience level of ensemble, instrumentation of your ensemble, amount of available rehearsal time, were replicated in both groups in the same order, and with the exception of the mean score for amount of available rehearsal time from the bachelors degree group ($m = 5.94$), all mean scores were over 6. These elements were all elements of suitability.

The next six elements, timbre/register of instruments, familiarity/preeminence, outside influences, tonality of a composition, rhythm used in a composition, and utilitarian concerns, were the same in both groups, but in different orders. All mean scores were between 5.67 and 5.01. Three elements were elements of suitability and three were elements of quality.

The last three elements, form of a composition, tempo/meter of a composition, dynamics used within a composition were the same in both groups, but in different orders. All mean scores were between 4.80 and 4.45. These elements were all elements of quality.

The means and standard deviations of the ratings of the twelve elements for the Levels of Instruction groups are presented in Table 9. Level of Instruction was divided into three categories: (1) Those who teach middle school, (2) those who teach high school, and (3) those who teach at both levels. The results are in descending order from the element with the highest mean, or the element that yielded the most importance rating, to the lowest mean, or the element that generated the least importance rating.
Table 9

*Distribution of Ratings of the Twelve Elements in the Selection of Literature among the Levels of Instruction Groupings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 9 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 9 (*continued*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Elements are presented from “Most Important” (7) to “Least Important” (1) based on the means across all groups.
Table 9 also shows similar trends between the level of instruction groups. The first three elements, experience level of ensemble, instrumentation of your ensemble, amount of available rehearsal time, were in the same order in all three groups, and with the exception of the mean score for amount of available rehearsal time from the high school group ($m = 5.95$), all mean scores were over 6. These elements were all elements of suitability.

The next six elements, timbre/register of instruments, familiarity/preeminence, outside influences, tonality of a composition, rhythm used in a composition, and utilitarian concerns, were the same in both groups, but in three different orders. All mean scores were between 5.93 and 4.76. Three elements were elements of suitability and three elements were elements of quality.

The last three elements, form of a composition, tempo/meter of a composition, dynamics used within a composition were the same in both groups, but in different orders. All mean scores were between 4.81 and 4.45. These elements were all elements of quality.

Table 10 provides the means and standard deviations of the ratings of the twelve elements grouped by ranges of years taught. For the purpose of comparison, the results were divided evenly onto three groups with some adjustment to avoid splitting up participants of the same range. The first range ($n = 78$) included those who have taught one through six years. The second range ($n = 83$) included those who have taught seven through sixteen years. The final range ($n = 76$) included those who have taught seventeen through forty-one years.
Table 10

*Distribution of Ratings of the Twelve Elements in the Selection of Literature among the Three Ranges of Career in Years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 10 (continued)

Range: 7 - 16 years \( (n = 83) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 10 (continued)

Range: 17 - 41 years ($n = 76$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Elements are presented from “Most Important” (7) to “Least Important” (1) based on the means across all groups.
Table 10 reveals a similar trend among the three ranges of years taught. The first three elements, experience level of ensemble, instrumentation of your ensemble, amount of available rehearsal time, were replicated in all three groups in the same order and amount of available rehearsal time had a difference of at least 0.22 (or more) mean score points between it and the fourth highest rated element. These elements were all elements of suitability.

The other nine elements, containing all six elements of quality, show a trend over the three ranges. The range of 1 – 6 years was the only group to have an element of quality, timbre/register of instruments, as the fourth element and had the only element of suitability, utilitarian concerns, in the bottom third of the elements.

As the number of years increases, elements of quality become more separated from the elements of suitability. The range of 7 – 16 years had all six elements of suitability within the first eight highest rated elements. The range of 17 – 41 years had all six elements of suitability within the first seven highest rated elements.

Rankings

The ranking section utilized a scale that ranged from 1 to 12 with 1 representing the most important and 12 the least important element in the selection of literature. In this section, the twelve elements were compared to each other. The means and standard deviations of the overall rankings of the twelve objective elements in the selection of literature are shown in Table 11. These results are also displayed (Figure 2) in increasing order from the element with the lowest mean (more important) to the highest mean (less important).
Table 11

*Overall Distribution of Rankings of the Twelve Elements in the Selection of Literature (n = 237)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Elements are presented from “Most Important” (1) to “Least Important” (12) based on the means across all groups.
The element instrumentation of your ensemble received the lowest ranking (indicating most importance) at 2.91 while dynamics used within a composition received the highest overall ranking at 8.83 (indicating least importance). Dynamics used within a composition was also the element that received the label of least important in the ratings section.

Figure 2 reveals groupings among the elements. The first three elements, instrumentation of your ensemble, experience level of ensemble, amount of available rehearsal time, were all elements of suitability. These elements had mean rankings between 3 and 4.

The next four elements, timbre/register of instruments, familiarity/preeminence, tonality of a composition, and rhythm used in a composition had mean rankings between 6 and 7. Three elements were elements of quality and one, familiarity/preeminence, was an element of suitability.
The last five elements, outside influences, utilitarian concerns, form of a composition, tempo/meter of a composition, dynamics used within a composition had mean rankings between 7.75 and 9. Three elements were elements of quality and two were elements of suitability.

Table 12 presents the means and standard deviations of the rankings between the Level of Education groups. The two divisions are those participants who earned a bachelor degree (n = 134) and those who earned a graduate degree (n = 103).

Table 12

*Distribution of Rankings of the Twelve Elements in the Selection of Literature between the Levels of Education Groupings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 12 (continued)

Graduate Degree ($n = 103$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Elements are presented from “Most Important” (1) to “Least Important” (12) based on the means across all groups.

Table 12 illustrates trends between the levels of education groupings. The first three elements, instrumentation of your ensemble, experience level of ensemble, amount of available rehearsal time, were replicated in the same order, and with the exception of the mean score for amount of available rehearsal time from the bachelors group ($m = 4.03$), all mean scores were below 4. These elements were all elements of suitability.

Elements ranked fourth through seventh, timbre/register of instruments, familiarity/preeminence, tonality of a composition, and rhythm used in a composition were the same in both groups, but in different orders. All mean scores were between 6.01 and 7.16. Three elements were elements of quality and one, familiarity/preeminence, was an element of suitability.
The last five elements, outside influences, utilitarian concerns, form of a composition, tempo/meter of a composition, dynamics used within a composition were also the same in both groups, but in different orders. All mean scores were between 7.50 and 8.93. Three elements were elements of quality and two were elements of suitability.

The means and standard deviations of the ranking of the twelve elements among the Levels of Instruction groups are presented in Table 13. Level of Instruction was separated into three categories: (1) Those who teach middle school, (2) those who teach high school, and (3) those who teach at both levels.

Table 13

Distribution of Rankings of the Twelve Elements in the Selection of Literature among the Levels of Instruction Groupings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Elements are presented from “Most Important” (1) to “Least Important” (12) based on the means across all groups.

Trends were present among the three levels of instruction groupings. The first three elements, *instrumentation of your ensemble, experience level of ensemble, amount of available rehearsal time*, were in the same order with all mean scores between 2.56 and 4.22. All three elements were elements of *suitability*.

The next four elements, *timbre/register of instruments, familiarity/preeminence, tonality of a composition, and rhythm used in a composition* were the same in both groups, but in different orders. All mean scores were between 5.19 and 7.69. Three elements were elements of *quality* and one, *familiarity/preeminence*, was an element of *suitability*. 
The last five elements, outside influences, utilitarian concerns, form of a composition, tempo/meter of a composition, dynamics used within a composition were the same in both groups, but in different orders. All mean scores were between 7.52 and 9.33. Three elements were elements of quality and two were elements of suitability.

Table 14 provides the means and standard deviations of the rankings of the twelve objective elements across the levels of experience. The first group \((n = 78)\) was those who have taught one through six years in their career. The second group \((n = 83)\) was those who have taught seven to sixteen years in their career. The final group \((n = 76)\) consisted of those who have more than seventeen years in their career.

Table 14

_Distribution of Rankings of the Twelve Elements among the Levels of Experience_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_(table continues)_
Table 14 *(continued)*

Range: 7 – 16 years (*n* = 83)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 14 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Level of Ensemble</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Available Rehearsal Time</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity / Preeminence</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre / Register of Instruments</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm used in a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo / Meter of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Concerns</td>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics used within a Composition</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Elements are presented from “Most Important” (1) to “Least Important” (12) based on the means across all groups.

Table 14 displays a similar trend among the three ranges of years taught. The first three elements, *instrumentation of your ensemble, experience level of ensemble, amount of available rehearsal time,* were in the same order with all mean scores between 2.56 and 4.25. All three elements were elements of *suitability.*

The next four elements, *timbre/register of instruments, familiarity/preeminence, tonality of a composition,* and *rhythm used in a composition* were the same in both
groups, but in different orders. All mean scores were between 5.19 and 7.50. Three of these elements were elements of *quality* and one, *familiarity/preeminence*, was an element of *suitability*.

The last five elements, *outside influences*, *utilitarian concerns*, *form of a composition*, *tempo/meter of a composition*, *dynamics used within a composition* were the same in both groups, but in different orders. All mean scores were between 7.67 and 9.33. Three elements were elements of *quality* and two were elements of *suitability*. 
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine which values music educators apply to the selection of wind band literature. Specifically, the purpose was to examine twelve elements of *quality* and *suitability* in the wind band field that influence the selection of literature. Data were collected in an online survey. The Survey on the Selection of Wind Literature (Appendix B) had four sections.

The first section was the rating of each of the twelve objective elements on an individual basis. The participant viewed one element at a time with the complete definition and was asked to rate each element’s importance in the selection of literature on a Likert-type scale. The Likert-type scale used a seven-point range with 7 representing *very important* and 1 signifying *not very important*. Each element received its own rating without making comparisons to any other element.

The second section was the ranking of the twelve elements considered as a group. The participants were asked to rank order the elements compared to one another to determine their overall relative importance. All twelve elements were displayed without definition. Each element, when selected, opened a window that allowed the participant to choose the relative ranking for that element on a scale of one to twelve with 1 being most important and 12 being least important. Unlike the rating section, each element could only receive one of twelve choices.

The third section posed several demographic questions. These requested the respondent’s: (1) level of instruction, (2) level of education, (3) years taught in career, (4) years taught in the current level of instruction, (5) total minutes for rehearsal in a two-week period, (6) band concerts per academic year, (7) selections per concert, (8) selections per academic year, (9) total estimated budget, (10) total estimated budget for literature, and (11) current library rating.

The final section posed three open-ended questions. These included: (1) how do you purchase music for the concert season? (2) how do you select literature to purchase? and (3) how do you select literature to perform? These questions were optional as disclosed in the email requesting participation in the survey.
Participants \((n = 237)\) were grouped by level of education, level of instruction, and total years taught sections. Additional demographic information (see Tables 9 – 14) and open-ended questions (Appendix C) were compiled and listed along with the number of responses.

**Ratings**

Overall, three elements, experience level of ensemble, instrumentation of your ensemble, and amount of available rehearsal time, in that order, remained the highest in importance for selecting music literature across all analyses of the data. All three of these are elements of suitability. In general, the elements of suitability were consistently higher than the elements of quality.

