PERSPECTIVES ON EMERGENT WIND BAND LITERATURE:
UNDERSTANDING THE VIEWS OF BAND DIRECTORS IN
HIGH SCHOOL INSTRUMENTAL SETTINGS

A dissertation submitted to the College of the Arts
at Kent State University in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Travis J. Weller

February 2014
Dissertation written by

Travis J. Weller

B.S., Grove City College, 1995

M.M., Duquesne University, 2007

Ph.D., Kent State University, 2014

Approved by

_________________________________, Chair, Doctoral Dissertation Committee
Craig Resta

_________________________________, Member, Doctoral Dissertation Committee
Patricia Grutzmacher

_________________________________, Member, Doctoral Dissertation Committee
Ralph Lorenz

_________________________________, Member, Doctoral Dissertation Committee
Cindy Kovalik

Accepted by

_________________________________, Director, School of Music
Denise Seachrist

_________________________________, Dean, College of the Arts
John R. Crawford
TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS ........................................................................................................ iii
LIST OF FIGURES .............................................................................................................. v
LIST OF TABLES ................................................................................................................ vi
ABSTRACT ............................................................................................................................. x
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ......................................................................................................... xii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION .................................................................................................................. 1
   Background of the Problem ............................................................................................... 1
   Need for the Study ............................................................................................................. 11
   Scope of the Study ........................................................................................................... 13
   Statement of the Problem ............................................................................................... 14
   Research Questions ......................................................................................................... 15
   Methodology .................................................................................................................... 16
   Terminology ..................................................................................................................... 19
   Limitations ....................................................................................................................... 20
   Conclusion ....................................................................................................................... 23

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .............................................................................. 25
   Introduction ....................................................................................................................... 25
   Consideration of Quality in Concert Band Repertoire ................................................... 26
   Essentials of Selecting Repertoire ................................................................................. 53
   Important Repertoire Research ....................................................................................... 66
   Conclusion ....................................................................................................................... 79

III. METHODOLOGY ............................................................................................................. 83
   Introduction ....................................................................................................................... 83
   Criteria Development ....................................................................................................... 84
   Selection of Repertoire Review Panel ............................................................................ 89
   Selection of New and Emergent Works ......................................................................... 90
   Description of Participants ............................................................................................ 92
   Survey Design ................................................................................................................ 94
   Analysis of Data .............................................................................................................. 97
   Analysis of the CBREC Review Panel Data ................................................................ 99
   Report on Repertoire Review Panel Selections ............................................................ 103
   Conclusion ....................................................................................................................... 108

IV. RESULTS ......................................................................................................................... 110
   Introduction ..................................................................................................................... 110
   Participant Background Data ......................................................................................... 111
   Evaluations of Selected Works by Participant Directors ............................................. 119
   Examination of Individual CBREC Items .................................................................... 127
   Examination of Background Variables across Three Selected Works ..................... 131
CBREC Ratings by Director Age Group .......................................................... 132
CBREC Ratings by Director Ensemble Groups ........................................... 140
CBREC Ratings by Comment and Non-Comment Director Groups .......... 152
Overview of Open-ended Responses by Participant Directors .................. 167
Conclusion .................................................................................................. 177

V. DISCUSSION ......................................................................................... 179
Introduction ............................................................................................... 179
Overview of the Study ............................................................................. 180
Discussion of Participants ......................................................................... 181
Discussion of Findings ........................................................................... 182
Discussion of CBREC Item Data .............................................................. 183
Discussion of CBREC Items between Director Age Groups .................... 196
Discussion of CBREC Items between Director Ensemble Groups ............ 204
Discussion of CBREC Items between Director Comment Groups .......... 208
Important Themes Pertaining to the Research Questions ....................... 215
Limitations of the Present Study ............................................................... 232
Implications for High School Directors .................................................. 234
Implications for Composers and Music Publishers ................................. 236
Implications for Future Repertoire Studies ............................................. 237
Views on Repertoire Selection from a Director and Composer ............... 239
Thoughts on the Profession ...................................................................... 244
Closing ....................................................................................................... 249

APPENDIXES

A. LIST OF PUBLISHERS DISTRIBUTED THROUGH J.W. PEPPER .......... 252
B. LIST OF PUBLISHERS INDEPENDENTLY DISTRIBUTED ..................... 253
C. CBREC REVIEW EMAIL INVITATION .................................................. 254
D. CBREC REVIEW ON-LINE SCREEN SHOT .......................................... 255
E. TOP-SELLING WORKS FROM J.W. PEPPER (2009-2012) .................. 257
F. REQUEST TO CONDUCT RESEARCH WITH PHI BETA MU ............. 258
G. APPROVAL FROM PHI BETA MU TO CONDUCT RESEARCH .......... 259
H. INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN SURVEY ..................................... 260
I. CONCERT BAND REPERTOIRE EVALUATION CRITERIA .................. 262
J. KSU IRB APPROVAL TO CONDUCT RESEARCH ............................... 263
K. SCREEN SHOTS OF ON-LINE SURVEY QUESTIONS ....................... 273
L. SUMMARY OF OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES FROM DIRECTORS ........ 282
M. LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED WITHIN STUDY ............................. 294

REFERENCES ............................................................................................. 295
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total new concert band publications made available from publishers during the catalog years 2007-2012.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total new concert band publications and total new original works for the concert band during the catalog years 2007-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Criteria for Determining Serious Artistic Merit (Ostling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Criteria for music selection from <em>Best Music for High School Band</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grade Level Descriptions (Dvorak, Grechesky, and Ciepluch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Criteria for Evaluating Music (Cramer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Concert Band Piece Categories (Feldman and Contzius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Evaluative Criteria for the Selection of Concert Band Music (Fiese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Concert Band Repertoire Criteria Development Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Concert Band Repertoire Evaluation Criteria (<em>CBREC</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Open-ended Questions for Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>CBREC</em> Individual Likert Item Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>CBREC</em> Inter-item Correlation Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>CBREC</em> Item-total Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>RPP Rankings of Works Under Consideration in the Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Original Concert Band Works to be used in the Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Phi Beta Mu Chapter Representation and Number of Participant Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Educational Background of Research Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Reported Ensemble Teaching Responsibilities of Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Reported Student Enrollment of Ensembles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reported Number of New Works Purchased Annually by Directors for Concert Band

Director Familiarity with Selected Works

Comparison of Response Rates with Other Repertoire Studies

Director CBREC Ratings of Rest

Inter-item Correlational Analysis of Rest

Director CBREC Ratings of Lux Aurumque

Inter-item Correlational Analysis of Lux Aurumque

Director CBREC Ratings of Elements

Inter-item Correlational Analysis of Elements

Inter-item Correlational Analysis of Participant Variables

Correlational Analysis of Melodic Craftsmanship Ratings

Correlational Analysis of Harmonic Language Ratings

Correlational Analysis of Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo Ratings

Correlational Analysis of Timbre and Orchestration Ratings

Correlational Analysis of Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast Ratings

Correlational Analysis of Pedagogical Usefulness Ratings

Correlational Analysis of Emotional Impact and Sensitivity Ratings

Correlational Analysis of Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use Ratings

Report on CBREC Ratings by Director Age Group on Rest

Independent t-Test on Director Age Group Ratings on Rest

Report on CBREC Ratings by Director Age Group on Lux Aurumque

Independent t-Test on Director Age Group Ratings on Lux Aurumque
Report on CBREC Ratings by Director Age Group on Elements .................. 137
Independent t-Test on Director Age Group Ratings on Elements .................. 138
Correlational Analysis of CBREC Items within Director Age Groups .............. 139
Background Variables of Ensemble Director Groups ................................... 141
Report on CBREC Ratings by Director Ensemble Groups on Rest .................. 142
Independent t-Test on Ensemble Director Group Ratings on Rest ................. 143
Report on CBREC Ratings by Director Ensemble Groups on Lux Aurumque ..... 144
Independent t-Test on Ensemble Director Group Ratings on Lux Aurumque ...... 145
Report on CBREC Ratings by Director Ensemble Groups on Elements .......... 146
Independent t-Test on Ensemble Director Group Ratings on Elements .......... 147
Inter-item Correlational Analysis of CBREC Items According to Director
Ensemble Groups .................................................................................. 148
Correlational Analysis of Directors Teaching One Ensemble Background
Variables .......................................................................................... 150
Correlational Analysis of Directors Teaching Two or More Ensembles
Background Variables ....................................................................... 151
Background Variables of Director Comment Groups .................................... 152
Report on CBREC Ratings by Director Comment Groups on Rest ............. 153
Independent t-Test on Director Comment Group Ratings on Rest .......... 154
Report on CBREC Ratings by Director Comment Groups on Lux Aurumque .. 155
Independent t-Test on Director Comment Group Ratings on Lux Aurumque .... 156
Report on CBREC Ratings by Director Comment Groups on Elements ...... 157
Independent t-Test on Director Comment Group Ratings on Elements ...... 158
Inter-item Correlational Analysis of CBREC Items According to Director Comment
Groups ............................................................................................ 159
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Correlational Analysis for Comment Director Group on <em>Rest</em></td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Correlational Analysis for Non-Comment Director Group on <em>Rest</em></td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Correlational Analysis for Comment Director Group on <em>Lux Aurumque</em></td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Correlational Analysis for Non-Comment Director Group on <em>Lux Aurumque</em></td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Correlational Analysis for Comment Director Group on <em>Elements</em></td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Correlational Analysis for Non-Comment Director Group on <em>Elements</em></td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Open-ended Survey Question #1</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Director Comment Frequency for Question #1</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Open-ended Survey Question #2</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Director Comment Frequency for Question #2</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Open-ended Survey Question #3</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Director Comment Frequency for Question #3</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perspectives on Emergent Wind Band Literature: Understanding the Views of Band Directors in High School Instrumental Settings

Dissertation Adviser: Dr. Craig Resta

Directors of school concert bands continue to program new and emergent works alongside pieces considered to be part of the core and traditional repertoire. The purpose of this dissertation was to discover what criteria directors consider important in their review of new and emergent concert band works for use in rehearsal and performance. A secondary objective examined if director experience and educational background influenced the evaluation of this music used in high school instrumental settings.

In order to evaluate this recent repertoire, the Concert Band Repertoire Evaluation Criteria (CBREC) was developed by the researcher, and reviewed by a panel of collegiate directors. The review of the CBREC revealed it to be a reliable tool for the purposes of the study. An independent panel of experts in concert band repertoire selected three works to be reviewed by participants. Invited participants comprised band directors who hold membership in an international band fraternity. The teaching responsibilities of these directors included conducting concert bands at American senior high schools. Participant directors rated each work using the CBREC after viewing an image of the music score and listening to an audio recording of the piece. The participant directors had the option of rating their familiarity with each piece used and answering three open-ended questions regarding repertoire selection.

Data collected from the participants indicated favorable mean ratings for the works used in the study. When the participant data were analyzed in sub-groups, several
statistically significant findings were reported. Sub-groups including older directors, directors teaching only one ensemble, and directors who answered open-ended questions in the study demonstrated more stability in their ratings of the repertoire used in the study than did younger directors, directors teaching multiple ensembles, and directors who did not respond to open-ended questions.

Results suggested participant directors reached a consensus regarding several aspects of the pieces used in the study, indicated by the CBREC Ratings and open-ended comments. The correlational analysis of CBREC Items demonstrated that directors are considering multiple aspects of a work during the evaluation process. Data supported that melodic material, pedagogical use, as well as timbre and orchestration influence how this group of directors estimate the longevity of new concert band works.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Background

Since the end of the nineteenth century, the American concert band has grown as an important part of modern education, thanks in part to significant conductors and leaders who have raised the standards for performance. The growth of the concert band has also been credited in part to the evolving repertoire that has been created for this ensemble by diversely talented composers. This evolution has been significant as, with some notable exceptions, the concert band is a relatively young ensemble in terms of its years of existence when compared to the orchestra (Jones, 2005).

From the beginning of the twentieth century when some of the first original and substantial pieces for concert band were written, the American concert band model has served as a standard for repertoire (Jagow, 2007, p.191). The core and traditional repertoire has been selected from a relatively small list of pieces as many of these works have been written since the middle of the twentieth century (Jones, 2005). For clarity, core and traditional repertoire has traditionally referred to an established, criteria-based collection or listing of music suitable for study and performance by a school concert band. Pieces from the core and traditional repertoire have long been considered to be familiar works of high compositional craft and pedagogical value that also retain aesthetic and artistic merit. A number of these works were written by American composers and have earned a distinguished reputation by their continual selection for study and performance by directors.
The evaluation and selection of repertoire for the school concert band has been the focus of numerous research studies over the past 15 years (Carney, 2005; Gaines, 1998; Gilbert, 1993; Greig, 2003; Hash, 2005; Hayward, 2004; Howard, 2001; Jones, 2005; Kish, 2005; Rhea, 1999; Stevenson, 2004; Towner, 2011; Williams, 2008; Young, 1998). Authors of these studies have produced a variety of lists that identify many pieces as part of the core and traditional repertoire for the school concert band. A number of recognized and respected conductors and educators have also written on the subject of repertoire selection for school bands based upon significant personal experience rehearsing and performing various works (Battisti, 2002; Begian, 1991; Cooper 2004; Dvorak, 1993; Feldman and Contzius, 2011; Gage, 2000; Jagow, 2007; Menghini, 1999; Miles, 1996; Miles, 1998; Reynolds, 2000; Williamson, 2008).

The resulting lists from both research and scholarly writing have become a valuable resource tool to many band directors in the selection of repertoire for concert bands. More than one of the authors and researchers above has made a case that a wealth of good, meritorious literature exists from which directors may select music. Many of the authors cited above also agree that the selection of literature is one of the most important responsibilities a director will undertake in teaching.

Several of the authors named above (Greig, 2003; Hash, 2005; Howard, 2001; Kish, 2005) indicate that while directors are selecting many pieces from the core and traditional repertoire for study and performance, they have also evaluated and selected other works alongside these pieces. The selection of pieces within the core and traditional repertoire might be explained by an examination of the criteria employed by some directors (Abril 2006; Bauer, 1996; Carney, 2005; Feldman & Contzius, 2011; Fiese,
1991; Gilbert, 1993; McCallum, 2007; Ostling, 1978; Persellin, 2000; Rosene, 2004; Towner, 2011; Whaley, 2005). The reasons and criteria employed by directors in the evaluation and selection of other works may not be so readily apparent.

Many of these pieces might be new works created by composers who exhibit a great deal of originality in their writing of pieces for the school concert band. Though the history of concert band repertoire is relatively short, there has been evidence that each decade has brought forth diversely talented composers who have been willing to explore new themes and concepts in their creation of new works (Stoffel, 2010). Concert band directors also have commissioned new works to commemorate special events, celebrate related anniversaries, or honor and memorialize groups and significant, unique events.

There have been many composers of concert band literature creating compelling and engaging new pieces in the twenty-first century that pay homage to prior works in the core repertoire, and also expanded into new material that transcends traditional labels, forms, and styles. Composers such as Frank Ticheli, Samuel Hazo, Steven Bryant, Robert W. Smith, John Mackey, Eric Whitacre, Robert Sheldon, Andrew Boysen Jr., Mark Camphouse, Brian Balmages, and Richard Saucedo have been but a few writers who continually contribute engaging and innovative pieces to the modern concert band repertoire. Works for the concert bands of today offer a broad array of styles, textures, pedagogical concepts, and programmatic elements from which directors have selected for their ensembles.

While these composers have created a diverse selection of music from which directors can choose, music education in the public schools has faced increased scrutiny in many parts of the country over the last twenty-five years. Educational reform has been
in a relative state of flux as new policies and mandates have been enacted by politicians and departments of education. This reform movement has resulted in teachers of nearly all content areas redefining the importance of their subject area as part of a twenty-first century education. Many teachers have identified the quality of their curriculum to defend their position and demonstrate the value of their subject to school administrators and policy makers.

Music has been subject to this same defense and examination by school administrators, and some band directors have sought to draw upon pieces from the core repertoire to alleviate some of this pressure. Yet, there are administrators, researchers, and parents who have expressed concern regarding the value of music being rehearsed and studied by some public school bands. Each school band program has made contributions to their school climate and culture, and has been situated in a unique context that should be taken into consideration by the director in the selection of music.

In the process of selecting music for the concert band, directors have a number of different aspects to consider. Directors have evaluated pieces with the strengths and weaknesses of the group for which they are choosing, technical demands, inherent value, pedagogical concerns, and the amount of rehearsal time with the ensemble. All of these factors have various levels of importance in the evaluation process, but there has also been the consideration that directors want to create a quality musical experience for their students through the study of all repertoire they have selected (McCallum, 2007, p. 105).

Many knowledgeable conductors and composers have expressed concern with concert band literature that is being published today, and they have shared interesting perspectives regarding their own selection and evaluation process (Battisti, 2002;
Camphouse, 2002; Camphouse, 2004; McBeth, 1990; Miles, 1996; Miles, 1998).

Individuals in both of these groups have specific criteria or questions to which they referred to in the evaluation and selection of individual works for the concert band. Often, there has been the suggestion that directors should select works identified as part of the core and traditional repertoire for the school concert band.

Educators and conductors have produced these lists through a personal evaluation process. Many of these individuals shared such lists with fellow educators, meaning them to be a useful resource in the selection of repertoire for the concert band. In some cases, it has been possible that the collective opinion about a certain work could lead to exclusionary choices being made, and thereby have begun to limit the exposure students have to certain styles, forms, and genres in the concert band setting. Beyond that possibility, a piece selected from the core and traditional repertoire may not have authentically connected with the students and ensemble for which it was chosen. This situation was not a dismissal of a piece from the core and traditional repertoire, but rather was meant to broaden the discussion of the evaluation and selection of music for the concert band.

Optimally, directors take into account the various contexts in which their ensembles have been situated and how connected students may be to certain styles, forms, and eras. To a further point, directors should remember that any style of music, including ones used in music education contexts, has examples on a gamut ranging from excellent to poor. It would be fruitless to deem one style of music as more superior (Reimer, 1991). There have been many factors and considerations in play in the selection
of repertoire, and not every choice might be easily justified or appropriate for a particular context.

While many directors, composers, and conductors might not argue against the inclusion of work considered to be part of the core and traditional repertoire, the selection of a new piece might prove to be more openly contested. Repertoire lists might provide insight as to why a piece has been selected by a director for a concert band, as over time that piece has been carefully evaluated and was considered part of the core and traditional repertoire. However, the reasons for the selection and inclusion of a new and emergent work for study and performance by a concert band have not been completely evident.

There have been many new pieces made available each year by music publishers that result in a myriad of options from which directors may choose. Figure 1 illustrates the number of new concert band publications made available from various music publishers during the catalog years 2007 through 2012. Many publishers have their works distributed through J.W. Pepper (2012), a national retailer of concert band music with fourteen locations that provide regional service to public schools in the United States of America. Because their regional stores each service only a few states, it was reasonable to expect that publishers recognize the value of J.W. Pepper to distribute music nationwide.

J.W. Pepper has maintained a useful web-site that provides directors the ability to search through thousands of concert band pieces, view score images, and listen to reference recordings. Using the search features available on the J.W. Pepper website, I followed a three-step process to ascertain the number of new works published over the past five years. The first filter applied was that of year of publication, which included all new music that J.W. Pepper distributed from various publishers during that year. The
second filter applied was that of ensemble type (Concert Band), and the website produced a list of all pieces released during that given publication year intended for use by a concert band. A list of these publishers can be found in Appendix A.

Once the number of new works published each year for the concert band was established, I applied a third filter to discern between the various musical styles within the new publications. The table shows the number of publications in popular styles, inclusive of Broadway, jazz, and pop music. This table also displays the number of new original works for the concert band, which included but was not limited to settings of folk songs, fanfares, overture, and novelty pieces. In the collection of this data, there were several aspects of concern that were noted.

The first aspect to consider is that marches (new arrangements or settings of existing marches) and re-editions of older works were not included in the total number of new original works for the concert band. The rationale for the exclusion of marches is that many repertoire studies traditionally have not included such works (Gilbert, 1993; Ostling, 1978; Rhea, 1999; Thomas, 1998; Towner, 2011). The decision to omit re-editions of older works was due to the probability that original editions of these works exist in school music libraries and were still being used by concert bands.

The second aspect that must be mentioned was that this process did not take into account a number of independent publishers, nor did it include self-published composers who have not elected to make their works available through J.W. Pepper. I attempted to contact publishers that either did not distribute through J.W. Pepper at all, or did not consistently distribute music through J.W. Pepper over the five-year period beginning in 2007, to ascertain the number of unaccounted for pieces. These music publishers were
contacted through their website, with a request to learn how many new pieces their companies published each year between 2007 and 2012. The email explained that they would only be identified as having contributed to the aggregate data of new concert band works.

Five of the twelve publishers responded to the email, and they provided the requested data. Through additional contact made to individual composers who wrote for these independent companies or were self-published, ten individual self-publishers and independent publishers were accounted for over the same five-year span (Appendix B). The total number of pieces published by these companies over the time period requested has been reflected in Figure 1 as part of the total new original concert band publications not available through J.W. Pepper.

![Figure 1](image)

*Figure 1* Total new concert band publications made available from publishers during the catalog years 2007-2012.
As illustrated in Figure 1, the majority of new pieces made available by the various publication companies over the past five catalog years have been original works for the concert band. Table 1 provided a detailed account of the total number of publications, and the percentage of publications each year that would be considered an original work for the concert band. The percentage of new original works for the concert band was calculated by dividing the total of new original works for concert band by the total number of concert band publications. The percentage of original works for the concert band has regularly (with the exception of the 2010-2011 catalog year) been greater than 75% of the total new works made available.

Table 1

_Total new concert band publications and total new original works for the concert band during the catalog years 2007-2012._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog Year</th>
<th>Total concert band publications by year</th>
<th>Total new original works for the concert band</th>
<th>Percentage of new original works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information retrieved from J.W. Pepper and other independent publishers suggested that there has been a consistent influx of new, original works for the concert band made available for the school concert band. A point worth mentioning was that many of the lists that identify core and traditional repertoire included only original works for the concert band and, with very few exceptions, has not included music taken from
popular styles. The absorption of new and emergent original works combined with many of the older pieces held to be core and traditional literature has contributed to a general state of semi-fluidity in the concert band repertoire.

There has been a wide array of musical and non-musical aspects attached to new and emergent works that must be accounted for by directors alongside standard questions and considerations unique to the context and makeup of the ensemble for which it was chosen. During the evaluation and selection process, directors have examined the presence of different styles of music in new and emergent works. Additionally, directors have witnessed the blending of other elements from multiple sources resulting in an innovative style of music that may prove difficult to define or label. Beyond that, directors must also consider the many different composers that have contributed repertoire, and unique musical elements that have pedagogical value or aesthetic merit.

Many new works published each year have been purchased by school concert bands and receive multiple performances across the United States. However, it was speculative to assume that sales figures alone have been an accurate indicator of the value a new and emergent work makes to the total experience in the concert band setting. One area that needed examination was whether directors perceive new and emergent works to meet standards similar to those they hold for pieces from the core repertoire. New and emergent works may be demonstrating characteristics similar to those pieces that were considered to be part of the core literature. These same pieces for concert bands may have also demonstrated educational merit while retaining aesthetic and artistic value. These questions about the emergent band literature currently available might be answered by evaluating recent pieces using evaluative criteria.
Need for the Study

A number of studies have been conducted in an effort to identify important repertoire for concert bands at the collegiate, high school, and junior high/middle school level (Gaines, 1998; Hash, 2005; Hayward, 2004; Howard, 2001; Jones 2005; Rhea, 1999; Stevenson, 2004; Thomas, 1998; Williams, 1998; Young, 1998). Additionally, a number of distinguished and recognized conductors have shared the viewpoint based upon significant personal experience in their work with such ensembles in periodicals and in texts (Dvorak, 1993; Gage, 2000; Reynolds, 2000; Williamson, 2008; Battisti: 2002). In both the research and the writing, there was little acknowledgement given to the evaluation of new and emergent works for concert bands.

Many new and emergent works have been evaluated by directors each year. Depending upon their budgetary allotment, curricular objectives, and programming needs, directors of these ensembles have invested time evaluating these works as part of their overall selection process. A limited budgetary allotment for the purchase of new works for the concert band may have required that directors make careful decisions in their evaluation and selection of such repertoire. As some of the new and emergent works have specific programmatic and cross-curricular connections, such pieces may have become a vehicle through which directors can reach specific curricular objectives and fill their programming needs. In either case, directors have examined new and emergent works for the concert band to make the best possible selection for their ensembles.

The existing scholarly literature demonstrated concerns being voiced by conductors, composers, and directors about the quality of new and emergent works for concert band. There was evidence in this literature to suggest that directors used differing
criteria in an effort to make the best possible choices for their ensemble when considering literature from any time period. Prior research has resulted in the development of lists that identify core and traditional repertoire for concert bands, but it was difficult to incorporate works that have not experienced a long programming history, nor sufficient review and performance in such studies. Studies evaluating unfamiliar works for concert bands by Fiese (1991), Heidel (1999) and Sheldon (2000) have been among the work completed specifically in this area.

As there has been sustained growth of new works being composed and made available to school concert bands, it seemed relevant to investigate directors’ perceptions of such pieces. These new and emergent, and to some degree untested, works seem to have been compelling choices for directors and their ensembles alongside and, at times, over pieces within the core and traditional repertoire. The traditional and core repertoire have been consistently discussed and utilized, and yet the appeal of new and emergent works has been sustained.

Directors have demonstrated that they can identify important works from the core repertoire, yet they also identified newer works to share with their ensembles for study and performance. Discovering what aspects of new and emergent works were perceived to be valuable to directors might provide a needed perspective to the discussion and investigation of repertoire in the future. What specifically have directors identified in new works for the concert band as being valuable in the instrumental ensemble setting?

Scope of the Study

This focus of this study was to collect and understand the views of band directors regarding new and emergent works for the high school concert band. The directors who
were invited to participate in this study held membership in an international band
fraternity, and directed at least one concert band comprising students in grades nine
through twelve. Demographic information regarding each director was obtained to gain a
better understanding of their educational background, years of experience, and teaching
situation. The views of band directors regarding new and emergent works for the high
school concert band were collected through the use of evaluative criteria.

A panel of collegiate and university directors reviewed a list of musical criteria
that I developed to be used by participants in the study. This criteria list included, but was
not limited to, aspects of melody, harmony, rhythm, timbre, form, pedagogy, sensitivity,
and longevity. Three new works for concert band were selected by a panel of experts for
examination in the study. Participant directors were invited to rate various aspects of
these three new and emergent works for concert band Using the criteria list I developed.
The resulting data generated was compiled and analyzed using a combination of
appropriate statistical tests to realize the goals of this study.

The main objective of the study was to identify what musical criteria directors
viewed as important during their evaluation of new and emergent concert band works. A
secondary objective was to examine if director experience and educational background
had any influence on the evaluation of concert band music. The results have provided
some insight into the programming choices made by band directors. The findings of this
study have also illustrated compositional trends and composer intent that would assist
directors in future choices for the school concert band. Additionally, the results of this
study have some importance to music publishers so they better understand the value of
the repertoire they have made available to school concert bands.
Statement of the Problem

The selection repertoire for the school concert band has been an area of importance for directors. Many studies have identified pieces from the core and traditional repertoire to assist directors in the evaluation and selection process. Research studies that examined concert programs over the last 50 years revealed that directors revisit pieces considered to be core and traditional literature. By selecting these pieces, directors may have fulfilled curricular objectives or a sense of obligation to the heritage of the American concert band. While pieces from the core and traditional repertoire have received multiple performances, directors have also evaluated and included new and emergent works alongside these pieces.

For many students, the school concert band has remained one of the common ways in which students stay active musically during their high school careers. While the school concert bands have faced curricular and financial challenges, large ensembles, like the concert band, have remained popular in schools because they contribute to social maturation in its members, and provide a forum for students with keen interests and well-developed abilities to provide leadership (Croft, 1997). They have also remained a viable experience because of the music studied and performed as part of that experience. Many original works for band have stood apart from other musical traditions and styles, and provided a unique experience that would prove difficult to replicate in another medium. Though some scholars criticized this music for being insensitive or creating an unresponsive culture of its own (Abramo, 2007; Allsup & Benedict, 2008; Budiansky 2005), directors should take into account that the selection of this music for the concert band may enhance the musical experience for students performing in such a group.
A number of other studies that have focused on repertoire selection have investigated how directors evaluate and select music for study and performance. The findings in several of those studies pointed to the fact that directors are concerned with the quality of the music they select for their ensembles. There may have been little question regarding the evaluation and selection of a piece that has been considered core and traditional repertoire, yet many new and emergent works were selected by directors for study and performance. The main focus of this study attempted to ascertain what criteria directors perceived to be important in their evaluation and selection of new and emergent works for the school concert band.

Research Questions

New and emergent works for the school concert band continually have received performances alongside pieces considered to be part of the core and traditional repertoire. Little work has been done to discover why directors select new pieces for the ensembles in the school setting. Initially, these pieces may have provided a unique and engaging appeal that result in a degree of popularity. This study sought to identify if there was underlying value found in new and emergent concert band works. Through use of an online survey, I sought to answer the following research questions:

1) What criteria do band directors consider important when evaluating new and emergent works for concert band?

2) How does personal and professional background impact the perspectives of band directors regarding new and emergent works for concert band?

3) What relationship factors exist between the various criteria identified as important by band directors and how do they compare?

These questions revealed but a few layers in the evaluation process of new and emergent concert band works used by high school band directors. The answers to these
questions provided a better idea of how personal and professional background experiences influenced the evaluation process and ultimately the selection of new and emergent works for the school concert band. The next section has included an overview of the methodology within this dissertation.

Methodology

Band directors whose teaching responsibilities include conducting concert bands made up of students in grades 9-12 at American public high schools were invited to participate in this voluntary study. Participants were asked to review three pieces of new and emergent concert band music using a list of evaluative musical criteria that addressed melody, harmony, rhythm, form, timbre, expression and longevity. These new works for concert band evaluated by participants were selected with the assistance of a national distributor of concert band music and leading instrumental music educators who review such works for scholarly music journals.

In an analysis of repertoire used in music contests, Hash (2005) contacted J.W. Pepper to gather a list of best-selling pieces. Similar to this procedure, I contacted J.W. Pepper for a list of the top-selling concert band pieces over the last three years appropriate for a high school concert band. A panel of music educators who review new pieces for scholarly journals was formed to select the new and emergent works from the list provided by J.W. Pepper. These educators were selected on the basis of 1) their position as a reviewer for a journal, 2) familiarity with repertoire and repertoire studies, and 3) past experience as a conductor of a concert band during their professional experience.
The Repertoire Review Panel (RRP) examined this list of new and emergent literature from J.W. Pepper considered several different aspects, including but not limited to artistic, aesthetic, and pedagogical value. From this list provided by J.W. Pepper, the RRP advised the researcher as to the three pieces to be evaluated by high school band directors who participated in the study. After the three pieces were selected, a recording and score image of each work was made available on a secure web-site.

With the assistance of an international band fraternity that promotes and supports school concert bands, high school band directors were invited to participate in the study. Within the study, participants provided basic background information detailing degrees earned, years teaching, and number of ensembles that they direct. Following the collection of basic demographic information, participants then examined each of the three pieces by viewing a score image while listening to an audio recording. At the conclusion of this listening section, participants evaluated and responded to various aspects of each work using a criteria list that was developed by the researcher.

For the purposes of this study a series of statements that identify various aspects within each piece was developed by the researcher. A number of different studies, texts, and articles were examined as part of the review of literature. From that review, a criteria list for evaluating new and emergent concert band repertoire was created. Prior to its use in this study, this criteria list was reviewed by a panel of collegiate and university band directors to ascertain its reliability. A statistical analysis of the data generated by the panel of collegiate band directors and professors of music was reported to the dissertation committee prior to its use with participants in the current study.
This list of criteria identified various aspects to be considered by band directors during the evaluation of concert band literature for the school concert band. The high school band directors in this study used this list of criteria to evaluate individual aspects of each piece. Participant directors rated each aspect on the criteria list using a Likert scale with a range from 1 to 7, with 1 designating very strongly disagree and 7 being very strongly agree. The responses to the Likert scale items in the list of criteria provided data for statistical analysis.

A series of open-ended questions was also presented to the participant group at the conclusion of the study to ensure that there was the opportunity to gain additional information and opinions that could not be measured by the criteria list that was created. This section of the survey provided the high school band directors the opportunity to expand upon their level of agreement and fully explain their perception of which criteria they hold to be of importance. These questions were optional for participants in the study.

Data from the survey were analyzed through descriptive statistics and determine the strength of each aspect. The primary purpose of this dissertation was to identify what musical criteria from the list I developed were important to directors during their evaluation of new works for the concert band. A secondary purpose of the study was to demonstrate how differences in age, educational background, and teaching experience might influence evaluation of band literature. A correlational analysis was conducted to determine what relationship aspects exist between the various criteria identified as important by the band directors who participated. Finally, responses from the open-ended questions at the end of the survey were analyzed against the statistical data to determine
if these statements provided reasonable explanations to the emerging perceptions of the participants.

Terminology

While some of the terms discussed within the following chapters have been clearly understood by educators, the review of scholarly literature and methodology required a mutual vocabulary to be established. For the purposes of this study, it was determined that a common understanding of the following terms was useful.

Band Director – refers to a music educator that as part of regular teaching duties provides instruction to a curricular instrumental ensemble in a school setting. The amount of instructional time spent in this role may or may not be a complete reflection of their teaching load and responsibilities.

Concert Band – refers to a curricular instrumental music ensemble within a school setting that studies and performs a varied repertoire of music. The standard instrumentation includes flutes, oboe, bassoons, clarinets, saxophones, trumpets, French horns, trombones, euphoniums, tubas, percussion and other instruments as called for in the repertoire. It may or may not be an auditioned group, and may range from a single player on a part to multiple players on a single part.

Core and Traditional Repertoire – refers to a collection or listing of music suitable for study and performance by a school band that has been subject to multiple evaluations and has established a consistent programming record over time. The works are considered to be familiar, have a high level of compositional craft, pedagogical value, and have also retained aesthetic and artistic merit.
**Instrumental Setting** – refers to a curricular instructional situation during which a band director teaches a group of students within a concert band. The use of a varied repertoire of works suitable to the ensemble and other supplementary materials is a common feature of the daily instruction provided to the ensemble.

**New and Emergent Works** – refers to a collection or listing of music suitable for study and performance by a school band that has not been subject to intensive evaluation nor has yet established a consistent programming record over time. This list is generally considered to be unfamiliar to directors, and may be written within 5 years of the present study. The compositional craft, pedagogical value, and aesthetic and artistic merit have not been closely examined by directors. Despite the lack of critical examination, the piece receives considerable attention due to its musical content, unique qualities, composer association, and sales by publishers.

Although other terms were used later in the study, the terms defined above served as a departure point for the review of literature in the following chapter. As it was necessary to introduce other terms that were less familiar, appropriate narrative was devoted to better inform the reader.

**Limitations**

A national sample of band directors participated in this study. Generalizations beyond the sample were carefully considered on the basis of the unique context in which each band director teaches.

A number of different studies, texts, and articles were consulted to develop an evaluative tool that was adequate to aid in the purpose of the present study. The sources
used were the most appropriate available as it pertained to the evaluation and selection of new and emergent works for the school concert band.

J.W. Pepper was contacted for a list of the top selling concert band works over the catalog years 2009 to 2012. It was possible that an independent publisher or self-published composer had a work that produced higher sales figures than any of the pieces made available through J.W. Pepper. Due to the limited number of responses from the independent publishers and self-published composers outlined earlier in the chapter, this limitation was considered to not be highly probable.

A number of pieces representative of the new and emergent works for concert bands were selected on the basis of their publication sales. The repertoire review panel, which included educators who examine such pieces for national and state periodicals, reviewed other aspects of the pieces to narrow the list to three works. It was acknowledged that the popularity of a given work does not always equate with its quality, and the initial popularity of such a new and emergent work has not always been sustainable over time for it to become part of the core repertoire.

Many of the repertoire lists generated by previous studies contained only original works for the concert band and wind ensemble. The three works selected from the new and emergent literature in this study were held to the same standard as previous repertoire studies. Only original works for the concert band were considered by the Repertoire Review Panel in their review of the new and emergent literature.

Music that was a transcription or arrangement from a popular style (e.g. jazz, Broadway, pop music, soundtracks) set for concert band was not considered even though their sales figures may have placed them within the top five during the last three years.
Transcriptions of classical works of choral or orchestral origins written prior to 1950 were not considered for inclusion in the study. Finally, no marches were included in the present study, as there was a paucity of new marches composed among the new and emergent literature.

It was possible the composers of the works selected for this study were recognizable by participants. Participants may have had familiarity with the piece and have studied and performed it with their ensembles. As a participant in this situation has direct experience with the piece, their evaluation of the various aspects may be more substantial and lend more credibility to the study.

As directors responded to the criteria through use of a Likert scale, it was noted that statements that fit the requirements for a Likert scale may not draw out more complex perceptions held by respondents (Sommer, 2011). Additionally, Likert scales have not predicted behavior very well, and the responses collected could have been influenced by the context, format, and wording of the criteria items (Sommer, 2011). It was possible that either of these conditions could be true concerning the directors participating in this study. For that reason, several open-ended questions were posed within the survey to draw out other perceptions that were not able to be fully encapsulated through use of the criteria list. It was beyond the limits of this study to make definitive predictions regarding how band directors would respond in future opportunities during the process of evaluation and selection of concert band music.

The views of band directors regarding repertoire was a focus of this study. I did not intend to generate a repertoire list of new and emergent works. Only three works were examined by participants in the scope of this study. Furthermore, an in-depth comparison
of new and emergent works with those considered core and traditional literature was beyond the limits of the present study.

Finally, the evaluative tool for determining value in the new and emergent concert band works was not used in a research study prior to this point. This evaluative tool went through a test of reliability prior to the collection of data to ensure that there was consistency. A panel of collegiate and university band directors was contacted to assist with this evaluation prior to use by the group of high school band directors who were invited to be participants in this study.

Conclusion

Within this opening chapter, a need to investigate the perceptions of high school band directors regarding new and emergent works for the school concert band has been presented. As these works have been part of the course of study for concert bands and the ensemble has been a primary means through which students receive training in music, it was worthwhile to learn what aspects of these new pieces directors view as being valuable. With the assistance of collegiate and university directors, the Repertoire Review Panel (RRP) composed of nationally recognized educators, and an international band fraternity, three new and emergent works for the school concert band were evaluated by a group of high school directors.

In the following chapter, a review of scholarly literature illuminated several different important themes as related to the evaluation and selection of new and emergent concert band works. Within the third chapter, a detailed description of the methodology used in the study has been outlined. Chapter three also has a detailed report on the reliability of the criteria list as a survey tool. Additionally, recommendations from the
panel of experts on the three pieces to be used in the study have been included.

Descriptive statistics of the sample population and an analysis of the ratings of the selected works by participants have been included in Chapter Four. An ample discussion and interpretation of the study results, and suggestions for future research as it relates to the process of repertoire evaluation and selection has been presented as part of the final chapter.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Many previous studies devoted to repertoire selection have identified core and traditional literature for concert bands demonstrating the importance of this area within the field of instrumental music education. As directors go through their own evaluation and selection processes, they will have the option to consider many new and emergent works among the many possible choices to study and perform with their concert band. The main focus of this study was to gather the perceptions held by band directors of new and emergent works for the school concert band, and explored what aspects or features they view as being important.

The review of articles, books, and research that followed in this chapter illuminated different views regarding the evaluation and selection of music for concert bands. There was some discussion regarding new and emergent works for the concert band in the literature. The most prominent idea that was revealed in the review of literature was the concern for quality regarding the new and emergent works expressed by many leading voices involved with such ensembles. Though considered by many to be elusive, there have been scholarly ideas to suggest that aspects of quality may be identified. There has been the suggestion by several authors that some new and emergent concert band works lack aspects of quality.

The viewpoints of many prominent concert band composers and conductors were stated to better frame the discussion from the side of those who create the pieces and those who choose to interpret them. There was also exploration of important research as
it pertained to repertoire selection to better understand previous work in the field. The review of literature fell into three major areas including the consideration of quality in concert band repertoire, the importance of evaluating and selecting repertoire, and important repertoire research that has been conducted.

Consideration of Quality in Concert Band Repertoire

Of all the aspects to be discussed as they apply to repertoire evaluation and selection, none is more elusive, difficult to define and quantify, and establish criteria for than is quality. What follows is a lengthy examination of multiple perspectives as it applies to quality and its application specifically with concert band repertoire whether it is core and traditional or new and emergent works. It would seem that no discussion about evaluating and selecting music for study and performance for a musical ensemble can insulate itself from the consideration of Using quality examples for study, rehearsal, and possible performance.

To begin this part of the review of literature, the work of Bennett Reimer (1991) has been considered alongside the views of Frank Battisti (2002). The important past research of Acton Ostling (1978) has also been compared against other writing that considers the concepts and characteristics associated with the term quality. As this examination begins, it has been suggested that criteria for identifying quality may be able to be identified, and that subjective judgments will be applied to those criteria (Reimer, 1991).

As aesthetic education has been an important part of the music education profession over the past fifty years, the thoughts and writings of Bennett Reimer have provided an appropriate starting point for the discussion of quality in music. Reimer has
been at the center of a music education philosophy that promotes opportunities for aesthetic development, and for this reason the musical quality of the literature selected for study and performance becomes very important. Reimer framed the concept of quality as it applies to repertoire selection in music education and helps provide a beginning viewpoint for consideration.

It was the view of Reimer that there is nothing more central and vexing for educators than the use of high-quality examples for study and performance (1991). He also challenged the notion that excellence in the arts was merely a matter of taste, and that criteria for excellence could have been applied with a high degree of discrimination by people who were trained to do so (p. 331). Reimer suggested four criteria can be used to determine the quality of an art form and in the case of the performing arts its eventual performance by an ensemble (p. 331).

The first of four criteria that he set forth was craftsmanship, defining it as the expertness by which all possible available elements of sound are molded into an expressive form (p. 332). The second criterion Reimer discussed was that of sensitivity which is defined as the depth and quality of feeling captured within the dynamic form of the work. In music, the composer is not expressing feelings as much as he or she is developing, expanding and forming feelings so their full possibilities may reach their expressive power (pp. 333-334).

Reimer discussed the criterion of imagination, and identified it as the vividness of a piece and how the piece might capture our attention. The concept of imagination in music expressed by Reimer takes into consideration how unexpected events planned by the composer challenge our feelings and bring them to a more vibrant realization (p. 335).
The final criterion he discussed was that of authenticity, or how the interactions of a composer with the materials he uses forms a symbiotic-like bond of reciprocity. Through the various processes of the creative act the composer creates interactively with all musical elements available allowing the various components of sound to arrive at a conclusion that is richly satisfying (pp. 336-337). Ultimately, for Reimer, it was the interaction of these four criteria that determine the quality of the music.

Reimer pointed out that each style of music must be evaluated on its own merit, and it would be fruitless to deem any particular style of music more or less worthy than any other style. Once a particular style has been selected for an educational context it is appropriate to apply the criteria for quality to examples within that style so the best materials are selected. He also acknowledged that educators must be devoted to the highest standards of quality, but also take into consideration the unique social and educational contexts in which they work (p. 338).

These ideas presented by Reimer challenge educators to seek the finest possible materials that can be applied to their own teaching situation. Hence, he suggests the primary purpose is to create the best possible experience for the students in the educational setting, and also to provide aesthetic nourishment through the power of great music. Reimer has championed this philosophy of music education that places a premium on the using great musical literature as it provides students with a satisfying and rewarding musical experience. This viewpoint regarding the potential that waits to be unlocked in great musical literature through student study and performance has not been insulated from instrumental music education.
There are a number of prominent conductors who have been readily identifiable in the history of the American Wind Band because of their work on the podium. Others have extended their work to beyond the rehearsal hall by contributing scholarly observations and research. Few have distinguished themselves with exemplary contributions in both areas, and one such person was the Conductor Emeritus of the New England Conservatory Wind Ensemble, Frank Battisti.

It was the view of Battisti that while all music offers opportunities for musical growth and development of knowledge and technical skills, great music provides experiences in which students could feel the expressive power of music (2002, p. 241). Study and performance of high-quality music affects an individual’s development of musical values and taste in a very positive way, and those who perform high-quality music develop musical values and tastes for understanding and appreciating high-quality art throughout their lives (pp. 241-242). By his own admission, Battisti appreciated many things that have a very wide range of artistic merit, but when called to select repertoire he chose music appropriate for the players of the highest musical quality and appropriate for the occasion and environment (p. 242).

Battisti has been among many composers, conductors, and some directors who have called for high-quality music for ensembles. There would appear to be universal agreement from all directors regarding this statement, but research and writing on more than one occasion has demonstrated that some directors do not demonstrate this agreement in their choices. Battisti stated there has been ample evidence to suggest that much of the repertoire being studied and performed in school bands is of questionable musical value (Battisti, 2002).
A study conducted by Brian Hughes (1990) involving band directors is a case in point for Battisti. The research conducted by Hughes revealed that although directors knew what pieces were considered to be of the best quality, these works did not earn regular performances on concert programs. From this observation by Hughes, it could be inferred that frequency of performance and educational value are not synonymous. As it was touched upon in the previous chapter, it may be possible that line of thinking could be extended to sales of concert band publications. Likewise, it would be speculative to assume that the publication sales are indicative of the educational value of such a work.

This quest for quality has not been a new debate within instrumental music, and many exceptional instrumental music educators, composers, and conductors have contributed to the discussion with timely articles, questions, and research. Acton Ostling, a respected conductor, composer, and educator, was one of the first to extensively research this area in the area of instrumental music. The famous study conducted by Ostling (1978) produced a list of ten criteria for judging repertoire quality of serious artistic merit. Ostling drew insight, information, and research from the areas of music theory and orchestration, scholarly journal and periodical articles, and a number of interviews that he completed with eminent wind band conductors.
Table 2

Criteria for Determining Serious Artistic Merit (Acton Ostling)

1) The composition has form and reflects a balance between repetition and contrast.

2) The composition reflects shape and design, and creates the impression of conscious choice and judicious arrangement on the part of the composer.

3) The composition reflects craftsmanship in orchestration, demonstrating proper balance between transparent and tutti scoring, and between solo groups and colors.

4) The composition is sufficiently unpredictable to preclude an immediate grasp of its musical meaning.

5) The route through which the composition travels in initiating its musical tendencies and probable music goals is not completely direct and obvious.

6) The composition is consistent in quality throughout its length and in its various sections.

7) The composition is consistent in its style, reflecting a complete grasp of technical details, clearly conceived ideas, and avoids lapses into trivial, futile, or unsuitable passages.

8) The composition reflects ingenuity in its development, given the stylistic context in which it exists.

9) The composition is genuine in idiom, and is not pretentious.

10) The composition reflects a musical validity, which transcends factors of historical importance, or factors of pedagogical usefulness.

In a similar way that directors will return to pieces held to be part of the core repertoire, a discussion of quality in music for the concert band revisits the research by Ostling. Two replications of this study have been completed, the first by Gilbert (1993) and more recently by Towner (2011) which have continued to examine pieces of serious artistic merit. Others have used the criteria developed by Ostling to examine music that may not be regarded as having serious artistic merit.

Thomas (1998) used the criteria of Ostling in a study to identify works of serious artistic merit at the grade III and IV level. The original study by Ostling assessed the serious artistic merit of wind ensemble works, and as Thomas observed, some of these are too difficult for high school level ensembles (p. 7). Based upon his study, Thomas
suggested that no quality compositions for high school literature have been written since 1970. Thomas cited that it may be a reflection of the current band culture or related to the lack of familiarity evaluators have with more recent compositions (p. 123). Several compositions were identified at the grade III and IV levels, but were not considered compositions of serious artistic merit by the evaluators. One such example identified in the study was the composition *Peregrin – A Traveler’s Tale* by Doug Akey.

A study by Rhea (1999) also made use of the Ostling’s criteria, and was similar in scope to the study conducted by Thomas examining only full band works in the Grade III, IV, and V range found in the 1995-1998 *Prescribed Music List of the Texas University Interscholastic League (UIL)*. Rhea concluded several possibilities for the lack of works that meet serious artistic merit at lower grade levels (1999, p. 50). Rhea first suggested that works of musical substance require higher technical and expressive demands from composers, and that many composers listed in the artistic merit category have written little music at lower grade levels. Rhea also proposed that the resources of the lower grade level limited a work from deserving artistic merit, and that there was a paucity of music that was available that meets the criteria for artistic merit.

During this time, others with vested interests in the continuing success of concert bands at all levels have stated their case for evaluating repertoire quality and have set standards for lower difficulty level music. One such example of criteria for music selection was included in the text *Best Music for High School Band* (Dvorak, Grechesky, and Ciepluch, 1993, p. 10):
Table 3

*Criteria for music selection from Best Music for High School Band*

1) The composition must exhibit a high degree of compositional craft.

2) The composition must contain important musical constructs necessary for the development of musicianship (e.g. variety of keys, variety of meters, variety of harmonic styles, variety of articulations).

3) Compositions must exhibit an orchestration that, within the restrictions associated with a particular grade level, encourage musical independence both of individuals and sections.

Dvorak, Grechesky, and Ciepluch also shared the difficulty in their experience in assigning grade levels to pieces, as both technical and aesthetics must were taken into account. Their review of music took into account a variety of forms and styles including airs and dances, chorale preludes, fanfares, overtures, suites, symphonies, and other miscellaneous forms and genres (p. 13). The following table was the general framework provided by the authors for the grade level designations and for what kind of ensemble such a designation was intended (1993, p. 11).

Table 4

*Grade Level Descriptions (Dvorak, Grechesky, and Ciepluch)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade I –</td>
<td>Music suitable for first-year bands (in elementary schools, middle schools, and junior high schools).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade II –</td>
<td>Music suitable for second year bands (likewise in elementary schools, middle schools, and junior high schools).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade III –</td>
<td>Music suitable for middle school or junior high bands or beginning or first year high school bands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade IV –</td>
<td>Music suitable for most high school bands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade V –</td>
<td>Music suitable for the finest high school bands, most college bands and community bands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similar to the list by Dvorak, Grechesky, and Ciepluch, Smith (2000) classified compositions on a grading scale of 1 through 6 where 1 represents *very easy* and 6 represents *very difficult*, which represented an approximate level of difficulty. Missing from this assessment by Smith was a strong indication of the intended age level for which a piece of concert band music was appropriate. This may be an unstated acknowledgement of sorts that the context of teaching and learning may impact the level of music a given ensemble is developmentally prepared to study and perform. As his primary intent was to provide background information on select works, Smith did not categorize the selected works on any scale of quality.

Thus far the writing of Battisti, research by Ostling, and the short list by Dvorak, Grechesky, and Ciepluch has presented an interesting perspective to consider. Battisti suggested that only great, high-quality examples would enable students to feel the expressive power of music, and that quality examples were considered and balanced against the context of the event for which he has been selecting the music. Examining this through the lens for quality suggested by Reimer would seem to indicate Battisti has been concerned with the sensitivity and authenticity in music. The lists presented by Ostling and Dvorak, Grechesky, and Ciepluch have more in common with the ideas of craftsmanship and imagination presented by Reimer. Their criteria lists covered a wide range of perspectives related to analytical, theoretical, and technical quality without making a firm connection to the aspects of sensitivity and authenticity. Further exploration of other literature and research will perhaps provide better structure and a common understanding of the many different aspects of quality.
What is Quality Music? by James Neilson identified criteria for the evaluation process such as rhythmic vitality, genuine originality, economical, logical and inspirational melody, harmony suitable to the style, craftsmanship, values evidenced by balance and proportion, justified emotion, quality and personal taste, and the ability of a piece to stand the test of time (as cited in Cooper, 2004, pp. 87-88). The account made by Neilson for emotion, personal taste, and the transcendent characteristics of the piece against time were items not fully addressed in the list created by Ostling. Ray Cramer has advocated the view that selecting quality music must be the top priority of teachers and conductors, and that there were many philosophical viewpoints to consider (Cramer, 1997, pp. 7-8). The seven criteria by which literature could be evaluated outlined by Cramer were not as expansive as Ostling, but do share some similarity with both Neilson and Ostling. The criteria Cramer authored have been outlined in the following table.

Table 5

Criteria for evaluating music (Ray Cramer)

1) Does the music have a well-conceived formal structure?
2) Does the music have creative melodies and counter-lines?
3) Does the music have a harmonic imagination?
4) Does the music have a 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?
Although he did not establish a numbered list like that of Cramer or Ostling, Composer Jack Stamp (1998) pointed out that quality music has included a variety of keys or key centers, use of non-diatonic melodies, use of non-triadic harmony, accompaniment not restricted to ostinato, texture (transparent and full), contrasts and unpredictability, counterpoint, transitions, and rhythmic variety inclusive of hemiola and meter changes (1998, pp. 94-95). Stamp shared that when he has been composing educational works, he was seeking to expose the performers to a wide variety of compositional techniques explored by not only Bach and Beethoven but twentieth century composers as well, and this required a high degree of craft. The music of educational composers should retain qualities of individuality (that reveals the composer’s identity) and strive for the perfection achieved by the masters (through homogenizing various techniques and running them through a personal filter) (Stamp, 1998).

Composer Elliot Del Borgo (1988) suggested looking for variety in the elements of melody and timbre, examining the balance of foreground and background textures and careful attention be given to contrast in the areas of dynamics, rhythm, tempo, instrumentation, mode and key signature (Del Borgo, 1988, p. 24). An important area that Del Borgo suggested examining was that of musical interest. He believed an objective examination of the piece’s originality in ideas, harmonic material that reflects tension and release, dramatic shape, coherent ideas, and natural transitions would have provided an idea of its inherent musical interest. It was his view that a combination of all these elements gave music its aesthetic impact, and has provided insight into the value of such work for young musicians to study (pp. 24-26).
It is interesting to note the acknowledgement of educational works given by Stamp. It would appear that regardless of the difficulty level for which the piece was intended, Stamp has carefully crafted a work in which he considered a multitude of techniques and concepts that have been used in other great works. This is not to say that all composers may employ similar strategies, but to provide further perspective on what might constitute a quality work for concert band. Have other composers employed techniques and concepts found in other great works? The examination of these criteria lists, which identified some of these techniques and concepts, perhaps has provided characteristics of quality music. It would seem on the surface that there are many factors in play for directors as they consider how quality is manifested during the repertoire selection process.

In his discussion of the importance of repertoire selection for band directors, Stephen Gage pointed out that the music selected must provide potential for aesthetic response (2000). For this to be possible, he suggested that repertoire decisions must be grounded in quality-first artistic choices. He further cited specific examples of music that could be used from a number of different difficulty levels. Gage also discussed the tempo marking \textit{Guisto} (appropriate) that allows for conductors to make a determination of the tempo based on all contributing factors (e.g. technical abilities, acoustical situations), and then applies this term to the selection of repertoire.

Gage has suggested taking into account all factors in selection of repertoire including a balance between age and musical appropriateness, the availability of players, and rigor and challenge of the work, sequence of concert repertoire, and audience and student appeal. One of his concerns towards the future of instrumental music was the
cultivation of an audience to advance the medium, and if it could be achieved with the programming of new original works for band. Based upon his personal experience, Gage acknowledged that these works have not always been warmly received by the public or in some cases the performers themselves (p. 14).

Howard (2001) noted that while many factors are influential in repertoire selection, for repertoire selection to be successful the music selected must be of high-quality. Almost all directors in the study indicated that they had a desire to teach music of the highest quality (p. 100). The survey results also suggested that the ability to determine quality of repertoire might be a characteristic of director experience (p. 101). Greig surmised that band directors in his study were interested in selecting music of high-quality, and that they recognized three works as benchmarks for their ensemble to perform (2003, pp. 75-76). The study also revealed that directors acknowledged pieces that have maintained relevance over time, and the difference in compositional craft between commonly mentioned works and all other pieces (Greig, 2003, p. 77).

Hayward (2004) extensively reviewed definitions of quality and various criteria used by both conductors and composers. Composer Pierre LaPlante suggested that an individual’s ability to judge quality was dependent upon personal intuition that draws from previous musical experience and knowledge (p. 30). A number of other composers have considered quality music to have balance in the compositional elements, emotional engagement, contain a sense of originality and great craft, and structure with recognizable shape (pp. 29-30). William Berz was among a number of prominent conductors who contributed to this discussion, and it was his view a piece of value should compare favorably with other masterworks by using relevant critical standards (p. 33).
The findings of Greig (2003) suggested directors were able to discern quality in compositional craft among different pieces, but this ability may have been a matter of director experience (Howard, 2001). Hayward’s study illuminated a number of commonalities that emerge when discussing quality in music, although quality itself has been difficult to define. Criteria for determining quality that have been frequently mentioned by composers and conductors alike included color effects, good soli writing, independent playing, unusual textures, good instrumentation/scoring, appealing and interesting melodies that stand up to repeated hearings, and well-crafted material (pp. 34-39). Hayward recommended further on-going evaluation as the body of literature for concert bands has been continually expanding, and newer works are at times assimilated into the standard or core repertoire in relatively short amount of time (p. 78).

The concept of a constantly expanding repertoire for the concert band has also been discussed by others associated with these ensembles. It was the view of Paul Rosene (2004) that the search for concert band repertoire is a quest for quality. Modern day publishers have provided a wealth of different media forms to educators in an effort to move new literature. The sheer volume has made the hunt for proper music difficult, especially given the fact that directors are trying to discover high-quality materials worth using with young instrumentalists. Rosene did not endorse using popular music or programming fads, and suggested that directors should avoid the music presented through popular media streams like radio and television. Rosene concluded by stating that it was the director’s responsibility to offer all styles and eras of music to students and audiences (pp. 34-36).
It is interesting to note that earlier in the article Rosene dismissed the use of popular music, but closed his article stating that all styles and eras of music should be offered. This is in contrast to Feldman and Contzius (2011), who by all accounts did not dismiss any style of music from consideration, including popular music. They suggest popular music should be treated with the same seriousness as serious works. These perspectives have demonstrated that there appears to be some difference of opinion as to what kind of music should be studied and performed by concert bands, and the inherent quality of certain styles of music.

James Cochran asserted that students are deserving of a director’s best effort when choosing quality music, and suggested examining a piece to see if there is form and structure (coherent, balanced, and distinctive), variety (texture and timbre), musical depth, and emotional expressiveness (Whaley, 2005, pp. 24-25). Roy Holder held the view that simply programming quality literature would not by itself ensure that the needs of the ensemble are being met. By selecting a highly varied set of music that meets the pedagogical needs of the ensemble, directors might also provide a program that is interesting to the audience (Whaley, p. 62).

McCallum echoed the line of thinking by Holder suggesting that one piece alone does not create a quality musical experience for the performers, but it is a combination of all pieces with the repertoire (2007, p. 105). McCallum also believed there were quality works at every grade level, and by playing a varied level of difficulty among repertoire choices young musicians could establish a variety of attainable goals and focus on different musical elements (p. 105). Both McCallum and Holder made an excellent point
that programming just one piece of quality literature is not a guarantee of a quality experience for that particular concert band in the instrumental setting within their school.

The selection of just one quality work may not meet all the pedagogical concerns, aesthetic and emotional needs, or garner a satisfying reaction from the performers and the audience. Based on the context in which the ensemble exists and the previous experiences of the director responsible for selecting repertoire, some directors have selected a wide array of pieces to guarantee a quality experience for their students. Those choices could potentially be evaluated quite differently by other directors as they consider their own instrumental setting. Although directors could come to agreement upon criteria of quality that repertoire should demonstrate, the degree to which a particular work might inherently display has been difficult to agree upon (Young, 1998, pp. 2-3).

Another prominent conductor who, like Battisti, has distinguished himself on and off the podium is H. Robert Reynolds. In an article in which he focused on the selection of repertoire, Reynolds (2000) stated that educators must strive to select the finest repertoire with lasting quality so that students can be engaged in aesthetic experiences that are extensive and meaningful (p. 31). Reynolds further stated that if a director believed music education was more than the improvement of technical skills, then the quality of music selected would be essential to the education of students (p. 32). Reynolds drew a comparison between the selection of literature in English class based upon inherent value of the work as opposed to student desires stating that music should be no different (2000, p. 33).

Reynolds was interviewed and shared additional thoughts regarding repertoire selection in a text compiled by Williamson (2008). Reynolds thought there was better
music being composed for school bands than ever before, and there were respectable pieces available at a wide range of levels (Williamson, p. 72). However, Reynolds did share concern with others in the profession that while there was an abundance of excellent literature from which to choose, other pieces of questionable merit have been produced as well (Reynolds, 2000, p. 34).

Stamp also drew a parallel to English in his discussion of music of questionable substance, which he identified as music that lacks emotional or intellectual depth or compositional craft. He stated that an English teacher would never avoid teaching Shakespeare because of fear of the initial reaction from the students. Stamp ruminated that many directors have been left with the responsibility to find their own musically equivalent work to Shakespeare for his or her medium and students’ level of ability. Stamp shared a line of thinking first articulated by Paul Hindemith that new music should be written in a contemporary style which students familiarize themselves with new styles of composition and thus come nearer to understanding them (Miles, 1998, p. 94).

In his discussion of personal evaluation of quality in music, McBeth stated that direction and originality are two constants found in all great music. Direction has been evident in great music as it becomes a journey of sound to somewhere and does not unnecessarily wander (1990, p. 16). When evaluating the level of originality in music, and new music in particular, McBeth believed that style becomes an important area to examine. McBeth noted that there have not been many young march composers, and his explanation drew a very interesting parallel. McBeth explained that it was similar to why there were no young men flying over the Atlantic in a single engine plane or young
composers of Protestant hymns: these accomplishments have already been completed and cannot be replicated. He stated:

If new marches and hymns are to be written, they cannot be in the style, form, melodic, and harmonic usage of the old standards and still be creative work…Just being different or strange does not constitute artistic creativity. (1990, p. 17)

Stamp and McBeth both present interesting perspectives on the creation of new music for the concert band. If composers are incorporating contemporary effects and expanding or adapting previous forms, they may be in fact creating a new style of music. There is perhaps no value in the creation of works that adhere to previously used forms as they may not provide a sustainable experience that is interesting for the directors, ensemble, and audience. This new style of music is perhaps no more or less valuable than other styles that have been prominently used by concert bands. The thoughts articulated by McBeth would seem to provide support for composers who are seeking to write original works for the modern school concert band.

While Stamp and McBeth presented a unique perspective from the side of the composer in regard to creating music, there are a number of individuals who have been concerned with the music that has been composed and published for the school concert band. Questions regarding the lack of exposure to not only specific musical concepts, but emotional impact and aesthetic expression have been expressed on a number of levels. Additionally there has been concern about the value of new, original works for concert band versus pieces in the core repertoire. This critique of original works for the school band has reached national awareness and bears mention as it relates to new and emergent works.
Battisti (2002) stated that he finds much of the music published for school bands to have monotony in sound, and he has been concerned about the lack of exposure to core and traditional repertoire. Based upon several articles that appeared in *The Instrumentalist* and some personal correspondence, Battisti suggested that band directors and publishers do not agree as to who has been responsible for the present state of school band music (Battisti, 2002, p. 230). He further asserted that a great deal of the literature being published for school bands has emphasized commercial or popular elements of American society. It is the view of Battisti that even the original concert band pieces retained a stale and artificial quality that was deliberately intended to make the band sound good (p. 230).

Composer Mark Camphouse has also expressed concerned about the presence of formula-style educational band music that diminishes important elements of musical sensitivity of young musicians in school bands (2002). Frederick Fennell has been more specifically critical of the publishing companies’ attention to sales figures and apparent lack of commitment to publishing quality music (Dvorak, Grechesky, & Ciepluch, 1993, p. 7). However on the other end of the spectrum, Harry Begian summed up the state of the music publishers by leveling the responsibility of supporting the production of quality materials on the shoulders of the directors who purchased such works for concert bands (1991, p. 11). With respect to Fennell’s opinion in regard to the publishers, publishers have needed to sell the pieces they put into publication each year as that determines the financial future of their company. The burden has fallen on the conductors to purchase quality literature so that publishers will continue to print it (Young, 1998, pp. 9-10).
Timothy Mahr shared some of the concern of Camphouse (2002) and Fennell (Dvorak, Grechesky, & Ciepluch, 1993) in that there have been an abundance of works of lesser value, but also agreed with Reynolds in the view that educational literature has increased in quality and substance (Camphouse, 2002, p. 262). When asked about the future of the wind band, McBeth named its ability to attract composers of high artistic merit who have been rapidly adding good literature. The end result from the viewpoint of McBeth has been an increased status for the wind band medium (Camphouse, p. 289).

David Maslanka also believed that the wind band medium has become more attractive to serious composers, and that a spirit of mutual development between bands and composers has produced many new fine works for the medium (Camphouse, 2004, p. 219). English composer and conductor Philip Sparke stated that the past 30 years have provided examples of a real maturing of the concert band repertoire regardless of the style of the individual piece. It was the view of Sparke that the concert band medium needs less pretentious opinions about the selection of repertoire and programming that often fill various periodicals (Camphouse, 2004, p. 246). Sparke maintained the view that when considering quality in music selection it has been a matter of taste and not an absolute judgment (p. 247). Similar to the thoughts of Philip Sparke, Elliot Del Borgo (1988) admitted that musical quality is difficult to quantify, and suggested that while musical taste has been one element of it, it was a personal factor that contains a degree of fluidity. He believed that solid compositional craft should be evident whether or not the music meets an individual’s taste (p. 24).

In his own experience of writing a new work for a middle school band, composer Michael Colgrass was initially stymied on how to construct interesting music for young
musicians and yet meet his own personal standards of composition. Colgrass settled on composing a piece based on Gregorian chant that used graphic notation, and alternative techniques to create a different soundscape. In his view, great composers of previous generations were able to write music for amateurs that were also great pieces of music. Colgrass surmised that modern composers need to develop the ability to shape a musical idea with emotional content in a simple way so that it could be reproduced effectively by young musicians. Colgrass expressed concern over the general sameness of new works being produced by the publishing companies as specific range and pedagogical guidelines determine what has been allowed to be experienced at certain grade levels (2004, pp. 20-23).

The concept of quality being tied to personal taste presents an interesting aspect to the area of repertoire selection. Del Borgo indicates a point of agreement with Reimer (1991) that quality can be identified whether or not the music meets one’s individual taste. However, as a number of composers attested, including McBeth, Maslanka, Mahr, and Sparke, the concert band has become an attractive medium for composers. The composers have, in turn, produced a number of compelling works that have elevated the status of the concert band repertoire. Whether or not these works meet the tastes of directors and conductors may not always be readily apparent, but the suggestion here is that the quality of such works should be evident.

The opinion expressed by Fennell regarding quality may bear some validity if one were to examine every single new piece of music that is published each year. Battisti made an excellent point regarding leveling all fault for the lack of quality in concert band music upon the publishers. It is the estimation of Battisti that the only group responsible
for endorsing the sale of new music is the directors who purchase such works. It would be fair to point out that many of the specific guidelines for band compositions at each grade level used by publishing companies are done so to correlate with ensemble method books. These restrictions mentioned by Colgrass include the amount of measures that may be used, instrument part numbers and ranges, and other guidelines related to harmony, rhythm, and timbre. Additionally, the grade level guidelines used by the various publishing companies would perhaps provide an answer for Battisti, and Camphouse, who are both concerned about the similarity in sound and formula-style pieces, respectively. As Colgrass and Stamp have both pointed out, many great pieces of music from previous generations were written by master composers that met both pedagogical and aesthetic needs, and have indeed stood the test of time.

The concerns regarding new and emergent works for concert bands have been documented through this review. It would be difficult to take this as a complete indictment of all new works for concert bands, as in many cases new composers are extending and expanding existing models in an effort to connect contemporary compositions with significant works of past eras. Consider that Cooper states that quality music has aspects of excellent construction, genuine expressiveness, and has stood the test of time. However, he also indicates that new music will also possess these qualities (2004, p. 87). The suggestion implied here is that there are perhaps new pieces for the core and traditional repertoire waiting to emerge or be incorporated onto such lists.

Not all new music, regardless of genre, has always been received warmly by the general population, the performers, and conductors. In a column that was printed in the Washington Post, Stephen Budiansky was openly critical of school band music and he
openly questioned the quality of new band music written over the past twenty years. His article reflected concern over the lack of American folk music, marches, and popular music on concert programs by school ensembles in favor of new works of – in his view – questionable quality levels (Budiansky, 2005).

Budiansky (Budiansky & Foley, 2005) has also collaborated on the issue of quality repertoire with Timothy W. Foley, former director of the United States Marine Band. It was their view that taste, a feel for style and phrasing, and an ability to pursue independent music making and appreciation could only have been attained by playing the best music, and not through the performance of artistically limited didactic works. They pointed out that there were many simple works by great composers (they specifically cite Serenade for Wind Instruments, Op. 7 by Richard Strauss) that were technically easy but musically and emotionally challenging. Additionally, Foley and Budiansky felt the kind of inspiration and seamless craftsmanship found in a work like the Strauss serenade was what makes music an art, and that has been lacking from modern school band compositions.

They make the point that great music has challenged and motivated students to develop the required technique. The concern has been that employing simplified or pedagogically conceived pieces has diminished the passion and excitement students have for playing. Budiansky and Foley identified several factors that they believe have allowed so much poor quality music to dominate the school music repertoire. These factors have included an obvious avoidance on the part of school music teachers to render aesthetic judgments in selecting repertoire, the relentless promotion of new educational music by music publishers, and the growing importance of non-musical considerations (such as
contests) in driving repertoire selection. The importance of events like contests has been evidenced by other research (Bauer, 1996; Young, 1998). Budiansky and Foley concluded by pointing out that the growing dominance of made-for-school pieces in the school repertoire has narrowed the range of styles, genres, and cultures authentically represented in school music programs.

Budiansky was later invited to give an address to band directors at the 2009 World Association of Symphonic Bands and Ensembles (WASBE Convention), and he outlined his concern for the kinds of music being selected and performed by school ensembles (Feldman, 2009). Budiansky was critical in his remarks of the music publishing business and the composers who write for many of these companies. He is opposed to the bombastic banality of educational music written by composers whose reputation is known nowhere else but within the realm of school music performance.

This was an astute point by Budiansky concerning the relative obscurity in which many composers of wind band music have worked, but it was definitely not a new one. It was interesting to note an observation made by Richard Bowles (1970). In his examination of band composers of his day, Bowles surmised they were receiving little recognition by musicologists in national publications. He also observed that band directors failed to bring these composers to the attention of the general public. Bowles stated “If the musicologists would devote enough space to our composers even to damn them, the criticism would be easier to take than is the unbroken silence” (1970, p. 16).

This observation by Bowles would seem to indicate that composers of wind band music have long been neglected in earning the kind of acknowledgement to sustain any kind of recognition outside the academic realm. The other side of this argument is that
perhaps wind band composers had not done anything significant to earn any kind of recognition. The writing of Budiansky would seem to indicate that today’s wind band composers have done enough to earn critical attention.

Budiansky made another timely point that there are historical accounts of harsh reviews of works by Liszt and Beethoven in existence, and that great art has rarely been immune to a critical discussion. Budiansky viewed the problem not only residing in that of the composers, but the directors who purchased the music, the publishing houses that promoted these pieces, and state and national competitions where some of this music has been used as a vehicle to earn a superior rating. One of the suggestions Budiansky made to help alleviate this problem was to improve teacher education that de-emphasizes education pedagogy and re-affirm musicianship and great literature, and include only quality and real music on concert programs (Feldman, 2009).

It is interesting to note that in the 2009 WASBE session and the column that originally appeared in the Washington Post, Budiansky stated this non-descript band literature has replaced transcriptions of classical music, folk songs, Sousa, American Popular music, Broadway, and Joplin among others. The styles and composers named above would seem to indicate what Budiansky thinks of as examples of quality and real music. Yet, there are knowledgeable conductors and educators within the music education profession who would strongly have disagreed with the inclusion of some of the styles (e.g. Broadway, Popular, transcriptions of classical music) named above and there has been evidence that supports pieces in such styles being excluded from repertoire lists and studies (Battisti, 2002; Gaines, 1998; Hayward, 2004; Young, 1998).
Another aspect of this critique by Budiansky that bears mention is that he declined the opportunity at the 2009 WASBE Convention to continue the discussion after the session ended with one of the composers cited as an example of not producing quality concert band literature in both his column and in the session of (Feldman, 2009). Critical commentary in any form of art seems to be directed towards how a new work relates to older works, its place within a particular style, or even within a tradition specific to a certain culture. While his reasons were personal in nature, it was interesting that such a harsh critic of contemporary wind band compositions would decline an opportunity to broaden his perspective regarding a subject on which he has written, especially with a composer working in that field.

In their chapter on repertoire selection, Feldman and Contzius (2011) mentioned the writing and opinions of Stephen Budiansky. They presented the ideas of Budiansky that works written for the school band fail to inspire students, and that it is removed from any genuine living musical tradition, classical or popular (2011, pp. 136-137). A perspective missing from the critique offered by Budiansky was that it would be fair to point out that America has a long history of various styles of music interacting, merging, and eventually evolving into a unique genre and style previously unheard of in the culture, popular or academic.

Budiansky viewed this literature with contempt because of its safety in cross-cuing, lack of challenge, and appeal to the lowest common denominator of ignorance and surface flash. In contrast, Feldman and Contzius presented the other side of the argument for consideration stating that:
Perhaps there is a difference between putting students in a position to fail as individuals and as a group, even in the name of great music, and challenging them in ways that might cruelly expose their faults. (2011, p.138)

Feldman and Contzius conceded the point that educational music may have pedagogical value that furthers the curricular needs and may still retain quality. They further pointed out that if educators demand quality (however they choose to define it), and only buy quality, then publishers would produce quality works for band. This was another acknowledgement that there has been a degree of subjectivity in the determination of quality, and to a point further that the determination of quality in concert band music may depend on contextual issues specific to the instrumental setting of the ensemble, the school to which it belongs, and the community in which it performs.

To further the consideration of context in the educational setting, Budiansky failed to fully acknowledge the shift that has occurred in the American school music curriculum that has started to reflect a more diverse society (Kelly, 2009). Works of American origin have played an important part in the heritage of the American concert band, and should continue to receive consideration in the selection of literature. However, works for school ensembles that make use of ethnic folk songs of different cultures or have cross-curricular connections have become important to directors to better connect their students to other parts of the curriculum and the communities in which they teach.

Selecting music with multicultural perspectives in mind within education has increased steadily, and publishing companies have grown accustomed to providing such literature for classroom and ensemble use (Abril, 2006). Additionally, emerging technology use in the music classroom has provided educators with a suitable resource to connect students to authentic music performances of different cultures (2006, p. 38).
Abril further discussed the selection process through a framework that takes into account matters of authenticity, validity, and bias. Authenticity examined context and culture, validity referred to locating reputable sources and culturally sensitive practices, and bias involved making oneself more aware of how music might be received by certain cultural groups with the school population (2006, pp. 39-45).

Fonder pointed out that as the repertoire options for bands grow each year it becomes difficult to find worthy pieces for study (2010). He advocated examining pieces that utilize folk songs in the concert band setting. These settings of folk songs are effective because of the familiarity they offer the audience, opportunity to explore music of other cultures with students, and excellent teaching opportunities. Quincy Hilliard surmised that the reason it may be difficult to find good, original music for younger ensembles is there must be a balance between creativity and the difficulty of the music for groups at each grade level. Composers must work diligently to create new sounds, perhaps through folk songs and cultural music, in the hopes that directors will be willing to try these creative pieces (Thomson, 2005, p. 17). This continual endeavor by composers has not been unique, but rather part of the evolutionary history of wind band music at all levels over the past 60 years.

Essentials of Selecting Repertoire

Within the review of literature, there were a number of fundamental considerations for directors as they evaluate and selecting repertoire that were identified. To begin this section of the review of literature, the work of musicologist Jan LaRue (1992) has been examined. LaRue provided a method from which music of any historical period could be studied. His system of analysis included thoughtful consideration of all
musical dimensions and components, an understanding of the interactions and purpose of those components, and a firm basis for evaluation and comparison. While the ideas he introduced were not specifically constructed to be evaluative criteria in the area of repertoire selection for concert band, they provide a broad perspective from which the discussion could begin.

Music, regardless of style or the type of ensemble that performs it, comprises many different components. Each of these musical elements exerts some influence upon how an individual piece will develop. Depending on the composer and the occasion for which a piece is written, some components will be more prominent than others, and will likely be given more attention. LaRue has suggested a systematic approach that covers the various components in a structured manner. His SHMRG system (Sound, Harmony, Melody, Rhythm, and Growth), described below, has been commonly used for musical analysis regardless of style.

*Sound (S)* includes such things as medium (vocal, instrumental, etc.), timbre, and, perhaps most importantly, texture. *Harmony (H)* covers not only the chords themselves but also such general questions as tonality, scale resources, and functionality. *Melody (M)* shares some features with harmony (e.g. tonality), and should suggest such things as scale resources, range of the melody, and the use of stepwise motion versus leaps. *Rhythm (R)* includes meter, and takes into account features like irregular, changing, and composite meters, as well as polyrhythms and poly-meters. *Growth (G)* refers to the way in which the piece develops though time. This development may include form at all levels, motives and phrase structure, the shape of the whole piece, or extra-musical elements (LaRue, 1992).
According to LaRue, *Growth* (*G*) has developed a dual existence as both the emerging product and the adjusting matrix of the other four components. *Growth* has controlled other components, absorbing contributions into the simultaneous processes of *Movement* and *Shape*, which has allowed it to stand somewhat apart from the other elements in character. The content expressed by the other four components (*Sound, Harmony, Melody, and Rhythm*) builds and determines the form, and the term *Growth* confirms the interactions that take place among them within a piece of music (LaRue, 1969, pp.455-456).

*Movement* accounted for contributions to the flow of the piece, and *Shape* entailed contributions made to the delivery and continuation of the ideas within the work. LaRue pointed out that the dual nature of *Growth* accounted for the contributions made to *Movement* and *Shape* through other components, and also explained how *Movement* and *Shape* resided within *Growth*. LaRue further stated the following:

As a final comparative value, the imaginative depth of a work, including range of expression and richness of resources and techniques, decisively influences our permanent evaluative response. The last source of evaluation goes beyond comparative musical considerations to matters of a distinctly external nature, such as novelty, popularity, and timeliness. Though we may not accept popularity as a valid artistic standard, we can learn much from the opinions of other periods about a piece we feel we know (LaRue, 1969, p. 463).

LaRue further suggested that the evaluation of music according to intrinsic, comparative, and external standards delivered a shared personal reaction. Similar to Reimer, he cautioned against the imposing of a value system upon others in the assessment and evaluation of a work (p. 464).

The thoughts of LaRue have provided an interesting lens to help focus the thoughts and scholarly writing provided by others associated with concert bands. Each
component listed by LaRue identified an important area for consideration when evaluating music, as each component has made an important contribution to the total perception of a musical work. LaRue’s method of analysis was not intended for a specific style of music. It may be appropriate to consider this method authored by LaRue in the evaluation and selection of original works for the concert band by directors.

With the process authored by LaRue in mind, it would be helpful to examine scholarly writing from distinguished and recognized leaders associated with concert bands to better frame the many important considerations in repertoire selection. In the foreword of the book *Best Music for High School Bands* (Dvorak, Grechesky, and Ciepluch, 1993), Fennell shared that the selection of music has been the most important responsibility of the band director (p. 7). This point has been agreed upon by many prominent conductors involved with concert bands, including Reynolds (2000) and Battisti (2002). Charles Menghini discussed the importance of finding high-quality repertoire through deliberate and thoughtful consideration at every stage (1999, p. 28). According to Menghini some pieces have been selected to teach specific musical styles and concepts, while other pieces were selected for the technical challenge and development they offer to musicians (pp. 28-29).

Battisti (1995) suggested that directors should make qualitative value judgments about the literature they select for study and performance, and establish criteria for selecting music (p. 17). Battisti further asserted that music should be selected that (1) is interesting, (2) fits the instrumentation, (3) is compatible with the skills of the ensemble, (4) includes a variety of styles, and (5) is appropriate (pp. 8-13). These considerations set forth by Battisti acknowledge some of the pedagogical and practical concerns that public
school band directors may have, but the writing and research has indicated that he has not been alone in aiming literature selection to reach educational goals.

Another voice in this discussion was that of Harry Begian, Director Emeritus for the University of Illinois Bands. Begian felt strongly that the music performed by school concert bands affects their quality and success. He urged band directors to bring the best music to their students so they might be introduced to musical expressiveness and play with sincerity and conviction. Through this process, Begian suggested the students may experience joy as part of their education, recruiting and retention would not be a problem, and students would give their best effort when playing (1991, pp. 10-11). These experiences suggested by Begian could in part be considered some of the extra-musical considerations that might influence the evaluative response identified by LaRue.

Frederick Fennell surmised that some contemporary compositions are brief, intense, and based upon a wider concept of harmony, and that the melodic process cannot be expanded any wider that it has been. Fennell was not suggesting these works are unattainable, but they would require directors sharpening their own musicianship skills to adequately help students achieve the goal of performing such a work (Dvorak, 2003, p. 18). It was the view of Croft that directors bear the responsibility of choosing a curriculum that will best educate their students (1997). Croft asserted that much of the new literature has called for a degree of sophistication and musical independence that has been difficult to find in high school students (pp. 52-54). Here again, the responsibility of the band director to make the best possible selections in their repertoire choices has come to the forefront of the discussion.
Educators often base their selection decisions to help reach some of their curricular goals with their ensembles. Bauer pointed out that compositions selected to introduce concepts and skills called for by the curriculum become the vehicle through which musical learning takes place in the ensemble setting (1996, p. 4). Repertoire formed the foundation for the musical growth and artistic development of young musicians and for those reason directors must seek pieces of the highest artistic value and strongest compositional craft (McCallum, 2007, p. 105). In their chapter devoted to repertoire, Feldman and Contzius (2011) pointed out that repertoire tends to be a fluid situation as some directors constantly have used new literature to teach recurring musical concepts while other directors have returned to certain masterworks every few years.

McCallum suggested directors make pre-determined decisions regarding the concepts or skills they wish to teach before selecting pieces. Through this process, directors could establish a personal core repertoire and create a rotational sequence that allowed use of successful past teaching strategies (2007, p. 105). Lynn Cooper offered an example of such a rotation through various masterworks (2004, pp. 92-96). This discussion of core repertoire included the concept, similar to McCallum, that each director should establish such a list for their own ensemble, and rotates through such works on a 3- or 4- year cycle (p. 92). Cooper advocated for directors to become aware of a broad range of pieces that balances technical demands with artistic sensitivity and awareness of musical styles. The core repertoire list Cooper suggested at the Grade 3 through 5 levels included 45 different works (3 levels, 3 year rotation, 5 pieces per level per year) (pp. 94-96).
Cooper also pointed out that there are abundant resources that can aid in the process of selecting new and old repertoire (Dvorak, et al 1993; Miles, 1996; Miles 1998). He added that the repertoire used has been the core of the curriculum for the bands, and those selections have enabled students to enjoy outstanding musical performance and learn about theoretical and historical concepts (pp. 88-89). Among the guidelines offered by Rosene were reading new music reviews in publishers and periodicals, keeping a list of preferred composers and arrangers, creating a repertoire list, studying contest lists, and using high-quality transcriptions (2004, pp. 34-35).