Research Question #1 asked if there would be a difference in which elements influence the selection of literature between all of the participants. Table 1 and Figure 1 illustrates that there were consistent differences. The twelve elements were not rated against one another directly, however, distinct differences between the means is visible (Figure 1) from experience level of ensemble, which received the highest rating (6.44), to dynamics used within a composition which received the lowest (4.59) rating.

Research Question #2 asked if there would be a difference in which elements influence the selection of literature between those band directors who have earned a bachelors and those with graduate degrees (Masters, DMA, or PhD). There were similarities and differences. Observing the mean results in Table 2, both groups rated the elements experience level of ensemble, instrumentation of your ensemble, and amount of available rehearsal time rated in the same one-three order. Both groups also had the elements tonality of a composition and tempo/meter of a composition rated in the same place within both orders at seventh and eleventh respectively. The remaining elements were in slightly different orders between the groups.

Research Question #3 asked if there would be a difference in which elements influence the selection of literature between those band directors who are employed at a high school, middle school, or both. Examining Table 3, all three groups rated the elements experience level of ensemble, instrumentation of your ensemble, amount of
available rehearsal time, and timbre/register of instruments in the same order. The element tempo/meter of a composition was rated in the same place within all three orders at eleventh.

It should be noted that even though all three groups had the first four elements in the same order, the number of participants within the three groups was distinctly different. However, this difference in the number of responses had little apparent effect on the order of the elements. Other elements were rated similarly but in slightly different orders.

Research Question #4 asked if there would be a difference in which objective elements influence the selection of literature between those band directors who taught in the profession for a maximum of six years, between seven and sixteen years, and seventeen or more years. Analyzing Table 4, all three groups rated the first three elements experience level of ensemble, instrumentation of your ensemble, and amount of available rehearsal time in the same order. The remaining elements were in slightly different orders between the groups.

**Rankings**

Table 5 illustrates that the element labeled instrumentation of your ensemble received the lowest mean ranking (2.91) signifying that it was the most important factor when selecting literature for performance while dynamics used within a composition received the highest mean rank (8.83).

Similar to the overall ratings results, the overall rankings yielded results that are repeated within the other analyses of the ranked data. The three elements that were rated most important, experience level of ensemble, instrumentation of your ensemble, and amount of available rehearsal time, again received the most importance, but were ranked in a slightly different order (see Table 5) than the overall rating results. Another consistency from the overall rankings results was that the fourth ranked element, tonality of a composition, was fourth in all other analyzed subdivisions of the ranked data (see Tables 5 – 8).
The three means for rank elements of suitability, instrumentation of your ensemble, experience level of ensemble, and amount of available rehearsal time, were separate from the mean rank of the fourth ranked element, tonality of a composition, by 2.1 points. For comparison, adding 2.1 points to the score for tonality of a composition (6.03) yields a score of 8.13, which is the mean rank score that utilitarian concerns received as the ninth ranked element. In other words, the range between the third and fourth elements was the same as the range from the fourth to the ninth ranked elements. Participants therefore, place a great deal of importance on those first three elements, instrumentation of your ensemble, experience level of ensemble, and amount of available rehearsal time when selecting literature for their wind band ensembles compared to the other nine elements offered as choices.

General Observations

In addition to the findings related to the rating and ranking data, there are aspects of this study that are relevant to the selection of music, music education, and further research. The following is a summary of these observations.

The Selection of Literature

The three most important elements were identical in the analyses of both the rating and the ranking data. This was unexpected. The fact that all three elements, instrumentation of your ensemble, experience level of ensemble, and amount of available rehearsal time, fall under the heading of suitability was not as unexpected. It was desired that the twelve elements should be as objective as possible in order to be measured accurately, the elements selected in the quality category were not the most common elements of quality found in prior research. In fact, many alternative elements that could be related to quality would certainly change the outcome of this study. However, quality elements such as longevity, aesthetic value, interpretation, and emotional impact (to name a few) are difficult to clearly define and measure. The quality elements used in the current study were easier to define and assess due to their frequent usage in Western music theory courses.
In the present study, it was anticipated that elements of *suitability* would be rated and ranked as more important overall when selecting literature compared to *quality*. It seems obvious that working music educators have to be practical and reasonable when selecting literature for performances. The results of the current study support the notion that elements of *quality* are not considered as important as elements of *suitability* when a wind band conductor is faced with the task of selecting literature.

When asked to rate the twelve elements individually, 5 of the top 6 elements were elements of *suitability*. Instead of a closely associated relationship between the elements of *quality* and *suitability*, apparently elements of *quality* were not valued as important as elements of *suitability*. The top three elements, *experience level of ensemble*, *instrumentation of your ensemble*, and *amount of available rehearsal time*, were the only elements to average 6 points or higher on the 7-point rating scale.

The importance awarded by the participants to these three elements is even more evident in the results of the ranking information. The separation in mean rankings between the third element, *amount of available rehearsal time*, and the fourth element, *tonality of a composition*, was 2.1 on a 12-point scale. This division of importance further suggests that the directors are more concerned with being pragmatic and functional than developing an artistic or aesthetic value system.

The survey may have induced some participants to rate and rank some elements higher that may actually come later in the selection process due to the wording of the survey. The survey asked “Please rate the importance of this element in the selection of literature” and presented a defined element with a Likert-type scale. It seems logical that one would assign a great deal of importance on those three elements, *instrumentation of your ensemble*, *experience level of ensemble*, and *amount of available rehearsal time*, when selecting literature for their wind band ensembles compared to the other nine elements offered as choices because the conductor is thinking of the goal as opposed to the process. In other words, the participant was answering the question, “What elements are important for my ensemble to have a successful concert?” as opposed to “What elements do I believe are important when I am selecting music?” The task of selecting wind literature is one of the more critical decisions made by the band director in establishing meaningful learning for students as well as performance success.
In the final section of the survey, three open-ended questions were posed. These included: (1) how do you purchase music for the concert season? (2) how do you select literature to purchase? and (3) how do you select literature to perform? The responses to the open-ended questions (all open-ended responses are in Appendix C) generally support the divisions of suitability and quality in the selection process that was found in the rating and ranking sections. A majority of responses included the use of, or referred to, the FBA approved listing of literature for festivals. Others mentioned new CD samplers from music publishing companies and the Florida Music Education Association (FMEA) annual convention as sources of selecting literature. However, elements of quality listed within the present study were mentioned only infrequently or in generalities such as “weaknesses of my ensemble”.

**English Pedagogy Transfers**

There is a long tradition of established approaches for selecting English literature. Like music education, English teachers determine curriculum through the selection of specific literature for study. It is possible that music educators may draw insight from the English literature selection process.

In both disciplines, the selection of literature is highly subjective. Some methods, such as using various evaluated literature lists or selecting literature based on specific pedagogical systems, are developed from personal value systems. Both academic domains use “expert” and personal values to a large extent to select literature.

However, English teachers have developed more objective methods to assist in the selection process. The method of selecting literature by determining readability is one of the more objective approaches. Readability refers to all the factors that affect success in reading and understanding a specific text. These factors include interest and motivation of the reader, legibility of the print and any illustrations, and the complexity of words and sentences in relation to the reading ability of the reader.

Could a similar method be used to assess music’s performability? Performability would refer to all the factors that affect success in performing and understanding a specific composition. These factors include interest and motivation of the performer,
legibility of the music and any instructions, and the complexity of music in relation to the performing ability of the performer. Could methods be drawn from the example of the Cloze technique, the Dale-Chall and Spache tests, or using calculations involving the sentence length and number of syllables to predict music’s performability?

As music educators, it seems useful to investigate other disciplines and their methods in developing curriculum. Further examination of these selection processes could identify a more objective process to select literature.

**Implications for Music Education**

Several aspects of this study appear relevant to conductors of wind bands. The overall results presented in Table 5 (rankings) suggest that the participants do not necessarily focus on literature as the curriculum, or the process, but as a concert, or as an end. The reason these elements are labeled as suitable is because they are exactly that—suitable for the ensemble to perform. However, the suitability of a composition does not necessarily transfer to the quality of a composition. Music educators need to be aware of the many facets in the selection of literature. There is also a need to examine both the quality and suitability of literature for the sake of the students’ learning and performance success.

One cannot choose what one does not know; therefore a firm grounding in the literature that is available and appropriate seems to be a prerequisite for the task of choosing. This does not mean simply having a list of compositions to choose from, it seems important that the director have knowledge of and experience with the available compositions.

**Implications for Future Research**

The results of the current study should be considered preliminary and numerous directions for future research are indicated. The three elements that were rated most important in the selection of literature, experience level of ensemble, instrumentation of your ensemble, and amount of available rehearsal time, should receive further
examination. Instruction designed to address these elements might provide for more efficient undergraduate training.

Further examination of the selection criteria of wind band conductors who have a documented history of successful festival performance might identify common factors in the process of literature selection. Also, further examination of the selection criteria of wind band directors who are considered experts in the field of conducting might also identify aspects of successful literature selection.

A survey of wind band conductors to determine as many elements of both quality and suitability would be a worthwhile study. Identifying elements not explored in the present study, both objective and subjective, may facilitate a deeper understanding of the selection process. Because the current study did not use an experimental design, a study that incorporated a controlled sample of participants would be a logical next step in researching the influences on the selection of literature.

Finally, considering the results of the present study and that literature become the curriculum used for instruction in music ensembles, further training in the selection process seems rational and essential. This training should be prominent during the academic instruction of future wind band directors as well as current conductors within their in-service education.
APPENDIX A:

SURVEY REQUEST EMAILS
April 27, 2005

Dear FBA Member,

Duane L. Hendon, Executive Director of the Florida Bandmasters Association, has authorized me to request your participation in the following data collection effort.

This survey addresses issues surrounding the selection of band literature for performance and education. The data collected will be used for a project in progress at Florida State University.

All data is collected anonymously, unless you elect to identify yourself in the optional, open-ended questions at the end of the survey.

The survey should take no longer than 15 minutes. Remember - there are no "right" or "wrong" answers.

Use the link below to begin the survey...

Survey: http://www.marchingchiefs.fsu.edu:16080/fmi/iwp/cgi?-db=Carney_Survey&-startsession

NOTE: The survey works ONLY on Internet Explorer 5.1, Internet Explorer 5.2 (or higher). (Mac users may also use Safari 1.1 or higher.) The survey does NOT work on all other browsers (Netscape, Firefox, etc.). If this applies to you, I apologize in advance and thank you for your time.

If you encounter problems, please feel free to report them to me.

I hope to use this information to increase our professional understanding of the critical literature selection process.

Thanks for your time and efforts!

Patrick K. Carney
Doctoral Student
Florida State University
Dear FBA Member -

Thank you to everyone who has completed the on-line survey introduced last week! The response was overwhelming. If you have completed the survey, I offer my appreciation and you may ignore the rest of this message.

If you have NOT participated in my survey, this is a friendly reminder to contribute to this project to ensure the broadest level of participation. The survey will be ending soon and your help will be greatly appreciated.

A copy of the original message is included below. I know this is a busy time of year, so it has been designed to not take much of your valuable time.

Thank you for your help and support.

=================================

(Original message attached)
Dear FBA Member -

Thank you to everyone who has completed the on-line survey! The response was outstanding. If you have completed the survey, I again offer my appreciation and you may ignore the rest of this message.

If you have NOT participated in my survey, this is a friendly, and final, reminder to contribute to this project to ensure the broadest level of participation. The survey will be ending next Wednesday, May 18th, and your help will be greatly appreciated.

A copy of the original message is included below. I know this is a busy time of year, so it has been designed to not take much of your valuable time.

Thank you for your help and support.

==================================

(Original message attached)
APPENDIX B:

ONLINE SURVEY INSTRUMENT
GREETINGS

I AM ASKING FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE. I AM A DOCTORAL CANDIDATE AT FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY, GATHERING DATA IN SUPPORT OF A PROJECT ON DETERMINING QUALITY AND FUNCTIONALITY OF WIND BAND LITERATURE. YOUR HONEST OPINIONS AND EXPERIENCES ARE VERY IMPORTANT AND WILL HELP CURRENT AND FUTURE TEACHERS UNDERSTAND THE STATUS OF MUSIC EDUCATION IN OUR SCHOOLS. I APPRECIATE YOUR TAKING TIME TO VISIT THIS WEBSITE AND COMPLETE THE SHORT SURVEY LINKED BELOW.

ALL DATA WILL BE SENT IMMEDIATELY TO A DATABASE AT THE FSU COLLEGE OF MUSIC. THE DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION REQUESTED WILL SERVE TO COMPARE TRENDS AND CONDITIONS OF FLORIDA BANDMASTERS ASSOCIATION HIGH AND MIDDLE SCHOOL DIRECTORS’ RESPONSES ONLY.

PATRICK K. CARNEY
DOCTORAL CANDIDATE
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

PKC-SURVEY@HOTMAIL.COM

By making your selection below, you agree to (1) participate in this research by completing the linked survey, and (2) only submit one survey. Your responses will remain anonymous. Thank you for your participation and support!

You will given various categories of factors that influence your music program. Please rate the importance of the category on the following pages.
AMOUNT OF AVAILABLE REHEARSAL TIME

This category covers the amount of time you can or could schedule prior to the performance of a composition. This should include in-school and out-of-school rehearsals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very important</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate the importance of this element in the selection of literature.

FORM OF A COMPOSITION
(INCLUDES CADENCE/MOTIVE/STYLE)

This category contains the organization and interaction of a number of discrete musical events known as Form. The return of a prominent melodic or rhythmic event known as Motive and Cadence which is the point of relative cession of musical activity such as harmony, melody, or rhythm are also included. Other concepts integrated in this category are phrasing, style, and character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very important</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate the importance of this element in the selection of literature.
FAMILIARITY/PREEMINENCE (COMPOSER/COMPOSITION)

This category covers both your familiarity of the composer and/or the composition. The familiarity can come from prior performances, hearings, recordings, or personal experience. This category also includes the distinction and preeminence a composer or composition may have, such as Stravinsky or Holst’s First Suite in E flat.

Please rate the importance of this element in the selection of literature

Very important 7
Neutral 6
Not very important 1

EXPERIENCE LEVEL OF ENSEMBLE

This category addresses the age of your group, such as middle or high, 7th grade only, etc. It also covers the prior experience of your groups’ individual players and their current ability level (i.e. beginner, intermediate, advanced, etc.).

Please rate the importance of this element in the selection of literature

Very important 7
Neutral 6
Not very important 1
TIMBRE/REGISTER OF INSTRUMENTS (INCLUDES BALANCE/BLEND/INTONATION)

This category incorporates the Timbre or tone color of sound that allows the ear to distinguish between one instrument and another, or between one group of instruments and another. It also includes Register, which is the range (tessitura) in which musical events occur. Other concepts integrated this category are balance, blend, and intonation.

Please rate the importance of this element in the selection of literature

OUTSIDE INFLUENCES

This category includes reference and/or recommendations of particular compositions from a source other than your own first person experience. May include state or national select music lists (i.e. Florida Bandmasters Association or National Band Association) or may include references you may have received from conductors, professors and colleagues outside of your own self-discovery.
Please rate the importance of this element in the selection of literature

TEMPO/METER OF A COMPOSITION

This category includes the changes in the speed of the beat(s) known as Tempo as well as the beats and subdivisions, the organization of subdivisions within beats, or of beats within measures known as Meter.

Very important: 7, 6, 5
Neutral: 4, 3, 2
Not very important: 1

RHYTHM USED IN A COMPOSITION

This category comprises the changes in note values not counting changes in tempo or meter. This is known as Rhythm.

Very important: 7, 6, 5
Neutral: 4, 3, 2
Not very important: 1
INSTRUMENTATION OF YOUR ENSEMBLE

This category includes your availability of simply having access to instruments, having instruments that function properly, and having a given number of players to perform all of the required instrumented parts.

Very important: 7
Neutral: 4
Not very important: 1

DYNAMICS USED WITHIN A COMPOSITION

This category includes the loud and soft changes in volume known as dynamics.

Very important: 7
Neutral: 4
Not very important: 1
TONALITY OF A COMPOSITION
(INCLUDES TEXTURE/DENSITY)

This category includes the use of key and modes, melody and harmony, orchestration, chromaticism, and how the sounds relate to one another vertically and horizontally. It also encompasses the changes in rhythmic and melodic relationships, melodically or vertically, known as Texture, and the amount of musical space filled, either harmonically or horizontally, known as Density.

Very important: 7
Neutral: 4
Not very important: 1

UTILITARIAN CONCERNS

This category encompasses specific events you are asked to do such as holidays or celebrations, and other events such as civic, ceremonial, pageantry or other special proceedings.

Very important: 7
Neutral: 4
Not very important: 1
## Part II - Ranking

Please rank the categories in order of importance with 1 being the most important and 12 being the least important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal time</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonality</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ABOUT YOU AND YOUR SCHOOL

1. **Level of Instruction**
   - Middle school
   - High school
   - Both

2. **Level of Education**
   - Bachelors
   - Masters
   - DMA/PhD
   - Other

3. **Years taught in career**
   - [ ] blank years

4. **Years taught at current level of instruction**
   - [ ] blank years

5. **In a 2-week period, how many total minutes do you have for rehearsal?**
   - [ ] blank minutes

6. **How many band concerts per academic year (on average)?**
   - [ ] blank concerts

7. **How many selections per concert (on average)?**
   - [ ] blank selections

8. **So total selections per academic year is (approximately)?**
   - [ ] blank selections

9. **Considering all sources (school, district, boosters, parents, etc.), what is your total estimated budget? (Please DO NOT include: travel & large, one-time purchases such as percussion, uniforms, etc.)**
   - $[ ] blank .00

10. **After considering the question above, how much of the budget is SOLELY for literature?**
    - $[ ] blank .00

11. **How do you rate your current music library?**
    - Bad
    - Poor
    - Average
    - Fair
    - Good

---
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Please click the submit answers button below!

Thanks for completing the survey! If you have any questions regarding the survey, or your participation in the survey, please feel free to contact me at PKC-SURVEY@HOTMAIL.COM. I will be happy to assist you in any way. Thank you again for your help.

Patrick K. Carney
Doctoral Candidate
Florida State University
APPENDIX C:

OPEN-ENDED QUESTION RESPONSES
QUESTION 1: How do you purchase music for the concert season?

literature purchase
PO / Boosters
I look at what the strengths and weaknesses of my ensemble are, ask for suggestions from experienced directors and listen to tons of recordings before making any decisions. I usually buy a lot of music at FMEA convention and read through them. My boosters pay for 95% of any literature that I purchase for my program.
Buy depending on instrumentation of group and quality of piece.
I evaluate my band program for the upcoming year, and I pick pieces that the kids can grow as musicians. I also select literature that the students would enjoy playing (in turn they will practice it). I select the music for the spring concert first and then pick the other concerts from there.
I look at the FBA list and purchase music from it. Also, I purchase music that I hear at concerts or on the word of other teachers. Sometimes, I purchase music I have heard from the promotional c.d.s that are sent by publishers. All of my music is purchased through JW Pepper.
School budget
Listen to performances at Chicago Midwest Clinic, then choose literature either immediately or throughout the summer. Recordings and score reading is vital in my search for literature.
Most purchasing goes through school purchase orders to various distributors. Some purchases are personal expense. Literature is selected based on familiarity, recommendation or after hearing recent demos.
On-line
I teach at a relatively new school, so I am constantly purchasing music from the FBA music list. I also order music on review from Pepper, we sight-read the music and send back whatever we don't want.
Out of my own pocket.
Our school purchases the music we request using textbook funds.
We usually go through a music supplier (FMEA vendor or JWPepper). More often than not we can find literature we wish to perform through our own music library. Our school is rather old and through the years the library has been kept up rather well.

Florida Music Service
I get a blanket purchase order to a music store using the district_allocated Textbook funds.

Consider new music to the FBA list, listen to demo CD's, talking to other directors, and listening to other bands.

Listen to music online, then purchase through textbook flex funds, or though internal account.

School District PO
Listen to recordings. Browse scores.

I look first and foremost for quality music. I look for enough doubling to reinforce those sections that historically are weak or scantly instrumented. I look for a variety of keys, meters, tempos, styles, harmonies, ethnicities, etc.

I choose literature that will best fits the group I have. I choose music that will accentuate their strengths but also have an element of challenge for them.

School Budget
I look at the size of our library and budget 80% for standard repertoire and 20% for new or popular literature. I spend about two hours a week build programs, researching composers and publishers. I also actively commission one or two composers a year to write pieces for our band that way students have the opportunity to interact with a composer. Because the current program I teach at in only a year old I have a long building process for a library but this year I purchased almost $4000 for music that will raise to 6000 next school year.

I decide, based on sample recordings, concert listening experiences, colleague recommendations, etc. on what to purchase and submit a purchase order through school channels.

online at jw pepper.com
I make my purchases through my booster group's funds. I evaluate my group in the early fall to decide what works will be good for them to both build in weak areas and have the students enjoy what they play. Additionally I work to give them a good sample of music from many different time periods and styles.

Order from retailer

Mostly online through Pepper. However I do make some additional purchases at FMEA Conference in January through various vendors.

From Florida Music Service and JW Pepper through Band Booster and School Board purchase orders.

Through various vendors from our internal band account.

usually through J. W. Pepper

I don't have a set procedure. Typically, I attend FBA Festival and listen to other bands. It's great exposure to quality material. During the spring, we play lighter Broadway and movie music. I also look for pieces that rely heavily on a concept I want to teach.

County Budget Line

www.jwpeper.com

Florida Music Service and J.W.Pepper. I will listen to recordings, consult the FBA list and pull from other directors and concerts that have made me familiar with a piece or composer.

Reviewing literature at Concerts, CD's, printed reviews etc

I research it through score study, recommendation and specific needs of the ensemble. - I order twice a year August and January. I order from four companies and which one will give me the best customer service.