*Blueprint for Band* (Garofalo, 1983) provided band directors with a curriculum guide for teaching comprehensive musicianship within the concert band, and pointed towards the importance of the selection of a qualitative body of literature for performance and study. The three primary areas identified that directors should focus on were (1) structural elements, (2) historical context, and (3) skills development. Garofalo acknowledged that there were many other considerations such as audience appeal, student interests, and other functional and practical concerns, but he recommended focusing on the three primary categories (1983). Different from Cooper and Rosene, Garofalo suggested directors should keep lists of unfamiliar works, and select a small group of them each year for study (p. 38).

Although Cooper, Garofalo, and Rosene were advocating for the creation and use of personal repertoire lists, Patrick M. Jones has observed that repertoire lists (national or state published lists) often regulate what has been performed by school bands in state sponsored festivals and evaluation contests (2005, p.60). Evidence of this observation was found in the study completed by Howard (2001). Howard investigated the repertoire
selection practices of expert middle school band directors. His research revealed that over 86% of directors reported consulting some sort of list during the selection process (2001, p. 99).

The observation made by Patrick M. Jones regarding lists was further evidenced in a survey conducted by Stevenson (2004) that discovered that many directors select music based upon recommended music lists and the judgments of those who compile these lists. One director responded that the lists identify high-quality literature, and eliminates review of frivolous music. An opposing view of lists was also shared by Stevenson as one director expressed concern over how often such lists are updated, and the limitations such lists place on the selection process (Stevenson, 2004, p. 18). The review of literature conducted by Stevenson pointed out that repertoire lists were the opinions of just one person. Using multiple lists could become an asset to the director in making qualitative decision regarding the evaluation and selection of repertoire (pp. 18-19).

This pattern demonstrates that repertoire lists have been used by directors, and there have been additional concerns about this practice being expressed as well. In a similar fashion in her discussion regarding repertoire selection, Jagow (2007, p. 192) extended the point that repertoire lists can provide a quick solution to programming issues, but over time have removed artistic responsibility from the director and diminished the ability of directors to make qualitative decisions. This point about directors not being willing to render an aesthetic decision regarding repertoire has also been shared by Budiansky and Foley (2005). Many organizations and publications have been providing published music lists to aid in repertoire selection. Although the titles
included were not selective works of artistic merit, such lists did provide a comprehensive range of pieces that allow directors to select an appropriate work for their ensemble (Jagow, p. 193).

The literature thus far has suggested that two important areas in repertoire selection were aesthetic and pedagogical considerations. The first perspective is that repertoire lists have limited exposure to certain styles of music for ensembles provides. This is an interesting consideration against the other line of thinking that has advocated for rotational lists that revisit certain pieces every few years to reach curricular goals.

On some level a paradox seems imminent: Repertoire lists have been limiting ensembles exposure to certain styles of music, yet there are knowledgeable conductors who have suggested that directors should only select music that has been identified on core and traditional repertoire lists and move through these pieces on a rotating basis. The resolution to this conflict between perspectives could perhaps be resolved in part through the inclusion of new and emergent works which reinforces the need to conduct the present study.

The idea that directors need to develop skills in evaluating repertoire for use with their ensembles seems to be an important part of effective teaching in instrumental music. A recurring theme throughout the review of scholarly literature supported the idea that directors must assume the responsibility for selecting repertoire that demonstrates musical quality, educational value, and at the same time accounts for the technical and musical abilities of the ensemble for which it was chosen. While many directors have acquired their repertoire selection insights during their in-service teaching experiences,
there are more recommendations in the scholarly literature that future educators need to be trained in the area of repertoire evaluation and selection.

Prior to 1990, there were not many recommendations for pre-service teachers to gain opportunities in the area of evaluating repertoire. Several research studies have commented that undergraduate training should expose pre-service teachers to the process of evaluating and selecting repertoire for school ensembles (Hayward, 2004; Howard 2001; Jones 2005). Writings by Cooper (2002), Feldman and Contzius (2011), and Jagow (2007) specifically addressed repertoire study and selection as part of an instrumental music education program. For Jagow, the attention given to repertoire selection was founded over her concern about the musical value of works that have been programmed by school concert bands today (2007, pp. 195-96). In his study of middle school band directors, Howard noted that undergraduate training in repertoire selection was not reported as a significant source in this process by directors (Howard, 2001, p. 100).

Hayward (2004) sought to construct a syllabus for a course in wind band literature aimed at preparing pre-service educators to select and evaluate repertoire through research. In Hayward’s review of related literature, she explored the difficulty of selecting quality music, and identified five major issues that contribute to this problem (p. 16). The five major issues identified included (1) the relatively short history of the wind band and its repertoire, (2) the large quantity of inferior music published for the wind band, particularly school bands, (3) the issues of art music versus educational music, (4) over-use of popular and entertainment music, (5) and the selection of quality music for the very young band.
Each of the authors mentioned above (Jagow, Howard, and Hayward) identified a crucial area for consideration by pre-service teacher educators. Their discussion also included an examination of concerns for in-service educators as well. Some of these recommendations have dealt specifically with the criteria directors are using in the evaluation and selection process. These recommendations have been shared in both research studies and within scholarly articles.

Technical demands within the repertoire have been an area given consistent attention by directors in their selection and evaluation of music. Bauer (1996) discovered that the leading factors influencing the selection of music by band directors in northeast Ohio included (1) their band’s ability to handle technical demands of the composition, (2) their band’s ability to handle the musical demands, (3) the ensemble performance concepts, and (4) stylistic concepts. It is interesting to note that in the study conducted by Bauer, technical and musical considerations ranked ahead of consideration of music that is in the standard repertoire, and ahead of aesthetic response to the work (p. 7).

The study by Greig (2003) of selection criteria ratings of band directors in the state of Pennsylvania revealed a number of interesting findings as it applies to the evaluation and selection of repertoire. Band directors in his survey were selecting certain band works with regularity, and they were primarily concerned with expressive and technical demands with the piece (Greig, p. 89). Expressive and technical demands are certainly important aspects in the repertoire evaluation process, but other criteria also must be given attention. Similar to other authors, McCallum offered a basic list of criteria for consideration by directors including key centers, variety in meter, traditional and contemporary notation, historical periods, different musical genres, forms, tempos,
lengths, cultures, individual section considerations, and opportunities for pedagogically relevant exercises within the piece (2007, p. 106).

Feldman and Contzius (2011) provided a detailed discussion of programming and the need for balance and variety through consideration of the factors of balance (range of composers & styles), difficulty (rehearsal time), presentation (satisfying experience), and technical considerations. Several common categories of concert band pieces were identified by the authors, and they have been listed in Table 6. While the authors identified nine different categories into which a piece could be placed, there may be other categories that could be listed. Additionally, the authors did not provide a description for each of the categories in their text. In Table 6, the category is listed on the left hand side, and I have provided a brief description on the right side for each of the categories.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert Band Piece Categories (Feldman and Contzius)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Openers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expressive work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-movement Work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feature</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stand-alone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildcard</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Double-agent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novelty</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Feldman and Contzius, other factors that influenced repertoire selection have included historical and cultural styles, compositional styles and
techniques, theory aspects (related to structure and form), and interdisciplinary topics.

They further suggested strategies to find new literature including using existing pieces in music libraries, researching past programs, requesting catalogs from publishers, attending conventions to hear new works and research scores, and soliciting the opinions and advice of trusted colleagues (pp. 143-150).

Their discussion on repertoire concluded with a discussion of the use of popular music with ensembles. They recognized school as a place for studying, experiencing, and performing music that was not heard at home, requiring guidance in order to fully appreciate its beauty. Feldman and Contzius suggested limiting popular music programming to one piece per concert, and that the piece be selected on the basis of its quality. They further proposed that a popular work should be treated with the same respect and attention as serious works (pp. 151-155). The various technical considerations named above are certainly not exhaustive. They present a wide range of perspectives that address specific pedagogical concerns, opportunities for stylistic exploration, and emotional connection and consideration. All of these items are important in the education of young musicians.

The various perspectives presented are all useful in the evaluation and selection process. Though many different items are addressed by each of the authors, they all have direct bearing upon the education of students within the ensembles. Jack Stamp, noted band composer and professor at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, made several interesting points related to music of earlier eras and how that might be applied to contemporary works written over the past 60 years.
Stamp introduced the idea that most pieces written before institutionalized music education were artistic in nature for a well-educated and somewhat sophisticated group of patrons of art and music (Miles, 1998, p. 92). He went on to point out that good music need not be difficult. When the music of the masters has been considered (e.g. Bach, Beethoven, and Brahms to name but a few), the features of their music that come to mind are not technical aspects but rather musical elements such as counterpoint, melody, orchestration, rhythm, clarity and contrast (p. 94).

Given this line of thought presented by Stamp, it is interesting to consider how technical considerations are a major concern for directors in the evaluation and selection process. The development of technical skills has certainly been a necessary and worthwhile endeavor for students to be guided by their director in an instrumental setting. Directors, conductors, and composers have also been concerned with the expressive elements of music and exposing their ensembles to pieces of artistic value.

Important Repertoire Research

A review of the evolution of the concert band medium since the mid-1950s demonstrates a transformation from an entertainment medium into an artistic one. Evidence of this change can be heard in the elevated compositional craft found in pieces like Fanfare and Allegro by Clifton Williams, and Howard Hansen’s Chorale and Allelulia (Stoffel, 2010, p. 24). While the 1960s saw creation of music that built on the style and success of the decade before, the 1970s witnessed art music for the sake of art – and in the process began to alienate audiences. One could make the argument this era witnessed pieces emerge that were different from any living musical tradition, such as the
aleatoric techniques used in Schwanter’s ...and the mountains rising nowhere or Paulson’s Epinicion.

The 1980s saw the premiere of David Maslanka’s Symphony No. 2 – emblematic of the driving and relentless writing that was to come. Although Stoffel admits that it was too early to characterize the music of the 1990s into the initial years of the twenty-first century, there are themes that are present that could be identified such as the humor in Eric Whitacre’s Godzilla Eats Las Vegas, and fantasy in Robert Sheldon’s A Longford Legend (p. 26). The early part of the twenty-first century has been sprinkled with themes of escapism such as Saucedo’s Windsprints, Rush by Sam Hazo, Slalom by Carter Pann, and Dana Wilson’s Shortcut Home (pp. 26-27). Just as many different types of works have emerged over this time period, they have been accompanied by research specifically examining what concert bands are studying and eventually performing.

Patrick Jones reviewed a number of dissertations about concert bands and discussed their implications for school and collegiate bands (2005). His examination pointed out that scholarly research on wind band repertoire and programming has been conducted since the middle of the twentieth century. The focus of these studies has been wide and varied with some studies focusing on identifying core literature, some on creating lists based upon compositional criteria, some examining the criteria used in the selection progress, and some focusing on the relationship between collegiate programming and its impact on teacher training (Jones, p. 61).

Almost half of the compositions rehearsed and performed by bands from larger high schools in the United States in a study conducted by Young (1998) did not attain the level of quality to appear on a list of 530 compositions developed through the opinions of
many wind band experts (p. 98). This study demonstrated that publisher materials and 
media do influence the selection of music by directors. As lighter works, marches, 
fanfares, and other novelty pieces were excluded from the study, Young’s list reflects 
only original compositions for the concert band. Young explained that sufficient expert 
opinion to evaluate such works that were outside original works for band was not 
available. Perhaps this lack of expert opinion is due to potential disagreement over the 
actual degree of quality a work might display within its respective genre.

In the study by Gaines (1998) that investigated core repertoire for the high school 
band, the researcher indicated that works such as marches, light concert selections, and 
novelty pieces are usually excluded from core repertoire lists (p. 1). His review of 
literature supported the idea that a core repertoire exists for high school concert bands, 
and that it was composed primarily of twentieth century original works for the concert 
band. The study completed by Gaines produced 106 compositions that varied in levels of 
difficulty, performance time, and styles (Gaines, 1998).

The diversity presented in his list would allow directors to take into account 
specific aspects such as the size of the ensemble, ability of the ensemble, and the quality 
and structure of the piece in their selection practices. While no marches were included on 
the original survey (and consequently no marches were included on the list of 106 core 
compositions), the write-in responses indicated that marches have a definitive role in the 
repertoire of the high school band as many respondents included works by John Philip 
Sousa, Karl King, and Henry Fillmore. The study by Gaines also indicated that band 
directors favor compositions that were written for the bands rather than transcriptions 
Patrick Carney (2005) investigated the values that music educators apply to the selection of wind band literature, specifically investigating twelve elements of quality and suitability. Carney suggested that the term suitable (or suitability) refers to pedagogical functionality of music education within the public school band or instrumental environment, and that the term quality referred to the structural components in a musical composition (2005, p. 5) Carney pointed out that educators are faced with the task of balancing quality and suitability during the process of repertoire selection. He further suggested that suitability was related to an ensembles experience while quality was related to the criteria for assessing the technical demands of a composition, form, and other musical phenomena (2005, p. 30).

Based upon his review of literature, Carney also indicated that quality literature did exist and was recognizable by contemporary musicians and music educators (p. 30). The six elements of quality Carney identified were: (1) Form of a composition, (2) Tonality of a composition, (3) Timbre/Register of instruments, (4) Tempo/Meter of a composition, (5) Rhythm used in a composition, and (6) Dynamics used within a composition (2005, pp. 32-33). Carney then went on to identify six elements of suitability that included: (1) Instrumentation of your Ensemble, (2) Experience Level of Ensemble, (3) Amount of Available Rehearsal Time, (4) Utilitarian Concerns, (5) Familiarity / Preeminence (Composer / Composition), and (6) Outside Influences (2005, pp. 33-34).

Within his study, Carney sorted the participating directors by instructional level and educational background. It was extremely interesting to note that educators who participated in this study by Carney demonstrated that the elements of suitability were rated and ranked consistently higher than the elements of quality. This finding was
corroborated by the study previously conducted by Young (1998). The elements of 
instrumentation of your ensemble, experience level of ensemble, and amount of available 
rehearsal time consistently ranked ahead of all other elements of suitability and quality. 
The results of the study suggested that elements of suitability were considered more 
important than elements of quality when selecting literature to be performed by school 
ensembles (Carney, 2005, pp. 41-54). Carney stated:

   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...Directors are more concerned with being pragmatic and 
   functional than developing an artistic or aesthetic value system (p. 70).

   King (2001) investigated non-auditioned, small college bands to determine the 
literature being performed over a three-year period, the quality of this literature, the level 
of difficulty, and the criteria used in the selection process. King discovered that the 
majority of pieces (62%) were quality compositions that appeared on the Repertoire 
Evaluation Inventory developed by Young (1998). Many of the respondents in this study 
performed compositions of a notable quality level. Considering the context and make-up 
of these ensembles, the repertoire selected for performance compared favorably with 
other studies (p. 101). In the examination of the individual criteria used in selecting 
literature, it is interesting to note that King discovered that criteria related to performance 
issues rated higher than all other criteria, but yet some of these criteria do not necessarily 
reflect a concern to perform music of quality (pp. 103-105).

   Kish (2005) performed a replication of a study first conducted by Karl M. Holvik 
in 1970 that sought to discover if there was indeed an emerging repertoire for the concert 
band. As it was impractical to replicate the method of data collection by Holvik, Kish
used reports of concert programming from the CBDNA reports over a five-year period, and it resulted in the tabulation and analysis of 11,765 individual performances. The inventory of pieces included 170 compositions appearing on 15 or more programs, and the most frequently appearing composers (in order) included Grainger, Sousa, Ticheli, Holst, and Vaughan Williams (p. 3). Eight out of the top ten most frequently performed works in the original study by Holvik were included on the list generated by Kish.

Kish observed that the literature available to the wind band to the time of his study was significantly greater in quantity and quality as compared to era in which Holvik conducted his study. However, Kish noted that the core body of literature remained extremely similar in his study when compared to that of the study by Holvik (Kish, 2005, p. 9). Both the studies by Holvik and Kish used performance frequency, or popularity, as a measurement tool. While this practice did not imply a substantial work in the repertoire, it illuminated works that appeal to a wide majority of bands (p.10). Based upon the presence of several new and emerging works that were published a short time before the study was conducted, Kish suggested that future studies should examine the lists of frequently performed works as compared to studies that indicate the quality of compositions for band (p. 11).

In his own investigation with band directors in the state of Pennsylvania, Jones (2005) conducted a repertoire study to compare the results with the findings by Gaines (1998). Using a questionnaire developed in collaboration with band directors and graduate students at two major universities, the results showed that 62% of the pieces on the Core Repertoire list developed by Gaines were programmed by participants in this
study. This would indicate that directors recognize works of quality among all repertoire choices available.

One of the questions Gaines (1998) posed to directors was the criteria they considered when they would evaluate new works. Three of the possible choices received a response rate of 97% from directors selecting *most often* or *often* as a response choice. These choices included *artistic value*, *educational value* and *programming balance*. Of those three, artistic value and educational value received a *most often* response rate of 62% from directors. Of additional interest was that *student appeal* received a response rate of 73% from directors selecting *often*. These results reported by Gaines suggested the directors were concerned with aesthetic awareness in students and their connection to the piece, in addition to musical development through study of the work (Jones, pp. 74-76).

Overall, directors in Pennsylvania are programming along the trends identified in Gaines’ study. Directors have been basing their programming decisions on artistic and educational values and balanced programming, and they were concerned for how the students might connect to the work. Also of interest was the fact that directors were primarily using publisher materials to learn of new works. In the absence of a repertoire list, directors must have developed skills to determine which repertoire best meets the needs of their curriculum. Jones asserted that teacher preparation programs need experiences and projects to help pre-service educators evaluate and analyze quality pieces appropriate for school bands (p. 77).

In a study that provided description and analysis of the repertoire performed at middle school band contests, Hash (2005) used information provided by J.W. Pepper on all pieces published between 2000 and 2002 to categorize the graded difficulty level of
each work. Hash stated that one indicator of artistic and pedagogical value may be found in the number of times a piece appears on a repertoire list. Using a number of different lists from texts such as the *Teaching Music through Performance in Band* (Miles, 1996, 1998, 2001, 2003, 2004), the *National Band Association Selective Music List* (2001), and the list generated by Stevenson’s study (2004), Hash arrived at a list of 211 works deemed to be of high-quality.

Hash discovered that close to 30% of the pieces receiving a performance at contest were less than three years old, and that 30% of the music was published by a single company. These findings would suggest that directors have included new and emergent works alongside older works in certain settings, and that publishing companies can exert influence in certain contexts. Programs from contests analyzed in this study suggested that a core repertoire for young bands was beginning to emerge as specific older works or several works by a single composer received multiple performances. This development in repertoire could be attributed to the fact that some music has not stood the test of time, but the familiarity an experienced director has with a specific composer or an older work should also be considered.

In an analysis of the *Texas University Interscholastic League Prescribed Music List*, from 1967 to 1994, Harris and Walls (1996) discovered that approximately two-thirds of pieces listed at the grade one and two levels did not remain on this list for more than two revisions, and over 42% appeared once. The revisionary process analyzed in this study would suggest that after works emerge they may not have the ability to stand the test of time. This finding would also seem to contribute to the potential instability or fluidity of available repertoire for bands. New music has not always constituted high-
quality music, and there have been only so many works at every level that have retained their relevance and usability for future programming needs year after year (McCallum, 2007, p. 105).

If there is a degree of fluidity to repertoire lists, whether compiled by an individual or an association of some type, there has been evidence to support that some pieces are able to stand the test of time due in part to their recurrent inclusion on lists. While directors may be able to recognize pieces among the core and traditional repertoire on such lists, it is important that, as research has suggested, they develop skills to evaluate repertoire against the context of their own situation. As new works are introduced, it would be appropriate to examine studies and articles regarding the evaluation of such unfamiliar pieces. Three studies that involved the examination of unfamiliar works for the concert band were conducted by Richard K. Fiese.

Fiese (1990) examined the effects of nonmusical cues on judgment of quality in concert band music by undergraduate conducting students. Fiese shared that the student conductors used nonmusical cues when making qualitative decisions regarding wind band music (pp. 13-20). While Battisti (1995) has stated that making qualitative decisions has been a responsibility of band directors, the suggestion from Fiese pointed to the idea that future educators needed training to evaluate quality literature (1990, p. 18).

Fiese (1991) also examined college and university wind band conductors agreement regarding the relative musical quality of three unfamiliar wind band scores. A secondary purpose of his study was to collect and synthesize criteria used by conductors in creating their rankings. There seemed to be agreement regarding the criteria used as a basis for the judgments, but there was no statistical agreement among the conductor’s
judgments of the relative musical quality of the three unfamiliar scores used in this study. The review of literature completed by Fiese suggested that music educators have long advocated the use of high-quality music in music programs and have noted that the quality of music materials should be continually upgraded (Fiese, 1991, pp. 239-247).

Fiese (1993) then conducted related research among public school band directors to determine the relationship among the director’s agreement as to their rankings of three unfamiliar works for the concert band on the basis of relative musical quality. While no significant agreement existed between the directors with respect to the rankings on the basis of quality or selected criteria, eight musical criteria were found to be influential on the director’s decisions. This finding demonstrated that although directors disagreed on the relative rankings of the three works, a level of agreement emerged about the criteria used to make those decisions. These criteria have been outlined in the table that follows.

Table 7

*Evaluative Criteria for the Selection of Concert Band Music (Fiese, 1993)*

1) This composition reflects structural unity and coherence of musical elements within a form.

2) This composition reflects the logical development of musical ideas.

3) This composition reflects the use of contrast and variety in rhythm, melody, harmony, texture, timbre, and dynamics.

4) This composition reflects activity and complexity.

5) This composition reflects an effective use of instruments.

6) This composition reflects creativity versus predictability.

7) This composition evokes interest.

8) This composition reflects suitability for the band medium.
The results suggested that individual perception and differing values placed upon the various criteria may have impacted the rankings by participants (pp. 27-31).

Heidel identified a need for the study to be conducted using undergraduate instrumental music educators and instructors and focusing on the qualitative judgments of both groups, and he modeled his study after Fiese (Heidel, 1999, p. 13). Student participants from five different universities were able to employ a set of musical criteria to evaluate the three pieces in a similar rank order on the basis of relative musical quality (pp. 126-127). His research further demonstrated that learning opportunities including musical and teaching experiences may better enable music education students to develop and refine the skills needed to evaluate music (pp. 130-131). Heidel acknowledged that subjective considerations like personal taste, programmatic concerns, technical and musical abilities of the ensemble, and student responsiveness will continue to influence the music selection process by directors (p. 157).

The study conducted by Williams also reviewed scholarly literature that supported the idea that it is the responsibility of the band director to select pieces demonstrating musical quality and educational value. Additionally, the review of literature by Williams also suggested that the music should not exceed technical and expressive abilities of the ensemble (1998, p. 17). Williams reported that elements with the highest indicators of importance in repertoire selection were musical quality, educational value, appropriateness for the musical abilities of the ensemble, and director preference (1998, p. 84). Williams suggested that directors perceived musical quality, educational value, and appropriateness for the ability of the ensemble as important elements when selecting
music for festival settings. He also stated that past success in this setting may identify a more successful process of literature selection for the concert band (p. 85).

Sheldon (2000) stated that it was inarguable that effective music education experiences depended on the quality of musical materials used to facilitate instruction (p. 10). In an examination of experienced and inexperienced teachers’ perceptions of band music content and quality in three experimental settings, several different findings are worth sharing as they relate to the present study. Sheldon reviewed differences in focus of attention to musical elements in new band literature under three different conditions that provided information about the ways in which teachers critique band music for possible curricular use (pp. 11-12).

The level of experience (in-service vs. pre-service teachers) did not seem to affect subject response within the study (Sheldon, 2000). Pre-service and in-service teachers seemed to be similar in their abilities to garner information from a score. Sheldon suggested that a future study might use familiar compositions considered by experts to comprise the core repertoire that might provide more insight into whether pre-service and in-service instrumental music educators have relied on similar decision-making processes when reviewing literature for curricular inclusion (pp. 21-22).

Although the works used in the third experimental setting differed stylistically, both groups focused on the aspect of melody across all three selections (Sheldon, 2000, p. 23). This finding regarding attention to melody corroborated research Sheldon previously conducted that demonstrated band directors consider melody as the most important specific musical consideration when critiquing literature. Sheldon also pointed out that
the results of this study indicated that combined score reading and listening have allowed more accurate critiques than either method alone (p. 23).

Gathering perceptions of unfamiliar band scores was also the subject of research by Flemming (2001). In that study, Flemming used Likert Scales to determine the perceived musical value of a sample of wind band compositions, many of which were among the frequently used pieces at the Florida Bandmaster’s Association State Festivals identified in a previous study by Williams (1998). The purpose of the study by Flemming was to investigate the assertion that exposure to quality literature will cause students to develop a preference for that kind of literature (p. 34). Flemming also used unfamiliar foreign concert band works in his study that to the best of his knowledge and research had not been made available nor performed in the United States of America (2001, p. 44).

A review of a number of studies led Jagow to suggest that directors’ opinions about certain pieces of literature differed although quality is important in the criteria they utilize (p. 197). Jagow later offered an evaluation tool, the Q-Meter, which puts the determination of a pieces’ quality factor in the hands of the director. This scale, the Q-Meter, involves assigning a quantitative value to 7 different qualitative components, and by totaling each qualitative category the resulting number would suggest whether or not the piece would be of value for study and performance. This tool has flexibility in that it could be used to evaluate music at any development level for the instrumental setting in the public schools.

Heidel noted that many of the lists of wind band literature generated from various research studies have been useful to collegiate and university ensembles, as well as some advanced high schools (1999, p. 38). Heidel observed that many of the pieces on these
lists would not be, as Carney (2005) indicated, suitable to many high school ensembles. The emphasis placed on various criteria by individual participants and groups that have been studied has been a part of these various studies. A strict definition of quality as it would be applied during the selection of music might prove difficult. The scholarly literature and research have demonstrated that directors apply different criteria in seeking quality literature for their ensembles as they have been given various opportunities to evaluate music for their ensemble.

Conclusion

In this chapter a number of important issues in the process of repertoire evaluation and selection were drawn from the review of literature. It has been apparent that repertoire has been a vehicle for realizing the goals of instrumental music education. For that reason, directors must select music carefully while considering a number of different aspects. A number of authors and researchers have suggested that directors need to familiarize themselves with masterworks from the core repertoire, and begin to assimilate personal lists and resources to aide them in the evaluation and selection of repertoire.

One of the central issues in the evaluation and selection of repertoire is that of quality in music for the concert band. From the review of scholarly literature, quality in music has appeared to be a multi-dimensional characteristic that accounts for the craft of the composer, the presence, balance, repetition, and contrast of various musical elements, aesthetic value, emotional value, and potential for having lasting merit over time. When evaluating quality music for the concert band, conductors have accounted for the melodic material present, the harmonic language, rhythmic vitality and variety, use of timbre, and the formal structure of the work.
Quality in music for the concert band may also be related to the pedagogical value the work provides and the opportunity to develop musical skills through the study and performance of such a work. Another aspect of quality that was apparent in the literature may be related to the emotional impact contained within a piece. Some of the literature suggests that technical considerations were often considered ahead of aesthetic and emotional aspects by directors. There has been criticism of the aesthetic and emotional content of new and emergent works. Yet, some works in the core repertoire praised for that specific aspect may not be a suitable choice for every ensemble.

Additionally, the interaction of all the various elements present within a piece of concert band music may have contributed to the work earning repeated performances. Each style of music can be evaluated on its own merit. The quality of the experience a representative concert band work can lend may be subjective and involve the interaction of a number of different musical aspects. These interactions may have included the context of the teaching and learning in which an instrumental ensemble is situated, or the balance of different styles of works when selecting repertoire for a concert.

Another issue that has been voiced by authors, critics, and conductors has been the role of the music publishers in the creation of new works for concert bands. Many composers and conductors identified that there are works of value still being created and that have been compelling choices for directors and ensembles. These works for concert band have provided directors with a multitude of repertoire choices from which to select for their ensembles. While directors are familiar with and sometimes program pieces to be considered part of the core repertoire, they have also been selecting new and emergent works they believe to be of high-quality to perform.
Original works for concert band have been included on repertoire lists, but other styles and genres have not frequently appeared on such lists with the exception of some marches. Frequency of performance has been an indication of popularity, but it has not always been an indication of the artistic or pedagogical quality. The repertoire available to concert bands has constantly expanded, but some works have distinguished themselves to earn repeated performances because of their artistic or pedagogical value. Directors need to develop assessment skills for repertoire evaluation purposes and not solely rely on lists or publishers materials. Some studies suggest there has been a degree of fluidity to such kinds of lists.

The most prominent concept that was discussed at length in this chapter was that of quality as it related to new and emergent concert band works. There have been critics of new and emergent concert band pieces who have posed questions regarding the quality of such works. Directors have not been deterred by such discussions as many of them are selecting new and emergent pieces for study and performance. The views shared by directors place an interesting frame around the process whereby directors evaluate and select new works for the concert band.

The main focus of this study will be to identify what criteria band directors place importance on in their evaluation and selection of music for concert bands in the high school instrumental setting. A secondary objective of the proposed research study is to discover how personal and professional background influence band directors in their evaluation and selection process. In the chapter that follows, the methodology for ascertaining the perceptions of directors regarding new and emergent repertoire will be outlined and discussed. Additionally, a report from the Repertoire Review Panel (RRP)
on the pieces to be examined by participants in this study will be provided. As mentioned earlier in the study, an evaluative tool will be developed, and the reliability of this tool will be tested prior to use in the study. A complete statistical analysis of the data will be documented in Chapter Four, and a discussion of the findings, the implications, and a need for further research will be presented in the concluding chapter.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The primary focus of this research study was to identify what musical criteria band directors place importance on in their assessment of new and emergent works for concert bands in the high school instrumental setting. A secondary objective of this research was to learn what effect personal and professional background had on band directors during the evaluation process of new and emergent works. This research study was non-experimental and descriptive in nature that collected both quantitative and qualitative data. Appropriate statistical tests were used to report the quantitative data, and the qualitative data was used to focus the discussion in the concluding chapters.

The procedures of this research study have been outlined in this chapter. Issues and aspects to be addressed in this chapter included (1) the process by which the criteria to evaluate the three compositions was developed, (2) the process by which the reliability of the evaluative criteria were tested, (3) the selection of the three instrumental music educators who served on the Repertoire Review Panel (RRP), (4) the process by which the RRP selected the three new and emergent works for concert band to be evaluated by the high school band directors, (5) a description of the participants who were contacted with the assistance of an international organization, (6) the design of how the survey was constructed and made available to participants, and (7) how the data generated from the survey were analyzed.

This chapter also includes a report on the analysis of the suitability of the evaluative criteria by the review panel composed of collegiate and university band
directors. A number of statistical tests were conducted to examine the reliability of these criteria for this study. Finally, the three pieces selected by the Repertoire Review Panel (RRP) that shall be analyzed by participants in the study were identified.

Criteria Development

After a careful review of existing lists and evaluative tools in scholarly literature, it was determined that the development of a different criteria list might best serve the purposes of this study. From the wealth of existing scholarly research and literature dealing with repertoire (Carney, 2005; Cooper, 2004; Del Borgo, 1988; Fiese, 1993; Gage, 2000; Greig, 2003; Hayward, 2004; Jagow, 2007; LaRue, 1992; McBeth, 1990; Ostling, 1978; Reimer 1991), a criteria list to evaluate the new and existing works was developed. While the Ostling list has been used in replicate studies and extensions (Gilbert, 1993; Rhea, 1998; Thomas, 1999; Towner, 2011), its use in those situations has been to assess the artistic merit of established literature. As this study sought to gather perceptions of new and emergent works for the concert band, it was appropriate to formulate a different set of musical criteria from those reviewed.

The following description of how this criteria list was developed integrated various perspectives and ideas found in scholarly literature. The four criteria offered by Reimer (1991) for determining quality in music were listed along the top of a table. After placing the four items across the top, the four elements of music (melody, harmony, rhythm, and timbre) were listed along the left side of the same table. I then placed different criteria and aspects from other lists and repertoire studies inside this four by four grid. Individual aspects of existing criteria lists were then analyzed, and placed in a
square on the table that most appropriately related to the intersection of the criteria of Reimer and an element of music. A synopsis of this process has been outlined in Table 8.

**Table 8**

*Concert Band Repertoire Criteria Development Table*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craftsmanship (Materials Molded into an Expressive Form)</th>
<th>Sensitivity (Depth of Feeling Captured within the Work)</th>
<th>Imagination (Vividness of the Piece to Capture Our Attention)</th>
<th>Authenticity (Genuineness of the Artists Interactions with Materials)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Counterpoint (Stamp)</td>
<td>- Emotional impact (Cramer)</td>
<td>- Creative melodies and counter-lines (Cramer)</td>
<td>- Genuine originality, economical, logical and inspirational melody (Nielsen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Logical development of musical ideas (Fiese)</td>
<td>- Justified emotion (Nielsen)</td>
<td>- Contrast (Cramer)</td>
<td>- This composition reflects suitability for the band medium (Fiese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contrast &amp; variety in melody (Fiese)</td>
<td>- This composition evokes interest (Fiese)</td>
<td>- use of non-diatonic melodies (Stamp)</td>
<td>- Movement and Shape (LaRue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consistent in style, clearly conceived ideas, &amp; avoids trivial, futile, or unsuitable passages (Ostling)</td>
<td>- Melody (LaRue)</td>
<td>- This composition reflects creativity versus predictability (Fiese)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Melody (LaRue)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Growth (LaRue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use of non-triadic harmony (Stamp)</td>
<td>- Harmonic imagination (Cramer)</td>
<td>- Harmony suitable to the style (Nielsen)</td>
<td>- This composition reflects suitability for the band medium (Fiese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This composition reflects structural unity and coherence of musical elements within a form (Fiese)</td>
<td>- Contrast (Cramer)</td>
<td>- Movement and Shape (LaRue)</td>
<td>- Movement and Shape (LaRue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Harmony (LaRue)</td>
<td>- Creativity versus predictability (Fiese)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Growth (LaRue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Well-conceived formal structure (Cramer)</td>
<td>- Emotional impact (Cramer)</td>
<td>- Rhythmic vitality (Nielsen)</td>
<td>- This composition reflects suitability for the band medium (Fiese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rhythmic variety &amp; meter changes (Stamp)</td>
<td>- This composition evokes interest (Fiese)</td>
<td>- Contrast (Cramer)</td>
<td>- Movement and Shape (LaRue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uses contrast and variety in rhythm (Fiese)</td>
<td>- Direction (McBeth)</td>
<td>- Accompaniment not restricted to ostinato (Stamp)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rhythm (LaRue)</td>
<td>- Movement (LaRue)</td>
<td>- Reflects activity and complexity (Fiese)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Suitability (Carney)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Growth (LaRue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Craftsmanship in orchestration (Ostling)</td>
<td>- Ingenuity in its development, given the stylistic context and reflects a musical validity, which transcends factors of historical importance, or factors of pedagogical usefulness. (Ostling)</td>
<td>- Sufficiently unpredictable and the route the composition travels in initiating its musical tendencies. Probable music goal is not completely obvious. (Ostling)</td>
<td>- Has form and reflects a balance between repetition and contrast. Consistent in quality throughout its length and in its various sections. The composition is genuine in idiom, and is not pretentious (Ostling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Effective use of instruments (Fiese)</td>
<td>- Emotional impact (Cramer)</td>
<td>- Contrast (Cramer)</td>
<td>- Growth (LaRue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Scoring which best represents the full potential for beautiful tone and timbre (Cramer)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Growth (LaRue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Texture (Stamp)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Suitability (Carney)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sound (LaRue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once all sources were analyzed and placed in the table, the various squares were examined for common ideas and themes as related to evaluation of repertoire. While there was no set number of aspects to be identified on this criteria list, eight major criteria headings emerged from the analysis of the grid illustrated in Table 8. Where appropriate, ideas and existing criteria were modified and adapted to create a clear evaluative statement related to a single aspect.

Within the row designated for melody, two ideas emerged from including the craftsmanship displayed in the writing and melodic material that is sincere and able to hold interest emerged as themes that should be considered. The row for harmony made reference to creative use of harmonic language that is suitable to the style of the work as another feature to be considered in the evaluation of concert band music. Vitality, variety, and suitability to the style and medium were important aspects of the rhythm row. Timbre included a variety of comments including the use of instruments, texture, and contrast.

Another feature that emerged and deserved consideration was related to formal structure and growth of music, evidenced by references in the Authenticity and Imagination column. The facet of pedagogical usefulness materialized in the comments authored by Ostling (1978), Cramer (1997), and Fiese (1993). In the high school instrumental setting, a student would receive exposure to a variety of pedagogical concepts through study and performance of concert band music. Emotional impact and sensitivity was another aspect that was readily identified by several authors. Finally as I sought to learn why directors have programmed new and emergent works with their ensembles, the concept of longevity and repeated use and interest in a work provided an important final piece for consideration in the evaluation of new and emergent concert
band works. The end result of this process was the creation of the *Concert Band Repertoire Evaluation Criteria (CBREC)*, and it has been listed below in Table 9.

Table 9

*Concert Band Repertoire Evaluation Criteria (CBREC)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic Craftsmanship (MC)</td>
<td>The composition displays expert craftsmanship and clearly conceived ideas in the melodic material. This includes presence of counter-melodies, and melodic material that is genuine, original, and able to hold interest without being repetitious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language (HL)</td>
<td>The composition utilizes an imaginative harmonic language suitable to the style of the piece. The harmonic language demonstrates balance, direction, and sensitivity in its progressions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV)</td>
<td>The composition displays rhythmic vitality and variety throughout. The use of tempo and meter reflects sensitivity to the interaction of rhythm with other musical elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration (TO)</td>
<td>The composition displays balance, contrast, and variety among the elements of timbre and texture. It utilizes traditional orchestration techniques while incorporating contemporary methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS)</td>
<td>The composition reveals a well-conceived formal structure that is consistent, and utilizes balance and contrast of other elements. The composition demonstrates growth throughout the various sections so it avoids moving into trivial, useless, or incompatible musical ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)</td>
<td>The composition encourages the development of musical skills of both the individual and the ensemble within the restrictions associated at the graded difficulty level that it is assigned. The composition takes into account historical, theoretical, cultural and technical aspects of music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)</td>
<td>The composition demonstrates an emotional impact that is recognizable, genuine, inspirational, and imaginative. The composition is sincere and sensitive in its interactions with other musical elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)</td>
<td>The composition displays promise to earn repeated study and performance in the future because of its pedagogical usefulness, and aesthetic sensitivity. The composition creates a unique musical experience through the interaction and growth of the various musical elements present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was suggested by several authors that when using a newly constructed Likert scale, independent judges need to rate how favorable each item is to the concept of interest (Sommer 2011; Trochim, 2006). Similar to a process used by Greig (2003), I contacted a group of experts in the field of repertoire evaluation and selection to rate the favorability of the proposed Likert scale. This process provided a measure of the content validity of the CBREC. The ratings by the panel of experts were completed prior to the use of the CBREC by participant high school band directors.

A group of collegiate band directors was contacted to assist with this part of the study. These directors were selected with the following background experience in mind: (1) actively conducting an ensemble at the collegiate/university level, (2) actively teaching/instructing pre-service or in-service music educators on repertoire selection for the school concert band, and (3) a minimum of five years at the collegiate/university level. I selected a portion of these directors assisting with this part of the study based upon my familiarity and access. This group of directors held positions in higher education in the state of Pennsylvania and Eastern Ohio.

The remaining judges were solicited from college and universities with which I had limited or no prior contact in order to gain an objective review of the CBREC. I sought to expand the geographic range of the CBREC review through this process as well. For that reason, a group of directors from colleges and universities across the continental United States of America were selected at random on the basis of their geographic location.

To gain a reliable return on the rating of the CBREC, I sent out an email invitation to ninety collegiate and university directors across the United States of America
(Appendix C). My goal for this portion of the study was to acquire thirty-six respondents for the review of the CBREC to ensure an adequate response rate that was consistent with expectations for educational research. Analysis of response rate levels for behavioral sciences and scholars has proposed a benchmark of 35-40 percent as being optimal (Baruch & Holtom, 2008; Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000). Some research has suggested that having responses from 40% (or less) of the potential respondents presents information that is worthwhile, and the effort and financial costs to increase the response rate may not justify the additional information that might be obtained (Archer, 2008).

The email invitation to be a part of the CBREC Review Panel included an active link where this panel of directors was asked to rate the favorability of the CBREC prior to its use by participants. These directors used a five-point scale where a scale response of five indicated the item is strongly favorable to the concept, and a scale response of one indicated the item is strongly unfavorable to the concept. Ideally high item-total correlations and high discrimination are desirable. These directors evaluated the eight criteria within the CBREC using a survey created on Google Drive, previously known as Google Docs. A screen shot of the survey has been included in Appendix D.

Selection of Repertoire Review Panel

To provide objectivity in the selection of the repertoire to be viewed and evaluated by participants, three instrumental music educators were contacted to assist with this process. I selected the music educators who assisted with the choice of the new and emergent repertoire with the following criteria in mind: (1) the music educator has reviewed new repertoire for a state or national level music journal, (2) the music educator
was not currently affiliated as a composer with any of the publishing companies, (3) the music educator had previous experience as a high school or collegiate band director.