I try to purchase 1 new piece, for each ensemble, for each concert. They rest of my allotted budget I have been trying to update my library to include more FBA listed literature. I have a lot of literature that has been removed from the list over time.

J.W. Pepper, Florida Music Service, (all online purchases)

I choose literature based on the ability level of my students and where the goal is set for the end of the year. I consider their range, rhythmic sensibility, and our
rehearsal schedule. Usually have a four year plan of expectations for each individual player, with assessments to keep in their portfolio. This process is a pretty good determiner for literature selection.

I ask advice from other professionals, use my own knowledge, and listen to recordings of available pieces.

I go through the FBA concert music list and try to purchase music that I am familiar with that we do not currently own. Also, I spend a good deal of time listening to recordings and order music that I find interesting and might consider for my students to perform.

Research CD's, check Band World's annual "best of" list, catalogues

I purchase literature for concert band based on the ability and skill level of my band. I have received money from the school and the boosters. The boosters pick up where the school cannot afford to buy more music for me.

www.jwpepper.com, Beethoven & Company, Florida Music Service

I have looked through the FBA list and I purchase 3-5 pieces per year that are considered Significant literature that we do not own. I also listen to recordings of new music just published or added to the list.

Email, conventions, and via phone

School purchase order

Usually through Pepper Music, sometimes through Florida Music Service or other vendor at the FMEA convention

A combination of internal school budget money and booster money.

J.W. Pepper and sometimes Florida Music Service

Not sure what you are asking. I will order from vendors like Pepper, and Florida Music Service. I often purchase music at FMEA

Online from J W Pepper

I use a purchasing card and order from JW Pepper

Through jwpepper.com

On line

I draw on past experience based on the skill level of the musicians. I listen to most new music CDs from publishers and read new music reviews in educational
journals. I try to find a mix of fun pieces, pieces that will challenge the students and help them mature as players, pieces that will expose the students to a variety of styles and pieces that parents and audiences will enjoy.

Through a school account or through textbook funds.

We have textbook funds through our school. I receive about 3,500 for concert music another 1000 for Jazz music.

Recommendations from friends and listening to literature in concert. I wish we were able to program more new literature here in Florida. The way that the list is structured makes it difficult. Still, it's a pretty good list. Most music is purchased in December or thereabouts.

Internal Accounts - Small program!

Majority of purchases are made through internal accounts within the school where money is collected through a County-Wide Band fee. 95% of all concert literature purchased comes off of the Florida Bandmasters' Association Music List.

I generally score most of my own music. Mine is a new program with odd instrumentation, and I find it easier simply to do my own work, when I am able. The rest I purchase, generally online, and mostly from Pepper.

We have a budget through the county of about 5k. When that runs out, the band boosters pick up the rest.

From the FBA list and knowledge of appropriate literature.

Through a music distribution company

Music dealer

Orders from companies such as J.W. Pepper, Florida Music Service, etc. I often purchase music using company websites for several reasons: they will ship it to you if they have your school's purchase order number, you can listen to recordings on the website, and you can see a wide variety of music at once.

I generally will order a majority of my music at the beginning of the school year after assessing the strengths and weaknesses of each group. I usually purchase solo-ensemble music and selected pieces at the FMEA Clinic in January based on listening to the new music and talking to other directors. I try to listen to the
recordings of the new music that is mailed out and like to add standard literature that I know are good teaching pieces for my students as well as a few light selections for the Spring Concert. I started a Jazz Band this year so that bumped up the budget on music for the year.

JWPepper, local music store, at conventions

I look on state music lists, and I choose some music that I have heard at concerts, on recordings, and at conventions.

I walk into an environment where over 80 years worth of music has been removed from my band room before I arrived. So I am faced with a situation where I have to rebuild the library. When I purchase my music for the year, I take into consideration what should be included in the "basic Library" must haves. I consult a great deal with other band directors in the middle school level to see what has worked for them. They sometimes loan me music to try, and if it works with my kids, then I go out and purchase the music to add into my library. Music selection is very overwhelming at times especially when its my first year as a band director at my school. Later in the year, when I am more familiar with my student's ability, I can then assess things like their level ability, the range of the music, and if they are able to manage the music. (I hope this answers your question...I am not quite sure how to have really answered this.)

VA Provider

Order online or call JWPepper or Florida Music Service

When you refer to literature purchase, I included jazz and marching band. I purchase from two suppliers - some with school purchase orders, and others I purchase with personal credit card reimbursed by the band boosters, who cover some of our music purchases.

Based on the approximate personnel of the up coming year

I assess my group and select appropriate literature that fits the needs of the student and the program.

I order through school funds which is collected from students assessed as a class fee @ $10 per student in all music classes.
JW Pepper is the first place I'll order from, if I need to browse through the music personally I'll go to Florida Music Service in Lakeland.

By going to different All-state festivals and conferences in Mississippi, Alabama and Florida, traveling to music stores in Montgomery and Atlanta to review music, listening to recordings, making notes at concert festivals, attending other band's concerts, asking other publishers and band directors about music

Ability of group. What I like at the time of my life. What will educate and motivate the students the best

Listen to music demos from Publishers. Listen to reading sessions at FMEA.

Order music on approval from music stores.

The primary factor in literature selection is aesthetic value. Just as one selects to read Hamlet in Literature class due to its enduring value as a work of literature which addresses the permanent human questions, literature selected for music class must be selected on a similar criteria. Questions of accessibility, instrumentation, utilitarianism, or perceived difficulty level are of secondary importance to the primary objective of developing the capability to make mature aesthetic differentiations within our students. This *is* the purpose of music education, as a well developed sense of aesthetics is foundational to the development of the proper use of reason.

I look at the educational needs on my ensembles, instrumentation, possible use for festival (is it on the FBA list?), and needs of the specific occasion. I get a great deal of info from other directors, listening, and printed resources.

At a music store or on-line online
via computer through J.W. Pepper

New music generally purchased from Florida Music Service, through school purchase order.

Internal accounts Florida Music Service...

I spend the late spring evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the groups for the following year. I then spend most of the summer researching pieces, looking over the FBA list, studying scores, getting recommendations from other directors
and listening to recordings of pieces (new and old). I usually form my concert programs in the late summer and order all selections by early September. Because I am a new teacher, I tend to rely on the advice of other local band directors and on samples and CDs sent by publishers. I then choose the literature that best suits my band and order it through a well established, local music dealer. Unfortunately, I am located far from a music store. I used to browse through music before purchasing the arrangement when I lived in Ohio. Today, I look through the catalogs that I receive in the mail and trust their description of the pieces. Many times I will purchase a piece of music for one band, and must either use it for a less experienced band or not at all if it proves to be more difficult than described. I order my music from Mannerino's Sheet Music in Cincinnati, Ohio. Listening to available recordings, reviewing scores, evaluating what type of music I need (i.e. winter concert = holiday music, spring concert = marches, lighter faire).

Listening to demo CD's and referencing the FBA music list. Purchase orders to stores.

I look at the FBA list and build up our library with quality works based on student sheets of the program. For spring concerts I try to purchase a lighter or patriotic work that students would enjoy playing, while trying not purchase music that will become dated in a few short years.

I listen to recordings, browse the mailings from various publishing companies and I attend the "reading band," session at convention in Tampa. For example I heard the Nimrod performed in Tampa...then went upstairs to FL. Music Service and purchased the tune. I keep festival programs and order music that other band directors have done. The FBA list is a great source as well. I generally go online and order my music over the internet.

JW Pepper

I GO TO THE MUSIC STORE OR THE FMEA CONVENTION AND STUDY SCORES FOR INSTRUMENTATION. FOR EXAMPLE, I HAVE ONLY TWO TRUMPETS IN MY HIGH SCHOOL BAND (25 TOTAL MUSICIANS) AND I LOOK FOR MUSIC THAT NECESSITATES TWO TRUMPETS. HOWEVER,
MOST GRADE 3 AND HIGHER BAND LITERATURE IS WRITTEN FOR A LARGE ENSEMBLE. THERE IS ALMOST NO MUSIC FOR SMALL ENSEMBLES. INSTRUMENTATION IS SUCH A PROBLEM THAT FORM, TONALITY, AND "MUSICALITY" ARE HARDLY A CONSIDERATION.

Listen to samples provided by publishers, Listen to recordings from my personal library, or go to the music store, study scores and select music. Then order from my vendor of choice.

Internal account to JW Pepper

With a P.O. for a music store.

FBA list, Reviews from literature stores, hearing other bands perform

I decided what I want then I call Pepper Music

Online sources.

Through school budget. I choose what I know we will be playing for the coming school year

Most of the literature in our music library is purchased by the Band Parent Association. The same goes for solo and ensemble. Our school does provide us with a small amount for the purchase of new music.

We are given $5000 to spend from the county. Generally we pull a Purchase Order Before FMEA and use approximately $1500 towards music. On occasion, we find the need to purchase a specific piece of literature and make a quick call to FL Music Service.

I order it from JWPepper or another distributor.


Mostly at FMEA or Midwest convention, or online - School PO's or Booster Money, depending on what is available at the time.

Through JWPepper.

Various sheet music stores

Through music vendors at conventions and through catalogues.

Internal funds, booster money, department money

Based off of the FBA list through online dealers
Order it from publishers.
We base it on current need of students, cost for replacing selections, availability of music from other sources (other schools, county library, etc.)

Online

recommendations from colleagues, pieces I've heard at concerts and familiar composers I've either played or conducted

With text book money I get from the school.

I try to find some up-to-date "fun" songs for the students to play, because that helps with motivation. I also try to keep an eye on our district festival music list, to be sure that I have a decent selection from which to choose each year. I also try to incorporate a couple of songs that demonstrate student knowledge...a medley, a song with tempo changes, a song with time changes, etc. I also talk to other directors to see what has worked good for them, and I experiment with their songs to see how they work for my own kids. I usually always order music from Peppers, and it goes through our band account. Once a year, we get money from the district for sheet music, but it has to be split between our band and chorus.

From past MPA's, other band director recommendations, new music for that school year by publishers.

Requesting funds. Band Fees.

Recommendations and listening to recordings.

Purchase Orders from band budget

Purchase a variety of pieces, and will usually pick something that fits the group.

Most of the materials I buy won't be used until I've spent some time with them.

I listen to the new music CD's. I then choose possibilities. Then the students listen and we choose their literature together for the winter and spring concerts.

Each level has a say in what they play.

Exclusively through J.W. Pepper

I buy it myself. I either get reimbursed if we have money and if we don't I just bite it and write it off in taxes.

School District Purchase Order
I start by selecting pieces I "need" -- 3 pieces for each group going to Music Performance Assessments from the FBA list, a piece for the Hispanic heritage month assembly, a couple "fun/pop" tunes to motivate kids in the spring. I fill in the remainder of the programs with tunes that have been recommended to me by another director, or those listed in the "Teaching Music through Performance" Series or other lists.

I usually purchase it at the FMEA after listening to the new music reading and taking time to browse through the different vendors. I also use the time to talk to a lot of people about what they have done and what the kids reaction to the music was.

Either through school(fee), booster(budgeted), or principal wish list/textbook money from dealers such as Pepper, Fl. Music, Stanton's, Shattinger, Pender's, Marina, etc.

I look through catalogs, listen to CD's, talk to other directors and then order. Based on the needs of the students and the demands of the ensemble.

I LISTEN TO DEMO CD'S, ATTEND CONCERTS, CLINICS, PERFORM WITH A LOCAL WIND ENSEMBLE. PURCHASES ARE MADE AFTER SOME PERSONAL CONSIDERATION OR RECOMMENDATION FROM THOSE WHOM I CONSIDER TO BE EXPERTS IN WIND LITERATURE.

I purchase music from my local music store if in stock, or order from Florida Music Service.

Check for new publications first and order what I wish to add to my library. Then recycle what I have used before. Lastly, I borrow from other directors.

If this question means what determines the literature I purchase, it is a combination of several factors. FMEA reading clinic is very important, Recommendations from colleagues, listening to publishers CD's, and browsing through arrangements at FMEA vendor booths. Hearing literature other bands are playing is also very important. If your question refers to the process of purchasing literature, I have traditionally purchased music from Florida Music Service. Recently, I have used a wider variety of sources. All music purchases are paid for by our parent association.
Catalogs such as Florida Music Service and Lucks
I listen to as many pieces as I can, new pieces. I try to add a certain amount of classics every year
I use school funds designated as "Department Budget."
on line: J.W. Pepper
Contest and teach ability
I get an allowance from the county each year (textbook funds) which I am allowed to use for the purchase of literature.
I purchase most of my concert music at the FMEA Clinic in Tampa.
Through the band fund and allotted funds from the school system.
School budget and State Text Book Money - fill needs for concert groups based on grade level of literature needed (FBA Music List).
Through internal funds - at fmea or online
Through School text book funds
purchase order
through a music vendor
At State Convention
Through Florida Music Service
Reading through catalogs, past experience, FBA lists, recommendations
Through J.W. Pepper
After determining the strengths of my band I investigate literature which will work best for them and have redeeming musical qualities and which I feel are good pieces of music.
Typically I will ask colleges what has worked for them. Do some listening to recordings and read the reviews in the instrumentalist. Once I narrow it down I will purchase through Pepper or Florida Music Service. I will sometimes purchase music at FMEA convention.
I purchase many of the grade 1 and 2 pieces on the FBA list every year. I read short descriptions in magazines and catalogues. I talk to other directors about what works for them. I listen to other concerts.
On-line when available
We need to fund raise and use money from our band booster account to buy new literature.

I purchase music through Florida Music Service or J. W. Pepper. I use an internal school account.

Based off of FBA list, starting with "significant literature".

Through music company (ie JWP)

Online through school purchase order. Throughout the entire year. We have no specific concert season. We work on concert music in the fall during marching season.

It is usually based on tunes I have heard on other concerts or at MPA.

I use on-line sources primarily. I preview most of the literature through Real Player or MP-3 file. I also use the FBA lists as guides.

Research selections. Decide on which ones to purchase and make out a purchase order through the school.

Fund raising

I choose music by grade, under recommendation by peers and studying scores to see if its range, orchestration and rhythms are wishing the grasp of my students.

For Christmas I choose a few numbers of differing styles, plus a pieces to perform with the chorus. I always program one light selection for Christmas. I choose from the FBA list for the MPA. Then I choose a march, and another piece that is in a jazz style or Broadway tune.

I do extensive listening to pieces that are listed on the FBA list in the appropriate grade levels. Then based on musical and educational interest and my own instrumentation demands and the particular group's playing abilities ( i.e. what instruments do the strong players play etc. ) I select music for the students to sight-read or listen to and we mutually decide what we want to work on together.

One criterion that I use that does not appear on your list is historic period and style. I teach a curriculum which involves the study of one main musical style per year so that students will graduate with a basic understanding of music history.

Either online orders or through Florida Music Service
Listening to new and old recordings; going thru the FBA music list - again; checking a variety of music lists & descriptions; New music on FBA list in January; I also borrow music from other schools.

Booster Club
Over the last 5 years, I have almost exclusively done so online @ jwpepper. Using my school band or my booster accounts
Already in library. Borrowed from other schools. I review the current sample CD's and also refer to my FBA list for pieces that I do not have that fit my group for my current year. I purchase new music for holiday concerts and popular music for spring concerts. According to my curricular plan for the year and as unexpected needs arise. I order online when I establish the need and bill to the boosters account.

FMEA
I listen to recordings and get feedback from other directors. I also order quite a bit on approval and study it to decide whether to keep it.

jwpepper.com
Most of my literature is purchased from J. W. Pepper. I order what I need. I pick up the phone and call the 800 number, instead of purchasing it over the Internet, because I prefer to speak personally to a sales representative. When I get an invoice, I give it to my PTA Music Treasurer, and she pays the bill using funds that have been raised through our fundraisers.
Recommendations from other director's and colleagues. Playing ability of the band. Also, previous experience with literature, titles that would be of interest of the members.

Pepper
If you mean from where? Pepper Fla Music Service Etc. If how by listening to other bands at FMEA listening to groups at MPA, looking for appropriate pop literature. Order through Stanton's Sheet Music, Columbus,Ohio as I need it
Sometimes on approval through mail order, sometimes in person.
I look at my instrumentation and experience level of the students and then I
choose a large group of pieces to read. As we get closer to concert time, I choose
some of the pieces (that we have the best shot at success with), and program them
on the concert.
online at J.W. Pepper or through Florida Music Service
I listen to recordings or live performances. Next I check out the score from JW
pepper.
Textbook funds through the school and band booster funds
I purchase my music from J.W. Pepper. I order music continuously throughout
the year. I place at least four music orders during a school year.
I order online from JW Pepper
Through sheet music companies such as JW Pepper.
Through publishing companies, listening to examples and asking around to other
band directors
Listen to promos.
Through purchase orders.
From either Pepper or Florida Music Service at FMEA Convention.
Director recommendations and listening to other bands
I purchase most literature at the FMEA All-State Convention using band boosters
money.
I start with a knowledge of my group's playing abilities that I have already
gathered from marching season. This includes weakness with strength. Then, I
begin listening to new pieces, tell fellow directors my strengths and weaknesses to
see if they have ever had such instrumentation/ability levels and what they
performed. I also feel there are certain staples that should be played sometime in
one's music career, and if possible will incorporate them in with less traditional
pieces, even if it's not on the "Festival" concert.
I purchase most of my music at the FMEA All-State Convention.
Through JW Pepper music service either on line or through school purchase
order.
call pepper
on line
Through our internal account.
From JW Pepper with School funds
Listen on JWPepper. Consult FBA list. Consult colleagues.
On line
By listening to recordings and advice from other directors, attending other directors concerts.
Based on my ensemble strengths. Order from Pepper and FL mus service.
Listen to it on recordings if available. If not, I check to see if it is a good seller. I make sure my concerts will have a balance of different types of music.
Florida Lists
Some school funds and some band booster funds
Through a music store that I have dealt with for several years.
QUESTION 2: How do you select literature to purchase?

literature purchase selection
By selecting music that is appropriate for the developmental level and instrumentation of my group.
I ask for the opinions of experienced successful directors, I look at the strengths and weaknesses of my ensemble and I listen to a lot of recordings to help make my selections.
Look at FBA list
Most of my music is selected from the FBA list. The other is chosen from recordings I have heard or from advice from colleagues.
Based on research
Review FBA lists to ensure that the library has a variety of "standard" literature.
Seek recommendations from colleagues. Make a point to sit on reading sessions at All-State conference to be exposed to new additions to lists.
Listen to publisher recordings and consult the state FBA list.
Instrumentation and ranges first then obligatory parts.
We order music on review from Pepper. When we receive the music, we have a month to sight-read and then we send back what we don't like and pay for the rest. I also attend MPA's to hear music. We are a relatively new school, so I also order quite a bit directly from the FBA music list.
There are many we I select literature. I try to select literature that will help the band develop a more balanced blend and quality sonority. I select literature based on the ability of the students and I also try to select music that will keep my students interested and challenged all the way to the performance.
Convention, catalogs,demos,price
If there is a piece that I want to perform or read through, and it is not in our library, I purchase it. I also like to purchase several small ensembles and solos every year, just to give students more variety in choosing solo/ensemble literature.
Whenever a new piece is composed that a lot of universities are programming, or
a piece that was on the rep list for a conducting workshop, I try to buy a copy as well.

Same as the last question.

I either look pieces I have played or have heard other schools play, or specific composers. I then browse through different music selections online or on the Teaching Music through Performance CDs. If I like it and I think it will be a quality piece to play with my bands, I buy it.

FBA List/Experience

Listen to recordings. Browse scores.

I try and find recordings to study. I also look at the state list for significant literature that is not in my library.

I base it on the types of performances I will be doing that year such as a Disney Concert or a concert downtown for a patriotic event, etc.

Florida list Listening

see question 1

Score study, sample recordings from publishers, concert listening experiences and recommendations from colleagues,

listen to sampler cds

I evaluate recordings and concerts for works that I think will inspire the students and I to prepare works to a high level. We try to sight-read a great deal.

Listening

Based on individuals and instrumentation within the band/ensemble; education and skill enhancement; and fun or potential interest for the students (and me!).

Listening to as many pieces as possible and selecting from those.

Level of difficulty, instrumentation and style

Guides, talking to colleagues, listening to performances of the music

Recommendations from other directors, published reviews, and recordings

I listen to recordings and consult the FBA list. I will also pull from memory about composers and pieces that I have heard before.

Listening to CD's, Concerts, clinics, printed reviews etc
I attend concerts, visit composer websites, get recommendations from others, commission new works. Before I purchase any set I make an analysis of every piece I want to by that I am not familiar with. It's time consuming but it expands my budget and I avoid real flops in my library.

I listen to MP3s of the music, talk with other more experienced directors, and check the FBA list.

Advice from other directors, FBA List, Browsing catalogs, references in books

It depends on the curriculum I have planned; for instance, if the focus is meter changes and syncopation for an average, freshman band, a challenging, exciting, yet accessible piece would be Ticheli's Fortress. Then the rest of the program would be determined being that I've selected the most difficult piece. They would probably deal more with sonority, long tones, and maybe stylistically choral like literature.

Same as above.

same

I select music based on the skill level of my musicians. But I have to have music for the type of performance as well. If it is an assessment, I feel that I have less choices and that I have to be extremely selective in order to have the band learn and have a great assessment performance. If it is a concert I tend to have some of the same discretion while looking for music that will be entertaining, exploratory, or challenging enough to stretch the band without sacrificing a quality performance. In other words can they perform the music at a level that people would go out and hear the music more than once because of the way the band performs the music.

FBA list, recordings

same

Prior knowledge or referral from colleague

Perusal. I pick music that interests me, is playable by my group, and will be enjoyable and educational for the musicians. If these things are met, audiences will generally enjoy the music.

Based on the instrumentation and recommendation of other band directors.
I purchase what I hear that sounds good and seems educational. 
I order on approval, and I order stuff I have heard before. Sometimes I order by looking over the score. I'm not great at hearing in my head by just looking at a score.