These educators were contacted via email to request their assistance in the review and selection of the three new pieces to be evaluated by participants. The email included a description of the study including its purpose, scope, overview of methodology and participants, and a detailed description of their role in the selection of repertoire for the study. Following the initial email, a telephone call was made to each of the three music educators to answer any questions related to their involvement in the study. Once the Repertoire Review Panel (RRP) was confirmed and established, they were sent a copy of the music scores under consideration from the list of best-selling works of 2009 through 2012 furnished by J.W. Pepper.

Selection of New and Emergent Works

Similar to the method employed by Hash (2005), J.W. Pepper was contacted and asked to provide a list of the best-selling pieces at the graded difficulty levels of III, IV, and V between the years of 2009 and 2012. The decision to only include pieces at these levels was based upon the graded difficulty levels suggested by Dvorak, Grechesky, and Ciepluch (1993). Pieces within these graded difficulty levels were best suited to be studied, rehearsed, and performed by high school ensembles.

As has been common in other repertoire studies discussed in the previous chapter, only original works for the concert band were considered for this study and thus, orchestral transcriptions and arrangements of music from popular styles (e.g. Broadway, jazz, pop, rock) were not included. Additionally, re-editions of older concert band works
(e.g. *First Suite in Eb for Military Band* by Holst, *Cajun Folk Songs* by Frank Ticheli) were not considered for the study.

A caveat worth mentioning at this point relates to two of the works on the list provided by J.W. Pepper. Two of the best-selling concert band pieces during this time were transcriptions of existing choral works. The composer of the original choral work was responsible for completing the transcription for the concert band setting. In both cases, the concert band setting was completed through a commissioning of the choral works original composers. As this only represented two of the potential works that could be selected by the RRP, I made the decision to keep these works classified as original works for the concert band as there were obvious differences in timbre, and in some smaller elements between the works.

Prior to the evaluation process, I identified all original works for band on this list. After the RRP received the mailing, they began the evaluation and ranking of the three concert band works. The RRP described earlier in this chapter provided me with rankings of eleven selected works from the list of best-selling works published between the years 2009 and 2012 provided by J.W. Pepper (Appendix E).

This study used publication sales, which provided an indication of popularity and interest, as a way to initially determine which new and emergent pieces might be considered for evaluation. The RRP then considered other aspects and elements of the pieces on the best-selling list provided by J.W. Pepper, Using the CBREC to assist in their evaluation of these eleven works. I requested the RRP to rank the pieces at each graded difficulty level based upon the value each work exhibits in the aspects and elements identified in the CBREC. From these lists provided by the RRP, the three
highest ranked works were identified and selected for evaluation by the participants in the study.

Description of Participants

The participants in this study were high school band directors whose teaching responsibilities included directing an ensemble comprised of students in grades 9-12 at a public high school. These directors also held membership in an international band fraternity. There were two primary reasons for sampling from this particular population. Of primary concern was the idea that repertoire evaluation and selection has been a responsibility shared by many directors across the United States. It was advantageous to gain an accurate perception from a national sample of band directors as to the value of new and emergent works.

Phi Beta Mu is an international band fraternity with over 3,000 active members in thirty-five chapters throughout the United States and Canada. The mission statement of the organization reads:

Phi Beta Mu is a non-political, non-profit fraternity organized to promote fellowship among its members, to encourage the building of better bands and the development of better musicians throughout the world, to foster a deeper appreciation for quality wind literature, and to encourage widespread interest in band performance. (Bearden, Crider, Green, & Ragsdale, 2000)

The mission statement of the fraternity provided a compelling second reason to approach members of this group and gather their perceptions regarding new works for the concert band, as the performance of this music might have an impact on the interest of band performance in the United States.

Members of Phi Beta Mu have not participated in a research study of this size, though members have participated in other studies on an individual basis (Murray, 2011).
I sought to gather input and data from the organization on a national level within this study. Membership in Phi Beta Mu is acquired through a prospective member being nominated by a current member, and after a year of observation they may be officially sworn into the fraternity. The criteria for membership are based upon musicianship, teaching, professional persona, and citizenship (Bearden, Crider, Green, & Ragsdale, 2000). As the membership criteria examines personal characteristics and musical pedagogy in the context of teaching, it was reasonable to expect that participants will be exemplary professionals representing a wide range of teaching situations and school sizes.

I contacted the Executive Board of Phi Beta Mu via email to request their assistance in this study (Appendix F). This email included a description of the study including its purpose, scope, overview of methodology and participants, and documentation that the study did not identify individual members of the fraternity. During this process, the preservation of the integrity of the by-laws of Phi Beta Mu was a priority, as well as maintaining objectivity within the study. For this reason, I only requested that an email I composed with an active link to survey be sent by the Phi Beta Mu webmaster.

Once approval from the Executive Board of Phi Beta Mu was granted (Appendix G), the email invitation I composed with an active link to the on-line survey was sent to fraternity members who were teaching in an American public high school whose responsibilities include directing at least one ensemble composed of students in grades 9-12. To allow time for potential participants to complete all facets of the active survey, a target window of four weeks was established in the notification email. A follow-up email
was distributed to all Phi Beta Mu Members invited to participate in the study within two weeks of the start of the collection of data from the survey. It was expected that the sample population from Phi Beta Mu would represent a wide range of teaching contexts, band program sizes, and professional background experiences.

Survey Design

To facilitate the ease of creation for the researcher and the ease of access for participants in the study, the bulk of the on-line survey was created using programs from Google Drive. The only items within the online survey not created using Google Drive were the audio players for each of the three concert band pieces selected to be evaluated. A leading social audio platform, Soundcloud, allowed recordings of the music to be uploaded and a code was generated to allow the sound file to be embedded into the study site. These steps were taken to ease issues of access and increase participation in the study by Phi Beta Mu members.

The study by Fiese (1993) examined three band compositions using only full scores, and a later study by Heidel (1999) used both full scores and a reference recording. As his study examined the quality rankings of undergraduate instrumental music education students, Heidel made the decision to assist students who may not have possessed an adequate ability to read a full band score. To a further point, Heidel aimed to replicate the process by which directors might follow when selecting new music for use with their ensembles (1999, p. 49). The present study sought to add the dimension of listening and evaluating new music for the concert band in an on-line setting, as this method has been used with more frequency among band directors as technology evolves and has been made more readily available in the instrumental setting.
More research has been conducted through the use of email and technology platforms due to methodological and economic reasons, and the response rates in some cases have been as high or higher than traditional mail methodology (Baruch & Holtom, 2008; Solomon, 2001). By employing such methods of electronic survey research, very large or representative numbers of a population have been reached, electronic correspondence with potential participants remains in place until purposefully deleted, and respondents find the ease of use appealing (Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000). Given the number of Phi Beta Mu members that were eligible to participate in such a survey, the use of email and technology platforms was an appropriate method to employ. Members of a professional organization, such as the international band fraternity Phi Beta Mu, would likely have access to the Internet and email. These two factors are important in electronic survey methodology (Cook, Heath, & Thompson, p. 829).

The design of this on-line survey collected data from participants in three steps. The first step of the survey was to gather basic demographic information. The initial screen of the on-line survey provided a brief overview of the study and requested informed consent. The screens that followed asked participants to provide information related to the following areas: the state in which they taught, gender, age, number of years in teaching, number of years in their current position, highest degree earned, number of ensembles they conducted composed of students in grades 9-12 and the number of new works they purchased each year for those ensembles.

The second step of the survey began the evaluation of each of the three works selected for the study by the repertoire review panel. To prevent participant bias due to non-musical information such as the title and composer association, each score image
was prepared to omit such information from being visible. The scores were labeled as Piece 1, Piece 2, and Piece 3. This practice followed previous research conducted by Fiese (1991) and Heidel (1999).

Participants began viewing a full score image of the work while listening to an audio recording of the piece. This audio recording which participants listened to was purchased from the company that published the work. Participants had to click a play button to begin the audio recording. Once the recording began, they needed to click an arrow button to advance the score image during the evaluation process. At the conclusion of the recording, participants advanced to the screen where they used the CBREC and began the evaluation of the various aspects of the piece.

The eight statements of the CBREC were constructed to gather director perceptions about new works for the school concert band (Appendix H). Each statement that was posed to participants asks them to rate their level of agreement as it pertained to a certain aspect of the piece that they were evaluating. Participants used a seven-point Likert scale to rate the level to which they agreed or disagreed with each of the statements in CBREC (previously outlined in Table 9). A scale response of 7 indicated the participant very strongly agreed with the statement, and a scale response of 1 indicated the participant very strongly disagreed with the statement.

Finally, the survey posed a series of optional open-ended questions to each of the participants. Table 10 listed below outlines the questions that were posed to participants in the fourth step of the survey. Participants also had the option of rating their familiarity with the work prior to the evaluation process outlined above.
Table 10

*Open-ended Survey Questions for Participants*

1) What aspects do you primarily examine when considering a new and emergent work for use with your concert band?

2) What is your view regarding the value of rehearsing and performing new and emergent concert band works with your ensemble?

3) What aspects do you believe contribute to a piece being able to sustain repeated programming over time and eventually move into the “core or standard repertoire”?

Analysis of Data

To ensure all statistics were accurately analyzed and reported, I contacted an independent expert to assist with and review all data analysis proposed in this chapter. As this study generated ordinal data, attention was given to proper analysis and interpretation throughout the study. While parametric tests have been generally regarded as being more powerful statistical tests than nonparametric alternatives, using such parametric tests on ordinal data generated from surveys may provide misleading information (Allen & Seaman, 2007).

Various forms of data analysis were used within the current study. The ratings of the *CBREC* completed by the group of collegiate band directors were analyzed prior to use by participants. Cronbach’s Alpha, which measures internal consistency, was used to evaluate the level of agreement among the collegiate directors regarding the favorability on each item of the *CBREC*. The independent statistical expert mentioned earlier in this chapter provided assistance with these procedures.
The reliability of the *CBREC* was reviewed to determine if any of the individual statements needed to be removed prior to use with the participant group of high school band directors. The study then proceeded with the *CBREC* items that were found to be reliable. Participants from the high school band directors in Phi Beta Mu were then contacted to take the on-line survey.

Once data collection from the high school band directors was complete, analysis began by calculating descriptive statistics so it was possible to summarize a meaningful and accurate description of the sample population. Descriptive statistics were used to report the demographic information (i.e., gender, age, years of teaching experience, number of ensembles). This information provided me with appropriate demographic information within the survey population.

A Likert item measures the strength of an attitude, but the resulting ordinal data generated from responses may not represent equal intervals. Rensis Likert and others recommend that it was best to use as wide a scale as possible, and the seven-point scale has been shown to reach the upper limits of the scale’s reliability (Dawes, 2008; Nunnally, 1978), and has been used in other research related to repertoire (Carney, 2005). The mean and standard deviation have sometimes been viewed as invalid parameters for descriptive statistics whenever data are on ordinal scales. For that reason, without careful examination of the values of the data and the objectives of the analysis, findings can be misinterpreted (Allen & Seaman, 2007).

For this reason, I approached this part of the data analysis with careful consideration. First, the mean and standard deviation were carefully analyzed with assistance from the independent statistician. This examination of each item in the *CBREC*
assisted in determining which, if any, criterion demonstrated higher levels of agreement among the directors. In addition to the analysis of individual Likert items, the Likert scales for each of the three concert band works were analyzed and examined to see if any relationship exists. A one-way analysis of variance, a test of significance, was used to test whether responses differed across participant background types. An alpha level of .05 was established for all statistical tests prior to data collection, as this has been common in other studies of similar nature (Fiese, 1991; Heidel, 1999).

Analysis of the CBREC Review Panel Data

As outlined earlier in this chapter, a review of the Concert Band Repertoire Evaluation Criteria (CBREC) by an independent panel of directors at the collegiate and university level was conducted to rate how favorably each CBREC item was aligned to the eight concepts of interest. Fifty-four directors (n = 54) from the 90 invitations reviewed the eight items of the CBREC, representing a return rate of 60%.

The independent statistician verified all statistical analysis and interpretation of the data generated by the CBREC Review Panel Members. Cronbach's alpha, a frequently used estimate of internal consistency (Trochim, 2006), was used as a measure of internal reliability of the ratings from the CBREC Review Panel. It has been used as a practical test of the overall reliability of a scale, with coefficients of 0.70 and above generally accepted as strong (Cortina, 1993; Kline, 1999). The CBREC yielded $\alpha = 0.872$, signifying it to be reliable instrument for the study. Means and standard deviations were calculated for all Review Panel Members on the eight items of the CBREC (Table 11). Based upon the five-point scale used by the review panel, the overall mean scores were relatively high.
Of the eight items in the CBREC, only two of the concepts evaluated by the panel of collegiate and university directors demonstrated standard deviations greater than 1.00 (Pedagogical Usefulness and Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use). The variability expressed in Pedagogical Usefulness (SD = 1.016) might be explained by the findings of Kish (2005) that suggested collegiate directors have been selecting music from a narrow body of literature. In this case, college directors were perhaps more focused on exposing their ensembles to core and standard repertoire, and the technical aspects of those core works were of lesser importance. The variability of Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (SD = 1.043) was interesting in light of the findings offered by Kish (2005). Directors in that study have revisited specific works with their ensembles over time. The variability on this Likert item might have been related to the make-up of CBREC Review Panel versus the programming reports used in the Kish study.

Table 11

*Item Statistics for CBREC Review Panel*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An inter-item correlational analysis (Table 12) was also completed during this process, and it provided important information regarding the association between different aspects of the CBREC. According to Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (2003, p. 109), only five of the coefficients listed below would indicate a moderate correlation. A positive low to moderate relationship was found to exist between all the aspects of the CBREC. To be sure that the CBREC would be appropriate for use by participants, further statistical tests were completed to be certain of its reliability for this study.

Table 12

**CBREC Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Melodic Craftsmanship</th>
<th>Harmonic Language</th>
<th>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</th>
<th>Timbre and Orchestration</th>
<th>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</th>
<th>Pedagogical Usefulness</th>
<th>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</th>
<th>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although several inter-item correlations did not demonstrate a high positive correlation, an examination of item-total statistics illustrated in Table 13 revealed the
CBREC a reliable tool for the purposes of this study. The first column displays Scale Mean if Item Deleted, which excludes the individual item listed, and all other scale items are summed for all individuals (n = 54) and the mean of the summated items has been given. The second column displays Scale Variance if Item Deleted, which excluded the individual item listed, and indicates the variability of the remaining seven items. The final three columns display the correlation between the respective item and the total sum score (without the respective item), the squared multiple correlations between the respective item and all others, and the internal consistency of the scale if the respective item was deleted.

Table 13

CBREC Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>30.54</td>
<td>21.800</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Language</td>
<td>30.57</td>
<td>19.834</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>30.89</td>
<td>19.874</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>0.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>30.76</td>
<td>19.432</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>30.67</td>
<td>20.566</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>30.93</td>
<td>18.938</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>0.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>30.74</td>
<td>19.290</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>30.81</td>
<td>19.135</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The column labeled Corrected Item-Total Correlation displayed the correlation of the item designated with the summated score for all other items. For example in Table 13, the correlation between item 1 and the summated score was 0.474. According to Gliem and Gliem (2003), these values should be at least greater than 0.400. Any item with a Squared Multiple Correlation that was less than 0.20 should be eliminated, and all CBREC items demonstrated a correlation of 0.436 or greater. Gliem and Gliem further suggested that the last column may be the most important column in the table. This column represents Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for internal consistency if the individual item was removed from the scale (p. 86). All values in this column are below the total $\alpha = 0.872$, which means the eight item scale has higher reliability than if any of the items were eliminated.

As the reliability of the scale remained greater than 0.70, but does not exceed the alpha level with the item excluded ($\alpha = 0.872$), it was reasonable to leave all items in the CBREC for use by participants. In consideration of the analysis of the CBREC review, it was established as a reliable tool for the purposes of this research study.

Report on Repertoire Review Panel Selections

As outlined earlier in this chapter, a Repertoire Review Panel (RRP) was established to provide objectivity in the selection of the repertoire to be viewed and evaluated by participants in the current study. The three members of the RRP received a packet of scores, a ranking sheet with each of the score titles listed, a copy of the CBREC, and a brief set of instructions to begin their evaluation. The top-selling original concert band works available from J.W. Pepper from 2009 to 2012 were evaluated.
To eliminate any bias, I did not contribute to the RRP in the selection of the three works for evaluation by the participants. Over the course of the past five years, I have established a professional relationship as a contributing composer with three of the five publishing companies that had works evaluated within the present study (Appendix E). For this reason, I decided that only the evaluations that were provided by members of the RRP would be used in the selection of the works to be evaluated in this dissertation.

The use of J.W. Pepper has been employed in other research (Hash, 2005), and maintaining consistency with other repertoire studies (Gilbert, 1993; Fiese, 1993; Flemming, 2001; Ostling, 1978; Rhea, 1999; Thomas, 1998; Towner, 2011), only original works for the concert band were considered for this study. The publication sales of each work suggest a status level and reputation, but other aspects of the work were evaluated by the RRP to identify three pieces for use in this study.

After members of the CBREC Review Panel completed their evaluation, it was determined that the CBREC would be an appropriate survey tool for the purposes of this study. The RRP was given a period of four weeks to complete their evaluations of the eleven pieces listed in Table 14. As outlined earlier in this chapter, the RRP was provided with scores for each of the eleven works, a description of the CBREC items, and a ranking sheet to complete their evaluation. The RRP used the eight items of the CBREC during their evaluation process. The members of RRP also shared additional notes on several of the pieces that were reviewed during this process, and some of these comments have been reported as it related to the overall top ranking pieces.

Table 14 outlines the overall average rank for each of the eleven concert band works that were evaluated by the three-member RRP. All of the pieces have been listed
from highest average rank to lowest average rank, and the standard deviation for each piece appeared in the final column. The rankings, standard deviation, and other statistical analysis were completed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 17.0 for Windows. Members of the RRP in Table 14 were randomly assigned a number for identification purposes.

Table 14

RRP Rankings of Works under Consideration in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>RRP #1</th>
<th>RRP #2</th>
<th>RRP #3</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELEMENTS</td>
<td>Brian Balmages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>Frank Ticheli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX AURUMQUE</td>
<td>Eric Whitacre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUNDRY</td>
<td>John Mackey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPALACHIAN MORNING</td>
<td>Robert Sheldon</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUR YESTERDAYS LENGTHEN LIKE SHADOWS</td>
<td>Sam Hazo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAL LULLABY</td>
<td>Eric Whitacre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELEBRATION AND SONG</td>
<td>Robert Sheldon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARABESQUE</td>
<td>Sam Hazo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAZIL CEREMONY SONG AND SAMBA</td>
<td>Robert W. Smith</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL MASS</td>
<td>Todd Stalter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Kendall's coefficient of concordance, a statistical measure used to calculate agreement between three or more raters (Chang, 2008), was employed to analyze the rankings assigned by the RRP. This statistical test has been used in other research involving the ranking of band scores (Fiese, 1991; Heidel, 1999). While the RRP members were Using the CBREC when evaluating the scores, a significant level of agreement could not be demonstrated among the RRP members with respect to the
rankings of the eleven compositions (n=3, W=0.538, X²=16.135, p = 0.09). It should be noted that the RRP only used three members, and the sample size of pieces reviewed was relatively small (eleven works were reviewed).

This provides reason for the rankings of the pieces by the RRP to be accepted with a degree of caution. As the p-value was greater than the alpha level (p > .05), the results of the RRP data analysis were statistically non-significant. The Kendall’s W value indicated only a moderate level of agreement among the three-member RRP. However, further examination revealed that two pieces were ranked either first or second by all three RRP members. Additionally, the piece with third highest average rank was tied for the second lowest standard deviation among the pieces evaluated, which has been an indication of lower variability (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003, p. 69).

Additional information related to each piece would need to be considered before making a final decision on the works to be evaluated. Comments shared by the RRP members during their evaluation process were taken into account. Through use of the website at J.W. Pepper, it was discovered that the top five ranked works out of the eleven under consideration appeared on state adjudication and contest lists.

Placement on a state list for adjudication or contest could provide additional exposure for a concert band work, and can serve as a validation of the merit in studying and performing such a piece. Additionally, the previous experience a director has with any work by a composer may influence their decision to select a different work by that composer in the future. The process by which a piece was included on a state list may be from the recommendations of a small committee. Direct experience by any of the
committee members with a specific work could in some way influence the recommendations made that create these lists.

RRP Member #3 identified *Elements* as the best pedagogical concept piece among the eleven. This work by Brian Balmages has been included on three different state adjudication and contest lists. While RRP Member #1 considered *Rest* to offer a connection to understanding the harmonic style of Ticheli, RRP# 3 pointed to the opportunities afforded all sections of the ensemble to make a musical contribution. *Rest* also appeared on one state adjudication and contest list. Finally, RRP#3 suggested that *Lux Aurumque*, a choral transcription for band, can assist in the development of nuance within an ensemble, and it appeared on five state adjudication and contest lists and two festival lists. In consideration of the comments from RRP members, mean rank, standard deviation, information provided by the Kendall’s coefficient of concordance, and other pertinent information, the three highest ranking pieces were selected for use by participants in this study (Table 15).

Table 15

*Original concert band works to be used by participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Brian Balmages</td>
<td>FJH Music Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>Frank Ticheli</td>
<td>Manhattan Beach Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>Eric Whitacre</td>
<td>Hal Leonard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted at this point that *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque*, were originally contemporary choral works by Ticheli and Whitacre. Both Frank Ticheli and Eric Whitacre have adapted their original choral works for the concert band setting. Within the
limitations outlined in Chapter One and earlier in this chapter it was stated that no transcriptions would be considered for use in the study. This stipulation specifically addressed classical transcriptions of choral and orchestral works and settings of music taken from popular styles, inclusive of pop music, jazz and Broadway.

Both Ticheli and Whitacre have earned recognition in writing for both instrumental and choral settings. The popularity of Rest and Lux Aurumque according to their sales through J.W. Pepper indicated that these contemporary works have reached a wider level of acceptance across two different genres. I also took into the consideration the ratings and comments shared by the RRP, and the recognition these two works have garnered from inclusion on state contest and festival lists. With these aspects in mind, I made the decision to keep these pieces among the three works used in the study.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the methodology for the study has been outlined. This procedure for the study has been selected to fulfill the purpose of discovering the consensus of band directors regarding new and emergent works for the concert band. The involvement of a group of outside directors, and the creation of a Likert scale made it necessary to use a number of different checks and tests to accurately analyze and present the data that was generated. The statistical analysis of the data generated by the CBREC Review Panel indicated that this Likert Scale was a reliable measure for the purposes of the current study. The evaluation of the rankings completed by the RRP identified three works to be evaluated by participants in this study. Finally, this study has received approval from the Kent State Institutional Review Board in July of 2012 to use human research participants.
The study was categorized as Level I/Exempt research because it involves minimal risk to human subjects that will be involved (Appendix J).

In Chapter Four, the demographic data has been reported via descriptive statistics. Other data collected has been reported through the use of appropriate statistical tests, seeking to learn if there was consensus among the various aspects that directors find compelling, and how background and experience might impact the perception of new works by high school band directors. Additionally, responses from the three open-ended questions have been analyzed to discern emerging themes and attitudes not able to be expressed through responses to the *CBREC*. A summary of these comments from participants has been included in the appendix. In the final chapter, implications from the resulting data have been discussed as it pertains to this participant group. Through this process, the current study has provided evidence as to why directors choose to program new and emergent works alongside pieces from the core and traditional repertoire with their ensembles.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

Introduction

Previous studies devoted to the selection of repertoire have resulted in the
identification of core and traditional literature for concert bands. Many directors across
the United States have been engaged in an evaluation and selection process that takes into
account these older works for the concert band. The opportunity to program a new and
emergent concert band work has added to the choices directors must consider when
selecting repertoire for their ensembles.

The primary focus of this research study was to identify what criteria band directors
place importance upon during their assessment of new and emergent works for concert
bands in the high school instrumental setting. A secondary objective of this study was to
examine the effect of personal and professional background of band directors during this
evaluation process. I was able to realize these goals by analyzing the statistical data and
responses generated by participants after the evaluation process of three new and
emergent works for the concert band.

Various procedures were selected to fulfill the purpose of discovering the
consensus of band directors regarding new and emergent works for the concert band. As
outlined in the previous chapter, a statistical analysis of the data generated by the CBREC
Review Panel and the evaluation of the rankings completed by the RRP solidified the
methodology to be used. With assistance of an international band fraternity, research with
high school band directors was conducted over a five week period. Within this chapter,
the demographic data has been reported through descriptive statistics, and other data
collected has been analyzed through the use of appropriate statistical tests. Additionally, responses from the three open-ended questions were analyzed to discern emerging themes and attitudes not able to be expressed through responses to the CBREC.

Participant Background Data

Phi Beta Mu, the International Bandmasters Fraternity, has over 3,000 members on its roster who instruct instrumental ensembles ranging from collegiate and university ensembles to elementary level bands. Of the members listed in the membership roster, 840 directors have identified their current teaching position and responsibilities. At the time the survey was conducted, 323 members who identified their teaching responsibilities within the Phi Beta Mu database were high school level directors. There were 125 directors within this group who participated in this web-based survey, and 119 of these survey responses submitted contained all required information. Six of the survey responses did not enter all information and were not used. The total number of participants who contributed data to the survey \((n = 119)\) represented 36.8\% of the known population of high school band directors in the Phi Beta Mu Membership Roster.

Response rate has been important when studying any population. Baruch and Holtom (2008) advocated that a representative group of respondents has been of equal importance in their analysis of surveys used in organizational research, and suggested a benchmark of approximately 35–40\%. Response rates have varied considerably depending upon the purpose of the study and the participants involved, and even after reminders have been sent a response rate of 30\% to 50\% has been typical (Lodico, Spaulding, and Voegtle, p. 221). Further examination of the demographic distribution of the respondents reflected an appropriate cross section of educational background (degree
earned), professional teaching experience (total years and years in position at time of research), and school environments (geographic location and band enrollments).

Phi Beta Mu has 35 international chapters, and 32 of those chapters are located in the United States of America. Thirty of these chapters were represented in the study. Table 16 provides a listing of each state chapter represented and the number of participating directors from that chapter.

Table 16

*State Chapter Representation and Number of Participating Directors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Chapter</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>State Chapter</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 119 participants, 95 indicated they were male, and 24 were female. Participant age averaged 49 years, with a range of ages from 32 to 70. The average age of male participants was 50 years old, and the average for female participants was 47. The educational background of the participants has been illustrated in Table 17 showing that a majority of the directors in this study hold a Master’s Degree in the field of music. It
should be noted that participants were not asked to identify their area of concentration for
the Master’s degree. Nearly 80% of the directors in Phi Beta Mu who contributed to this
study have earned a degree beyond their Bachelor’s. Almost 15% of those directors with
a degree beyond their Bachelor’s have studied in a field outside of music education (i.e.
administration, counseling, guidance).

Table 17

*Educational Backgrounds of Research Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree in Music Education</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree in Music</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Education, Performance, Conducting Theory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree outside Music</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Administration, Counseling, Guidance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree in Music</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Education, Performance, Conducting Theory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree outside Music</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Administration, Counseling, Guidance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants in this study averaged 25 years of teaching, and on average had been
in their current teaching position for 14 years. These averages were slightly higher for
male participants (26 years of teaching, 14.5 in their current position), and slightly lower
for female participants (23 years teaching, 13 in their current position). A total of 89
participants were responsible for teaching all four grade levels considered to be senior
high (Grades 9-12) in their instrumental setting. There were 18 directors in the study who
taught only two grade levels. Three participants were responsible for instructing students
at three different grade levels, and nine participants directed an ensemble comprised of just one grade level of students.

On average, directors who participated in this study instruct two ensembles as part of their teaching duties. The number of ensembles taught by participants has been outlined in Table 18. The majority of directors are instructing multiple ensembles composed of students in various grades levels. However, 37 of the 119 educators are responsible for teaching only one ensemble (31.1% of the participants). The average size of the single ensemble taught by the 37 directors was 76 students. Directors who were responsible for two ensembles on average taught 61 students per group. The group of directors who instructed three or more groups on average worked with 53 students per ensemble.

Table 18

*Reported Ensemble Teaching Responsibilities of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Ensembles</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 119 participant directors as a group reported teaching a total of 275 ensembles. As outlined earlier in this chapter, some of the ensembles are comprised of a single grade level of students, and others involve students from multiple grade levels. The
average ensemble size reported by directors was 58 students with a range from 7 students up to 140 students. Ninety-three of the ensembles (33.8%) taught by participant directors in this study were comprised of 41 to 60 students, and another 77 of the reported ensembles (28%) had student enrollment between 61-80 students. Table 19 illustrates the reported student enrollment in ensembles taught by participating directors.

Table 19

Reported Student Enrollment of Ensembles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Students</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 or more</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directors on average purchased eight new works for their ensembles per year. Four directors reported that they did not buy any new music for the ensembles, while six reported buying greater than 20 new pieces each year. Table 20 provides an illustration of the number of new works that are being purchased by directors in this study.
Table 20

Reported Number of New Works Purchased Annually by Directors for Concert Band

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Pieces</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the evaluations of the three selected concert band works were required of all participants, the rating of participants’ familiarity with those pieces and the open-ended responses regarding repertoire were optional parts of the study. A total of 68 participants (15 female, 53 male) elected to contribute information in this part of the study, which represented 57% of the sample population of directors. Within this group of participants, directors averaged 47 years in age, 23.4 years of teaching overall, and had been in their current position for 14.4 years. The first section of this study asked directors to rate their familiarity with each of the works from three possible choices, and these choices are listed on the left hand side of Table 21.
Table 21

Director Familiarity with Selected Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece #1 – Rest</th>
<th>Piece #2 – Lux Aurumque</th>
<th>Piece #3 - Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - I have not heard this piece prior to evaluating it in this study.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - I have heard this piece in a different setting.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - I have rehearsed this piece with one of my ensembles.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty-eight of the 68 directors who rated their familiarity with the works also included responses to at least one of the three open-ended questions. Of these responses, 37 (77%) came from male directors and 11 (23%) were from female directors. Also, 40 of the participant directors who responded to the open-ended questions had earned an advanced degree. This sub-group (n=48) of respondents included 28 directors who held a Master’s degree in music and all five directors who had earned a Doctoral degree in music. A summary of the open-ended responses has been included in Appendix L. A brief analysis and discussion of the responses to the open-ended questions have been included in this chapter, and they are further used in the concluding chapter.

Research conducted in the behavioral sciences has indicated that a response rate of 35-40% may be ideal (Baruch & Holtom, 2008; Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000).
Cook and colleagues (2000) also suggested that the average response rate for electronic surveys may fall into a similar return rate. While the return rate of the present study fell into the response rates suggested above, a comparison of the return rate with other repertoire studies was determined to be an appropriate method to strengthen the case for moving forward with data analysis.

Table 22 provides a comparison of the return rate of previous repertoire studies that were reviewed in the last chapter that at least in part involved participation from band directors in instrumental settings. The examination of previous studies revealed the return rate of this study (36.8%) was consistent given the nature of the survey research and comparable to other studies involving concert band repertoire.

Table 22

*Comparison of return rates for other repertoire studies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Researcher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carney</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiese</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaines</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greig</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of the geographic representation, educational background, and individual teaching situation of the participants provided a wide perspective to begin the analysis and interpretation of the data. The additional ratings and open-ended responses from participants provide an additional lens to aid in focusing the discussion in the final
chapter. The return rate of the present study has compared well with other repertoire studies involving band directors. For these reasons, I moved forward with presenting data from the evaluations completed by the high school directors of the three works selected for use in this study.

Evaluations by Participant Directors of the Three Selected Works

The second step in this research study asked participant directors to view a score image of each of the three concert band works while listening to a recording in an on-line setting. After completing this process, directors used the CBREC to rate the various aspects of the work. A total of 119 surveys were analyzed and descriptive statistics have been included for each work. The first piece evaluated was Rest, a work by Frank Ticheli.

Table 23

Director CBREC Ratings of Rest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CBREC Rating</td>
<td>39.84</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Likert-type scale response (1= “Very Strongly Disagree” to 7= “Very Strongly Agree”)
The total mean rating for the work was 39.86 with a standard deviation of 7.62. In their evaluation of this work, the CBREC Item Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES) achieved the highest mean rating followed by Harmonic Language (HL) and Timbre & Orchestration (TO). Three of the CBREC Items had a mean rating greater than 5.00, and three other items, Melodic Craftsmanship (MC), Formal Structure and Balance (FS), and Pedagogical Usefulness (PU) were at least 4.94. Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV) fell near the middle of the scale with a mean rating of 4.08. The CBREC item Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L) demonstrated the highest standard deviation. All standard deviations were close in value (range from 1.04 to 1.25) meaning the variability of choices for each item was very similar.

Similar to the process with the CBREC Review Panel, a test of Cronbach's alpha (α) was used on the responses provided by the participant directors when using the CBREC, and it yielded α = 0.934. This alpha level fell into a desirable level for research using Likert scales (Santos, 1999). Additionally, an inter-item correlation of the CBREC for Rest has been outlined on Table 24. Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) is a measure of the strength and direction of the association between two variables on an interval scale. According to Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (2003, p. 109), a correlation coefficient between 0.50 and 0.70 would indicate a moderate positive (or negative correlation) and coefficients between 0.70 and 0.90 would indicate a high positive correlation (or negative correlation).

As illustrated on Table 24, high positive correlations (r > 0.70) were found to exist between the items of Melodic Craftsmanship and four of the other CBREC items. Two high positive correlations were discovered for both Harmonic Language and Timbre
and Orchestration. Three more high positive correlations were found to be associated among Pedagogical Usefulness, Emotional Impact and Sensitivity, and Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use.

Table 24

**CBREC Inter-item Correlational Analysis of Rest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Melodic Craftsmanship</th>
<th>Harmonic Language</th>
<th>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</th>
<th>Timbre and Orchestration</th>
<th>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</th>
<th>Pedagogical Usefulness</th>
<th>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</th>
<th>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Language</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>0.782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In analyzing the reliability of a set of items using the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient, a part of the result examines what happens if each item is not included in the total. This is accomplished by comparing the alpha resulting from deleting each item to the total of all eight items. If alpha from seven items is greater than the total of the eight items, then the item lessens the reliability and is not well-related to the other items. This situation did not occur in any of the pieces. In fact, alpha remained fairly stable and did not exceed $\alpha = 0.934$. 

The second work evaluated by directors in the study was *Lux Aurumque* by Eric Whitacre, a setting for concert band that he completed from his own choral work of the same name. Table 25 provides mean value and standard deviation for each of the *CBREC* items for *Lux Aurumque*.

**Table 25**

*Director CBREC Ratings of Lux Aurumque*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CBREC Rating</td>
<td>35.78</td>
<td>10.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Likert-type scale response (1= “Very Strongly Disagree” to 7= “Very Strongly Agree”)*

*Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)* received the highest mean rating on *Lux Aurumque* in the study followed by *Harmonic Language (HL)* and *Timbre and Orchestration (TO)*. Additionally, *Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)* was the only *CBREC* Item that achieved a mean rating greater than 5.00. *Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)* fell in the middle of the rating scale. Similar to *Rest*, the *CBREC* Item *Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV)* displayed the lowest mean rating. All standard
deviations for this piece were higher than \textit{Rest}, implying that there was slightly more variability within the ratings of these \textit{CBREC} Items by the participants.

Table 26

\textit{Inter-item Correllational Analysis of Lux Aurumque}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Melodic Craftsmanship</th>
<th>Harmonic Language</th>
<th>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</th>
<th>Timbre and Orchestration</th>
<th>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</th>
<th>Pedagogical Usefulness</th>
<th>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</th>
<th>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inter-item correlational analysis of \textit{Lux Aurumque} outlined in Table 26 revealed all coefficients were greater than $r = 0.650$, and 25 of the 28 pairs would fall into a high positive range (Hinkle, Wiersma, Jurs, 2003). The remaining three pairs fell into a moderate positive range ($r = 0.50$ to $0.70$). A test of reliability using Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient for internal consistency was conducted on the data above and yielded similar results to \textit{Rest}. The responses provided by the participant directors for this piece yielded $\alpha = 0.965$. When each item was removed, Cronbach’s alpha remained between 0.957 and 0.963.
The final piece of concert band music evaluated by directors in this study was *Elements* by Brian Balmages. This four movement work is structured in similar fashion to the traditional classical symphony in form though comparatively shorter in length. Table 27 provides mean rating score and standard deviation for each of the CBREC items for *Elements*.

### Table 27

*Director CBREC Ratings of Elements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CBREC Rating</td>
<td>42.66</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Likert-type scale response (1 = “Very Strongly Disagree” to 7 = “Very Strongly Agree”)

The CBREC Item of Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV) received the highest mean rating, followed by Timbre and Orchestration (TO) and Harmonic Language (HL). The lowest standard deviation was also found to be in Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV), followed by Timbre and Orchestration (TO) and Harmonic Language (HL). Of the eight CBREC items across all three works evaluated in this study, *Elements* had the lowest standard deviations across five of the eight items.
The inter-item correlational analysis of *Elements* outlined in Table 28 above shows that 26 of the 28 pairs were greater than $r = 0.600$, and eight of the coefficients fell into a high positive range ($r = 0.70 – 0.90$). Similar to the other two works evaluated in this study, a test of reliability using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for internal consistency if the individual item was removed was conducted on the data above. The responses provided by the participant directors when using the *CBREC* yielded $\alpha = 0.941$, and when each item was removed, Cronbach’s Alpha remained between 0.929 and 0.936.

One of the questions to be answered as part of this study was the influence of personal and professional background on the perspectives of directors. An inter-item correlational analysis was calculated between the items of participant age, number of ensembles, number of pieces purchased, number of students in the first ensemble, and the
total rating provided by participants for each of the three works used in the study. This information is presented in Table 29.

Table 29

*Inter-item correlational analysis of participant variables and selected works*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Director Age</th>
<th>Number of Ensembles</th>
<th>Number of Pieces Purchased</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Total Rating Rest</th>
<th>Total Rating Lux Aurumque</th>
<th>Total Rating Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director Age</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Ensembles</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pieces Purchased</td>
<td><em>0.237</em></td>
<td><em>0.235</em></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rating Rest</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>-0.176</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rating Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td><strong>0.298</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rating Elements</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td><strong>0.295</strong></td>
<td><em>0.227</em></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - significant at 0.05 level, ** - significant at 0.01 level

As seen in Table 29, the selected variables of director age, number of ensembles, number of pieces, number of students, and the total rating of all three works did not demonstrate a prominent relationship. There were several weak positive relationships, between Director Age and the Number of Pieces, Director Age and the Number of Students, and the Total Rating of *Lux Aurumque* with *Elements* that were significant at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level. A correlation coefficient found to be between 0.00 and 0.30 has generally been considered to have little if any statistical relationship (Hinkle, Wiersma, Jurs, 2003). The Total Rating of *Rest* demonstrated a weak positive relationship with each of the other works that was significant at $\alpha = 0.01$ level. Although several weak relationships were established, a closer examination of the individual CBREC items and background variables was warranted to better answer the research questions.
Examination of Individual CBREC Items

A correlational analysis of each *CBREC* item from across all three works was conducted to better understand what aspects directors held as important in the evaluation of new works for the concert band. The following tables provide an overview of these findings, which included a test for Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient. While the test for Pearson’s provided an indication of the strength of the relationship between the ratings, the two-tailed test of significance allowed for better analysis of the various potential relationship factors. The first *CBREC* item examined in Table 30 was *Melodic Craftsmanship (MC)*.