Reading books: Talking to Band Director's who are well established, Listening to reading bands at conferences, Attending Mid West Clinic in CHICAGO!!! Attend collegiate Wind Band Concerts
Familiarity with composer, s work. Recommendations of other directors, catalog comments.
AND some of my best discoveries have been "shots in the dark".
By listening to Teaching Through Performance CD's, asking older directors, listening during MPA's, and having a general knowledge of the literature myself experience
See previous question.
Ability level of the ensemble and purpose of the event are the top two factors.
I listen to MP3 files on-line of different selections; I also talk to other directors and get their suggestions. I consult the FBA list as well.
FBA lists, sample disks (Jazz band), or from college band concerts.
I listen. I usually purchase new music for concerts etc. as our library has most of the music that is on the FBA list.
Some is done through sample recordings sent by publishers. Most is done through listening of various works at county-wide band evaluations and making determinations on future purchases.
For purchase: I look largely at instrumentation, difficulty, and range.
For my own charts: I look for public domain source material as much as possible, or rescore out-of-copyright/print "classic" arrangements.
I look at all of our ensemble needs for upcoming festivals, concerts and then also pick some literature that will push each ensemble to learn something beyond preparing for performances.
From knowledge of literature.
Listening to recordings and buying a variety of selections at a time
Review music: 1. Recommendation from others. 2. Recordings from the publishers. 3. Personal recordings. 4. Concerts and programs from conventions (such as FMEA).

I like to purchase quality literature that I know can be used over a long period of time. It needs to be a piece that has substance and an array of solid musical interest. I try and determine what the students will learn by rehearsing or performing this piece. Always focus on basic music fundamentals. I like to give my students challenging music so that they have an opportunity to improve their basic skills over the length of the school year. I tend to start with easy to medium easy at the beginning of the year and gradually increase the difficulty as the year progresses.

At the middle school level, I have to look for material that would appeal to the kids enough that they would enjoy playing. But on the other side, I have to balance the fact that it has to have function in teaching the concepts I need to cover in class. I listen to lots of recordings provided by publishers, and seek advice from other middle school band directors to see what has worked for them. I also attend when possible, music reading sessions to hear the actual pieces live and what the director had to say about the literature. With those tools at hand, I then have a better idea more or less what to look for and purchase.

Concert Band is selected from recommendations by other directors, my personal familiarity with the specific music, or from hearing it performed by others. Jazz is selected primarily by demo recordings. Marching band from a combination of demo recordings and working directly with specific arrangers.

Standard Literature, Word of mouth, State Lists
Same as previous question.
Fortunately, my school has a tremendous library in terms of quality and quantity. During the first four months of school, we read through 30 to 40 pieces before selecting pieces for contest and concerts. If I'm not buying something I know, I browse through the music and look at the scores to see if they're suitable. Usually by reviewing the music on site, then receiving the music on "approval" and having the band sight read the different literature. when doing this, out of courtesy I will try to buy at least half of what I remove from the shelves (Keep in mind --- choose carefully!!)

same

Budget and need

By the criteria outlined previously. By considering all the previous information, along with instrumentation, experience levels (we currently have two bands of greatly different experience), and available budgets. We are a new schools (2 years old), so we have a very poorly supplied library. With nothing to start from and then limited resources, choosing and buying music must be done very carefully. Long term use/lasting quality are also very important considerations because of the limited amount of available music we have, and can get in the future.

Listening to demos and performances of literature of which I am not familiar.

listening, performing, word of mouth
difficulty, instrumentation, style

I usually have a "wish list" of music I would like to add to the library, and I simply go down and add as much as I can to the purchase order.

Needs of the Ensemble--Growth of the students

see previous

See previous question

I look at the catalog's description of the piece and how it is graded. I tend to buy grade 1/2-1 for my 6th grade band, grade 1 1/2-2 for my 7th grade band, and 1 1/2 -3 for my 8th grade band. I also choose music depending on what time of the year it is. My students perform 4 times a year: October (concert band music)
December (holiday music) March (concert band music) May (Pops Music Concert - Students choose the music that they want to perform.)

Listening to recordings, attending other schools concerts, recommendations from mentors
Listening to Demo CD's, purchasing band recordings of know literature, referencing FBA music list, advice from outside sources.
I listen to ensemble recordings or at FMEA All-State, the Collegiate Band to new music added to the FBA list. I also listen to recordings from publishers and online.
Listening, saving festival programs, convention performances
Publisher CD's, catalogs, experience

READ MY RESPONSE TO THE FIRST QUESTION. WHEN I FIND MUSIC TO FIT OUR INSTRUMENTATION, I PURCHASE IT BECAUSE IT IS RARE.
see previous answer
cds...experience

Looking at lists - Listening to recordings
Listening and experience.

1) I decide on music for festival 2) I listen to cd's sent to me from publishers 3) I order things I already know 4) I form a list at concert festival of pieces I like

Music I like, that is appropriate for the group, and will interest them
Based on what I feel my band will be able to perform. Also, I choose it based on our academic theme for the year. Example, this year we studied film scoring and performed a concert based on music soundtracks
I attend new music sessions, listen to recordings, get recommendations from other directors and select music by composers I feel write quality music.

Ability level of the student based on Rhythmic Values, Tonalities and Melodic Lines.
Catalogues, suggestions from other directors, personal wishes.
Listening to promotional CDs and attending convention, concerts and conferences. 1. Recommendation 2. Composers reputation 3. Publisher's CDs 4. FBA lists
Based on what I know or recommendations from other respected musicians
Listen to selections online, listen to selections other bands perform, select pieces based on composer's previous works.
Look at score listen to recording
Mostly by title and from the description in the catalogue.
on-line music stores with Po's, ..... Do you mean 'How do I choose my music?'
Titles which will educate my students, they will enjoy playing, titles that fit my instrumentation and things I like.
Based on recommended literature from the FBA list or from pieces I have heard at various concerts.
Ask other directors for suggestions
I know a lot of pieces and I listen to music a lot.
In addition to the above, we also consider playing ability of students, instrumentation and approximate cost.
FBA list, previous concerts attended, colleague recommendations, pinpointing specific skills to work on within the ensembles
Difficulty, range, purpose of piece, educational benefit, quality score
From the FBA list or from what I hear new at the convention. Sometimes from the promotional CD's you get in the mail. Also, from what I hear at Festival each year.
I think I combined this answer with the previous one.
Read through it
Current Events, Listening to samples
Discussion with other directors; listening to promotional CD's from publishers; score review
Mostly through recommendations or through recognition.
Once we've chosen the music, I buy it.
I use the music on approval system from J.W. Pepper. 1. The level of the group to play it. 2. difficulty. 3. what type of piece i.e. character piece, march, sonorous Quality/Need/Recommendation/Variety

Usually, 75% of the music I want to use during the year is NOT in my library. I go to jwpepper.com or floridamusicservice .com and order the rest. Price is usually not a factor.

since I confused the question with the first one I will answer it here. I purchase my music through my internal budget in the school. This money is generated through the instrument rental fee the county charges every student using a school instrument.

Some from past experience playing or conducting. Some from FBA list. Some from listening to CD's and concerts. Some from talking to other directors. Also the big catalogs(Pepper) is a good resource.

Same as above.

Preview and the use response of last question.

as mentioned above

Personal experience, recordings, score study, or recommendation from colleagues.

Score study usually. Often from recordings from publishing companies. Hearing it played by other bands

See previous answer.

Aesthetic and Educational Value

I just buy what I think will fit my group the best

I refer to the sate list and convention performances. I will also look at a lot of scores at publisher's booths at conventions. I don't often listen to the demo CD's put out by the publishers. I will also order some pieces from dealers "on approval" to study and possible sight read.

I listen to recordings and view scores.

Concepts taught in the music

It's based on how well it fit's my band's instrumentation and ability level of my students.

From a recommended list or music that I have heard.
Fill library with significant literature as indicated on the FBA Music List, then fill based on selections performed by other quality band programs. suggestions from others, listening at clinics Recommendation, Reading sessions, Recordings level of performers through other directors, music heard at festivals and music lists Preview concert at conv. Recommendations, FBA List, Familiarity I often buy it on approval, and send those that will not work back. Listening and by recommendation If I think a piece is a good fit and it's not in my library, I purchase it. I think I just answered that in the last question. recommendations from other directors or listen to recordings I select literature using a rotating curriculum that focuses on the elements of melody, harmony, rhythm, timbre, and form, and all the subcategories there within. student skill level See previous question. New arrangements out for the seasons, older arrangements on and off the FBA music list to add to the library I base it upon the needs of the ensemble. Which groups need attention and improvement, as well as which groups are strong and should be featured. I try to select a variety of literature in order to keep the students and the audience interested. It is usually something I have heard on another concert or at MPA. Same way. Research through the Instrumentalist, FBA All State Convention reading sessions, Kreines' Annotated Literature Guide, going to concerts, listening to performances at FBA MPA's, FBA Music List recommendations, colleague recommendations, catalogue descriptions recordings, recommendations, advertising
see previous answer.
The literature I purchase is what I choose for concert performance.
I go to a lot of concerts and take notes and I listen to a lot of recordings. I read
descriptions and recommendations in catalogues, but that doesn't usually really
reap as effective results. My selections are made according to the season I am
working in. I ado the most technically difficult music in the Fall while I major on
fundamentals. Then I do technically easier music that has expressive qualities for
concert season so that I can work more on musicality. In the Spring we do light
concert and feature soloists and ensembles. The best results are obtained if I can
plan a year in advance so that I am reading music the Spring before the year in
which I actually want to play it.
I seek quality literature that is within the ability range of my students. Some a bit
below their ability level, some above. Literature is selected on basis of quality. I
feel that it is import for my students to experience some of the masterworks of
wind literature such as the Holst Suites and Lincolnshire Posy as well as good
transcriptions of orchestral literature such as Italian in Algiers, and The Promise
of Living. Recommendations from more experienced colleagues are of great help.
I guess I answered that question on the last line. I purchase the music sometimes
thru textbook flex funds, mostly band booster money.
Word of mouth, recommendations, pieces I have heard
Listening, Composer, Occasion.
Reputation, recommendation, & interest in new literature
N/A
Needs of my curriculum.
trial and error
I choose pieces that have many opportunities to learn about music fundamentals.
I choose pieces that I know are significant works. I choose composers that the
students should know (i.e. Bernstein, Wagner). I choose music that the students
will enjoy and will be both do-able and a challenge for most of them.
I purchase it based upon my needs for an upcoming "theme" concert and I order literature that I heard at the FMEA Convention. I order literature that I liked based upon timbre, instrumentation, and level for my groups.

Sight reading with the band. FBA lists. Recommendations from other directors and colleagues. FBA reading sessions, recommendations of publishers.

Marching almost every year, Middle school to provide variety, High School for Festival and new for concerts

Listen to other bands, directors, look at online scores on occasion mostly for pop literature. Use the FBA list as stripped as it has been lately.

Listen to recordings, take suggestions from colleagues.

by hearing it first

By recommendation, or on approval, or after hearing another group perform it.