Table 30

**Correlational Analysis of Melodic Craftsmanship Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Melodic Craftsmanship</th>
<th>Rest</th>
<th>Lux Aurumque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lux Aurumque</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td><strong>0.250</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td><em>0.214</em>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td><strong>0.292</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*
** *Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)*

Three weak positive correlations were discovered among the *Melodic Craftsmanship* ratings of the three works. The correlation between *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque* (*r*=0.250), and the correlation between *Lux Aurumque* and *Elements* (*r* = 0.292), and both of these correlations were significant. Additionally, *Rest* was found to have a weak positive correlation with *Elements* (*r* = 0.214) that was significant at the 0.05 level.
Table 31

Correlational Analysis of Harmonic Language Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harmonic Language</th>
<th>Rest</th>
<th>Lux Aurumque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lux Aurumque</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The analysis of Harmonic Language (HL) produced only one significant correlation. A weak positive relationship was discovered to exist between Rest and Lux Aurumque where Pearson’s $r = 0.288$. This correlation was significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 32

Correlational Analysis of Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</th>
<th>Rest</th>
<th>Lux Aurumque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lux Aurumque</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td><strong>0.375</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The next CBREC Item analyzed was Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV). It should be noted that among the eight CBREC Items used to evaluate each of the three works, this item had the lowest mean rating on Rest and Lux Aurumque, and the highest mean rating on Elements. As seen above, a low positive correlation was discovered between Rest and Lux Aurumque ($r = 0.375$) that was significant at the 0.01 level. A weak positive relationship was also revealed to exist between Lux Aurumque and Elements ($r = 0.195$) that was significant at the 0.05 level. While the significance level was notable, the strength of $r = 0.195$ indicated that there was little, if any, relationship.
Table 33

Correlational Analysis of Timbre and Orchestration Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timbre and Orchestration</th>
<th>Rest</th>
<th>Lux Aurumque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lux Aurumque</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Timbre and Orchestration (TO) were analyzed next and the results have been outlined in Table 33. The relationship between each pair of works in this study once again produced three positive relationships. A test of Pearson’s $r$ produced a weak positive relationship that was significant at the 0.01 level between Rest and Elements ($r = 0.273$). A weak positive relationship was also found to exist between Lux Aurumque and Elements ($r = 0.208$), which was significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 34

Correlational Analysis of Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</th>
<th>Rest</th>
<th>Lux Aurumque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lux Aurumque</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>*0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 34 includes the findings as it related to Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS). This analysis produced three weak positive correlations, with only one significant finding. Rest was positively correlated with Lux Aurumque ($r = 0.231$) and it was significant at the 0.05 level.
Table 35

**Correlational Analysis of Pedagogical Usefulness Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical Usefulness</th>
<th>Rest</th>
<th>Lux Aurumque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lux Aurumque</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation <strong>0.302</strong></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation *0.220**0.260</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) 0.016 0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The correlational analysis of *Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)* revealed one low positive relationship and two weak positive relationships. Two positive relationships were found to exist between *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque* \(r = 0.302\) and between *Lux Aurumque* and *Elements* \(r = 0.260\) that were significant at the 0.01 level. Additionally, a weak positive relationship was discovered between *Rest* and *Elements* \(r = 0.220\) significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 36

**Correlational Analysis of Emotional Impact and Sensitivity Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</th>
<th>Rest</th>
<th>Lux Aurumque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lux Aurumque</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation 0.171</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) 0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation 0.164 *0.199</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) 0.076 0.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The analysis of *Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)* revealed three weak positive relationships, but only one was significant at the 0.05 level. *Lux Aurumque* was found to have a weak positive relationship with *Elements* \(r = 0.199\). Here again, the strength of this correlation, though significant, does not indicate any real relationship.
Table 37

**Correlational Analysis of Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</th>
<th>Rest</th>
<th>Lux Aurumque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td><strong>0.316</strong></td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

The final CBREC Item, *Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)*, was found to have a low positive correlation between *Rest* and *Elements*. Pearson’s *r* was calculated to be 0.316, and was significant at the 0.01 level. *Lux Aurumque* held a weak positive correlation with *Rest* and *Elements*, but the strength of the Pearson’s *r* suggested little if any relationship and neither finding was significant.

Examination of Background Variables across Three Selected Works

One of the research questions that I wanted to answer in this dissertation was the impact that personal and professional background had on the perspectives of band directors regarding new and emergent works for the concert band. As outlined earlier in this chapter, statistical analysis of background variables against the three selected works revealed only several low positive relationships with some significance (Table 29). Additionally, while some low positive relationships were discovered among the individual CBREC Items, closer analysis of the background variables and responses to the open-ended questions might better frame the discussion in the concluding chapter. Thus, a closer examination of these background variables would be appropriate to answer the research questions.
Upon consideration of the background variables of gender and educational background, it was determined that there were not suitable sized sub-groups that could be appropriately analyzed. The analysis of the age level of participant directors revealed a range in ages from 32 to 70. Because of this wide range of ages, it was possible that the participants could be divided into two age groups for further examination and comparisons. To gain perspective on the impact of professional background as directors evaluate new concert band works, a second sub-group was created based upon those directors who taught only one ensemble \((n = 37)\), and those who taught two or more ensembles \((n = 82)\).

As was mentioned previously in Chapter Three, there may be attitudes and perspectives unable to be expressed through responses to questions using a Likert scale. For that reason, this study included three open-ended questions for participants to provide additional perspectives on the selection of new and emergent works for the concert band. A decision to conduct an analysis of the group of directors \((n=48)\) who elected to provide answers to the open-ended questions as compared to the directors who did not offer such responses \((n=71)\) was looked upon as another possible way to answer the research questions.

**CBREC Ratings by Director Age Groups**

The participant directors were divided into two age groups, and the ratings of the three pieces were then analyzed. There were 61 directors placed into an age group of younger than 50 years, and the remaining 58 were placed into an age group of 50 years of age and older. It should be noted that although the directors were divided by age, the educational backgrounds in each group were comparable. A total of 79% of the directors
within the younger age group were found to have an advanced degree beyond as compared to the 83% of directors in the older age group.

Table 38

Report on CBREC ratings by director age group on Rest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>Director Group &lt;50 Years Old (n = 61)</th>
<th>Director Group &gt;=50 Years Old (n = 58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic craftsmanship (MC)</td>
<td>M = 4.85 S.D. = 1.21</td>
<td>M = 5.03 S.D. = 1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language (HL)</td>
<td>M = 5.44 S.D. = 1.16</td>
<td>M = 5.48 S.D. = 1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV)</td>
<td>M = 4.02 S.D. = 1.19</td>
<td>M = 4.14 S.D. = 1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration (TO)</td>
<td>M = 5.28 S.D. = 1.07</td>
<td>M = 5.34 S.D. = 1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS)</td>
<td>M = 4.89 S.D. = 1.03</td>
<td>M = 5.03 S.D. = 1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)</td>
<td>M = 4.89 S.D. = 1.08</td>
<td>M = 5.09 S.D. = 1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)</td>
<td>M = 4.66 S.D. = 1.21</td>
<td>M = 4.64 S.D. = 1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total CBREC Rating for Rest: 39.43 (n = 61) vs. 40.31 (n = 58)

Note: Likert-type scale response (1 = “Very Strongly Disagree” to 7 = “Very Strongly Agree”)

Table 38 above shows the mean rating for each of the eight items, with the corresponding standard deviation for each Director Age Group. In the ratings for Rest, the Director Group 50 Years of Age and Older (DG >=50) means were higher than their younger counterparts for all items except Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L), which showed almost equal mean values. However, the differences between the mean values were small. The standard deviations were also very similar for most of the items, which indicated the spread of the choices by item was comparable for both groups. The total means and standard deviations were also nearly equivalent. An independent t-test was conducted to test whether each of the items was significantly different between the
age groups for this piece, and these findings have been reported in Table 39. Statistically, there were no significant differences.

Table 39

*Independent t-Test on Director Age Group Ratings – Rest*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>-.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Language</td>
<td>-.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>-.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>-.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>-.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>-.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>-.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rating for Rest</td>
<td>-.631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40

Report on CBREC ratings by director age group on Lux Aurumque

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>Director Group &lt;50 Years Old (n = 61)</th>
<th>Director Group &gt;=50 Years Old (n = 58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic craftsmanship (MC)</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language (HL)</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV)</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration (TO)</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS)</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CBREC Rating for Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>35.08</td>
<td>9.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note*: Likert-type scale response (1= “Very Strongly Disagree” to 7= “Very Strongly Agree”)

The Director Group 50 Years of Age and Older (DG>=50) had means greater than the Director Group Younger than 50 Years of Age (DG<50) for all items but *Rhythmically Vitality and Tempo (RV)*. Both groups shared the highest mean value for *Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)*, 5.07 for the DG<50 and 5.21 for the DG>=50.

The means for both groups were similar except for *Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)*, with the DG<50 mean being 3.77 and the DG>=50 mean equal to 4.31.

Standard deviations were equal or near equal in most cases, with the exception of *Melodic Craftsmanship (MC)*, where the DG>50 had a much wider spread of ratings (1.78) than the DG<50 (1.28). The total mean value for the DG>50 (36.52) was higher than the DG<50 (35.08). However, the standard deviation was higher for the DG>=50 (11.22) than the DG<50 (9.92). This would be an indication of more variability in the DG>=50 for the item ratings of Lux Aurumque. As with the piece *Rest*, an independent t-
test showed no significant differences between the groups on the eight items and the total, and it has been reported in Table 41.

Table 41

*Independent t-Test on Director Age Group Ratings – Lux Aurumque*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Df</td>
<td>Sig. 2-tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>-.431</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Language</td>
<td>-.499</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>-.559</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>-.702</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>-1.014</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>-.539</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>-1.866</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rating for <em>Lux Aurumque</em></td>
<td>-.740</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 42

Report on CBREC ratings by director age group on Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>Director Group &lt;50 Years Old (n = 61)</th>
<th>Director Group &gt;=50 Years Old (n = 58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic craftsmanship (MC)</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language (HL)</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV)</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration (TO)</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS)</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CBREC Rating for Elements</td>
<td>42.82</td>
<td>6.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Likert-type scale response (1= “Very Strongly Disagree” to 7= “Very Strongly Agree”)

Elements had the highest mean values for all items as well as the total mean. The pattern of values between the two groups for the means was similar and the totals were almost equal (42.82 for the DGY<50, 42.48 for the DG>=50). The standard deviation values for all the items showed the DG>=50 with consistently higher values than the DGY<50 except for Timbre and Orchestration (TO), which had equal values. The total standard deviation values (6.48 for the DGY<50 compared to 8.43 for the DG>=50) indicates, as in the items of the piece Lux Aurumque, that the variability of the scale total is greater for the DG>=50. Similar to the process with the other two pieces used in the study, the independent t-test conducted and reported in Table 43 showed no significant differences between the items and the total CBREC Rating.
Table 43

*Independent t*-Test on Director Age Group Ratings – Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Language</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-.218</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.132</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-.435</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rating for Elements</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A correlational analysis of the ratings provided by each director age group was conducted on each *CBREC* Item to determine if there were any important relationship factors that came forward. Table 44 includes the director group less than 50 years in age in the first column (*n* = 61), and the director 50 years and older in age in the second column (*n* = 58).
Table 44

**Correlational analysis of CBREC Items according to director age groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>Director Group &lt;50 Years Old (n=61)</th>
<th>Director Group &gt;=50 Years (n=58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>Elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic craftsmanship</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>**0.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>0.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CBREC Rating</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level, ** Significant at 0.01 level

In the *DGY<50*, the 24 relationships between items for each of the three pieces were negligible with few exceptions. *Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV)* for *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque* was found to have a low positive relationship (*r = 0.407*, significant at the
0.01 level), and *Longevity* (*L*) for *Rest* and *Elements* (*r* = 0.258, significant at the 0.05 level). Ten of the correlations in this age group were less than 0.10, which is indicative of no real relationship.

Conversely, eight of the correlations in the *DG>=50* were significant at the 0.01 level, ranging in value from *r* = 0.342 to 0.493. Six of the correlations in the older group were significant at the 0.05 level, ranging in value from *r* = 0.264 to 0.335. Eleven of the paired correlations were not significant. The highest three values occurred between *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque* for the items *Melodic Craftsmanship (MC)*, *Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS)*, and *Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)* (which *PU* was the highest of all correlations at 0.493). Correlations between the Total CBREC Ratings for the three pieces in the *DGY<50* were very low, while those for the *DG>=50* were all significant.

**CBREC Ratings by Ensemble Groups**

The participant directors were divided into two groups based upon the number of ensembles they taught, and the ratings of the three pieces were then analyzed. There were 37 directors in the group of directors responsible for teaching only one ensemble. The remaining 82 directors were in the group responsible for teaching two or more ensembles. The background variables for each of these groups were very similar, and these have been reported in Table 45.
Table 45

*Background variables of Ensemble Director Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Directors teaching one ensemble</th>
<th>Directors teaching two or more ensembles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Directors</td>
<td>28 (76%)</td>
<td>67 (81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Directors</td>
<td>9 (24%)</td>
<td>15 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Teaching Experience</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors with Degree beyond Bachelor’s</td>
<td>31/37(84%)</td>
<td>65/82 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Students</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Number of Pieces Purchased</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratings provided by participants were analyzed within their director group based upon the number of ensembles they taught. The mean and standard deviation of the *CBREC* Items for each of the three works used in this study have been included. Similar to the report on the director age groups provided in this chapter, a brief synopsis of the ratings on each work has been provided following the table. Ratings for *Rest* have been reported in Table 46, followed by *Lux Aurumque* in Table 48, and *Elements* in Table 50. Similar to the Director Age Groups, independent t-tests were performed on the ratings by each Ensemble Director Group across all three works and this data has been reported in Table 47 for *Rest*, Table 49 for *Lux Aurumque*, and Table 51 for *Elements*. 
Table 46

Report on CBREC Ratings by Director Ensemble Group on Rest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic craftsmanship (MC)</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language (HL)</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV)</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration (TO)</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS)</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CBREC Rating for Rest</td>
<td>39.86</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>39.85</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Likert-type scale response (1 = “Very Strongly Disagree” to 7 = “Very Strongly Agree”)

Table 46 above shows the mean rating for each of the eight items, with the corresponding standard deviation. In the ratings for Rest, Directors Teaching Two or More Ensembles (DTTM) rated Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV), Timbre and Orchestration (TO), Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS), and Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES) higher than Directors Teaching One Ensemble (DTOE). Directors Teaching One Ensemble (DTOE) rated Melodic Craftsmanship (MC), Pedagogical Usefulness (PU), and Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L) higher on Rest than DTTM. Both groups had the same rating on Harmonic Language. The standard deviations were very similar for all items, indicating that the spread of the choices by item were comparable for both groups. The total means and standard deviations for Rest were also nearly equivalent. An independent t-test was conducted to test whether each of the items
were significantly different between the age groups for this piece. Statistically, there were no significant differences, and this data has been reported in Table 47.

Table 47

**Independent t-Test on Director Ensemble Group Ratings – Rest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Equality of Means</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Language</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-.814</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-.468</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-.657</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rating for Rest</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 48

**Report on CBREC ratings by director ensemble group on Lux Aurumque**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic craftsmanship (MC)</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language (HL)</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV)</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration (TO)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS)</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CBREC Rating for Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>35.92</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>35.72</td>
<td>10.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Likert-type scale response (1=“Very Strongly Disagree” to 7=“Very Strongly Agree”)*

As reported in Table 48, Directors Teaching One Ensemble (DTOE) had means greater than Director Teaching Two or More Ensembles (DTTM) for CBREC Items MC, TO, FS, PU, and ES. Both groups shared the highest mean value for Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES), 5.22 for the DTOE Group and 5.10 for the DTTM Group. Several of the mean ratings were very close between groups on several items including MC, RV, and L. DTTM were found to have higher standard deviations on all eight CBREC Items when compared to DTOE.

It was interesting to note that RV was found to have a wider spread among DTTM (1.48) than the DTOE (1.07). The total mean value for the DTOE (35.92) was higher than the DTTM (35.72), but the standard deviation was slightly higher among the DTTM (10.93) than the DTOE (9.50). This indicates more variability in the DTTM for the item
ratings of *Lux Aurumque*. The independent t-test reported in Table 49 showed no significant differences between the groups on the eight items and the total rating.

Table 49

*Independent t-Test on Director Ensemble Group Ratings – Lux Aurumque*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Language</td>
<td>-1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>-.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>-.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rating for <em>Lux Aurumque</em></td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 50

Report on CBREC ratings by director ensemble group on Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic craftsmanship (MC)</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language (HL)</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV)</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration (TO)</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS)</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CBREC Rating for Elements</td>
<td>43.14</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>42.44</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Likert-type scale response (1 = “Very Strongly Disagree” to 7 = “Very Strongly Agree”)

Table 50 above shows the mean value and standard deviation for each of the eight CBREC Items on Elements for both Ensemble Director Groups. The DTOE group had higher mean ratings on MC, TO, FS, PU, ES, and L, while the DTTM was found to have higher mean ratings on RV and HL. It should also be noted that pattern of values between the two groups for the means was similar, as was the total rating (43.14 for the DTOE, 42.44 for the DTTM). With the exception of RV, the DTOE group was found to have lower standard deviations on all eight items, though many of these values were similar in range. The total standard deviation values (7.11 for the DTOE compared to 7.57 for the DTTM) indicated similar variability between each group. As was completed with the two other pieces in the study, the independent t-test conducted showed no significant differences between the items and the total CBREC Rating.
A correlational analysis of the ratings provided by the director ensemble groups was conducted on each CBREC Item to determine if there were any important relationship factors that came forward. Table 52 has included the Directors Teaching One Ensemble (DTOE) in the first column (n = 37), and Directors Teaching Two or More Ensembles (DTTM) in the second column (n = 82).
Table 52

Inter-item correlational analysis of CBREC Items according to director ensemble groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>Directors Teaching One Ensemble (DTOE) (n = 37)</th>
<th>Directors Teaching Two or More Ensembles (DTTM) (n = 82)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>Elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>*0.397</td>
<td>**0.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**0.523</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language</td>
<td>*0.382</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>**0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance Contrast</td>
<td>**0.537</td>
<td>**0.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*0.340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>**0.433</td>
<td>*0.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**0.467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>*0.344</td>
<td>0.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*0.363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>*0.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CBREC Rating</td>
<td>**0.456</td>
<td>**0.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**0.446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - significant at the 0.05 level, ** - significant at the 0.01 level

In the DTTM group, there were only six significant correlations found among the 24 relationships between items and the total rating of each work. Only RV for Rest and Lux Aurumque \(r = 0.426\), significant at the 0.01 level, \(L\) for Rest and Elements \(r = 0.302\), significant at the 0.01 level, \(HL\) for Rest and Lux Aurumque \(r = 0.250\), significant
at the 0.05 level), and $PU$ for $Rest$ and $Lux Aurumque$ ($r = 0.253$, significant at the 0.05 level) bear mention for this group. Eighteen of the 24 correlations in the $DTTM$ were less than 0.200, indicating little if any relationship. Two correlations between the Total $CBREC$ Ratings for the three pieces in the $DTTM$ were significant at the 0.05 level, but would not be considered strong relationships.

Conversely, seven of the correlations in the $DTOE$ were significant at the 0.01 level, ranging in value from 0.433 to 0.537. An additional seven correlations in this group were significant at the 0.05 level, ranging in value from 0.334 to 0.397. Ten of the paired correlations were not significant. The highest three values occurred between $Rest$ and $Elements$, and $Elements$ and $Lux Aurumque$ for the item $MC$, and between $Rest$ and $Lux Aurumque$ for the item $FS$ (which was the highest of all correlations at 0.537). Correlations between the Total $CBREC$ Ratings for the three pieces in the $DTOE$ were all significant at the 0.01 level and would indicate a low to moderate level of strength.

To help provide additional perspective to the second research question, an inter-item correlational analysis was calculated between the items of participant age, years of teaching experience, number of pieces purchased, number of average students, and the total rating provided by participants for each of the three works used in the study. Table 53 includes the analysis of the background variables for Directors Teaching One Ensemble ($DTOE$).
Table 53

*Correlational Analysis of Background Variables for Directors Teaching One Ensemble*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Teaching</th>
<th>Total Rating of <em>Rest</em></th>
<th>Total Rating of <em>Lux Aurumque</em></th>
<th>Total Rating of <em>Elements</em></th>
<th>Average Number of Students</th>
<th>Average Number of Pieces Purchased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Teaching</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.890</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Rating of <em>Rest</em></strong></td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Rating of <em>Lux Aurumque</em></strong></td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td><strong>0.456</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Rating of <em>Elements</em></strong></td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td><strong>0.448</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.446</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Number of Students</strong></td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Number of Pieces Purchased</strong></td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - significant at 0.05 level, ** - significant at 0.01 level

As seen in Table 53, only four correlations that were statistically significant at the 0.01 level came were found. The high positive correlation between age and years of teaching was to be expected, and each of the correlations involving the three works rated by the *DTOE* indicated a low positive relationship. The strength of those three correlations would only indicate a low positive relationship. A correlational analysis of the total *CBREC* ratings and background variables of the Directors Teaching Two or More Ensembles (*DTTM*) was conducted as well, and this has been reported in Table 54.
Table 54

*Correlational Analysis of Background Variables of Directors Teaching Two or More Ensembles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Teaching</th>
<th>Total Rating of Rest</th>
<th>Total Rating of Lux Aurumque</th>
<th>Total Rating of Elements</th>
<th>Average Number of Students</th>
<th>Average Number of Pieces Purchased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td><strong>0.948</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rating of Rest</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rating of Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td><em>0.242</em></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rating of Elements</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td><em>0.236</em></td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Students</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.143</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Pieces Purchased</td>
<td>*0.233</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td><em>-0.256</em></td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - significant at 0.05 level, ** - significant at 0.01 level

Similar to the correlations from the *DTOE* group, a high positive correlation between age and years of teaching was to be expected. Two weak positive correlations significant at the 0.05 level were found between the Total Rating of *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque*, and the Total Rating of *Rest* and *Elements*. There were two weak correlations found between Average Number of Pieces Purchased and Director Age (positive, significant at the 0.05 level), and Average Number of Pieces Purchased and the Total Rating of *Rest* (negative, significant at the 0.05 level). Outside of these finding there were no correlations that indicated any kind of relationship between the background variables and the Total Ratings of the work.
CBREC Ratings by Director Comment Groups

As reported earlier in this chapter, 48 of the 68 directors who rated their familiarity with each of the three works provided responses to the open-ended questions at the conclusion of the survey. These comments provided another layer of data to expand the discussion of emergent concert band literature. This data provided by directors who provided comments were analyzed against those remaining directors who did not opt to provide comments. Table 55 provides a descriptive comparison of several background variables of the directors in each of the groups (comment and non-comment). There is a relative amount of balance between the Comment and Non-Comment Director Groups, including the number of directors holding an advanced degree beyond the Bachelor level.

Table 55

Background variables of Director Comment Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Comment Group</th>
<th>Non-Comment Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Directors</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Directors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors with Degree beyond Bachelor’s</td>
<td>37/48 (77%)</td>
<td>59/71 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Number of Ensembles</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Students</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Number of Pieces Purchased</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CBREC ratings provided by directors were analyzed again within their designated group (Comment or Non-Comment). The mean and standard deviation for each of the three works used in this study has been included in Table 56 (Rest by Ticheli), Table 58 (Lux Aurumque by Whitacre), and Table 60 (Elements by Balmages).
### Table 56

**Report on CBREC Ratings by director comment groups on Rest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>Comment Group (CG) (n = 48)</th>
<th>Non-Comment Group (NCG) (n = 71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic craftsmanship (MC)</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language (HL)</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration (TO)</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS)</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CBREC Rating for Rest</td>
<td>38.04</td>
<td>8.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Likert-type scale response (1 = “Very Strongly Disagree” to 7 = “Very Strongly Agree”)*

Table 56 shows the mean value for each of the eight items with the corresponding standard deviation for Rest. Directors in the Non-Comment Group (NCG) rated all CBREC Items higher than their counterparts in the Comment Group (CG). The NCG displayed lower standard deviations on all but one CBREC Item, Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast. Standard deviations were similar on most other items, indicating the spread of choices were comparable for both groups. The Total CBREC Rating was higher in the NCG, and the Total Standard Deviation was lower.

Independent t-tests were performed on all eight items, plus the Total Rating. Three significant t-tests, all within the piece Rest, were discovered between these director groups. The two significant items were Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (t = -2.564, p = .012) and Longevity (t = -2.14, p = .034). The Total Rating of Rest also differed...
significantly between the groups (t = -2.17, p = .032). All other comparisons showed no significant differences between groups.

Table 57

*Independent t -Test on Director Comment Group Ratings – Rest*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-1.902</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Language</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-1.781</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-2.564</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>* .012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-0.871</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-1.817</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-1.715</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-1.415</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-2.140</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>* .034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rating for Rest</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-2.170</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>* .032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - significant at the 0.05 level
Table 58

Report on CBREC Ratings by director comment groups on Lux Aurumque

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>Comment Group (CG)</th>
<th>Non-Comment Group (NCG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic craftsmanship (MC)</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language (HL)</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration (TO)</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS)</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total CBREC Rating for Lux Aurumque 34.04 10.64 36.96 10.40

Note: Likert-type scale response (1= “Very Strongly Disagree” to 7= “Very Strongly Agree”)

Table 58 above shows the mean value for each of the eight items with the corresponding standard deviation for Lux Aurumque. Similar to the ratings for Rest, directors in the Non-Comment Group (NCG) rated all CBREC Items higher than their counterparts in the Comment Group (CG). Both groups shared the highest mean value for ES, 4.96 for the CG and 5.25 for the NCG. The means for both groups were relatively similar with the exception of Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L), with the CG mean being 3.73 and the NCG mean being 4.24.

Standard deviations were equal or nearly equal in most cases for all items between groups. Two items had equal standard deviations (MC and PU), while the remaining six items were split evenly between the two groups. Similar to the findings regarding Rest, total mean rating was higher (36.96) and standard deviation (10.40) was lower among the NCG as compared to the CG total mean rating (34.04) and standard
deviation (10.64) for *Lux Aurumque*. The independent t-test conducted on the ratings of the two groups showed no significant differences.

Table 59

*Independent t -Test on Director Comment Group Ratings – Lux Aurumque*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>-1.486</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Language</td>
<td>-1.381</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>-1.057</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>-0.991</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>-1.245</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>-1.576</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>-1.109</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>-1.727</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rating for <em>Lux Aurumque</em></td>
<td>-1.486</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 60

*Report on CBREC Ratings by director comment groups on Elements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>Comment Group (CG) (n = 48)</th>
<th>Non-Comment Group (NCG) (n = 71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic craftsmanship (MC)</td>
<td>M 5.21 S.D. 1.07</td>
<td>M 5.30 S.D. 1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language (HL)</td>
<td>M 5.38 S.D. 1.08</td>
<td>M 5.39 S.D. 1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV)</td>
<td>M 6.00 S.D. 0.96</td>
<td>M 6.07 S.D. 0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration (TO)</td>
<td>M 5.56 S.D. 1.11</td>
<td>M 5.77 S.D. 0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS)</td>
<td>M 5.10 S.D. 1.15</td>
<td>M 5.32 S.D. 1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)</td>
<td>M 5.27 S.D. 1.14</td>
<td>M 5.25 S.D. 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)</td>
<td>M 4.71 S.D. 1.18</td>
<td>M 5.07 S.D. 1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)</td>
<td>M 4.56 S.D. 1.35</td>
<td>M 5.06 S.D. 1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CBREC Rating for Elements</td>
<td>41.75 S.D. 7.66</td>
<td>43.27 S.D. 7.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Likert-type scale response (1 = “Very Strongly Disagree” to 7 = “Very Strongly Agree”)*

*Elements* had the highest mean values for all items as well as the total mean. The two groups shared the highest mean value for RV, which also had the lowest standard deviation among all eight items in both groups. Although the pattern of values between the two groups of directors for the majority of means was similar, the NCG mean values were higher than the CG with the exception of PU. The standard deviation values showed the NCG being lower on all but three items (MC, PU, and L), although the differences among the groups was very small. The total standard deviation values (7.66 for the CG, 7.32 for the NCG) indicated slightly higher variability in the CG, but here again the difference is minimal. An independent t-test demonstrated no significant differences between the items and the total and this has been reported in Table 61.
Table 61

*Independent t -Test on Director Comment Group Ratings – Elements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Df</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>-.433</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Language</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>-.454</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>-1.120</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>-1.039</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>-1.708</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>-1.938</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rating for Elements</td>
<td>-1.013</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A correlational analysis of the ratings provided by the director comment groups was conducted on each CBREC Item to determine if there were any important relationship factors that came forward. Table 62 has included the Comment Director
Group (CG) in the first column (n = 48), and Non-Comment Director Group (NCG) in the second column (n = 71).

Table 62

Inter-item correlational analysis of CBREC Items according to director comment groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>Comment Director Group (CG)</th>
<th>Non-comment Director Group (NCG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 48)</td>
<td>(n = 71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>*0.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>*0.356</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Harmonic Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>**0.474</td>
<td>**0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>*0.315</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>**0.473</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>**0.433</td>
<td>*0.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formal Structure and Balance Contrast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>*0.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>**0.475</td>
<td>**0.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>**0.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>**0.446</td>
<td>**0.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>**0.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CBREC Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>**0.407</td>
<td>**0.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux Aurumque</td>
<td>*0.295</td>
<td>0.160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - significant at the 0.05 level, ** - significant at the 0.01 level

In the NCG, there were only five significant correlations found among the 24 relationships between items. Only MC for Rest and Lux Aurumque (r = 0.295, significant
at the 0.05 level), MC for Lux Aurumque and Elements ($r = 0.254$, significant at the 0.05 level), RV for Rest and Lux Aurumque ($r = 0.265$, significant at the 0.05 level), FS for Rest and Lux Aurumque ($r = 0.258$, significant at the 0.05 level), and PU for Lux Aurumque and Elements ($r = 0.326$, significant at the 0.01 level) were noted for this group. Nineteen of the 24 correlations in the NCG were between $r = 0.188$ to -0.103 indicating little relationship. All correlations between the Total CBREC Ratings for the three pieces in the NCG fell into a range less than $r = 0.200$, indicating little if any relationship (Hinkle, Wiersma, Jurs, 2003).

Conversely, nine of the correlations in the CG were significant at the 0.01 level, ranging in value from 0.496 to 0.374. An additional five correlations in this group were significant at the 0.05 level, ranging in value from 0.368 to 0.288. Ten of the paired correlations were not significant. The highest three values occurred between Rest and Lux Aurumque for the items HL, RV, and PU (which was the highest of all correlations at 0.475). Among the Total CBREC Ratings by the CG, two low positive correlations significant at the 0.01 level were discovered, as well as a weak positive correlation significant at the 0.05 level.

A correlational analysis of the ratings provided by each director group (Comment or Non-Comment) was conducted on each of the three pieces to determine if there were any important relationship factors that came forward. The tables that follow have presented this statistical analysis in the order the pieces were viewed in the research, with the Comment Director Group being presented prior to the Non-Comment Director Group.
Table 63

*Correlational analysis for Comment Director Group on Rest*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Director Age (A)</th>
<th>Number of Ensembles (Ens)</th>
<th>Number of Pieces (Pcs)</th>
<th>Melodic Craftsmanship (MC)</th>
<th>Harmony Language (HL)</th>
<th>Rhythmic Vitality (RV)</th>
<th>Timbre &amp; Orchestration (TO)</th>
<th>Formal Structure (FS)</th>
<th>Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)</th>
<th>Emotion &amp; Sensitivity (ES)</th>
<th>Longevity (L)</th>
<th>Total Rating (TR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENS</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td><strong>.463</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>-0.245</td>
<td><strong>.724</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td><strong>.47</strong></td>
<td><strong>.527</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td><strong>.589</strong></td>
<td><strong>.632</strong></td>
<td><strong>.519</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td><strong>.728</strong></td>
<td><strong>.623</strong></td>
<td><strong>.626</strong></td>
<td><strong>.76</strong></td>
<td><strong>.722</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-0.219</td>
<td><strong>.788</strong></td>
<td><strong>.761</strong></td>
<td><strong>.472</strong></td>
<td><strong>.752</strong></td>
<td><strong>.716</strong></td>
<td><strong>.691</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td><strong>.319</strong></td>
<td><strong>.786</strong></td>
<td><strong>.643</strong></td>
<td><strong>.664</strong></td>
<td><strong>.661</strong></td>
<td><strong>.725</strong></td>
<td><strong>.804</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>-0.284</td>
<td><strong>.875</strong></td>
<td><strong>.843</strong></td>
<td><strong>.696</strong></td>
<td><strong>.827</strong></td>
<td><strong>.846</strong></td>
<td><strong>.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>.892</strong></td>
<td><strong>.887</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *significant at 0.05 level, ** significant at 0.01 level

The analysis above indicated that many directors in the Comment Group were rating this work along a similar path. Of the 36 correlations involving the CBREC items, 33 were > 0.5. There were 13 correlations that fell into a moderate positive range (r = 0.5 – 0.7), and 20 fell into a high positive range (r = 0.7 – 0.9). The remaining three CBREC correlations fall into a range 0.431 to 0.472, indicating a low positive relationship. All 36 of the CBREC correlations were significant at the 0.01 level. Two low negative relationships of significance were discovered between Number of Pieces Purchased (PCS) and Melodic Craftsmanship (MC) (r = -0.463) and Number of Pieces Purchased (PCS) and Longevity (L) (r = -0.319) that were significant at the 0.01 and 0.05 level, respectively.
Table 64

**Correlational Analysis for Non-Comment Director Group on Rest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Director Age (AGE)</th>
<th>Number of Ensembles (ENS)</th>
<th>Number of Pieces (PCS)</th>
<th>Melodic Craftsmanship (MC)</th>
<th>Harmonic Language (HL)</th>
<th>Rhythmic Vitality (RV)</th>
<th>Timbre &amp; Orchestration (TO)</th>
<th>Formal Structure (FS)</th>
<th>Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)</th>
<th>Emotion &amp; Sensitivity (ES)</th>
<th>Longevity (L)</th>
<th>Total Rating (TR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENS</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>* .241</td>
<td>* .256</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>* .277</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>* .268</td>
<td>-0.176</td>
<td>** .677</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>** .386</td>
<td>** .369</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>** .56</td>
<td>** .847</td>
<td>* .292</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>-0.162</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>** .618</td>
<td>** .601</td>
<td>** .347</td>
<td>** .704</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>* .261</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>** .694</td>
<td>** .649</td>
<td>** .393</td>
<td>** .679</td>
<td>** .681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>** .668</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>-0.176</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>** .721</td>
<td>** .719</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>** .73</td>
<td>** .655</td>
<td>** .665</td>
<td>** .758</td>
<td>** .734</td>
<td>** .463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>* .238</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
<td>** .758</td>
<td>** .734</td>
<td>** .463</td>
<td>** .722</td>
<td>** .77</td>
<td>** .772</td>
<td>** .755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>* .243</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
<td>** .842</td>
<td>** .827</td>
<td>** .538</td>
<td>** .797</td>
<td>** .824</td>
<td>** .856</td>
<td>** .844</td>
<td>** .915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * significant at 0.05 level, ** significant at 0.01 level

The analysis of the Non-Comment Director Group revealed some similarities to the Comment Group, as well as some notable differences. Of the 36 correlations involving CBREC Items, 29 were > 0.5 and fell into a moderate to high positive range.

With the exception of the relationship between Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES) and Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV) \((r = 0.196)\), the remaining CBREC Items were significant at the 0.01 level. The Number of Ensembles (ENS) shared six correlations that were significant at the 0.05 level, and five of these six correlations fell into a weak negative range \((r < -0.3)\). The Number of Pieces Purchased (PCS) shared two weak positive correlations with Director Age (AGE) and Number of Ensembles (ENS) that were significant at the 0.05 level.
Table 65

**Correlational analysis for Comment Director Group on Lux Aurumque**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Director Age (A)</th>
<th>Number of Ensembles (Ens)</th>
<th>Number of Pieces (Pcs)</th>
<th>Melodic Craftsmanship (MC)</th>
<th>Harmonic Language (HL)</th>
<th>Rhythmic Vitality (RV)</th>
<th>Timbre &amp; Orchestration (TO)</th>
<th>Formal Structure (FS)</th>
<th>Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)</th>
<th>Emotion &amp; Sensitivity (ES)</th>
<th>Longevity (L)</th>
<th>Total Rating (TR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENS</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td><strong>.371</strong></td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td><strong>.683</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td><strong>.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>.711</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td><strong>.818</strong></td>
<td><strong>.783</strong></td>
<td><strong>.76</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td><strong>.822</strong></td>
<td><strong>.69</strong></td>
<td><strong>.859</strong></td>
<td><strong>.773</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td><strong>.817</strong></td>
<td><strong>.746</strong></td>
<td><strong>.815</strong></td>
<td><strong>.806</strong></td>
<td><strong>.792</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td><strong>.743</strong></td>
<td><strong>.749</strong></td>
<td><strong>.689</strong></td>
<td><strong>.791</strong></td>
<td><strong>.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>.777</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td><strong>.844</strong></td>
<td><strong>.772</strong></td>
<td><strong>.843</strong></td>
<td><strong>.815</strong></td>
<td><strong>.875</strong></td>
<td><strong>.846</strong></td>
<td><strong>.851</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td><strong>.908</strong></td>
<td><strong>.844</strong></td>
<td><strong>.900</strong></td>
<td><strong>.905</strong></td>
<td><strong>.918</strong></td>
<td><strong>.911</strong></td>
<td><strong>.886</strong></td>
<td><strong>.949</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * significant at 0.05 level, ** significant at 0.01 level

The correlational analysis of the Comment Group for *Lux Aurumque* produced similar ratings when looking at the CBREC Items. Of the 36 correlations involving CBREC Items, 32 fell into a high positive range \((r = 0.7-0.9)\), and the remaining four would be considered a moderate positive correlation \((r = 0.5-0.7)\). It should be noted that all 36 CBREC Correlations were significant at the 0.01 level. A low positive correlation was discovered between the Number of Ensembles (ENS) and Harmonic Language (HL) \((r = 0.371)\) that was significant at the 0.01 level. Although there were other weak positive relationships found to exist between the background variables and CBREC items for this work, they did not meet an acceptable level of statistical significance.
### Correlational analysis for Non-Comment Director Group on Lux Aurumque

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Director Age (A)</th>
<th>Number of Ensembles (ENS)</th>
<th>Number of Pieces (PCS)</th>
<th>Melodic Craftsmanship (MC)</th>
<th>Harmonic Language (HL)</th>
<th>Rhythmic Vitality (RV)</th>
<th>Timbre &amp; Orchestration (TO)</th>
<th>Formal Structure (FS)</th>
<th>Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)</th>
<th>Emotional &amp; Sensitivity (ES)</th>
<th>Longevity (L)</th>
<th>Total Rating (TR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENS</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>**.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>**.766</td>
<td>**.666</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>**.724</td>
<td>**.753</td>
<td>**.666</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>**.775</td>
<td>**.737</td>
<td>**.744</td>
<td>**.782</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>**.803</td>
<td>**.73</td>
<td>**.686</td>
<td>**.78</td>
<td>**.891</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>**.725</td>
<td>**.77</td>
<td>**.617</td>
<td>**.814</td>
<td>**.858</td>
<td>**.834</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>**.756</td>
<td>**.708</td>
<td>**.722</td>
<td>**.847</td>
<td>**.819</td>
<td>**.871</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>**.878</td>
<td>**.847</td>
<td>**.819</td>
<td>**.881</td>
<td>**.934</td>
<td>**.921</td>
<td>**.914</td>
<td>**.913</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at 0.05 level, ** significant at 0.01 level

The analysis of the Non-Comment Group Correlations for *Lux Aurumque* in Table 66 revealed that all correlations on *CBREC* Items were significant at the 0.01 level. The correlations involving *CBREC* Items included 31 pairs that would be considered to be in the high positive range ($r = 0.7-0.9$), and five that would fall into a moderate positive range ($r = 0.5-0.7$). The two weak positive correlations ($r < 0.3$) were found to exist between Number of Pieces (PCS) and Number of Ensembles (ENS) ($r = 0.256$) and Director Age (AGE) ($r = 0.241$) that were significant at the 0.05 level and have been documented in Table 66.
The Correlational Analysis of Comment Director Group for Elements also revealed that all correlations involving the CBREC were significant at the 0.01 level. Of these 36 correlations involving CBREC items, 18 fell into a high positive range ($r = 0.7 – 0.9$) while the remaining 18 fell into a moderate positive range ($r = 0.5 – 0.7$). The Number of Ensembles (ENS) and The CBREC Item Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV) demonstrated a weak positive correlation ($r = 0.286$) that was significant at the 0.05 level. Other correlations among the background variables and the CBREC Items ranged from low positive to negative scores that did not indicate any kind of strong linear relationship. A total of 21 correlations out of 30 between the background variables of Director Age, Number of Ensembles, Number of Pieces, and the CBREC Items were calculated between 0.10 and -0.10 which did not indicate any real relationship.
Table 68

Correlational analysis for Non-Comment Director Group on Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Director Age (A)</th>
<th>Number of Ensembles (Ens)</th>
<th>Number of Pieces (Pcs)</th>
<th>Melodic Craftsmanship (MC)</th>
<th>Harmonic Language (HL)</th>
<th>Rhythmic Vitality (RV)</th>
<th>Timbre &amp; Orchestration (TO)</th>
<th>Formal Structure (FS)</th>
<th>Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)</th>
<th>Emotion &amp; Sensitivity (ES)</th>
<th>Longevity (L)</th>
<th>Total Rating (TR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENS</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>* .241</td>
<td>* .256</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>** .719</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>** .645</td>
<td>** .709</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>** .595</td>
<td>** .643</td>
<td>** .546</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>** .695</td>
<td>** .774</td>
<td>** .607</td>
<td>** .625</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>-0.131</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>** .806</td>
<td>** .763</td>
<td>** .672</td>
<td>** .701</td>
<td>** .724</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>** .687</td>
<td>** .712</td>
<td>** .64</td>
<td>** .648</td>
<td>** .655</td>
<td>** .787</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>** .668</td>
<td>** .643</td>
<td>** .5</td>
<td>** .605</td>
<td>** .63</td>
<td>** .758</td>
<td>** .793</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>** .859</td>
<td>** .875</td>
<td>** .76</td>
<td>** .785</td>
<td>** .843</td>
<td>** .92</td>
<td>** .879</td>
<td>** .846</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at 0.05 level, ** significant at 0.01 level

Table 68 includes the analysis of the correlations for the Non-Comment Director Group on the piece Elements. The examination of the correlations on the CBREC Items from the Non-Comment Director Group revealed similar findings to the Comment Director Group (Table 67) on the same piece. Here again all 36 correlations on CBREC items were significant at the 0.01 level. The strength of 19 correlations fell into a high positive range \((r = 0.7 – 0.9)\), and the remaining 17 of these correlations fell into a moderate positive level \((r = 0.5 – 0.7)\). Although there were other weak positive and negative relationships uncovered by the correlational analysis of the background variables and CBREC Items, 25 of these 30 fell between 0.10 and – 0.10 and did not meet an acceptable level of statistical significance.

This analysis provided another lens to assist in focusing the discussion in the final chapter. The Comment and Non-Comment Director Group shared some similarities in their ratings of the works used in this study. The statistical analysis demonstrated some
unique findings that have been included as part of the final chapter. Before leaving this chapter, an overview of the open-ended responses has been included. As these responses contribute to the data collected, I have included salient comments that would be of use in part to understand the context of the responses from the band directors.