I listen to CDs from publishers, attend other band concerts, listen to wind band CDs, and take suggestions from peers.

Listening to recordings, familiar pieces, standards that I believe every student should play, music that is on the FBA list we don't own yet

listening, prior knowledge, word of mouth

By the experience, ability, and instrumentation of the group. I get music recommendations from other directors and by listening to other bands and recordings.

I listen to the new cd's each year that the publishers send, or use recommendations of other directors.

I review FBA Lists for significant literature, and then order several pieces at a time to peruse. If they suit the circumstances of my band, we give them a read.

Even if they don't work, I don't return anything, because my library needs everything it can get. Ordering only quality literature, I've at least provided options for future bands.

Hopefully listen to an example of it and by the instrumentation of the band.

Listen to promos.

I consider the difficulty level and instrumentation of my band program. 1.FBA music list, 2. Hearing the music performed, 3. Director recommendation
I choose quality literature that has been recommended to me by music educators I respect. The instrumentation must work for my group and the difficulty level must be challenging to my students and yet be attainable so they can be successful performing it.

Listen to mass recordings. See if I already have a recording to listen to or scour the internet trying to find an example. I also have books, like "Teaching Music Through Performance" that has standard pieces from a variety of different levels (1-6) and deals with different interpretations.

I choose literature that has been recommended by music educators I highly respect. The literature must have instrumentation that will work with my students. The difficulty level must be challenging for my students to push them, and yet attainable for them to be successful.

Personal knowledge, recommendation, listening to recordings to find appropriate selections for all of our bands.

listen to recordings, use the FBA provided list to refresh myself of titles
recommendation, listening, personal knowledge

We find music appropriate for the age group. We have ordered new music that was introduced at the conference in Tampa.

Listen to music, pick music that will help my students become better musicians and that fit the ensemble.

same

Get music on approval and look it over

By listening to concerts/recordings/advice from other directors
Same as above.

I listen to recordings and check on whether it's a good seller. I check the difficulty of the music to be sure my students can perform it.

As our library is fairly substantial with classic band literature, everything at this point is seeking out fresh compositions that utilize the band to best advantage.

Either by comparing my library catalog with the FBA list and find what is lacking, or through listening to publisher demo CDs. I also consult reference recordings such as the Teaching Music through Performance series.
QUESTION 3: How do you select literature to perform?

literature performance selection
Level of experience...Needs to be appropriate for the musicians
By balancing what they play well and what is educationally best for them
same as above
look at instrumentation of group and group's capability to technical ability and
tone
This selection is based upon 3 factors. 1. The maturity level of the ensemble and
its instrumentation. 2. How much the music will teach the students. 3. The
audience for whom we are performing.
research /Professional Organization
I pick the literature that: a) has musically redeeming qualities and teaches
concepts b) reflects the skill level and work ethic of the group c) is appropriate for
the given event
Concert Band - from state list and instrumentation that matches my ensembles.
Jazz band - Playability and audience appeal with various styles and genres.
time I have to perfect the tunes
There is a number of factors involved in that process. A lot of the process
involves reading music with the bands, determining what their strengths and
weaknesses are. I also talk to colleagues to find music that fits our needs. I really
try to find great music that challenges all students, yet still allows them to be
successful. To do this, one needs to have a firm grasp on the ability level of the
band.
See question #2.
Appropriate for ensemble
It must be something that will offer something of value to the concert or
performance, it must fit within the flow if the program. It must be musically
valuable--depth, technical, musical, and show opportunities for teaching musical
concepts. It must be playable by the ensemble. If we can't even sight-read it,
chances are we will never reach the musical depth of the piece because I don't want to be spending every rehearsal drilling notes and rhythms. Based upon strengths of the sections.

Is it exciting for the kids AND a quality piece of literature? If yes to both, then I will perform it. I do not do a lot of novelty pieces. There is plenty of good music available that is exciting to play that is not "cartoon movie melody magic for flutes and drums."

A process of trial and error...a narrowing from a large number of pieces in the folder that is being sight read and rehearsed...

Browse scores. Examine utilitarian needs.

Instrumentation and variety. The piece has to be very good for me to cue a solo into another instrument. Otherwise, I want to be true to the composers intent. I never want to play two pieces that sound alike in any way on a concert.

Difficulty level, students appeal, etc

How it fits the group

When selecting Literature I look at the occasion and my audience and also how I can meet the needs of educating my students. Once I know who we are performing for I can begin building a concert. To begin the selection I will look at the ensemble last performance for the past 3 - 5 years to avoid repeats; members on ensemble should not have to perform "greatest hits" over and over. We'll leave that to the orchestra, BUT all students should be exposed to specific genres and styles during their academic career. Students should be exposed to Holst, Grainger Vaughan Williams, Schuman, Sousa, King, Orchestral Transcriptions, Grundman, and contemporary composers as well. It troubles me that many bands play only "new" stuff and the most difficult. There are quality works in Grades 2 and 3 that all performers regardless of ability should perform.

I consider the ability level of the (middle school) students and the type of program we will be performing for, such as holiday concert, spring concert, festival performance and select music I deem appropriate to these factors.

friends' comments, personal liking of the piece
first, what will be ready for the public to hear it at the level we want to be know for second, what will have a good "flow" on the program
Rehearsing several pieces to get an overall feel for how my group will respond to it, and potential for success. Also I look for what my students can learn by performing a particular selection. Then I choose.
Level of preparation--sometimes the "dream" piece just doesn't work out; audience interest; possible theme related to concert. Presently we are a very new private school so we are developing both the band and choir programs from w/in. We have plans to feature each group and then combine for one or two selections. The use of a common theme is very important for the audience's appreciation and interest.
I find literature that meets the educational goals of the program and appropriate level for students. Wide range of styles.
Guides, Talking to colleagues, listening to performances
Published critiques.
I listen to recordings or go with composers or pieces I know will be appropriate to the concert.
Based on the musical needs of the students or special event we perform at I look at rehearsal time, audience and what my students human need to be learning. It's a shame but not all students who graduate from HS experience Holst, Sousa, King, Vaughan Williams, Grainger, Schuman, and a transcription. Directors are cheating by just listening to recordings and ordering music that turns out to be too difficult or playing the newest music. I am a firm believer in contemporary music - I have done many premieres but not all new music is good music. Students need to experience standard rep to prepare them to perform Art Music as their musical experience evolves.
I have my ensembles sight-read a lot of lit. After they have sight-read it, if I like it and it can serve either a performance or pedagogical purpose, I have them keep it.
Amount of "teaching material," Is it realistic with a given time line, do the kids enjoy it, do I enjoy it, is it entertaining?
Same

The literature selected is based on the ability of my students. I try to chose music that is challenging yet attainable for these students. Sometimes my literature selection is limited by a list that the music must be selected from. I try to have a balance of lyrical and technical selections as well as original band works and transcriptions.

same

Assessments are performances also. So I'd have to say that I consider the musician's ability, the band instrumentation, and will the students learn more about musicality? Being in the band field we have the good fortune to have a rich variety of music. So typically, I try to give the listener new and interesting music to listen to as well as tunes and styles which they are familiar with. I try to have the best of all worlds. Proper programming is essential for keeping your audience in the seats, your students captivated, and a strong learning agenda. I also try not to put too much on one concert. Everyone should (performers included) walk out of the auditorium feeling as if they enjoyed what they came to hear on more than one level.

Level of ensemble, instrumentation

This is normally based on instrumentation of the ensemble, ability level, etc. I distribute pieces I think are appropriate, then let students vote to narrow it down. Perusal. I pick music that I enjoy, that is playable by my group and that the musicians will find enjoyable and educational. If these things are met, audiences will generally enjoy the music.

Based on the groups ability and specific musical goals we have for that upcoming performance i.e. - a piece to introduce/improve double tonguing)

Based on what the concert is for, who the audience is, but mostly based on what level of ability my band is at.

I pass out the music and read it with my band to make sure it seems do-able.

I select literature that has educational merit to my students. I choose music that has solid musical ideas well composed music.
1. Suitability for the performing group. 2. Suitability for the performing situation. 3. Good music is good curriculum so I select music I can use as a tool to teach.

Based on the FBA system, by grade level. For concerts, it depends on the mood/style of the concert, and what the audience/students would like the most and give them a challenge.

Experience

See previous question.

Ability of the ensemble and the purpose of the performance.

I try to expose the students to a variety of styles. I program at least one "lighter" selection on each concert, and then the other selections are more serious literature.

I look at what the piece calls for instrumentation wise and difficulty level. I look at the FBA list and try to find the highlighted pieces that are "significant literature". I also listen to a lot of the recordings that are out designed as resource recordings or suggestions from people I respect.

Ability of the group. Purpose of the concert. Can I find the score.

I look for contrasting styles and keys, but always focusing on just shooting above the level of my students, particularly with rhythmic interpretation, key signatures, range, technique and tempo, etc.

Partially, I try to theme my concerts in some way (Broadway tunes, Folk music, etc.). This partially guides my selections. I also look to connect across curricula where possible, in consultation with other faculty (largely in the humanities).

Finally, some of my literature choices are dictated by the programs (Veterans' Day, Holiday programs, etc.).

I compare programs from around the area including all county, all state, and then determine what our audience will enjoy and also put a few selections in there that give our students a more in depth look at either form or a certain composer, or a certain style.

Literature to teach appropriate concepts needed at the time.

1 classic, 1 popular or Broadway, one programmatic and then another

Based on playability
I like to find pieces that suit the certain group (according to skill level, experience, and instrumentation) and I like to pick pieces that will hopefully push them to a higher level in those areas, as well as in the areas of musical expression and musical understanding.

I use the same concepts as mentioned in the previous question. If a piece is too difficult or easy for them I usually will not have them perform that selection on a concert.

what is the best fit for the band performing it - parts, rhythm, tonality, variety, phrasing, etc. I determine what the goal of the piece needs to be -- emphasis on rhythm for instance, I may look for pieces that challenge whichever rhythm concept I'm wanting to accomplish.

I pick contrasting styles, meters, and or tempos for performances. I also look into my strengths and weaknesses in the ensemble. If I have a strong woodwind section, the I'd want to pick something that would bring them out a bit more and vice versa. If I have a theme for the performance then I try to pick similar pieces, for example, I had an Black History assembly to play for, so I selected African folksongs, and pieces that had those themes to it. For FBA I selected pieces that would allow my students to be the most successful as possible. Even if the piece might be slightly easier for them to play.

level of ensemble; instrumentation

I consider the season that the concert takes place, something that can be played at a high level and still challenge my students, and look at lists and listen to recordings to find things that I like.

I select literature to perform for FBA from the (outdated) FBA lists. For concerts at home, I often select literature that is not on the FBA lists. For jazz, I select from the music I purchase and the music already in my library to try and find the best fits for the group. For marching band, I work hard to study what is available, and listen to what others have performed and working with my visual people, I select music that we jointly believe will communicate well with our audiences.

I try to find the music that fits my program

Same a previous question.
I choose pieces which compliment the instrumentation of the ensemble. I try to stay away from pieces which are very contrapuntal. I try to select pieces which explore textures within the ensemble. Pieces with strong melodic lines are given priority. I also try to pick pieces which includes, to a limited extent, areas of weakness for the band i.e. meter changes, duple meters, syncopation.

Based on my ensemble's abilities to perform it, I choose music which is interesting to play, listen to, and will teach the students something valuable. Either I already know what I want the band to play, or if I am unfamiliar with the selection, I have the band read through my purchases or music "on -approval" and see what is more realistic. It also provides a chance to read a variety of literature (sight-reading)

same

By the criteria outlined previously.

Using all the information in the last two questions, and then what works given the current dynamics of each group.

Usually, that which best fits the needs of the ensemble as well as that which advances the concepts on which I am working at that time.

intended programming

A variety of factors! We want to present logical and coherent programs that will be interesting to the audience. We want the students to study a variety of literature of different styles. We want them to be challenged and grow both expressively and technically.

Needs of the students/occasion/growth of the ensemble

see previous

The band works on many pieces throughout the year. Those pieces that are the most successful for us and suite the occasion are performed.

Same answer as question 2.

Based on our groups ability level and amount of time we have to make the music sound perfect.
I want to know what my students can learn from it. I often select music based on their weaknesses so we can work on them. I also select music that they have the potential to have a good performance eventually.

I take into account the instrumentation and needs of the ensemble for development.

ability of current group, strengths and weaknesses are taken in to account.

Amount of rehearsal time and maturity of students.

What they sound good on, what is important to have performed

I WORK AT A NAVY HIGH SCHOOL AND A GOOD PORTION OF OUR LITERATURE IS DICTATED BY THE US NAVY. THE ONLY LIBERTY I HAVE WITH LITERATURE IS FOR CONCERT BAND EVALUATION, SOLO AND ENSEMBLE, AND FOOTBALL GAMES.

Sight read a lot of literature early in the year to assess the level and needs of the ensembles.

Then create a balanced program based on the ability and need for growth within the ensemble.

personal pref

Know theme of the concert. Have students read through a few pieces. Choose with a combination of how well it's played and how well liked the piece is. Make sure you have strong players on the right parts

Sight reading and reasons listed before 1) Good literature 2) for a festival - something the band can play well 3) for other concerts some pieces that challenge them and some that are easy 4) something for the students, director, audience same

A lot of it depends on instrumentation that I have and the level the music is at. I also try to choose a variety of different blends so students can grow musically and still enjoy what they are playing.

I try to balance my programs with a march, two challenging but contrasting serious pieces, some type of popular piece (not radio music, but maybe movie music - Pirates of the Caribbean or Lord of the Rings) and perhaps a novelty piece (Snakes or Clouds). I try to play in a variety of keys but that is not always easy at
the middle school level. I try to avoid 'formula' music, especially with my advanced group.

Music selections are based on the concert the music will be performed on. For instance, we try to keep it interesting for the audience as well as the performer for the Spring Concert, however, for our Winter Concert, we try to select pieces that will help train the musicians for the upcoming concert season as we transition from the Marching Season.

At this time, I usually only purchase music I will perform. I will also thumb through my library and find music appropriate to my ensemble.

Based on ensemble make-up (skill levels of students, instrumentation etc.)

1. FBA Grade requirements
2. Instrumentation
3. Level of difficulty
4. Enjoyed by students

Based on educational level of music, and talent level of ensemble.. must be enough to teach, challenge, but be achievable in the end.

Look and instrumentation and ability level of my players. Look at the cultural value of the piece.

listen to band

I let the band read several pieces and the ones that pose the fewest problems are the songs I will focus on for the concert MPA

See previous answer.

Depends on the situation and the audience.

We sight-read a lot and decide from there. 1) What we are capable of playing
2) What kind of performance is it, i.e.. holiday, MPA, light concert, etc.
3) How much time do we have to prepare

We do consider time of year, level of playing ability by students, and other considerations already mentioned. We also try to build the playing level of students progressively as the year goes along.

Same as question 2

Educational benefit, rehearsal time, level of players, instrumentation

What fits my ensemble best or if something new grabs my attention.
After we've rehearsed all of the music that has been passed out for the semester, then I make selections based on the following items: how the students like it, if it can be used as a learning tool as well, if I feel the students have the potential to perform it well, if we have the instrumentation to carry it off for a performance. From reading through it and listen to feedback from the kids, and if I feel they should play regardless if they like it or not, just to perform good literature. Performance level, student interest
Age level, time for rehearsal, instrumentation, etc.
Selections are based on instrumentation; and ability of the students.... we're a tiny private school and things tend to vary both in ability and instrumentation the literature needs to be flexible and have the ability to be played without full instrumentation
Variety of style music that the students and I enjoy playing, or if it relates to specific concepts I am teaching.
Same as the other 2 questions.
It depends on the season of the year. Usually concerts are built around one theme.
same as before
Quality/Variety/Appropriateness
After doing a lot of sight reading, I survey the students. I ask them what they like. I feel that if they like it, they will put more of an effort. The good thing is that if the music is good, the students usually like it. My students also know that every once in a while, we'll perform a piece that is strictly for me. It is something they I want to do because I feel it is something they should play, but since I let them choose what we will play from the music I put out, they are o.k. with me imposing my choices over there choice.
Same as the purchasing section. I'm always trying to balance standard works with works by newer composers. I also try to balance pieces that should be experienced(Holst, Grainger, Ticheli, etc.) with works that the ensemble may enjoy in addition to these.
I play it with the group and see if it sounds good. I also try to program a variety ex- a march, serious pieces and pop pieces.
Same as last question.
selection as noted above
I usually choose from six or seven selections that the band is currently working on.
We read a wealthy of music to determine what fits us the best.
See answer to 1 of 3. Whether a piece fits my ensemble is critical. I trust certain composers/arrangers also. John Edmondson, Mike Williams, Mike Story, Elliot Del Borgo, others.
Aesthetic and educational value
Depends how much time we have, I the students feel about the music and the occasion
I try to select literature that allows the ensemble to showcase its strengths and address some of its weaknesses. I have a limited instrumentation, so that plays a large role in the process. I like to challenge the students to play in different keys and meters. We will sight read several pieces to see what is workable in the time allowed. I keep the rejected pieces in mind for later in the year or for the ensemble in the future with different personnel.
Depends of the type of event and the level of my ensembles experience.
Teach ability
I select it based on my band's instrumentation and ability level of my students.
I want a it to be interesting so I use all different styles and times.
Type of Audience being performed for and quality of literature.
what fits the kids - purpose of concert - variety of styles / time periods, , ,
Sight Reading with group
rehearsal time and performance level
look at the horn parts
Ask colleagues
Selecting a balanced program, recommendations, FBA list
Based on interest level of music, appropriateness for event, familiarity
Listening and recommendation
Same as first question with the additional consideration of program appeal.
Find music appropriate for their level. Then we will play through more pieces then we will play that year. And when I find a piece that "Fits" the ensemble, we will work on it for a concert.
After we get used to a piece, I decide whether or not the piece works with the personality of the band for that year, and then I choose to either continue to work toward the concert or give up on beating a "dead horse."
Same procedure as before...I only have the budget to purchase literature that will be performed.
student skill level and the occasion/time of year
Based on a combination of concepts I want to teach, literature my students need to be exposed to, level of ensemble, and student interest.
Same
Same as previous question.
For concerts I usually try to program one march, a couple of serious band pieces, the a couple 'pop' type pieces.
Same way.
I look for a balanced program of literature that is educational and entertaining for the students and audience alike. The music must be consistently high in standards.
variety and performance readiness
see previous answer.
I choose music that is within the capabilities of my ensemble. Usually that means what the demands are from the trumpets or low brass, and what are the ability level of the students that I have that year.
See answers to Question 1 & 2.
Performance literature is based on three factors. One, is this quality literature. Two, is my band going to sound good playing this piece. Three, will it appeal to my target audience.
It fits the band, it provides a variety in programming, the students enjoy playing it
We will work up a number of selection. The kids will choose one and I will pick the other two selections

Quality first. Level of difficulty second.

have a varied program, how an ensemble reacts to the piece, potential for successful performance

Personal experience, ensemble ability, rehearsal time, requirements by FBA for MPA, concepts to be taught.

Educational (curriculum) decisions as to what music is best for my students to explore, study, and perform.

trial and error

I select music that fits my "theme" concerts, school functions, and music that I liked at the FMEA Convention. I choose music for its timbre, instrumentation, style, and level of my groups.

How well each piece is prepared by the students. Variety of selections for concert.

Ability level of students, What I feel they currently lack to be a good overall musician

Try to find stuff that is appropriate for the musicians I have at the time. I like to expose them to all idioms. From transcriptions, original band, as well as movie and pop themes where they are good and appropriate. For example A John Williams movie them is an excellent vehicle for teaching many sound musical concepts.

Sight-read and look for students reactions as well as the concepts that I want to teach.

how it fits the ensemble

Sometimes, I narrow down the choices to pieces that I feel are appropriate, then let the students decide from there. Other times I make an "executive" decision.

After ready a ton of music, I choose a few pieces that will be easy to perform well and I also program a few pieces that will really challenge the group.

what fits the ensemble best based on instrumentation strengths, teachable content, likeability of the piece from ensemble and conductor

quality of writing, playability, rehearsal time
For each concert, every band performs a march, an overture, and a fun piece (or holiday piece). I do a student conductor piece in the spring and I always have ensembles (flute choir, percussion, etc.) perform at every concert. The advanced band always does a lyrical or musically challenging piece for each concert.

I consider my band's ability before choosing the piece. I want something that is challenging, but still playable.

After reading a few times, and getting a feel for the band's response and performance, I'll choose to perform or try something else.

Something that is a good teaching tool.

Literature selection is based on "quality" and/or perform ability by students. 1. Appropriate for performance (ie. Holiday, Pops, MPA) 2. Appropriate for ensemble

Fit to the band, and appropriate for the season

It depends on how much time we have to prepare; what the instrumentation is; if the music difficulty level is challenging, yet attainable; who our audience will be; what kind of concert we are giving; and how educational and enjoyable the music will be for me and my students to work on for a period of time.

I have four separate bands and a jazz band. When selecting appropriate literature, I try to find selections that fit the instrumentation and skill level of each group.

We work to perform a varied selections. Marches, overtures and at times lighter music is programmed. The music should challenge the students, but I do not program pieces that can't perform.

level of difficulty and instrumentation. If I don't have good horn then Amazing Grace, Ticheli is not being played

Level of group, time to rehearse, quality

It depends on what the performance is for. Also depends on which grade level is performing.

We perform almost everything that we rehearse.

same and then play through with my group.

Hear it, look at it
By playing it with my band and listening to how it fits my ensemble's instrumentation and playing level
Same as above.
I listen to recordings and check that my students can perform it...that it's not too difficult.
Taking into consideration where the group is in relation to where we want to be, and the time available to rehearse prior to performance.
I select literature based around the type of concert we will be putting on. I try to program some standard band literature in addition to some more "lighter" tunes that are more recognizable to a generic audience. I like to have a good variety of literature for my bands on the program.
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