Overview of Open-Ended Responses by Participant Directors

The final step in the last section of the on-line survey posed three optional open-ended questions to each of the participant directors. While 68 of the directors rated their familiarity with each of the works used in this study, only 48 of the directors responded to at least one of the open-ended questions. These questions were previously outlined in Table 10, but they have been restated here individually along with some observations delineated from the comments provided.

The responses provided by participants have also provided an additional layer of data that may provide additional information to help answer the research questions. These responses might also provide insight into relationship factors that have existed in the selection of new concert band works by directors. Appendix L has included all comments from the directors. The time stamp has been removed from the comment and directors have only been identified by a number. Further discussion regarding these comments provided by the band directors will be included in Chapter Five. Table 69 is a restatement of the first open-ended question.
Table 69

*Open-Ended Survey Question #1*

What aspects do you primarily examine when considering a new and emergent work for use with your concert band?

As the review of comments from participants began, a series of themes emerged that was closely in line with each of the descriptions for each individual *CBREC* Item. For that reason, I categorized responses from participants and matched them with items from the *CBREC* to aid in focusing the discussion in the next chapter. Some of the responses provided a perspective that directors considered multiple *CBREC* items in the process of evaluating new works for the concert band. With this in mind, I had to include some comments offered by the band directors under two or more *CBREC* items so the responses were reflected accurately. The frequency of comments from 43 participants that matched with a *CBREC* Item has been included in Table 70.
Table 70

*Frequency of Comments from Directors Open-ended Question #1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBREC Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
<td>28/43</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
<td>17/43</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
<td>14/43</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
<td>13/43</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre and Orchestration</td>
<td>13/43</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
<td>8/43</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Language</td>
<td>7/43</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
<td>2/43</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CBREC Item Pedagogical Usefulness* was the most frequent category into which comments were connected followed by *Melodic Craftsmanship*, and *Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use*. The category of *Timbre and Orchestration* connected to a number of different comments made by participants. While some of these comments specifically addressed an analysis of the score and use of instruments in the orchestration process, the topic of instrumentation was frequently mentioned. Taking into account comments regarding fitting a specific instrumentation alongside the 13 comments dealing with score analysis, the category of *Timbre and Orchestration* could have been considered to have a total of 30 comments.
To illustrate this point about *Timbre and Orchestration* being tied to fitting the instrumentation of an ensemble, consider the comments of Director #21 who stated:

I think about my own band's strengths and weaknesses first, and then analyze the music from that standpoint. Our instrumentation and ability (that we currently have and can develop) are of primary importance in my situation when considering a new work. I try to find melodies and textures that are interesting to the students and will keep them engaged without being overwhelming.

This consideration of the context of developing musicians within a rehearsal was echoed in statements by other directors. In his response, Director #5, age 48 asked:

Can I develop musicianship with my students through rehearsal and performance of the piece? This takes into account developing executive technical and expressive skills within the ensemble. Our instrumentation also is considered against the demands of the score. In some cases I only have one student per part in various sections year to year.

Another response related to the idea of developing musicians within a rehearsal was offered by Director #4, age 38. This comment also supports the idea of educators who are examining the orchestration of a work and comparing that to the ability level of the ensemble they are teaching. This director commented:

My chief consideration is the difficulty level of the individual parts compared to the strengths and weaknesses of my band. Some works are selected to stretch them as musicians, others to put them in the best possible situation for success.

A similar line of thinking was echoed by Director #10, age 45, when she shared:

I attend to the basic elements present in the work (melody, harmony, rhythm, and timbre) to determine if the piece will 1) line up with the strengths of my concert band, and 2) provide good learning opportunities to develop musicianship.

Director #17, age 42 offered a perspective that was related but also extended into the area of instrumentation. Director #17 reported that he examined melody and harmony, but then reviewed instrumentation, especially in French horn and oboe. He then checked for
options in doubling on a part observing that “Instrumentation and ability is not always perfect unless in a festival setting.”

A final thought demonstrating the importance of Timbre and Orchestration was shared by Director #22, age 45, who stated:

I try to compare the technical and expressive demands with the abilities and available players of my own band. Great melodies are important too, but if my band is not developed or enough or lacks some necessary instrumentation I avoid choosing a work.

Not all directors shared the same concern about what aspects are considered when considering a new concert band work. The views of Director #38, age 38, would seem to indicate that instrumentation is not a concern in this process:

The title and concept of the piece are important first considerations. I examine the melodic material, and use of rhythms/meters/tempo. I don't worry about the demands of the instrumentation as all my groups are relatively well-balanced, and if I need extra players I can borrow from one of the other ensembles.

A similar thought offered by Director #23, age 55 did not reflect concern about the area of instrumentation in his response either, rather emphasizing the rigor offered by music that is challenging. He stated that:

I want a piece that my students will be able to learn good musical values. Does the piece offer complicated harmonies that the performer must listen and evaluate their part with that of other performers? I want a piece that will inspire my students to become better performers as well as better listeners.

Several other smaller themes that did not fall directly under a description of a specific CBREC item emerged during this process. These themes were related to the amount of available rehearsal time and familiarity with a specific composer. A final theme that was touched upon by several of the directors was that of programming, and how a new and emergent work might compare or fit with other works being studied.
Open-Ended Survey Question #2

What is your view regarding the value of rehearsing and performing new and emergent concert band works with your ensemble?

There were 44 participants who responded to the second open-ended question, and the emerging themes generated from the responses have been outlined in Table 72. Three of themes generated response frequencies greater than 43%. These three themes – Contrast/Balance in Programming, Evolution of the medium, and Enhance Teaching/Expand Musical Concepts – were intertwined throughout the comments offered by directors. Three other themes emerged from the comments provided, but none of these themes were found to have a frequency response greater than 20%.

Table 72

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Theme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contrast/Balance in programming</td>
<td>20/44</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance teaching/Expand musical concepts</td>
<td>20/44</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution of the medium</td>
<td>19/44</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to a living composer</td>
<td>9/44</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection of music to other subject areas</td>
<td>7/44</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect music to culture/community</td>
<td>6/44</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An example of how the top three themes were intertwined in comments by the directors could be seen in the statement offered by Director #34, age 54, who said:
It provides nice contrast to older works. Sometimes it allows them to see how wind band music has evolved - how treatment of certain instruments has changed over time. Newer works can be very valuable, as long as the works are quality literature.

A similar line of thinking was offered by Director #24, age 41, who stated:

I want my students to have the knowledge of new music and where it is going. I also want my students to have a divergent repertoire. They need to know the new music as well as the old classics and transcriptions.

While some of the directors viewed new works as a means to compare and contrast against older works, others expressed a critical perspective of the value and quality offered by these pieces. Director #41, age 46, had this to say regarding the value of using new and emergent concert band works:

A few new works on each concert provides nice contrast. Sometimes though new works are contrived and insulting, yet other works go too far the other way and speak only to the composer. It is hard to find a balanced work that is artistic yet sensible, satisfying yet stretching, and emotionally recognizable without being completely sappy or unreachable by a high school musician. These are just kids who have trouble identifying their own emotions from time to time.

Director #36 was more direct in his view on the value of new works for the concert band, and made the following comment related to the works used in this study when he stated:

Some are really good. The first two in this study were pretty mundane. Lots of pretty chords, but not very interesting and the melody line lacked direction. The final work hits on a number of different areas and offers a variety of musical concepts that can be addressed.

Although Director #36 was critical of *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque*, not all participants shared this viewpoint of new and emergent works. Some directors, like Director #40, praised new pieces for helping students recognize “they are partners in exploring the musical frontier”. The comments of Director #9 indicated that he saw value in new and emergent works for himself and for the students when he stated:
I admittedly have gravitated towards new and emergent works as I believe it has challenged not only me as an educator, but also the persona of the ensembles I have taught. Obviously, a well-rounded curriculum investigates literature representing several historical periods, but I try to find diverse repertoire matching those elements of instrumental music which have endured the ages.

As indicated above, some directors were very accepting of what new and emergent works could offer to an ensemble within the instrumental setting. A cursory review of the other comments and emergent themes indicated that directors have considered other factors that may impact how new concert band works might connect to their ensembles and enrich the overall large ensemble experience. As an example, Director #39 shared:

Some new works have really great concepts that allow the ensemble to make connections with other parts of the curriculum or the outside world. Not all standard repertoire allows for such connections without a lot of work by the director in planning.

To sum up the responses regarding the value of new and emergent works, consider the response offered by Director #6 who stated “It is imperative to the art form. While I love the standard pieces for wind band, there has to be a place for new standard pieces in programming.”

The final question in the open-ended response section of the survey specifically asked directors to share their perspective on the eventual move of a work into the core repertoire. 47 Directors out of 48 provided responses to this question. While this question did not target new and emergent works specifically, it required participants to consider distinct and important features that they believed would contribute to a piece becoming part of the standard repertoire.
Table 73

Open-Ended Survey Question #3

What aspects do you believe contribute to a piece being able to sustain repeated programming over time and eventually move into the “core or standard repertoire”?

Six major themes came into focus from these comments offered by band directors. Of the six themes, five of them had a frequency response that was greater than 31%. The two most prominently mentioned by directors were Technical Merit and Artistic/Aesthetic Merit, which received 19 mentions and 18 mentions respectively. Emotional merit was referenced by 11 of the participant directors. Table 74 has included the frequency of comments from question #3.

Table 74

Frequency of Comments from Directors Open-ended Question #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Theme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Merit</td>
<td>19/47</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Merit/Aesthetic Merit</td>
<td>18/47</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal/Engagement Factor</td>
<td>15/47</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lists/Festival Programs/Conductor Attention</td>
<td>15/47</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melody/Melodic Material</td>
<td>15/47</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Merit</td>
<td>11/47</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In response to the final open-ended question, three of the themes listed above were encapsulated when Director #1, age 46, offered the following:

The melody must be memorable. It must provide some type of emotional connection and lift. It must be able to develop musicians technically and also raise their aesthetic awareness in performance.

The top two themes that emerged from this question were also touched upon by Director #4, age 38, who commented:

These pieces have to prove they are valuable from a teaching perspective. They must also prove themselves to be valuable from an artistic standpoint. Can this piece raise our appreciation of music while helping grow our students’ skills (technical, intellectual, and artistic)? It is a fine line to balance, and while I like many new works not all of them meet this criteria.

Directors #5, 27, and 34 each intertwined multiple themes in their answer to the third open-ended question. While Director #27 looked for “artistic and teachable moments”, Director #34 shared that the best core works answer to artistic, technical, and emotional aspects “like First Suite (by Holst)” Director #5 stated that:

It must be memorable. It must be sincere. It must have an emotional impact of some sort. It must be engaging for the ensemble. It must be interesting for the audience. It must challenge the ensemble without overwhelming it.

It is possible that the appeal/engagement factor for both the audience and the ensemble is a consideration that directors are taking into account. Still there were others whose attention focused on the melodic content found within the piece, and others who seek out music that contains emotional merit for the ensemble. Many of these comments offered by directors brought up multiple themes indicating there may be no single answer to this question. While each of the other four themes has value and perspective in this discussion, the top two frequent comments bear mention again. This perspective that took
into consideration both artistic and technical value was presented by Director #22, age 42, who stated:

The piece has to demonstrate some artistic value - the music should ennoble all who interact with it. The piece also has to require the students to become competent musicians that can meet the demands of the work. Finally I think the piece needs exposure over time. Any work of art takes time to be absorbed before people can finally appreciate it for when it was created, why it was created, and what makes it valuable.

These comments have been valuable in understanding the themes that emerged from all the open-ended responses. The first major theme was the importance of several CBREC Items to this group of directors (MC, PU, & TO). Among the open-ended responses, the second theme to emerge was the value new concert band works provide in programming, teaching, and the evolution of the medium. The final theme that was identified was the importance of technical and aesthetic merit in new works. As the study moves into the final chapter, open-ended responses that were provided will be used and compared against some of the statistical findings to provide additional perspective to the research questions.

Conclusion

This chapter was devoted to the statistical analysis of the responses generated by directors who participated in the survey. From this analysis there were several statistical findings that merited further discussion to answer the research questions. Three sub-groups were identified on the basis of director age, number of ensembles taught, and directors who provided answers to the open-ended questions posed at the end of the study. The analysis of the statistical data generated by these three sub-groups delivered additional insight that has been valuable to focus the three research questions.
The initial analysis of data in this chapter has provided a departure point from which the research questions of this study might be explored in the final chapter. Additionally, several themes emerged from the open-ended questions that warranted examination against the statistical data at hand. As the research questions are explored in light of these findings during the final chapter, implications for educators, publishers, and composers will be discussed. There will be some discussion regarding limitations that were not seen prior to the start of the research. In addition to areas regarding future research for instrumental music education and the selection of repertoire, key aspects of the study applicable to the profession will be offered for consideration.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Introduction

While many previous studies sought to identify core repertoire for concert bands at all educational levels, the purpose of this study explored what aspects high school band directors placed importance upon in their evaluation of new and emergent works for the concert band. Additionally, the effect personal and professional background had on band directors during the evaluation process of new and emergent works was also examined.

Before the discussion of the statistical findings commences in this chapter, an overview of the study, including key points of the methodology, has been provided.

Overview of the Study

As mentioned above, this research centered on identifying what criteria are viewed as important by high school band directors in the evaluation of new concert band music, and to delineate if personal and professional background had any influence on this process. A criteria list, the Concert Band Repertoire Evaluation Criteria (CBREC), was developed through synthesizing over 40 years of research and writing regarding concert band repertoire. The CBREC was then vetted through a process involving 54 collegiate and university directors and professors of music, and was determined to be a reliable tool for the purposes of this study.

I contacted J.W. Pepper, a nationally recognized retailer of concert band music, for a list of the top-selling concert pieces at the Grade III, IV and V level over a three-
year period. After removing pop transcriptions, marches, and re-issued older work from the list provided by J.W. Pepper, eleven pieces remained. I selected an independent group of music educators, the *Repertoire Review Panel (RRP)*, to rate these eleven works. From their ratings, the top three average ranked pieces were used for the study.

With the assistance of Phi Beta Mu, an international band fraternity with over 3,000 active members, invitations to participate in the study were emailed to all high school directors in the Phi Beta Mu database. Over a six-week period, directors accessed the survey in an on-line setting. After viewing a score image and listening to a recording of the work, the directors evaluated each of the three pieces using the *CBREC*. Participant directors also had the option of rating their familiarity with the pieces that were used, and answering three open-ended questions regarding repertoire evaluation and selection.

In the previous chapter, the data generated by participant directors and statistical tests used to verify this information was reported. Directors from thirty states across the nation participated in the study. These directors (*n* = 119) represented a variety of teaching contexts, years of experience, and educational backgrounds. Several statistically significant relationships were discovered among the ratings of the three works by participant directors after the initial analysis was completed.

To better answer the research questions of the study, I also examined three pairs of sub-groups within the participants. The first sub-group of directors was divided between directors 50 years of age and older (*n* = 58), and directors younger than 50 years of age (*n* = 61). The second sub-group consisted of those directors who taught one ensemble (*n* = 37), and directors who taught two or more ensembles (*n* = 82). The final sub-group was composed of those directors who chose to respond to the open-ended
questions \( (n = 48) \) and those directors who did not respond to the open-ended questions \( (n = 71) \). The analysis of data within the various sub-groups also revealed important relationships that warranted discussion and consideration.

In addition to the statistical data reported, responses from the open-ended questions provided by 48 participant directors revealed a series of themes in regard to the evaluation and use of new and emergent works for the concert band. Within this chapter the various relationships and important statistical findings will be discussed. Additionally, themes that emerged from the open-ended responses will be reviewed to provide additional perspective to the discussion. Implications for music educators, composers, and publishers will be offered as part of this discussion, and areas for future research will be suggested. The three research questions I sought to answer as part of this study were as follows:

1) What criteria do band directors consider important when evaluating new and emergent concert band pieces?

2) How does personal and professional background impact the perspectives of band directors regarding new and emergent works for concert band?

3) What relationship factors exist between the various criteria identified as important by band directors and how do they compare?

Discussion of Participants

The high school band directors who participated in this study represented 36.8% of the known high school band directors within the membership database of Phi Beta Mu. Of these 119 participants, 78.2% of them have earned a degree beyond their Bachelors, and 63.9% have an advanced degree in music. With these statistics in mind, it is reasonable to expect that this group through their advanced studies would have some
focused experience in the area of selection and evaluation of materials for the classroom, and it could specifically involve repertoire for ensembles.

Additionally, the average years of experience of this group reflects that directors have spent a significant amount of time in the music education field. The time spent in their current position suggests over the course of their career that they would specifically have evaluated music for high school ensembles. Within this group, 68.9% of the directors reported they taught multiple concert bands as part of their teaching responsibilities. A majority of directors are selecting concert band music for multiple ensembles, and are potentially evaluating many works within an academic year in an attempt to best meet the musical needs of their students. The education levels and experience with ensembles was an appropriate indication that this group of directors had adequate familiarity in the area of repertoire evaluation and selection, which lends perspective and support to the discussion to follow.

Discussion of Findings

On the basis of their background and experience, this group of participant directors was determined to be a suitable group to realize the purposes of this study. The discussion that follows focuses first on data for each individual *CBREC* Item. The sections that follow examine the *CBREC* data among each of the sub-groups identified within the study. Emerging themes have been drawn out from the data prior to the discussion regarding implications for directors, composers, and publishers, as well as additional limitations that were not foreseen at the onset of the study.
Discussion of CBREC Item Data

In this study involving high school band directors, the ratings of three new and emergent works for the concert band revealed several interesting results related to the research questions. Participants made use of the Concert Band Repertoire Evaluation Criteria (CBREC) to evaluate three new and emergent works for the concert band. Through this evaluation process several of the CBREC Items were rated highly across all three works by this group of directors. A correlational analysis of each CBREC Item between the three works provided additional perspective to understand what criteria this group of participants considered to be valuable when evaluating new concert band works. Additionally, six high positive correlations were found across all three works between the same CBREC items.

The CBREC Items Harmonic Language, Timbre and Orchestration, and Emotional Impact and Sensitivity were given a favorable rating by directors based upon the mean value across all three works that were evaluated. In examination of the open-ended responses, Melodic Craftsmanship, Timbre and Orchestration, and Pedagogical Usefulness were also valued by participants in this setting. The data generated by participants from using the CBREC and answering the open-ended questions has provided valuable insight to pursue the research questions.

Harmonic Language (HL) received a favorable rating on two of the three works used in this study. The mean rating for HL was highest for Rest, followed closely by Elements, and then Lux Aurumque. While a level of consensus was reached by this group of directors, the reasons that the ratings across all three works on this CBREC Item were not higher could be various. The ratings given to HL could in part be explained by the
fact that *Rest, Lux Aurumque, and Elements* each made use of triadic harmony and included various suspensions. Both *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque* used a key change towards the end of the piece, and *Elements* made use of one key for the first two movements before changing key for the final two movements.

The relative amount of key stability may have contributed to the overall balance and direction of the harmony within these pieces. It is possible that some directors in this study may have been seeking more imaginative harmonies and thus were reluctant to rate the works higher. The fact that *Rest* and *Elements* were rated higher than *Lux Aurumque* by participants could possibly be explained by decisions made by the composer of each work to include some chords from outside the original designated key area.

The correlational analysis of each CBREC Item between all three works was conducted to provide additional insight as to what aspects this group of participants held to be important. All three correlations for *HL* were positive, but they would have little if any relation at all. There was a significant relationship between the *HL* of *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque*. This finding may be more related to the balance and direction of the harmonic language than the actual content of the harmony (e.g. key centers, choice of chords, cadences). The fact that both *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque* had similar compositional origins and texture also may have contributed in some way to this relationship.

It was interesting to note that although *HL* received a relatively favorable rating among the total group of directors, there were only seven specific references to harmony among the 43 directors who responded to the first open-ended question. Within the responses made regarding what aspects directors primarily examine in new concert band music, several participants were very critical of the works employed in the study,
commenting that they were imitating music from film scores. While not all directors were critical of the works in the study, the statistical data offers some support to the idea that this group determined HL to be appropriate and sensitive in the progressions among these new and emergent works for the concert band.

Timbre and Orchestration (TO) was also rated favorably on two of the three works used in this study and this appraisal was also based upon the ratings given using a seven-point Likert scale. The mean rating was highest on Elements, followed by Rest, and then Lux Aurumque. It was interesting to note that the standard deviation for TO was the second lowest across all three works among all CBREC Items. While Rest and Lux Aurumque shared similar stylistic elements, the statistical data suggests the unique moments in orchestration crafted by each of the composers in their respective work were recognized by this group of directors.

The correlational analysis for TO between all three pieces yielded two positive significant relationships that bear mention in this discussion. Rest and Elements were found to have a positive relationship significant at the 0.01 level, and Elements and Lux Aurumque was found to have a positive relationship significant at the 0.05 level. Although both relationships were significant, it would be difficult to surmise the reasons that they were not stronger. Directors may have rated these three works with their own ensembles in mind, and the instrumentation and ability level of that group may have influenced their ratings. Conversely, other directors may have rated these works more objectively taking into consideration only the score and the recording without thought to their own ensembles.
Within the responses from directors to the first open-ended questions, the topic of having necessary instrumentation was prevalent. I included comments regarding instrumentation as part of TO. The rationale for including these comments stemmed from directors indicating that the manner in which various parts are scored would have an impact on whether or not they would select a work for study. Lacking sufficient instrumentation to cover the demands of the score, or wanting to provide an appropriate musical challenge to a specific instrumental section within the ensemble requires careful analysis of the score by a director. This analysis of the orchestration of a work must be considered against the current ability levels and available players within the ensemble for which the piece is chosen.

Some concert band works have contrast and variety in timbre and texture because of the instruments selected by the composer in the orchestration process. These choices by the composer provide a unique ensemble experience for a concert band during the study and performance of the piece. Several directors in this study pointed to the fact that if their ensembles lacked certain instrumentation to completely represent the work as written they may avoid selecting the piece. Based upon this perspective, composers should be aware that the treatment and use of instruments during the orchestration process could have a positive or negative impact on how well a piece is received by directors and their ensembles.

From this perspective, the responses from directors on the first open-ended question support the attention that was given to TO in the evaluation of a new concert band work. Taking into account the strength of the mean rating, and low standard deviation across all three works, this group of directors considers this CBREC Item to be
of importance in the evaluation process of new concert band works. As directors consider the instrumentation demands within the score and compare that against the ability levels and availability of personnel within their ensembles, TO is an important area in the evaluation of new and emergent concert band repertoire.

*Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)* was the final CBREC Item that was given a relatively favorable rating by all directors across all three works. The mean rating for ES was highest on *Rest*, followed by *Lux Aurumque*, and *Elements* was third. *ES* for *Rest* was noticeably rated higher than the other two works in the study. Given that this piece was commissioned as a memoriam, it was not surprising that directors recognized the genuine emotional overtones to the work.

While *Lux Aurumque* was originally a choral work by Eric Whitacre, he was later commissioned to set the work for concert band. Although *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque* share this similarity in their origins, the difference in mean rating for *ES* between the two works might be related to the interplay of other *CBREC* Items. *Lux Aurumque* had lower mean ratings on all *CBREC* Items across all three works except for *ES*. This work also had higher standard deviations on all eight items. It is possible that the low ratings by this group of directors on these various *CBREC* Items contributed to the *ES* for *Lux Aurumque* not being perceived as prominent as that of *Rest*.

Favorable ratings were provided by participants on *ES*, but the correlational analysis yielded three weak positive relationships. While the analysis produced positive significant findings, the strength of the Pearson’s *r* did not suggest a real relationship. *Lux Aurumque* was found to share a significant positive relationship with *Elements* on *ES*. There may have been subjective application of the *CBREC* related to the perception of
various musical aspects, and the value assigned by each participant could have differed during the process. This could have some bearing upon the correlational analysis conducted on ES across the three works used in the study.

The comments from the first open-ended question provided additional information to consider against the statistical responses regarding ES. The responses to the first open-ended question included only 13 references to ES, which represented only 30% of the participants who responded to these questions. Several of the open-ended responses revealed some participants did not find all the material employed by the composer genuine or sensitive in its interactions with other musical elements. While not all the comments from participants were favorable towards the three works in relation to ES, the statistical data supports the idea that this group of directors perceived some emotional value in these three works.

As mentioned previously in this section, director comments for the first open-ended questions most frequently gravitated towards Timbre and Orchestration. Comments that could be considered under Pedagogical Usefulness(PU) were the second most frequent response. The mean ratings for PU expressed by the all the participants regarding this CBREC Item indicated a somewhat favorable perception on Elements and Rest. The mean rating was highest for Elements, followed by Rest, and Lux Aurumque was third.

The correlational analysis of the ratings between the three works for Pedagogical Usefulness produced three positive relationships. A significant positive relationship was found between Rest and Lux Aurumque. This may be an indication that some directors viewed these two works as having similar uses in making the ensemble aware of certain
musical concepts despite the fact that *Lux Aurumque* was not rated as high as the other two works in the study.

Similar to the discussion about *ES on Lux Aurumque*, the interaction of other CBREC Items may have impacted the perspective of the *PU* within the work held by participants. Many directors and conductors advocate the use of chorales for the development of tone and balance in the large instrumental ensemble. It is possible that this group of participants could be hesitant to select a setting of a chorale if they are already studying such music as part of their daily rehearsal routines.

Although some directors may use supplemental materials to foster and develop individual and ensemble musical skills, the use of ensemble music for this same purpose has been a common practice among many directors across the country. In the selection of works by the Repertoire Review Panel (*RRP*) that was detailed in Chapter Three, *RRP* Member #3 identified certain pedagogical aspects within each of the three works used in the study, and identified *Elements* as the best pedagogical work among the eleven that were initially reviewed. While this was the view of only one member of the *RRP*, the ratings generated for *PU* by participants for *Elements* essentially validated this assessment. The other statistical data also offers some support to the idea that directors in this study value *PU* among new concert band works.

The other two CBREC Items that could be identified as important based upon their mean rating and comments to first open-ended question were *Melodic Craftsmanship (MC)* and *Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)*. The mean ratings for *MC* expressed by the all the participants regarding this item, similar to *PU*, indicated a favorable perception of *Elements* and *Rest*. The mean rating was highest for *Elements*,
followed by Rest, and finally Lux Aurumque. The comments regarding melody on the first open-ended question gave MC a place of importance to directors in this study. The ratings from participants indicated that two of the works included expressive material that could sustain interest. Based upon the statistical data, there was not as strong convictions expressed regarding the MC of Lux Aurumque. The reasons this group of directors did not rate the melodic material in Lux Aurumque of interest equal to that of the other two works may be a matter of personal preference beyond the scope of this study.

All relationships between the three works on MC were significant positive correlations. Although significant relationships were discovered, the strength of Pearson’s $r$ indicated these were all weak relationships ($r < 0.30$). The interplay of other musical elements may have influenced the ratings completed by participants for MC, which could impact the correlations between the works on this CBREC Item. Still, there were favorable ratings for MC expressed by the participants indicating that this is an important area that directors will examine when evaluating new concert band works.

Consistent with the other two CBREC Items identified from the open-ended questions, the mean rating for Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L) was highest for Elements, followed by Rest, and then Lux Aurumque. It should be noted that the standard deviation for this item was the highest across all three works indicating more variability from the participants in the ratings. From the responses to the first open-ended question, it appears at least on the surface that some directors in this study were carefully considering the long-term use of new literature for their ensembles. The correlational analysis of $L$ between the three works revealed that a significant positive relationship existed between Rest and Elements. It is possible the consideration participants gave to
items HL, TO, PU, and Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS) might have some influence upon their evaluation of L.

The statistical data did not strongly suggest that directors in this study view these works as eventually being considered core or standard repertoire. While there was statistical data that supports the idea there was value to the study and performance of these works with a high school level ensemble, the ratings of L for each work were at best moderate. Given the relatively short time during which these works have been available for study and performance and the variability expressed by participants on L, it may be premature to definitively make this assertion or declare it impossible.

The final two CBREC Items to be discussed are Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS) and Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV). The mean value for Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast indicated that this item was rated favorably on Elements and Rest. The mean rating was highest for Elements, followed by Rest, and finally Lux Aurumque. The fact that Elements was the highest rated of the three works was not necessarily a surprise when one considers it follows the classical symphony form throughout the four movements. It is possible that this compositional ploy was recognized by participants, which contributed to them rating Elements higher than the other two works.

According to the rehearsal notes and analysis provided by Ticheli in the score to the work, Rest was cast in rounded binary form (AABA) with a coda. Here again, this choice to set the work in a relatively familiar form by the composer may have been recognized by the participants. This could in turn have some impact upon the ratings, and contributed to it being rated more favorably than Lux Aurumque. The use of familiar
forms (classical symphony or rounded binary) may have indicated to some directors that there would be musical aspects to expect within the scope of the work. While in some instances this assessment would be accurate, the ratings suggest that this group of directors acknowledged that moments of contrast and unpredictability were also present within both *Elements* and *Rest*.

A strong consensus was not demonstrated by the participants in regard to the *FS* of *Lux Aurumque*. One possibility for this group of directors not rating the *FS* higher might be related to a choice made by the composer. Whitacre acknowledged in the program notes of the score that he included material that was not part of the original *a cappella* choral work within the piece. Coupled with the lower ratings given to other CBREC Items such as *MC* and *RV*, it is possible this choice made by Whitacre was perceived as unsuitable to the original existing material to be used as part of the climax of the work. It is also conceivable participants did not perceive this piece as having enough structure to sufficiently guide the work through the various sections and allow contrasting material to be effectively presented. The correlational analysis of *FS* between the three works yielded three positive relationships. Only the correlation between *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque* was found to be significant, but the statistical data suggests this was not a strong relationship.

*Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV)* was the final CBREC Item to discuss among the participant ratings of each work. Similar to ratings of other items previously discussed in this chapter, the mean rating for *RV* was highest for *Elements*, followed by *Rest*, and finally *Lux Aurumque*. The mean value for *Rest* was closer to a level of *neither agree or disagree*, while the mean value for *Lux Aurumque* did not indicate a favorable rating.
among the participants. It should also be noted that the mean rating for RV on *Lux Aurumque* was the lowest mean rating of all CBREC Items among the three pieces. Conversely, *Elements* had the highest mean rating of all items among the three pieces. This rating may be a result of participants perceiving *Elements* to be more rhythmically complex and active after listening to *Lux Aurumque* and *Rest*, which incidentally were the first two pieces evaluated in the study.

The correlational analysis conducted on RV among the three works yielded three positive relationships. The strength of Pearson’s *r* between *Lux Aurumque* and *Elements*, though significant, did not suggest any real relationship. A significant positive relationship between *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque* was discovered, indicating that there was a similar trend in how participants rated RV of these two works. As mentioned earlier, the mean values for RV on *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque* were the lowest among all CBREC Items on each piece. It was possible participants did not think these two works displayed enough variety rhythmically, whereas *Elements* used three distinct tempos and two different time signatures among the four movements in the work. It may be unfair to make a definitive statement regarding RV as it applies to all new concert band works based upon the data above due to the nature of the works. The use of three other concert band selections could have produced data that might be interpreted differently.

As was outlined in the previous chapter, an inter-item correlational analysis was conducted on the CBREC Items for each work. An interesting trend was discovered upon examination of the various correlations across all three concert band works. There were six high positive correlations found to exist across all three works between the same
CBREC Items. This finding presents an additional perspective for consideration in answering the research questions of the study.

Melodic Craftsmanship (MC) was found to have a high positive correlation with three other items. The correlation between MC and Pedagogical Usefulness (PU) lends some support to the idea that this group of directors considers melodic content as valuable for developing musical skills of the ensemble and the individual. MC was also found to have a high positive correlation across all three works with Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES). This group of directors had expressed a level of agreement regarding the ES on all three works, but only the MC on two of the works, Rest and Elements, received favorable ratings. Although directors did not rate the MC as high on Lux Aurumque, it is certainly still possible that they found the material to be genuine and deliver an emotional impact that would be valuable in the ensemble setting. Considering the aforementioned comments about relation between MC and PU, directors in this study may value these particular works because they are able to raise ensemble and student awareness of the emotional content in music.

A final high positive correlation was found to exist between MC and Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L) across all three works. This finding may suggest that the melodic content of a piece of music could have some bearing on how well a piece is received by directors, ensembles, and audiences over time. The mean rating for L was moderate at best across all three works among the directors in the study. Given the relatively short time during which these pieces have been available for study and performance, the interpretation of the mean rating should be tempered. Within this study,
there remains the possibility that perception and evaluation of MC may influence how a
director estimates the PU, ES, and L of a concert band work.

A high positive correlation was found to exist between Pedagogical Usefulness
(PU) and Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS). While Lux Aurumque did not
receive a strong rating from directors on either CBREC Item, Elements and Rest were
rated favorably by this group of directors on both FS and PU. The high positive
correlation lends some support to the idea that the participants in this study examine
major structural elements within new concert band works to better determine their value
for ensemble study.

Pedagogical Usefulness (PU) was also found to share a high positive correlation
with Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L). As mentioned earlier in this chapter,
the mean rating for L indicated a moderate level of consensus among the participant
directors. The mean value for PU revealed this group of directors rated this aspect of
Elements and Rest favorably. It is conceivable that PU contributes to L as directors
consider certain works valuable for teaching a recurring musical concept or skill to
ensembles over multiple years.

A final high positive correlation was found to exist between Emotional Impact
and Sensitivity (ES) and Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L) across all three
works. ES was one of the CBREC Items that directors indicated a favorable rating across
all three works. Similar to the thoughts offered regarding PU and L, ES may be another
contributing factor to a piece garnering repeated study and performance over time.

The interpretation of these correlations for each work used in the study offer some
insight to what these directors value in new concert band music. However, there may be
other factors that contributed to the ratings and the interaction of the various CBREC Items. To help identify these possible factors and provide more perspective to the study, three pairs of sub-groups within the main group of participants were examined. The next section discusses the CBREC Items between two sub-groups based upon director age.

Discussion of CBREC Items between Director Age Groups

In an effort to better answer the second research question, which considered personal and professional experience, the participant group was divided into two age groups for further examination and comparisons. There were 61 participants placed into the Director Group Younger than 50 Years of Age (DG<50), and the remaining 58 participants were placed into the Director Group 50 Years of Age and Older (DG≥=50). The educational backgrounds and average number of ensembles for each of these groups were very similar.

The Director Group 50 Years of Age and Older (DG≥=50) demonstrated higher ratings on seven of eight CBREC Items on Rest and Lux Aurumque, but rated only three of eight CBREC Items higher on Elements than the director group younger than 50 years of age (DG<50). The initial consideration of this data might suggest to some that the DG≥=50 did not rate Elements favorably. Closer examination of the ratings revealed that six of the eight items were rated at a level of agree (5 out of 7) based upon a seven-point Likert scale. Additionally, the differences between the mean ratings of both sub-groups on Elements for Melodic Craftsmanship (MC), Harmonic Language (HL), Timbre and Orchestration (TO), Pedagogical Usefulness (PU), and Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES) ranged from only 0.04 to 0.24. The total mean rating of Elements for the DG<50
was 42.82, and was 42.48 for the $DG_{>}=50$, which indicated an overall similarity in rating between sub-groups.

The standard deviations for the CBREC Items rated by the $DG_{>}=50$ were higher on five of the eight items on Rest, six of the eight items on Lux Aurumque, and seven of the eight items on Elements. On the surface, this data suggested that ratings from the $DG_{>}=50$ demonstrated more variability on certain items and could be seen as less reliable. This data could also have been an indication that some directors in the $DG_{>}=50$ were willing to rate each of the three works along more critical positions of agreement or disagreement on those CBREC Items.

These observations would offer support to the idea that a director with more years of experience in the process of evaluating and selecting repertoire for their ensembles may demonstrate more critical assessments of new concert band music than younger counterparts. A director with more years of experience may compare newer concert band music to previous existing works of similar style, length, tonality, pedagogical aspects, emotional content, or programmatic elements. This kind of prior experience with other works could have exuded some influence upon the evaluations of these emergent pieces for concert band by the $DG_{>}=50$.

The total mean rating for Rest and Lux Aurumque was higher among the $DG_{>}=50$, and as was indicated earlier in this section, the total mean rating for Elements was higher among the $DG_{<}50$. Based upon the total mean ratings from each director age group on the piece, Rest and Elements demonstrated a level of agreement. Lux Aurumque was not rated as favorably as the other two pieces, and the high standard deviation indicates there was more variability in evaluation of this work. Directors in both groups
were at times critical in their evaluation of _Lux Aurumque_. Their evaluation should not be construed as being dismissive of the value this piece might have to a high school level ensemble. Both director age groups indicated the work retained _ES_, and the ratings for _HL_ were close to a level of _agree_ between groups as well.

The correlational analysis of the _CBREC_ Item Ratings from the two age groups was reported upon in the previous chapter. Upon examination of the _DG<50_, it was interesting to note that there were only two significant relationships among the 27 that were reported for this age group. A significant positive relationship was found between the _RV_ of _Rest_ and _Lux Aurumque_. Though a low relationship, it should be noted that the _DG<50_ had rated _RV_ lower than all other items on each piece, and the standard deviations for _RV_ on both pieces was the third highest among the eight aspects. It was possible that participants in the younger age group did not perceive _Rest_ and _Lux Aurumque_ as having enough variety within the rhythms used by the composer as the pieces developed.

_Rest_ and _Elements_ were found to have a significant positive relationship on the _CBREC_ Item _L_ among the _DG<50_. While the mean rating for this group for _L_ on each piece was closer to a level of _agree_ than _neither agree or disagree_ on a seven-point Likert scale, the standard deviations for this item were the highest among all _CBREC_ Items on both works. Though statistically significant, the fact that the relationship was not stronger is not necessarily surprising. It is difficult to forecast whether these two works will endure the test of time and earn repeated programming in the future.

Statistical evidence in this sub-group of participants suggested that there were aspects in both works that directors value for use with a high school level ensemble. This group of
directors may have been hesitant to predict the success and use of the work with future ensembles.

Within the \( DG \geq 50 \), positive significant correlations were discovered to exist between the ratings of Rest and Lux Aurumque, and between Lux Aurumque and Elements for MC. While the relationship between Rest and Lux Aurumque is not surprising given the compositional similarities between the pieces, the positive correlation between Lux Aurumque and Elements does seem on the surface to be inconsistent. This relationship between the works of Whitacre and Balmages may not be connected by similarity in the melodic material that each composer used. Although the melodic material between the pieces was different, it was possible that participants in this sub-group clearly perceived the MC within each piece.

A similar pair of significant positive correlations was found to exist on Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast. A positive significant correlation for FS between Rest and Lux Aurumque, and Lux Aurumque and Elements was found. The positive correlation between Rest and Lux Aurumque could possibly be explained by the interaction of other CBREC Items and the stylistic aspects that are comparable between the two works. Each work contained sections of dramatic musical contrasts that might have influenced the ratings of each piece by participants.

The positive correlation between Lux Aurumque and Elements could possibly be related to the perception of Water, the second movement of the work by Balmages. Water contains sections of contrast and similar texture to that of the work by Whitacre. However, this observation might be analogous to the comments regarding MC in the \( DG \geq 50 \), and it may not be an acknowledgement that directors found similarities
between the FS of *Lux Aurumque* and *Elements*. It is possible that participants in this sub-group found each work to have sufficient balance, contrast, and unpredictability in the various sections. This idea perhaps coupled with observations regarding MC provides some additional support to the idea that this older sub-group of directors are more stable in their ratings of the works.

The $DG_{>50}$ rated HL favorably in their evaluation of all three works. The positive correlation significant found between the HL ratings of *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque* might be attributed in part to similar direction and balance in the harmony found in both pieces. The harmonic progressions in *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque* also moved at a slower pace than three of the movements within *Elements*, which could have some bearing upon how directors would perceive this *CBREC* Item. Participants in the $DG_{>50}$ might have seen value in the HL of *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque* for this reason, and why they rated the works in a similar manner.

There were no significant relationships found between the ratings of the three works by the $DG_{>50}$ on the *CBREC* Item *Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo*. Given that this sub-group rated *Lux Aurumque* close to a level of disagree and *Elements* was rated at a level of strongly agree, this is not surprising. Interestingly enough, the standard deviations of RV on *Lux Aurumque* and *Elements* were the lowest among all *CBREC* Items. The mean value for *Rest* was moderate with a standard deviation that was the third lowest of the eight *CBREC* Items. The positive correlation between *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque* would seem to indicate that some directors were rating the RV of these two works in a similar manner, but this relationship was not found to be significant. It is conceivable that the $DG_{>50}$ perceived the various rhythmic elements and complexity
of each work differently, which contributed to the lack of any significant relationship being established in this group.

Two positive significant correlations were found on *Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)* in the $DG \geq 50$. A positive significant relationship was found between *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque*, and while it was not a strong relationship, it is possible that similar stylistic aspects within each work could have exuded some influence upon this rating. A significant positive relationship was found between *Rest* and *Elements*. The mean rating for this group for $L$ on each piece was closer to a level of *agree* on a seven-point Likert scale. The standard deviations, however, for this item were the highest among all *CBREC* Items on both works.

There would appear to be a number of *CBREC* Items on each work this group of directors rated favorably in their evaluation which could have contributed to their overall estimation of $L$. While the statistical data does not indicate that these two new works are uncontested new additions to the core repertoire for concert bands, the $DG \geq 50$ does demonstrate some shared perspective regarding the future success of these works. There are several items that this group has indicated would be of value for study by high school bands, but whether *Rest* and *Elements* would be revisited in the future to experience those aspects is difficult to predict.

Of all the correlations in both groups, the fact that there were no significant relationships found in *Emotional Impact and Sensitivity* among the three works bears some discussion. The mean rating would indicate that both groups rated the $ES$ found in each work favorably. However, correlations for this *CBREC* Item would be considered in the weak positive range ($r < 0.30$). The correlations between *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque*, and
Rest and Elements in the DG<50 were < 0.10, respectively, which indicated no real relationship.

The correlational analysis seems to indicate that individuals in both director age groups perceived the emotional aspects very differently from work to work. Given the discussion that has pointed towards the stylistic similarities of Rest and Lux Aurumque, the lack of any significant positive relationship that would fall into at least a low range (0.3-0.5) from either director group was surprising. The perception of the emotional content of a given work for concert band can be drawn out by the listener from the interaction of the various musical elements within each work crafted by the composer. In the case of these three pieces, the ES recognized by the participants in each work may be a personal matter of preference and identification that is beyond the scope of the study.

In the DG>=50, two of the CBREC Items and the total CBREC rating were found to have statistically significant correlations between each of the three pieces. The correlations ranged from weak to a low positive relationship for TO, PU, and total CBREC rating. This data would suggest that the DG>=50 was more stable in their ratings of TO, PU, and total CBREC rating. Though the strength of the correlations ranged from weak to low positive, it would appear that TO and PU are aspects that this sub-group of older directors examined carefully in their evaluation of the three pieces.

The DG>=50 sub-group rated the TO found in Rest and Elements favorably, and this CBREC Item had the second lowest standard deviation on both pieces within the older director group. The significant positive correlation between Rest and Elements would indicate that directors in this group were rating these two works in a somewhat similar manner. This data provided a confirmation of the comments from Repertoire
Review Panel Member #3 who observed that Rest gave all sections of the ensemble opportunities to make a musical contribution. Additionally, it offers support to the idea that TO is an important aspect that directors in this study examine when studying new works for the high school concert band.

Pedagogical Usefulness (PU) was found to have three significant positive correlations. Of all the aspects that were examined, the $DG_{>50}$ sub-group who were rating this item provides compelling insight within the study as it pertained to the research questions. The strongest of the three correlations existed between Rest and Lux Aurumque, and the $DG_{>50}$ rating PU along a similar path might have been influenced by the stylistic similarities shared between the pieces. The fact this CBREC Item had significant positive correlations between all three works may be related to directors in this sub-group having the ability to pick out important teaching aspects in their evaluation process. This provides additional support to the observations of RRP#3 that was previously reported in Chapter Three regarding the pedagogical aspects of these works.

In consideration of the frequency of comments to the first open-ended question, it is worth mentioning that PU was the second-most mentioned by participants. Taking into account comments related to instrumentation towards TO, this CBREC Item was the most frequently mentioned aspect examined by directors when evaluating new concert band works. The responses to these open-ended questions provide an additional lens for viewing the statistical data. It would appear that the older director group holds several CBREC Items as important in their evaluation of new concert band works. Although some participants in the $DG_{>50}$ were more discriminating on certain aspects than their
younger counterparts, this older group of directors demonstrated that they were more stable in their ratings of these works.

Discussion of CBREC Items between Director Ensemble Groups

Another possible way to provide additional perspective to the second research question, which considered the impact of personal and professional experience, was to divide the participants into two groups on the basis of number of ensembles taught. Based upon the data provided by participants, there were 37 participants placed into a sub-group identified as Directors Teaching One Ensemble (DTOE). The remaining 82 participants indicated they were instructing multiple ensembles, and thus, were placed into the Directors Teaching Two or More Ensembles (DTTM).

Overall, the percentage of gender representation and educational backgrounds for each of these sub-groups were very similar. There was a higher percentage of participants in the DTOE who earned an advanced degree beyond their Bachelors in Music Education when compared to the DTTM. It was noted that the eight educators with a Doctoral degree were among the 65 directors with an advanced degree in the DTTM. Although the DTTM had fewer students per ensemble than the DTOE, they were teaching more students per day by virtue of having multiple ensembles. As was expected, the number of pieces purchased by participants in the DTTM was higher than the DTOE.

The DTOE sub-group rated Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES) and Timbre and Orchestration (TO) favorably as all mean ratings were at a level agree (5 out of 7) or higher based upon a seven-point Likert scale. Additionally, this sub-group gave favorable ratings to Melodic Craftsmanship (MC) and Pedagogical Usefulness (PU) on Rest and
Elements. The DTOE demonstrated a bit more stability in their ratings of the three works evidenced by lower standard deviations across the majority of CBREC Items.

The DTTM sub-group produced favorable ratings on Harmonic Language (HL) as mean values across all three pieces were at a level of agree or higher based upon a seven-point Likert scale. This sub-group also gave a favorable rating to the ES within Rest and Lux Aurumque, and the Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS) and TO found in Rest and Elements. The fact the DTTM sub-group was found to have higher standard deviations on certain CBREC Items could be viewed as this sub-group being less consistent in their ratings. It is also possible that the DTTM rated each of the three works along more extreme positions of agreement or disagreement. It is certainly possible that participants in the DTTM are evaluating more music per year than their counterparts in the DTOE. The DTTM may be more critical as they seek to find multiple works that best fit the various musical, pedagogical, and artistic goals for their students.

The total CBREC rating for all three works was higher among the DTOE sub-group, but it should be noted that the difference between the total rating by each sub-group for Rest and Lux Aurumque was very small. The total mean rating of Rest and Elements from both the DTOE and DTTM reflected a favorable impression of the works. Lux Aurumque was not rated as high as the other two pieces, and, similar to the findings in the Director Age Sub-groups, the high standard deviation indicated more variability in evaluation of this work. Both sub-groups demonstrated a level of consensus on the ES of Lux Aurumque, and other aspects received a moderate to favorable rating including TO in the DTOE and HL in the DTTM. Directors in this study found some value in Lux Aurumque for a high school level ensemble.
The correlational analysis of the CBREC Item Ratings from the two director ensemble groups was reported upon in the previous chapter. Upon examination of both sub-groups, it was interesting to note that the DTOE was found to have 17 significant correlations among the 27 reported (63%), which took into account all CBREC Items and the total CBREC rating. By stark contrast, the DTTM was found to have only six of 27 significant correlations (22%). Coupled with the fact the DTOE tended to have lower standard deviations on most items, it would seem that the directors in this sub-group were more stable in their ratings of the three works. As the DTOE are only selecting music for one ensemble, it may be easier for them to evaluate and select new concert band music with more certainty about how it will benefit and engage their students.

In considering the research questions of the study, it was important to note that within the DTOE sub-group correlations involving MC, FS, PU, and the total CBREC rating of all three works were all significant. While this is an important finding regarding the stability of the ratings among the DTOE, it is worth mention that MC and PU were among the top three most frequent comments to the first open-ended question. Similar to the findings with the Director Age Groups, Pedagogical Usefulness (PU) was found to have three significant low positive correlations among the DTOE. Additionally, MC was found to have three significant low positive correlations as well among the DTOE.

*Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast* (FS) may be an area that educators in the DTOE are able to examine with more attention than their colleagues in the DTTM. It is possible that directors in the DTOE were able to recognize formal structure or appreciate the balance and contrast within new concert band works during their initial review as they only needed to attend to evaluating music for one ensemble. In turn, this could have
potentially contributed to those directors rating FS in a similar manner. Additionally, directors in this sub-group may have also recognized important pedagogical points of these new works or noticed compelling melodic material with greater attention as they only had to consider one ensemble as opposed to multiple groups with varying strengths and weaknesses.

When a correlational analysis of the total CBREC rating of each work was conducted with several of the background variables, there were few prominent relationships that came forward from the analysis. Within the DTOE, none of the background variables were found to have any significant relationships with each other or the total CBREC rating of each work. The total CBREC rating for each the three works were found to have a significant positive correlation with each other. There would seem to be at least some similarity in how the DTOE rated these three works. As directors in this sub-group only evaluate music with one ensemble in mind, this could have been a contributing factor. However, the strength of the correlation would temper this observation regarding teachers in that situation.

The correlational analysis involving background variables and total CBREC rating of each of the three works among the DTTM produced few statistically significant findings. With the exception of the correlation between Director Age and Years Teaching, the correlations that were statistically significant fell into a weak range ($r < 0.30$), indicating there was a lack of a prominent relationship. The fact that directors in this sub-group are responsible for selecting repertoire for multiple ensembles and the interplay of other background variables and professional experience might have in some way contributed to lack of statistically significant data. That observation provides
additional perspective to the second research question of this study, and points to an area for future research.

Discussion of CBREC Items between Director Comment Groups

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, two additional sub-groups were identified on the basis of whether or not they completed responses to the open-ended questions. There were 48 directors who responded to at least one of the optional open-ended questions that were posed to participants after rating the three works. The background variables of the Comment Group \((n = 48)\) and Non-Comment Group \((n = 71)\) were found to be very similar, and the two groups compared very closely with the Director Age Groups previously reported in terms of the gender representation, educational background, and number of ensembles.

A closer examination of the individual \textit{CBREC} Items revealed that the \textit{Non-Comment Group} (NCG) rated all aspects higher than the \textit{Comment Group} (CG) with the exception of Pedagogical Usefulness \((PU)\) on the piece \textit{Elements}. The CG was found to have higher standard deviations on six of eight \textit{CBREC} Items on \textit{Rest}, and five of eight \textit{CBREC} Items on \textit{Elements}. The CG had the same standard deviation as the \textit{NCG} on Melodic Craftsmanship \((MC)\) and \textit{PU}, and had higher standard deviations on three of the remaining six \textit{CBREC} Items on \textit{Lux Aurumque}. The standard deviation for the total rating of each work by the CG was also higher than the NCG. This data could be a potential indication that participants who were willing to share expanded perspectives on repertoire selection took a more critical view – both positively and negatively -- of the three works during their evaluation process than those in the \textit{NCG}. 
Independent t-tests were performed to see if there were any significant differences between the two sub-groups on the 24 items and the three totals, and account for these differences should they exist. The CG and NCG were the only sub-groups that demonstrated any significant differences. Further, the independent t-tests conducted on the item and total ratings for Rest resulted in significant differences for two items plus the total. *Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV)* had the lowest mean score in both Director Comment Groups within Rest, and *Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)* had the second lowest within this sub-group. Additionally, the standard deviations for RV and L were higher among the *Comment Group*. This means the CG tended to have a wider spread of responses on items RV and L, indicating less agreement among the group.

The significant p value (<.05) provides an indication of the probability that the findings were not the result of chance. However, these findings may not indicate any real importance given the sample size and scope of the study. As only two items and the Total Rating of the piece Rest differed significantly (from the total of 24 items and three totals among all three works), it was determined that overall the Director Comment Groups do not differ. With this in mind, the discussion of specific CBREC Items between the two groups can begin.

The first CBREC item to discuss was *Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV)*. Within Rest, only RV was found to have a mean rating below four on a seven-point Likert scale, as the CG rating was inclined toward a level of disagree. The NCG rated this same CBREC Item on Rest at a moderate level close to that of neither agree nor disagree. The standard deviation for the CG indicated slightly more variability in the ratings of this group on this aspect of the piece. It would seem that the CG did not perceive this piece to
have enough rhythmic variety throughout which could explain why their rating on this aspect was unfavorable.

The second CBREC Item worth discussion among the two comment groups was that of *Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)*. The CG rating of *L* was the second lowest among all CBREC Items on both *Rest* and *Lux Aurumque*, and was the lowest on *Elements*. The rating of *L* on *Lux Aurumque* was closer to a level of disagree on a seven-point Likert scale, which is perhaps an indication that the CG questions the future use of this work. A cursory examination of the other CBREC items provides a possible reason for this rating by the CG. The MC and PU ratings were close to a level of neither agree nor disagree. As pointed out earlier in this discussion, these two items were specifically identified as the top two aspects examined by the CG when evaluating new concert band works. It is reasonable to expect that if these CBREC Items were not perceived to be strong aspects of a given piece of concert band music, their overall estimation of the *L* for the same piece will not be favorable.

The correlational analysis of the CBREC Item Ratings from the two director comment groups was reported in the previous chapter. Upon examination of both sub-groups, it was interesting to note that the CG was found to have 17 significant correlations among the 27 reported (63%), which took into consideration all CBREC Items and the Total Rating of the Work. Similar to the pattern seen in the other two sets of sub-groups, the NCG was found to have only five significant correlations among the twenty-seven (18%).

It was interesting to note that the NCG rated all CBREC Items higher across all three works than their counterparts in the CG. However when examining the standard
deviations of both groups, higher values were seen across many of the CBREC Items in the CG. This could be interpreted that there was less stability in the evaluation of the three pieces by the CG. However, this data could also point toward the idea that directors who were more comfortable expressing their viewpoints regarding new and emergent concert band literature rated those same pieces along more critical standards than the directors in the NCG. While there were several CBREC Items among the pieces that were not rated favorably by the CG, the overall ratings for each of the three pieces ranged from a moderate estimation of Lux Aurumque to a favorable evaluation of Elements.

A case can be made for Harmonic Language as being rated favorably by the CG group, given the mean value, standard deviation, and that all three correlations for HL were significant. Although the overall rating of this item was favorable, there were several directors in this group who did not share the same impression of the HL employed within the works. In the examination all CBREC Items, Melodic Craftsmanship (MC), Harmonic Language (HL), Timbre and Orchestration (TO), Pedagogical Usefulness (PU), and Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES) were each found to have two significant correlations within this group of directors. It is worth mention that MC, PU, and TO were the top three frequent comments in response to the first open-ended question. The Total Rating of all three works by the CG sub-group were significant, an indication of the stability of their ratings using the CBREC.

With regard to the NCG, the paucity of significant correlations among the 24 pairs and Total Ratings of the work is somewhat surprising. Although the CBREC Items were rated higher than the CG and had lower standard deviations, there were only five significant correlations. There were several CBREC Items across all three works in which
the mean value and standard deviation differed only slightly between the two groups. Still, the lack of significant correlations points to less stability in the ratings by the NCG, which might indicate that some directors in this study were not comfortable discussing aspects of new and emergent works in this setting. It is also plausible that some directors did not wish to contribute to this part of the study because it was optional.

A correlational analysis was conducted on the ratings of the CBREC Items and background variables of Director Age, Number of Ensembles, and Number of Pieces purchased for both Director Comment Groups. This analysis on the ratings for Rest provided by the CG would indicate that this group of Directors rated most CBREC Items in a similar manner, as evidenced by 20 of the correlations falling into a high positive range, and 12 correlations falling into a moderate positive range. Of primary interest to the goals of the study were two negative correlations discovered involving the CBREC Items and background variables.

A significant negative correlation was found to be present between MC and the Number of Pieces purchased on Rest. It is possible that this sub-group of directors was more discerning of melodic material, and this could potentially influence the number of pieces they will purchase. If a director perceives a high level of craftsmanship or compelling interest from the melodic material within a new concert band work, the data from this group lends some support to the idea that they will not purchase additional works for study with the ensembles that they instruct. However, this observation must be taken with caution as the other two works, Lux Aurumque and Elements, did not demonstrate a similar correlation between MC and the Number of Pieces purchased.
A second significant negative correlation was found between $L$ and the Number of Pieces purchased on Rest. While not a particularly strong finding in the study, it does provide a perspective worth mentioning as it relates to the goals of this study. It would seem that this sub-group of directors would be less likely to purchase a new piece of concert band music if they do not favorably estimate how it could be used in future settings for rehearsal or performance. Given the mission of the Phi Beta Mu International Band Fraternity and that it seeks to foster a deeper appreciation for quality wind band literature, this is a validation that this group of directors was discerning in its evaluation of this new literature for concert band.

The correlational analysis on the ratings for Rest for the NCG produced five significant negative correlations. While the strength of each individual correlation does not suggest any real relationship, the fact that all eight CBREC Items and the total rating of Rest were correlated negatively with Number of Ensembles bears mention. On average, directors in the NCG were responsible for teaching more ensembles than their counterparts in the CG. The NCG rated all CBREC Items higher than the CG and had lower standard deviations. This data was an indication on this particular work that the NCG was more stable in their ratings on this work. The NCG was not as stable across the other two works, which contributed to the lack of significant correlations between pieces. This finding lends some support to the idea that directors who are not confident in discussing aspects of repertoire do not evaluate those works consistently.

The correlational analysis of the CBREC Items and background variables on the ratings for Lux Aurumque provided by the CG produced a significant low positive relationship between Number of Ensembles and Harmonic Language (HL). A significant
strong positive correlation was found to exist between $HL$ and $PU$. As the rhythmic
demands of this work were less complex, directors in this sub-group may have viewed
this piece as valuable to raise awareness of harmonic language and progressions within
the ensemble setting.

Earlier in this discussion it was noted that the perception of $MC$ by participants in
this study could have had some bearing upon their estimation of other $CBREC$ Items.
Within the $CG$, $MC$ was found to share a strong positive relationship with both $Emotional$
Impact and Sensitivity ($ES$) and Longevity ($L$) across all three works. Additionally, $MC$
was found to have a strong positive correlation with the Total Rating of all three works in
this sub-group. This observation provides some insight into the importance of melodic
material in concert band music. Given the frequency of responses to the first open-ended
question that included aspects related to $MC$, it would seem this $CBREC$ Item is one of
primary importance.

Another important observation that came forward from the correlational analysis
was seen in both the $CG$ and $NCG$. The $CBREC$ Items $ES$ and $HL$ were found to have a
strong positive correlation across all three works in both groups. The interaction between
the $CBREC$ Items has been mentioned at various points within this discussion. Both
comment groups appeared to rate these items along a similar line within the study. It
would seem that the development of specific harmonic language and progressions may
have some influence on how a director will perceive the emotional impact a work seeks
to impart to the conductor, ensemble, and audience.

This discussion provides some additional perspective to better identify possible
relationship factors that exist between the aspects that directors value in their evaluation
and selection of new concert band music. With the analysis of these three sub-groups complete, these observations can be considered alongside data and observations that were discussed earlier in the chapter. In the following pages, data generated from responses to the open-ended questions will be used as the final lens to focus the important themes of the study. In addition, limitations of the research and future considerations as it applies to band directors in high school instrumental settings, composers and publishers, and future repertoire studies will be offered.

Important Themes Pertaining to the Research Questions

Within this section, a series of important themes relevant to answering each of the research questions set forward at the beginning of the study will be addressed through a synthesis of the main points of the discussion. The information collected in this study included important data and perspective that can be added to the body of research concerning repertoire selection. It is important to remember that while some answers have identified, there are still layers underneath each of these research questions that will require future studies to completely answer. The first research question has been restated to focus this part of the discussion.

1) What criteria do band directors consider important when evaluating new and emergent concert band pieces?

The first prominent theme was the importance of five CBREC Items to this group of directors. I reviewed numerous research studies and scholarly articles to formulate the CBREC. It was important that the items identified on this list were consistent with aspects of quality repertoire that have been identified in prior research and writing. The ratings of all eight items on the CBREC by the collegiate and university band directors revealed these Likert items to be reliable and consistent for the purposes of the study. If a
participant high school director favorably rated or identified one of the **CBREC** items in their comments, it essentially acknowledged they hold this aspect to be valuable during the process of evaluating new and emergent concert band works.

On the basis of the favorable ratings and responses to the open-ended questions, *Melodic Craftsmanship, Harmonic Language, Timbre and Orchestration, Emotional Impact and Sensitivity, and Pedagogical Usefulness* were identified as valuable to band directors as they evaluate new and emergent concert band works. Each of these items has various levels of importance to directors based upon their teaching context and experience. It would appear in some cases that these items do not exist in isolation from each other. Rather, some of the statistical correlations and open-ended comments imply a reasonable amount of interaction among these items during the evaluation process.

*Melodic Craftsmanship* appeared to be a primary aspect that directors evaluate and value within new concert band music. The mean values indicated favorable ratings existed among participants regarding the **MC** of the three works and that the melodic material would sustain interest. Additionally, the comments of the directors to the first open-ended question provided a stronger indication of the importance of the melodic material during the evaluation of a new concert band work.

Nearly 40% of the participant directors made reference to the importance of melodic material in their response to the open-ended questions. The open-ended comments offered by six of the directors centered on the idea that melodic material should be memorable for the conductor, the performer, and the audience. Director #7 shared a succinct question in his response to the first open-ended question when he asked “Does the melody have a strong presence and does it stay with you?”
Some of the directors who participated in the study were pointedly critical of the Harmonic Language (HL) employed based upon comments to the open-ended questions. Despite these comments, the statistical data suggests that overall it was imaginative, suitable, and sensitive for the work as a whole. Directors may view new and emergent concert band literature as valuable to expand the awareness of their ensemble to different kinds of harmonies and progressions.

The statistical data suggested a relatively favorable rating of HL. Although there were only seven comments offered that addressed this aspect, thoughts from several of the directors were very critical. Director #8 assessed the pieces as “…self-indulgent composers trying to dress the next emperor.” While HL was not mentioned frequently in the open-ended comments, these ideas, both critical and supportive, suggested that these directors hold this aspect to be important in the evaluation process of new and emergent concert band works.

Timbre and Orchestration (TO) would appear to be an item of importance to directors within this study. The data regarding TO would seem to reflect a favorable impression regarding the various timbres employed by each composer. Statistically, this group of directors seemed to appreciate the various colors and textures employed in each of the works used in the study.

The responses to the open-ended questions indicated TO was an area that directors had to carefully consider based upon the ensemble they teach. Instrumentation is a unique part of each concert band that ultimately varies from one school to the next, even within a single school that offers multiple instrumental ensembles. There were over 30 comments that made reference to the piece fitting a specific instrumentation, which is directly
related to how any concert band work has been orchestrated. Director #22, whose comments were shared in the previous chapter, identified TO as a crucial area that ultimately determines in some cases why or why not a director will choose a work.

The statistical data demonstrated a moderate to favorable estimation among the participants regarding the Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES) of the works used. There were, however, some challenges in gathering an accurate read if ES was important when evaluating a new concert band works. Some of the open-ended responses indicated there were directors who did not feel genuine emotional interactions within the pieces used in this study. Director #8 went as far as to say:

The snob appeal of this type of music does not travel far in the minds of the young or their parents. At best it sounds like original movie music of the mid-twentieth century… I am looking for hard-hitting music like The Witch and the Saint, for example.

The fact that there were strong opinions expressed and statistical data gravitated towards a favorable ES rating supports the idea that this aspect was important to directors in this study.

Pedagogical Usefulness (PU) was the final CBREC Item that received a favorable rating from participants in this study. The favorable rating of PU suggests there were musical aspects within each piece that could be employed for teaching broad concepts in the ensemble setting. It should be noted that PU was the second-most frequently mentioned concept to the first open-ended question and was tied for the most frequent comment to the third open-ended question. Beyond the statistical data, the references to the open-ended questions provided a strong case for PU being valued in new concert band music by directors in this study. Specifically, the comments of Director #27 on the
first open-ended question asked question as to how new concert band works would be used as a vehicle for teaching:

Is the piece in a realistic difficulty level? Will the students learn musical and non-musical things from performance of the piece? Can the musicians be expected to grow as a performer because of the piece? Can the audience connect with the piece?

It was interesting to analyze the ratings for Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use. There seemed to be fair amount of variability in how all participants rated the \( L \) of these three works. On the surface level there appeared to be some consideration by directors that these three works might one day be classified as core repertoire for concert bands. The relatively short time that these works have been available does make it difficult to forecast whether or not they will reach that status among directors. In response to the final open-ended question, Director #32, who had direct experience with all three works in the study, offered the following estimation of \( L \) stating:

Bands must give repeat performances of works that are deserving. I have done all three works in this study - popular right now, but this will not last. The melodic material must be strong and engaging - these works don't have it. The textures must be unique - the last piece has moments of that.

The comment above reinforces the idea that the estimation of \( L \) held by a director is influenced, both positively and negatively, by other aspects within the work. While the director above was critical of the \( MC \) in the three works, the comment indicated there were moments of \( TO \) that were appealing within \( Elements \). The interplay of other \( CBREC \) Items in the rehearsal and performance setting is very important in determining the \( L \) of an emerging work for concert band. This observation was echoed in the comments of Director #44 who shared:

It must be a memorable work. The composer must have created something that retains a timeless feel – that though you hear it for the first time or the fiftieth, it
retains a freshness and vigor that is unmatched. The interplay of the various musical elements separates the trivial works of our generation from the true gems.

Within the open-ended comments section, L was mentioned by just over 30% of the directors who responded to the first open-ended question. The final open-ended question asked participants what musical aspects specifically influenced a piece to be considered core or standard repertoire. Technical Merit and Artistic/Aesthetic Merit were identified by participants as the two leading themes for this question. Several specific comments illustrate this point, including Director #13 who stated “The piece has to leave a lasting impact through its aesthetic side, or through its technical side. If it can somehow do both, it will be long remembered and programmed by other bands.”

Both Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo (RV) and Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS) received mixed ratings on the three works by participants. While RV was rated very favorably on Elements, it was not rated as strong on either Lux Aurumque or Rest. It is possible that the degree of rhythmic activity, complexity, and variety contributed in some manner to the lower ratings on Lux Aurumque and Rest. Still, in response to the second open-ended question regarding the value of rehearsing and performing new and emergent concert band works, there were several interesting responses as it relates to RV. Director #4 stated that “Rhythms infuse lots of different styles,” and Director #15 shared that “Melodically and rhythmically, newer works are much more advanced which presents value to challenge students in that regard.”

Similar to RV, the ratings for FS indicated at best a moderate evaluation by participants, but not to the degree at which other items were rated. Comments connected to the aspect of FS were the least mentioned among responses to the first open-ended questions. It was interesting to recognize that although these pieces are considered new
and emergent works, two of the composers elected to cast their work in older musical forms which perhaps contributed to the ratings in both positive and negative ways. This decision by the composers did not go unnoticed by participant directors. Consider the response to the second open-ended question given by Director #22 who stated:

The value (in new and emergent works) is to see how they compare against the “masterworks”. I program one older masterwork per year. It’s nice to compare something from the core (repertoire) against something new. For instance, the third piece (Elements) seems to follow a classical symphony form of sorts – it would be neat to compare that against Second Suite in F (by Holst).

It has been important to arrive at a partial understanding of what directors consider to be important as they evaluate new concert band repertoire. The data collected from this group of directors reflected a wide range of teaching contexts and background experiences. Although there was diversity among the personal and professional background variables, there were only a few significant findings worth reporting in the various groups that were analyzed.

Directors groups were sorted by age, experience, number of ensembles, number of pieces, and whether or not they provided responses to the open-ended questions. The educational background and gender of participant directors were not conducive to subdividing into an appropriate size group for analysis. All three sub-groups added compelling data to the discussion that further contributed to the over-arching themes of the study. The second research question has been restated to focus this part of the discussion.

2) How does personal and professional background impact the perspectives of band directors regarding new and emergent works for concert band?

The statistical data suggests that some older directors within this study were willing to evaluate new concert band music along more critical positions than their
younger counterparts. Directors in this study with more years of experience may have an advantage of comparing new concert band music to previous familiarity with existing works of similar style, length, tonality, pedagogical aspects, emotional content, or programmatic elements. This background could have exuded either positive or negative influence upon the assessment of these emergent pieces for concert band within the study. The statistical data suggested that the sub-group of older directors rated the works along similar lines and exhibited more stability, which could be a product of their past experiences with other concert band works in their responsibilities as an educator.

*Longevity (L), Melodic Craftsmanship (MC), Timbre and Orchestration (TO), Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES) and Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)* were all items that were important to several of the sub-groups within the study. *L* was an area that older directors rated in a similar manner on two of the works used in the study. The consensus that this group reached on several *CBREC* Items may have influenced their overall estimation of *L* on *Rest, Lux Aurumque, and Elements*. Older directors also demonstrated attention to *PU* and *TO* in their evaluation of these works. By virtue of their teaching experience, this group may be able to discern important teaching aspects in new and emergent concert band works. Director #34, a participant from the older director group (*DG* > = 50), reinforced this idea sharing that he examined “Suitability for the ensemble and potential for musical growth among the student musicians.”

Additionally, older directors may have developed the ability to identify features within *TO* in a work that have direct application or importance to their ensemble during their evaluation process of new concert band music. Director #25, who was a participant
from the older director group \((DG \geq 50)\), touched upon both \(L\), \(TO\), and \(PU\) in the response offered to the first open-ended question:

Instrumentation, and the facility level that would be required to perform it. Solo opportunities, as well as the basic range for all instruments. The musical style of the work, as to how it fits in with the programming, as well as its educational value. The value of the work monetarily. Is it able to be programmed again in the future, or is it just currently popular?

*Longevity* \((L)\) also received consideration by the *Directors Teaching Only One Ensemble (DTOE)* sub-group. *Rest* and *Elements* were found to have a positive relationship on the *CBREC* Item \(L\) that was statistically significant. The *DTOE* reached a moderate to favorable rating on several *CBREC* Items, which could have contributed to the overall estimation of \(L\). Additionally, directors in the *DTOE* were more stable in their ratings of *Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)* and *Timbre and Orchestration (TO)*, and produced a moderate rating regarding *Melodic Craftsmanship (MC)* and *Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)*. The statistical data reinforced the theme that melodic material and the ability to use the music in rehearsal to develop skills in the ensemble and individual was important to this group of directors.

Comments like those shared by Director #21 in the previous chapter underscore the attention given to these two areas by educators in the *DTOE* Director Group. Further support to \(MC\) and \(PU\), and consideration of \(TO\), were echoed by Director #29 who stated “Of primary importance is the melodic line. I also consider if it is in the ability range of my students, and if we have the necessary instrumentation to play the piece with sincerity.” Sharing a similar viewpoint, Director #40 shared that he sought “tuneful melodies, appropriateness in instrumentation for my ensemble, ability to realize goals for the ensemble through study and performance” in new concert band works. A final
thought reinforcing the attention given to TO, MC, and PU by the DTOE sub-group was 
encapsulated in the comments of Director #13, who stated:

I examine the musical skill required by the score and compare that against the 
abilities of my students. The melodic and rhythmic material gives me a lot of 
information about if my group can develop the necessary skills while studying 
this music. I examine use of rhythm and ranges on instruments.

The DTOE rated all three works higher than the Directors Teaching Two or More 
Ensembles (DTTM), and had lower standard deviations on the majority of CBREC Items. 
The DTOE were found to have more significant correlations, which coupled with some of 
the other information presented, pointed towards more stability in their ratings of the 
three works. The fact directors in the DTOE only have to consider music for one 
ensemble would allow them to attend to the various aspects of a work with more attention 
and detail. Educators in the DTOE may have an advantage over the DTTM in the 
evaluation of new concert band music that best meet the needs of their students in this 
regard. This is not to say that directors in the DTTM are doing poorly in their choices for 
their ensembles. The fact that participants in the DTTM must consider additional music 
presents an additional challenge in their effort to plan for their ensembles each year.

The data indicated that some directors within the DTTM sub-group rated each of 
the three works along more extreme positions of agreement or disagreement. Given their 
teaching context, directors in the DTTM must evaluate more music than their counterparts 
in the DTOE. As directors in the DTTM seek multiple pieces that best meet the 
educational needs of their students, this process could influence them to be more critical 
of new concert band works. The added responsibility of selecting music for more than 
one ensemble may influence the level of discernment both positively and negatively 
exercised by directors during the evaluation process of selecting new music.
The CBREC identified eight important aspects to be considered in the evaluation of the music in the study. The statistical data, open-ended comments, the interplay of background variables, professional experience, and teaching contexts suggested some influence upon the ratings submitted by directors in the DTTM. There may be more factors and attitudes not identified within the scope of this study that contributed to a lack of significant findings among directors charged with the responsibility of selecting music for two or more ensembles.

Directors who elected to provide their views regarding repertoire selection involving new works for the concert band were more critical during the evaluation process. These educators who shared their opinion on the open-ended questions were found to have lower ratings and higher standard deviations across most CBREC Items. There appears to be some question regarding the Longevity (L) within the Comment Group (CG) of the works used in this study. The standard deviations were second highest among all CBREC Items in the CG, indicating there was less definitive agreement among these directors.

Across all three works, L was found to have a high positive significant relationship with the Melodic Craftsmanship (MC), Pedagogical Usefulness (PU), and Total Rating of the Work in the CG. Analysis conducted on the data from this sub-group reinforced the emerging theme that MC and PU are important to directors in the evaluation of new and emergent works. These two CBREC Items were the top two most frequent responses to the first open-ended question posed in the study. The significant negative correlation found between MC and the number of pieces purchased in the CG on Rest supports the importance of melodic material to directors within this sub-group.
The lack of significant correlations in the NCG between pieces provides some insight into this sub-group. Although they rated the works higher than their counterparts in the CG, the lower standard deviations suggest the directors in the NCG did not rate the works along such critical positions. Directors in the NCG may not have keen insight regarding the various aspects in each of the works. This lack of perception regarding aspects within these pieces may have deterred them from providing answers to the optional open-ended questions in the survey.

As the data was analyzed and discussed, it became obvious that repertoire selection regardless of whether it involved new works or existing works has been a multi-faceted process for many directors. Multiple relationships that exist between the CBREC Items were identified for the purposes of this study. Aspects unique to the context of the school in which a concert band is situated were also drawn out from the data. The third and final research question has been stated before concluding this part of the discussion.

3) What relationship factors exist between the various criteria identified as important by band directors and how do they compare?

One of the major themes as it relates to the final research question deals with the inter-connected fashion in which the CBREC Items were evaluated. It would seem that some directors in this study took multiple CBREC Items into consideration during the evaluation process of the three works. As they would evaluate other new pieces for concert band, these directors may value some items more than others depending upon their programming ideas and the needs of their students in the ensemble. The data generated from the CBREC ratings and the open-ended comments reinforced that directors are examining individual aspects of new works, but also recognized their interactions with other aspects.
The statistical data presented throughout the previous chapter and the discussion of the participants and various sub-groups in this chapter pointed towards the importance of *Melodic Craftsmanship (MC)*, *Timbre and Orchestration (TO)*, *Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)*, and *Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)* to directors as they evaluate new works for the concert band. Higher ratings among these aspects suggested some indication whether or not there would be agreement on *Longevity (L)* and the Total Rating of the Work. These aspects were frequently mentioned by directors who responded to the open-ended questions.

There were several instances where the perception by directors of certain *CBREC* Items may have both positively and negatively influenced the ratings of other items. The correlational analysis of the ratings of all three works by participants revealed six important relationships as it pertains to the final research question. *Melodic Craftsmanship (MC)* was found to have a high positive correlation with *Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)*, *Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)*, and *Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)* across all three works. A high positive correlation was found to exist between *Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)* and *Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast (FS)*. *Pedagogical Usefulness (PU)* was also found to share a high positive correlation with *Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)*. *Emotional Impact and Sensitivity (ES)* and *Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use (L)* across all three works.

Some of the responses to the open-ended questions provided a perspective that directors are considering multiple *CBREC* Items during the process of evaluating new works for the concert band. Issues related to *Timbre and Orchestration (TO)*, such as having all instrument parts covered or how the orchestration demands lined up with
available instrumentation, were mentioned by many of the respondents to the first open-ended question. Directors also expressed wanting to use the ensemble repertoire to develop musicianship in the students and the ensembles that they teach, which relates to Pedagogical Usefulness (PU). These comments seem to indicate there may never be a singular reason that directors select a particular piece of concert band music.

The implication here is that the relationships between the various CBREC Items are intertwined with the goals established by directors for their ensembles and students each year. A response to the first open-ended question posed to participants from Director #27 reinforced this implication. The response touched upon aspects of PU, realizing the long-term growth for students, and the L of the work stating:

Is the piece in a realistic difficulty level? Will the students learn musical and non-musical things from the performance of the piece? Can the musician be expected to grow as a performer because of the piece? Can the audience connect with the piece?

There are readily identifiable aspects in new concert band works that directors find to be valuable in the high school instrumental setting. When asked about the value of programming new concert band works, three primary themes emerged from the responses including Contrast/Balance in Programming, Evolution of the Medium, and Enhance Teaching/Expand Musical Concepts. The responses provided by directors indicated an acknowledgement of the core literature that has been established, but also a respectful willingness to seek out the best new repertoire available. Several directors acknowledged that new works provide balance and contrast to their programming choices, but others indicated it can be a challenge at times to find artistic works of emotional and pedagogical merit. Consider the comments of Director #7 who observed:
I choose very carefully - the best newer works are really stellar. They provide a contrast to traditional marches, folk song settings, and the classic band "overture". I wouldn't do any of the ones in this study - the first two meander and go nowhere, and the final selection's melodies are too short to be memorable.

The comments above were somewhat critical of the programming balance and melodic material offered by the works in the study. There were comments from directors that were both complimentary and critical of contemporary band composers who are producing new and emergent concert band works. Director #45 was openly critical of Rest and the ES within the work stating “Not everything Ticheli writes is a slam dunk piece for band – Rest is okay. The first two works (Rest and Lux Aurumque) attempted to be very lyrical and moving, but lacked some sincerity.” Director #15 assessed the third open-ended question regarding what aspects contribute to a new and emergent work moving into the core repertoire stating:

The melodies must be memorable, fresh, creative, and unique. This is why we remember the Chaconne from 1st suite. The harmonies must be logical, and complement the melody - Persichetti was great at this. Timbre and orchestration must extend existing usage and be creative without being contrived - this is what separates Alfred Reed from Robert W. Smith. This is why Boysen and Camphouse are exciting, and Curnow and Swearingen are not.

The comment above again reinforces the idea that there is a multi-faceted relationship between the L and the other CBREC Items of a given work. Comments from other directors gave specific examples of these relationships in the CBREC, such as ES and L. Director #14 addressed this important connection between the CBREC Items in response to the final open-ended question stating that:

People must be able to recognize the music and they must be emotionally connected to it. The surge of emotions connected to any style of music is important, and how a piece makes someone feel has a lot to do with its longevity. Band music is no different.
Other directors maintained a more receptive view of what new and emergent works can provide in terms of programming, and helping students understand how the medium has evolved. Responding to the second open-ended question, Director #14 specifically praised new and emergent concert band works as “they also provide extra-musical aspects that can help connect band with other parts of the curriculum and outside subjects.” Director #43 offered a similar and expanded line of thinking when he stated:

Some newer works are very unique and creative. Exploring this music can be refreshing for students to get away from the predictability of their pop music. Additionally the opportunity to have students connect to a living composer is a unique experience that helps them understand the piece better, which in turn helps them perform the piece better.

The idea that Longevity (L) would be influenced through the consideration and interaction of other CBREC Items was a recurring theme throughout the discussion of data. Director #25 was among those who gave attention to Melodic Craftsmanship (MC) stating that “standard literature has many songs with great melodies – I think that is the most important characteristic.” Another director who made a connection between MC, ES, and L of the piece was Director #24. He stated, “like all music that tends to be repeated, new literature must inspire emotions within the listener. It has to have a melody that the audience can leave humming.” While these two observations implied just a couple of CBREC Items influencing L, other directors acknowledged that there is a multi-faceted relationship that ultimately determines if a new and emergent concert band work will be considered part of the core repertoire.

The two most mentioned aspects that contribute to a piece moving into the core or standard repertoire from directors in the study were Technical Merit and Artistic/Aesthetic Merit. Three other aspects were mentioned by nearly one-third of the
directors who responded to the final open-ended question. These aspects included Appeal/Engagement Factor, List/Festival Programs/Conductor Attention, and Melody/Melodic Material. Several comments seemed to be intertwined expressing that a piece needs to raise musicianship skill and aesthetic awareness to distinguish itself from other works.

It would appear that some directors are seeking works that retain Emotional Impact and Sensitivity, yet provide Pedagogical Usefulness. Several comments from the participant directors to the third open-ended question illustrated this balance sought among new and emergent works for the concert band. Director #7 stated the following:

A piece must have artistic opportunity that heightens the intellect and emotions of the conductor, ensemble, and audience. It also must push the musicians to acquire useful musical skills. Finally, higher education conductors must learn this music and share it at festival honor bands. Making a contest list doesn't make a piece standard repertoire.

Director #11, in response to how a work becomes part of the core repertoire, offered a more aesthetic overview that touched upon the balance of emotional and pedagogical merit directors are seeking when he stated:

Standard repertoire are works that many people have found worth the time and effort required to prepare the piece. The musical rewards of the core repertoire are apparent and are considered to be important steps in the musical development of our students. At the highest level, these works touch the listener in ways that change their perceptions of life.

These comments to the final open-ended question seem to indicate that Technical Merit and Artistic/Aesthetic merit are important aspects of pieces considered to be core repertoire for bands. While one director went so far to specifically mention First Suite in E♭ for Military Band, many of the comments pointed to the importance of Melodic Craftsmanship, Pedagogical Usefulness, Emotional Impact and Sensitivity, and
Longevity, which, arguably are the qualities valued by directors in that famous work by Gustav Holst.

Limitations of the Present Study

Several areas of concern were identified that were not considered at the onset of the study. The first was related to the return rate on the survey. Phi Beta Mu has over 3,000 members on their roster that teach in an American school setting, yet only 840 directors had identified their teaching level within the database of the fraternity. While an acceptable level of high school directors in this population was reached and completed the survey, it would have been advantageous to secure more participation from the various chapters on a national level. There is a possibility that some educators were reassigned or changed positions that were not accounted for in the database of Phi Beta Mu. There also remains potential for the invitation being delivered to an email address that was no longer in use or valid.

Also related to overall participation, it would have been beneficial to be able to identify other sub-groups based upon personal and professional background variables. The participation by an additional number of female band directors would have permitted an analysis of the data in two gender groups. Traditionally, high school band director positions seemed to be filled more frequently with male candidates. A comparison of perceptions between male and female directors at the high school level regarding repertoire evaluation and selection would have added a valuable perspective to instrumental music education.

If more even representation from each of the Phi Beta Mu chapters could have been reached, it may have been possible to compare data from several sub-groups that
were based upon geographic regions. The added participation of several more members who had not yet earned an advanced degree beyond the Bachelor’s Degree would have also added an important layer to the discussion of the second research question.

It is possible that the limitation related to the return rate was compounded by a third concern that developed regarding the study. To effectively listen and analyze the concert band works used, and respond to the open-ended questions, the survey itself took approximately 20 minutes to complete. As my goal was to gather a national consensus of band directors regarding new and emergent works for the concert band, the use of web-based technology seemed the best possible solution to gather such data and perspective. It is certainly reasonable to expect that some directors in the survey population would consider this amount of time too extensive in which to invest their school and personal time. Depending upon the level of protection employed by a school district for their computer network, it is conceivable that some potential participants were not able to access the survey from their school due to a firewall restriction.

Although steps were taken to ensure anonymity of the participants, there may have been reluctance to share their perspective on repertoire selection in a national study. Other directors who chose not to participate may have been reluctant to rate the works in the study because they did not view their bands as having the ability level to perform these works. Additionally, it is possible that some directors who received survey invitations were reassigned to a different grade level by their district, and did not feel that they should contribute as they were no longer high school directors. While the sample size was adequate for the purposes of the study, it should not be assumed that the results of this study could be generalized to other similar populations.
Another limitation to the study that bears mention is the final decision to utilize the three works for the study. Through a careful process of selecting impartial educators to serve on the Repertoire Review Panel (RRP), this group arrived at a consensus for the three works through a statistical ranking process that were best representative of new and emergent concert band works. While the RRP identified three works that would be evaluated by participants in the study, it would not be surprising if three different experts in this area would have identified three completely different works from the list of top-selling pieces provided by J.W. Pepper. This could have impacted the length of the survey, and created a markedly different perception of the CBREC Items by the sample population of band directors.

Implications for High School Band Directors

Throughout the past sixty years, music educators in public school settings and in college and university positions have discussed, researched, and written articles regarding the topic of repertoire selection for school concert bands. There have been important criteria produced during this process that might be employed by directors when evaluating repertoire for their ensemble. The Concert Band Repertoire Evaluative Criteria (CBREC) was arrived at to help realize the goals of the current study, but based upon the results has practical application to help directors in their annual evaluations of concert band music. While I acknowledge that it may not be a criteria list that all directors will feel comfortable Using, there are several benefits to the CBREC.

One chief benefit of Using the CBREC during the evaluation of concert band works is that it identifies eight specific areas upon which directors might focus their attention. While repertoire and festival lists can provide a starting point, the idea of
picking from such a list with little or no review of specific musical aspects within the work could potentially be very ineffective for a director and their students. Additionally, while sample recordings or hearing a work at a festival or concert can initially contribute or influence a director to select that piece, a secondary level examination to analyze the material further is important. Within that secondary examination, directors must focus more specific attention to the various musical, pedagogical, and artistic demands called for by the ensemble that will perform the work.

If directors are going to commit the majority of the rehearsal time with their students over a two- to four-month period, it is important that these educators utilize some sort of criteria to validate their selections. The CBREC could prove to be beneficial to younger directors who do not have extensive experience in the area of repertoire selection. Directors who are selecting music for multiple ensembles of varying ability levels may find the CBREC useful in focusing their selections to ensure they are addressing important musical aspects, selecting pedagogically helpful material, and growing aesthetic and emotional awareness of the ensemble. Additionally by becoming more closely aware of these aspects, directors may find it easier to balance repertoire selections in terms of tonality, tempi, and expressive elements so that their students perform a diverse and effective repertoire.

Within this study, directors who shared their opinions regarding new and emergent wind band literature and older directors tended to be more stable in their ratings. Directors who are comfortable discussing repertoire should seek opportunities to do so through collaborative presentations at conferences and clinics, participate in on-line discussions, and provide objective presentations on repertoire selection to undergraduate
instrumental music educators. Younger directors who do not have as much experience selecting music for concert bands may benefit from use of the CBREC and discussing potential choices and aspects of works with older directors. The importance of scholarly dialogue between professionals when it comes to evaluating and selecting materials for the rehearsal can never be understated to directors who lack experience or are not as confident in making selections for their ensembles.

Implications for Composers and Music Publishers

Over the last thirty years, the music publishing industry has witnessed significant changes to the manner in which pieces are accepted for publication, the graded difficulty levels assigned to these works, and the method in which the works are made available for review. Many publishers have set certain guidelines regarding the technical aspects of a work so an appropriate graded difficulty level is assigned to the work. Additionally, while some music is still published as artistic works, others are intended for specific pedagogical use, aesthetic response, programmatic in nature, and even novelty pieces to elicit a strong reaction from the ensemble and audience.

Within this study, directors seem to value the melodic material, pedagogical effectiveness, timbre and orchestration, and the emotional impression that new and emergent concert band works provide. Timbre and orchestration seemed to be very important to directors in this study. Some of the comments provided by directors who responded to the open-ended questions indicated that orchestration is balanced against existing instrumentation, and in some cases will determine whether or not a director will choose a work. Still, composers work diligently to create unique moments in the texture of a work by varying the timbre so that different colors of the ensemble are featured or
the piece itself retains a distinct sound. For that reason, publishers must be aware that there is a fine balance that must be achieved in this area to produce works that are unique in sound without limiting the number of ensembles that can access and effectively recreate the intent of the composer through performance.

While some ensembles across the country are highly developed with ample resources, there are other programs that lack such advantages and do not have the same background and experience. As some of the directors in this study indicated, the development of musical skills in the individual and ensemble is important. Sometimes the new concert band music purchased by school districts becomes the method to realize those educational goals.

With that in mind, composers and publishers should consider the melodic material they are developing and publishing, respectively. They must also scrutinize whether the music affords opportunities to develop individual and ensemble skills. While this provides an important perspective for composers and publishers from one group of directors, additional research would need to be conducted to see whether or not other directors across the country value these same things from music publishers.

Implications for Future Repertoire Studies and Lists

This study benefited from nearly 40 years of research that was completed and compiled regarding the selection of repertoire. The various criteria lists and methods used to collect data provided an important starting point from which the current study could begin. The advancements in technology afforded this study to reach a national group of band directors at little cost to the researcher. While many repertoire studies have examined past programming of concert band works, this study was primarily concerned
with delineating what aspects of new and emergent concert band works band directors valued in the high school instrumental setting.

While understanding what influences directors as they select repertoire is important, gathering a deeper understanding of what aspects are valued by directors in ensemble music may prove to be just as equally essential. This study itself could in effect be replicated with the goal of gaining more participation on a national level. A secondary goal of such a study would be to gather more input from younger teachers, female band directors, and those directors teaching only one ensemble. A comparison of the criteria held to be valuable between older directors and their younger counterparts or between male and female directors could add considerable value to the repertoire discussion.

There have been few studies conducted regarding repertoire evaluations, selection and programming with directors at levels lower than high school. Another replication of this study with directors at the Junior High, Middle School, or Elementary levels might also prove to be valuable. A study of this kind might provide worthwhile insight for publishers to better understand what directors are seeking from repertoire used in ensemble rehearsals at lower grade levels. It may also be valuable to replicate this study involving directors in orchestral and choral setting. Discerning whether these music educators have similar views on what aspects are valuable during the process of new repertoire evaluation could provide an interesting snapshot of the three traditional ensembles in music education.

An examination of pieces published over a ten year period and how many times directors would choose to study and program such a work might prove to be an interesting study valuable to both educators with an interest in repertoire evaluation and
to music publishers and those scholars with an interest in repertoire. Although publishers and distributors of concert band music market various works based upon the appeal, educational value, or aesthetic content, it would be fair to state that not all works put into publication receive equal exposure during that process. Discovering why a specific group of concert band works has been receiving repeated performance and study may lead to previously undiscovered or unconsidered perspective regarding various attributes of those works to future ensembles.

It was interesting to note the differences between the ratings of the Ensemble Director Groups. A case-study might provide key insight into the selection and evaluation process of directors who are tasked with instructing multiple groups, and possibly illuminate other areas that influence repertoire selection that have not been previously been considered. A larger survey of directors teaching multiple ensembles that examines time allocated, resources used, and criteria employed for the selection of repertoire might also be of value.

Views on Repertoire Selection from a Director and Composer

As an educator, the evaluation and selection of repertoire is the most important task that I undertake over the course of an academic year. This responsibility of any high school band director requires specific awareness of what areas the students and ensembles have developed strength, and where they will need to improve and mature. If repertoire is the curriculum for the concert band, then the materials selected must be done so with great care for the well-being of the student musician.

As a composer, the process by which I have created pieces has provided me with interesting perspective in the area of repertoire selection. An analysis of the score
provides awareness into why the composer made some of the choices related to various musical aspects including melody, harmony, rhythm, expressive elements, and even insight into the pedagogical points of the work. The additional information has been useful to better prepare and plan for the ensembles that I instruct on a daily basis.

As a student researching this issue in which I am a contributor and consumer, I am situated in a unique position to grasp both sides of this topic. The perspectives presented by the participant directors through the statistical data and open-ended questions have been personally fascinating. The data in this study provided several important perceptions regarding the value of new and emergent concert band works and their place in high school instrumental settings.

The open-ended comments reinforced to me that this group of directors were very aware of what constituted core and traditional repertoire. The comments also revealed that many of these directors hold all concert band pieces, regardless of when they were written, to high standards in all aspects of the works. This group of directors has been committed to finding repertoire for their concert bands that contained strong artistic, emotional, and technical merit. They also indicated through various comments that the longevity of the new and emergent works, and the flexibility and variety they provide in programming has been important in their evaluation process.

Based upon data in this study and my own experience, the value in new and emergent concert band works for high school instrumental settings is realized in a number of different areas. First of all, by no means am I suggesting here to ignore the core and traditional repertoire that has previously been identified. The continual study of this literature and exposure to bands helps students realize their role in being a culture
bearer of the American Wind Band. However, to ensure that culture continues to advance and evolve, directors must carefully and thoughtfully evaluate new contributions with both artistic and educational perspectives in mind.

The artistry and aesthetic or emotional overtones of a work from the core and traditional repertoire has rarely been questioned by high school directors. The technical merit of works from the core and traditional repertoire has been readily acknowledged for the challenge and rigor it presents to young musicians. These aspects of the work have helped solidify it being included on such lists, and being recognized as important repertoire for study. These lists, as Heidl (1999) pointed out, have been helpful to many collegiate and university ensembles, as well as some advanced high schools.

However, not every high school may have developed the artistic and technical skills of their students, and a work from the core and traditional repertoire might not be ideally suitable (Carney, 2005) for that program. Directors in some situations need options for providing a quality musical experience through study of concert band music in the large instrumental ensemble. New and emergent concert band works provide that option for directors to find literature of artistic and educational quality. Through the study of that literature, the director, the ensemble, and the audience members have a quality experience through the eventual performance of the work.

Directors may have aspirations to perform the finest literature that has been associated with the core repertoire, but the artistic and/or technical skills of the ensemble may not be developed enough to effectively perform such a work. Music selected from new and emergent literature may provide a suitable option for directors to begin developing certain artistic and technical skills in a meaningful context. For example, in
lieu of exposing students to the rich, sentimental feeling expressed within *Irish Tune from County Derry* by Percy Grainger, a director may find his ensemble is better suited to realize the same concept in *Loch Lomond* by Frank Ticheli. The technical demands of *Suite of Old American Dances* by Robert R. Bennett may in fact be too advanced for a high school band. Yet, the same group might find *Songs of Old Kentucky* by Brant Karrick a moderate challenge that would serve as a means for developing technical skills within the players of the ensemble.

Another area in which new and emergent works have demonstrated their worth to high school instrumental settings is the programmatic elements and cross-curricular connections that can be made. While there have been pieces written since 1950 with such elements (*Music for Prague* by Karel Husa, *Elegy for a Young American* by Ronald Lo Presti, or *The Trail of Tears* by James Barnes), there has been increased emphasis on making cross-curricular connections within public school settings to better serve and enrich the academic lives of students. There has been a wealth of new and emergent works for concert band that have explored important cultural and historical events (*Appomattox* by James Hosay, *Grant Them Eternal Rest* by Andrew Boysen, *A Movement for Rosa* by Mark Camphouse) written over the past twenty years.

The favorable ratings given to many of the CBREC Items demonstrated the value of new and emergent concert band works to high school instrumental settings. Some of the directors in the study only used new works for sight-reading purposes or as a comparison against older works. Other directors identified that many of the traditional elements that have been present in the repertoire throughout the last 50 years have been expanded and enhanced in newer concert band works. As composers expand concepts
related to CBREC Items that incorporate new ideas and are creative and imaginative, both the director and the students encounter a new musical test. New and emergent concert band works present some challenges that, while unique and different, are as engaging and appealing as pieces found among the core and traditional repertoire.

There are additional areas that new and emergent concert band works have demonstrated their importance to the modern concert band setting. Different kinds of technology, including email, video-conference, and web-sites of composers, have provided directors and students a manner to connect with a living composer. Through this connection, deeper insight into the creative impetus that produced a work can be gained, and directors and students might recreate the intent of the composer more effectively. This connection to a living composer enriches the large instrumental ensemble experience for all who are involved.

Over time, many creative mediums evolve and advance to maintain their relevance and connection to contemporary society. Education at all levels goes through the process of reform as necessary to improve the quality of instruction delivered by teachers and received by students. It should come as no surprise that new and emergent concert band works are subject to this same development in both their artistic and educational aspects. Interestingly enough, these two aspects were identified by Gaines (1998) in his study regarding repertoire selection. Created by composers and used by educators, this music provides a compelling example that there is value to new and emergent concert band works that can be realized by directors and their students.
Thoughts on the Profession

Within band programs across the country, there are numerous aspects and duties that require the focused attention of directors in order for the large ensemble experience to be successful. While other subjects are accountable to address state mandated requirements, music, with some exceptions, remains outside such a rigid framework. Many music educators who direct ensembles are left to choose their own materials, and this includes the selection of repertoire. This leads me to reiterate that the selection of repertoire for the large ensemble is one of the most important responsibilities that band directors must undertake.

The review of literature reinforced to me there is a well-conceived notion regarding what pieces are considered to be among the core repertoire for the high school concert band and wind ensemble. Although it makes sense and I support drawing from such lists to select repertoire, I acknowledge that such a process may not in every instance be the most beneficial for students, the ensemble in which they play, and the director who instructs them. The school setting, the development of a sequential grade-school band program, the community expectations, the background and experience of the director, and the instrumentation of the ensemble are but a few variables that could impact how successful a band might be with a piece drawn from the core repertoire.

Some directors are tasked with developing the technical and artistic performance skills of their students within the instrumental setting. Each instrumental setting may not be ideal due to curricular, social, and economic conditions within that school setting, but it should be noted that this option keeps students involved in their school band program. For some band programs, the pressure of contests or festivals, and upcoming
performances may force many directors to teach executive skills through the study of ensemble literature. With those reasons in mind, evaluating and choosing literature that will nurture and sustain growth of student musicians becomes of paramount importance.

This era, the twenty-first century, in instrumental music education may be at an advantage when it comes to the evaluation and selection of repertoire. There are many new and emergent works available that explore a multitude of musical concepts, highlight different programmatic elements, and create unique aesthetic and artistic moments. These pieces of music are vast in quantity and, to some extent, quality as well. Quality will continue to be an elusive term and concept for the music education profession to address when it comes to the selection of materials for the classroom or rehearsal hall. The concept of quality, as it applies to repertoire, takes into account multi-dimensional characteristics that it encompasses which includes compositional craft, pedagogical value, and artistic and aesthetic dimensions.

A quality experience in an instrumental setting may be markedly different from school to school depending upon a number of different aspects, including the repertoire used. The unique context of the instrumental setting and background experience of the director must also be taken into consideration. Speaking directly to the background experience of these instrumental music educators, we cannot ignore that personal preference plays a role in the process of evaluating and selecting concert band repertoire. Directors may have personal inclinations and dispositions that influence their repertoire choices. These attitudes might not be able to be drawn out by the best efforts of research and professional dialogue regarding repertoire.
Some experts and scholars in the profession have been critical of the choices in repertoire made by directors suggesting that the selections lacked quality. It would be incorrect to assume, that in every case, the choices made by directors have been forced upon them by the publishing industry. There have been critical views taken in scholarly writing of the music publishing industry when it comes to repertoire they are making available to school bands. It cannot be discounted that the sales of the new concert band works the publishers are making available are very important to their financial security moving forward.

While financial gain is a primary motivation for the publishers, it would be fair to say that these companies are concerned with directors and their ensembles having a quality experience with the repertoire they provide. These publishers are committed to providing directors with many different repertoire choices from which to pull. Each year, new and emergent works are placed into production because each of the publishers recognize musical, pedagogical, or artistic aspects that would be useful to educators in school instrumental setting.

Some retailers of concert band music seek to distinguish new works with awards or promotions through advertising materials. Several publishers have sponsored reading sessions as part of clinic or conference events for instrumental music education. Many publishers now provide complete audio-recordings and score images on their web-sites as a resource for band directors. Recently, several publishers and retailers have used social media platforms, like Facebook and Twitter, to better connect with directors and share with them the new and emergent repertoire that is available.
It is difficult to forecast with certainty whether any of the three works used within this study will one day be considered part of the core repertoire for concert band and wind ensemble. Each of the composers, Frank Ticheli, Eric Whitacre, and Brian Balmages, have contributed many new works for concert bands over the past 15 years. While it could be argued these pieces are not their best works, various aspects of each of these pieces received favorable ratings by the Repertoire Review Panel, and participant directors reached a consensus regarding the value of certain CBREC Items in each work.

There are tender emotional overtones within Rest by Ticheli that some directors and ensembles would find moving, not unlike the sentiments at times expressed for works like the setting of Irish Tune from County Derry by Percy Grainger, Yorkshire Ballad by James Barnes, or Air for Band by Frank Erickson. There are aspects of Lux Aurumque that are reminiscent of the transcription of the Russian choral work Salvation Is Created arranged by Bruce Houseknecht. There have been a number of symphonies written for the concert band and wind ensemble over the years by composers such as Paul Hindemith, Vincent Persichetti, and John Barnes Chance. Though shorter in length than some of those works regarded as core repertoire, Elements by Brian Balmages offers a unique experience of the symphony form in a modern compositional style.

Is it possible for one of these new and emergent works to eventually supplant one of the aforementioned pieces considered to be among the core and traditional repertoire? The amount of exposure each work receives will be a contributing factor. Directors who have experience with one of the works used in the study and a similar work from the core repertoire may be in the best position to evaluate this possibility. While there were valuable aspects of each piece identified within the study, it would be premature to
designate any of these works as an instant classic to be included among other works considered to be core and traditional repertoire.

There is a wealth of core repertoire to which students deserve exposure to over the course of their school career. These works provide a window in which our students can see how the American Wind Band started. New and emergent concert band works also deserve exposure as well as they provide students a window in which they can visualize where the medium is headed. Furthermore, new and emergent pieces may provide an appropriate point of departure for directors to develop the artistic and technical abilities of their students so that they can one day perform a work from the core repertoire with clarity, conviction, and excellence.

Many directors attempt to balance styles, tonality, rhythms and meter, melodic content, and emotional overtones in the selection of a course of study for their ensembles each year. So too, a balance of new and emergent works alongside pieces from the core or traditional repertoire might be the most beneficial in instrumental settings. Directors and students can delineate a great deal from the experience that new and emergent concert band works provide, and that experience may be as meaningful as the study of a work from the core repertoire. There are proponents on both sides that could argue from either direction in favor of core repertoire over new and emergent works and vice versa as the most beneficial for high school instrumental settings. Still, I cannot envision a healthy learning atmosphere for young musicians that did not take into account the best materials from the entire span of the medium alongside the most current contributions.
Closing

The area of repertoire evaluation and selection will continue to be an important area for instrumental music education. As outlined in the research questions, I sought to provide some perspective on what aspects of new and emergent concert band works are valuable to band directors in high school instrumental settings. A small panel of experts on repertoire, a large panel of collegiate directors, and the ratings and opinions of 119 directors from across the country contributed to the findings of this study. The *Concert Band Repertoire Evaluative Criteria (CBREC)* was produced to help realize the goals of this study, and can also be used by directors as a guide in the evaluative process.

Several different aspects of new and emergent concert band works were identified as important to the group of directors in this study. The statistical data and open-ended comments of participants identified aspects of melodic material, pedagogical effectiveness, timbre and orchestration, and the emotional impression as important in the evaluation of new and emergent concert band works. The various sub-groups within this study revealed that older directors, directors teaching only one ensemble, and directors who shared their comments regarding the selection process were more stable in their ratings than their colleagues in other groups. This study provides some insight into the evaluation and selection process of new and emergent concert band works, but there are still areas related to this topic that further research, scholarly writing, and dialogue might provide additional understanding.

While the aspects identified as important to this group of educators is important to the body of research regarding repertoire, a different group of band directors might have produced a markedly different list. That being stated, this kind of study provides
important descriptive data from a group of knowledgeable band directors regarding a topic vital to the success of high school bands across the nation. New works for the school concert band will continue to be composed, and this small area will require directors to recurrently go through the process of evaluating and selecting from this ever-expanding repertoire. It is important that instrumental music education continue to reexamine certain questions over time so that this profession can maintain relevance and rigor as an academic subject.

Faculty in other academic areas, like science and math, promote their core knowledge and require their students to revisit important experiments and theories that have shaped their content area. Instrumental music education and the school concert band also have unique conceptual, technical, historical, and procedural knowledge that students must know. Many directors have made it a practice of revisiting the important compositions that have been completed within the past 60 years. As implications from new research are disseminated in any academic field and how those findings may be applied in a practical context, the exposure to new and emergent concert band works for students in an instrumental setting continues to advance the educational aspects and artistry of the music education profession.

With this in mind, directors in high school instrumental settings need to utilize some type of criteria to help plan their teaching and validate their selections of materials. Repertoire is the means by which many directors are able to engage their students to meet annual musical objectives and goals. Though repertoire selection is but one area of importance for band directors to consider in their teaching, it is important and will need
constant attention as new and emergent concert band works are evaluated for use in instrumental settings.
## APPENDIX A

### LIST OF CONCERT BAND MUSIC PUBLISHERS
DISTRIBUTED THROUGH J.W. PEPPER (2007-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher Name</th>
<th>Publisher Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activist Music</td>
<td>Hal Leonard Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred/Belwin Music Publishing</td>
<td>Heritage Music Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Publications Inc.</td>
<td>Imagine Music Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amstel Music</td>
<td>John Mackey/Osti Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangers Publishing Company</td>
<td>Lauren Keiser Music Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Holab Music</td>
<td>Lorenz Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS Music</td>
<td>Ludwig-Masters Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boosey &amp; Hawkes</td>
<td>Maestro &amp; Fox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. Barnhouse Company</td>
<td>Masters Music Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Alan/McClaren Productions</td>
<td>Manhattan Beach Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capo Tasto Music</td>
<td>Mary Erickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Fischer LLC.</td>
<td>Matrix Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curnow Music Press</td>
<td>Music Propria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daehn Publications</td>
<td>Neil A. Kjos Music Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehaske</td>
<td>Northeastern Music Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devmusic Company</td>
<td>Playintime Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editio Musica Budapest</td>
<td>Queenwood Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editions Bim</td>
<td>RBC Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Note Publications</td>
<td>Salvation Army Music Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward B. Marks Music</td>
<td>Schoener Custom Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJH Music Company, Inc.</td>
<td>Shawnee Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forte Publications</td>
<td>Smd Schott Music Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G &amp; M Brand International Music</td>
<td>Southern Music Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Schirmer, Inc.</td>
<td>Theodore Presser Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goeblin Music Publications</td>
<td>TRN Music Publishing Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mesa Music</td>
<td>Wingert-Jones Publications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

LIST OF INDEPENDENT CONCERT BAND MUSIC PUBLISHERS
NOT DISTRIBUTED THROUGH J.W. PEPPER (2007-2012)

Aldridge-Winterport Music Publishing
Bandworks Publications
Lovebird Music Publishers
Michael Daugherty (self-publishing composer)
Magnolia Music Publications
PDF Band Music Publishing Company
ROLM Music Publishing
Stormworks
Joseph Turrin (self-publishing composer)
Dana Wilson (self-publishing composer)
APPENDIX C

CBREC REVIEW EMAIL INVITATION

Dear ___________,

I hope that you are having a good summer, and that your year at Iowa went well. As a matter of introduction, I am a HS Band Director in Western Pennsylvania, and a doctoral candidate in music education at Kent State University. I am seeking some assistance with part of my dissertation, and am trying to branch out beyond my circle of contacts and colleagues so that I can get an objective response.

I am in the process of writing chapters one through three for my dissertation proposal defense this fall at Kent State University. I have developed a criteria list to which participants will respond using a Likert scale. I am going to examine the consensus of high school band directors regarding various aspects of new and emergent works for the school concert band.

To ensure that there is a desirable level of agreement regarding the favorability of the Likert items I have constructed, it is necessary to have it evaluated by an independent committee. I write to you today to inquire if you would be willing to serve on the criteria review panel for this study. I have set a goal of having the Likert scale evaluated by at least 30 collegiate and university directors.

If you can be of assistance, please click on the included link at the bottom of this email. It will take you to an on-line survey where you will rate the criteria. The survey should require approximately 5 to 10 minutes of your time. If you do not wish to participate, I understand and it is not an issue. Thank you for your time, and have a good day.

Sincerely,
Travis J. Weller
Kent State Doctoral Candidate

Link to on-line survey:
<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/viewform?formkey=dG15czFjT1QyZVhrd0g1UldFUjhQZmc6MQ>
APPENDIX D

CBREC REVIEW ON-LINE SCREEN SHOT

Review of the Concert Band Repertoire Evaluation Criteria (CBREC)

For this study at Kent State University, the researcher has constructed the following criteria list that will be utilized by high school directors in a perception study. To ensure that there is a desirable level of agreement regarding the favorability of the Likert items constructed, it is necessary to have each item evaluated by an independent committee. A group of college/university directors has been contacted to complete this portion of the study. Please indicate your evaluation of each CBREC item by clicking the circle that best represents your rating.

1) Melodic Craftsmanship, Ideas, and Materials
The composition displays expert craftsmanship and clearly conceived ideas in the melodic material, inclusive of counter-melodies, and the melodic material is genuine, original, and able to hold interest without being repetitious.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Unfavorable to the Concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Harmonic Language & Harmonic Progressions
The composition utilizes an imaginative harmonic language suitable to the style of the piece, and the harmonic language demonstrates balance, direction, and sensibility in its progressions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Unfavorable to the Concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Rhythmic Vitality & Tempo
The composition displays rhythmic vitality and variety throughout, and the use of tempi reflect sensitivity to the interaction with other musical elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Unfavorable to the Concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Timbre and Orchestration
The composition displays balance, contrast, and variety among the elements of timbre and texture utilizing traditional orchestration techniques while incorporating contemporary methods.
5) **Formal Structure & Balance/Contrast**
The composition reveals a well-conceived formal structure that is consistent, and utilizes balance, contrast, and unpredictability in its performance to avoid moving into trivial, useless, or incompatible musical ideas or sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Unfavorable to the Concept</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) **Pedagogical Usefulness to the Individual & the Ensemble**
The composition encourages the development of musical skills of both the individual and the ensemble within the restrictions associated within the difficulty level assigned, taking into account technical, historical, theoretical, cultural and pedagogical aspects of music, and aligns with ensemble experience level, required instrumentation, and available rehearsal time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Unfavorable to the Concept</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) **Emotional Impact & Sensitivity**
The composition demonstrates an emotional impact that is recognizable, genuine, inspirational, imaginative, and not pretentious or insensitive in its interactions with other musical elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Unfavorable to the Concept</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) **Longevity & Promise for Repeated Performances**
The composition displays promise to earn repeated study and performance in the future because of its pedagogical usefulness, aesthetic sensitivity, and unique musical experience it adds created through the interaction of other musical elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Unfavorable to the Concept</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

TOP SELLING NEW AND EMERGENT ORIGINAL BAND WORKS AT GRADE III, IV, & V LEVEL BASED UPON SALES THROUGH J.W. PEPPER (2009-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPALACHIAN MORNING</td>
<td>Robert Sheldon</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELEBRATION AND SONG</td>
<td>Robert Sheldon</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL MASS</td>
<td>Todd Stalter</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUNDRY</td>
<td>John Mackey</td>
<td>Osti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEMENTS</td>
<td>Brian Balmages</td>
<td>FJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX AURUMQUE</td>
<td>Eric Whitacre</td>
<td>Hal Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUR YESTERDAYS LENGTHEN LIKE SHADOWS</td>
<td>Sam Hazo</td>
<td>Hal Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>Frank Ticheli</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAL LULLABY</td>
<td>Eric Whitacre</td>
<td>Hal Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARABESQUE</td>
<td>Sam Hazo</td>
<td>Hal Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAZIL CEREMONY SONG AND SAMBA</td>
<td>Robert W. Smith</td>
<td>Barnhouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F
REQUEST TO CONDUCT RESEARCH WITH MEMBERS OF PHI BETA MU

To: [Name], International President of Phi Beta Mu
    [Name], International Executive Secretary of Phi Beta Mu

Date: Monday, June 4, 2012

Hello [Name] and [Name].

I hope both of you are doing well. I write to you today to inquire about the possibility of conducting research with the membership of Phi Beta Mu International.

My dissertation proposal involves gathering perceptions of high school band directors of new works for concert band. The proposal targets band directors who are actively conducting at least one ensemble composed of students in grades nine through twelve.

The research would be strictly voluntary on the part of the membership, and there is complete anonymity for all participants. The survey itself will be on-line for participants to access. Basic demographic information will be collected (i.e. year in teaching, number of ensembles they direct). Participants will view a score image and listen to an audio recording of 3 new works for the concert band. Members will then evaluate 8 aspects of each work using a Likert scale.

I would compose an invitation email with a link to the active survey. My request would be that the email I provide would be sent out by the Phi Beta Mu International webmaster to the members who are active high school band directors. To alleviate concerns about the access to the membership database, I believe having the invitation to participate sent by the webmaster with the approval of the executive board would be in the best interest of all parties.

Please let me know at your earliest convenience if you decide this request is possible. Thank you for your time, and I wish both of you a restful summer.

Sincerely,
Travis J. Weller
Phi Beta Mu, Nu Chapter
APPENDIX G

APPROVAL FROM PHI BETA MU TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

To:  

CC: 

Date:  Monday, August 20, 2012

Hello Travis,

I am writing to update you regarding your request to conduct research. Thank you for your patience as it took a little time to connect with all members of our executive board and gather their feedback.

We have agreed unanimously to approve your request. We also appreciate your willingness to let the email be delivered by a third party to protect you as the researcher and to protect our membership. David did make us aware that there may be errors in the membership database (i.e. incorrect emails, educators now reassigned to different positions in the district in which they teach), so please be aware that some of the invitations may not reach the high school directors you are specifically targeting.

, our website administrator, will be sending the email on your behalf. When you have approval of Kent State University, please forward your email invitation to and he can assist you from there. We have several mass communications to send during the fall in preparation for our annual meeting at the Midwest Clinic. We will include a reminder about the research opportunity so hopefully you gain adequate participation.

Again, thank you for your patience. This is an exciting opportunity for our brothers and sisters. We look forward to hearing about your research in the future!

Best Wishes,


Phi Beta Mu, International President
November 1, 2012

Dear Brothers and Sisters of Phi Beta Mu,

The purpose of this email is to invite you to participate in a research project, which has been undertaken in partial fulfillment of degree requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy in Music Education at Kent State University. It will focus on a national sample of high school band directors and their perceptions of various aspects of new works for the high school concert band. The study is entitled "Perspectives on emergent wind band literature: Understanding the views of band directors in high school instrumental settings". This research study will examine high school band directors who direct at least one concert band comprised of students in grades nine through twelve. The purpose of this study is to a) discover if there is a consensus among directors in their evaluation of various aspects of new and emergent concert band works, and b) examine if director experience and educational background has any influence on the evaluation of concert band music.

Repertoire evaluation and selection is a responsibility shared by many directors across the United States. For this reason, it would be advantageous to gain as accurate of a national perception as to the value of new and emergent works. As a member of Phi Beta Mu International Band Fraternity, we are charged with responsibility of promoting bands, nurturing a meaningful appreciation for quality wind band literature, and encourage widespread interest in band performance. For these two reasons, I sought permission from the Phi Beta Mu Executive Board to invite you to contribute to this study.

Participants will be asked to submit basic demographic information related to age, teaching experience, educational background, and teaching situation. The second part of the study requests participants to rate their familiarity with three new and emergent works for the concert band. During the third part of the study, participants will listen to an audio recording and view a score image of each work. When that is completed, participants will utilize a criteria list to evaluate various characteristics of the three works. The final part of the study poses three open-ended questions to participants to expand upon their perspectives regarding new works for concert band.

This study will also seek to simulate conditions of evaluating and selecting music in an on-line setting by viewing a score image while listening to an audio recording. You may wish to make use of headphones during the listening of the three pieces, but regardless you will need some form of audio playback as you evaluate the works. I expect that this study will take you twenty to twenty-five minutes to complete. All information will be collected on-line through the use of a Google Docs Survey.

After completing the survey, information and data that is provided by participants will only be identified by a time stamp and will be compiled in aggregate data. The resulting data generated will be compiled, analyzed using a combination of appropriate statistical tests, and reported in aggregate form only. There is no compensation offered for participation. Results of this study will be available after the study is complete, and you may request to have a synopsis sent to via email at the conclusion of the study. If you have any questions about this research protocol, please contact me at (724)748-5584, my
advisor, Dr. Craig Resta at (330)672-4803. If you have further questions, or if you wish to lodge a complaint or concern, you may contact the Kent State University Institutional Review Board, at (330) 672-2704.

Thank you for your time and consideration today regarding this study. In advance, I appreciate your generosity and willingness to contribute to our profession through research and I hope that you find the experience valuable. The link at the bottom of this email will take you to the introductory page of the study. Best wishes to you through the rest of the school year.

Sincerely,

Travis J. Weller
Kent State University, Doctoral Candidate
Phi Beta Mu, Nu Chapter

Link to survey:
APPENDIX I

CONCERT BAND REPERTOIRE EVALUATION CRITERIA (CBREC)

1) *Melodic Craftsmanship* – The composition displays expert craftsmanship and clearly conceived ideas in the melodic material. This includes presence of counter-melodies, and melodic material that is genuine, original, and able to hold interest without being repetitious.

2) *Harmonic Language* – The composition utilizes an imaginative harmonic language suitable to the style of the piece. The harmonic language demonstrates balance, direction, and sensitivity in its progressions.

3) *Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo* – The composition displays rhythmic vitality and variety throughout. The use of tempo and meter reflects sensitivity to the interaction of rhythm with other musical elements.

4) *Timbre and Orchestration* – The composition displays balance, contrast, and variety among the elements of timbre and texture. It utilizes traditional orchestration techniques while incorporating contemporary methods.

5) *Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast* – The composition reveals a well-conceived formal structure that is consistent, and utilizes balance and contrast of other elements. The composition demonstrates growth throughout the various sections so it avoids moving into trivial, useless, or incompatible musical ideas.

6) *Pedagogical Usefulness* – The composition encourages the development of musical skills of both the individual and the ensemble within the restrictions associated at the graded difficulty level to which it is assigned. The composition takes into account historical, theoretical, cultural and technical aspects of music.

7) *Emotional Impact and Sensitivity* – The composition demonstrates an emotional impact that is recognizable, genuine, inspirational, and imaginative. The composition is sincere and sensitive in its interactions with other musical elements.

8) *Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use* – The composition displays promise to earn repeated study and performance in the future because of its pedagogical usefulness, and aesthetic sensitivity. The composition creates a unique musical experience through the interaction and growth of the various musical elements present.
APPENDIX J

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY IRB APPROVAL TO CONDUCT RESEARCH


I am pleased to inform you that the Kent State University Institutional Review Board has reviewed and approved your Application for Approval to Use Human Research Participants as Level I/Exempt research. This application was approved on July 16, 2012. Your research project involves minimal risk to human subjects and meets the criteria for the following category of exemption under federal regulations:

Exemption 2: Research involving the use of educational tests, surveys, interviews, or observation of public behavior.

***Submission of annual review reports is not required for Level 1/Exempt projects.

If any modifications are made in research design, methodology, or procedures that increase the risks to subjects or includes activities that do not fall within the approved exemption category, those modifications must be submitted to and approved by the IRB before implementation. Please contact the IRB administrator to discuss the changes and whether a new application must be submitted. It is important for you to also keep an unstamped text copy (i.e., Microsoft Word version) of your consent form for subsequent submissions.

Kent State University has a Federal Wide Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP); FWA Number 00001853.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me by phone at 330-672-2704 or by email at Pwashko@kent.edu.
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL TO USE HUMAN RESEARCH SUBJECTS

Move through this document using TAB or mouse. DO NOT USE THE ENTER KEY. Please type all information.
HANDWRITTEN FORMS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED. To check a box, double-click in the box.
Submit completed form with signatures and all required attachments to the IRB REVIEWER associated with your Department or College, or to: Office of Research Safety and Compliance, Research and Graduate Studies, 224 Cartwright Hall, Phone: 330-672-3704.
PROJECT TITLE: PERSPECTIVES ON EMERGENT WIND BAND LITERATURE/UNDERSTANDING THE VIEWS OF BAND DIRECTORS IN HIGH SCHOOL INSTRUMENTAL SETTINGS

Principal Investigator:
Name: Travis J. Weller
Address: 
Phone: 
Status: 
☑ Faculty
☐ Doctoral Student
☐ Graduate Student
☐ Undergraduate Student
☐ Other: (Specify: )

Project:
☐ Faculty Research
☐ Student Dissertation
☐ Student Thesis
☑ Course Requirement: (Course #: )
☐ Other: (Specify: )

KSU Faculty Co-Investigator(s): (Use additional sheets if necessary)
Name: 
Address: 
Phone: 
Status: 
☐ Faculty
☐ Doctoral Student
☐ Graduate Student
☐ Undergraduate Student
☐ Other: (Specify: )

Faculty Advisor: (If PI is a student)
Name: Dr. Craig Dosta
Phone: 330-672-4803
Email: cresta@kent.edu

Protocol Funding: ☐ Not-applicable ☐ Funding ☐ Awarded ☐ Federal ☐ Yes ☐ No
Funding Agency: 
KSU Sponsored Programs File Number: 

Estimated Project Duration: Starting Date: 
(But not before approval is obtained) Ending Date: 

IRB Reviewer Determination
☐ Level I – Exempt, Category
☐ Level II – Expedited, Category
☐ Level III – Full Board review
☐ Disapproved

Primary Reviewer 
Date
Secondary Reviewer 
Date

IRB Administration Action
☐ Approved Level I – Exempt, Category
☐ Approved Level II – Expedited, Category

Administrator, IRB 
Date
Chair, IRB 
Date

Full Board Review Action 
☐ Approved 
☐ Contingent Approval 
☐ Tabbed 
☐ Disapproved 
☐ Contingencies Met 
Date:

AGENDA Item
Correspondence
☐ E-mail approval
☐ Date
☐ E-mail notice of annual review
☐ Date
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Form Version: 07/29/10
Part I: Please answer the following questions by checking the correct response.

☐ Yes ☐ No 1. Will participants be identifiable to anyone other than the researchers through records, responses, or identifiers linked to the participants?

☐ Yes ☐ No 2. Could participants be at risk of criminal or civil liability, damage to employability or to financial standing, or undue embarrassment, if responses became known outside this research project?

☐ Yes ☐ No 3. Does research deal with sensitive aspects of participants' behavior, such as illegal conduct, drug use, sexual behavior, use of alcohol, or potential harm to self or others?

☐ Yes ☐ No 4. Does research involve the study of existing data? (If yes, please specify.)
   ☐ Documents, archives, and/or records ☐ Biological specimens
   4.a. Is the database, archives, or record collection publicly available? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   4.b. Are the subjects who provided the data individually identifiable? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   4.c. Will any identifying information that may link your data to individuals be included in your research record? ☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ Yes ☐ No 5. Does the research involve audio, video, digital, or image recordings of participants? (If yes, please specify.)
   ☐ Taped ☐ Audio-taped ☐ Photographed ☐ Other: (Specify: )

☐ Yes ☐ N/A 6. Are participants free to withdraw at any time without penalty?

☐ Yes ☐ No 7. Is there deception of participants? (If so, answer questions in Part VII, #35-44)

☐ Yes ☐ No 8. Does the research deal with participants under the age of 10?

☐ Yes ☐ No 9. Will identifiable medical information be collected?

10. Does the research deal with any of the following vulnerable populations:
   ☐ Yes ☐ No Legally incompetent adults ☐ Yes ☐ No Traumatised or Comatose
   ☐ Yes ☐ No Cognitively/Mentally Impaired ☐ Yes ☐ No Economically Disadvantaged
   ☐ Yes ☐ No Physically challenged ☐ Yes ☐ No Terminally Ill
   ☐ Yes ☐ No Pregnant women ☐ Yes ☐ No Prisoners

11. Does the project involve: (If yes, also answer question #20 on page 4).
   ☐ Yes ☐ No Administering drugs ☐ Yes ☐ No Medical devices
   ☐ Yes ☐ No Administering alcohol ☐ Yes ☐ No Invasive procedures
   ☐ Yes ☐ No Administering nutritional supplements ☐ Yes ☐ No Drawing blood
   ☐ Yes ☐ No Taking tissue samples ☐ Yes ☐ No Giving injections

12. Are you collecting any portion of your data on-line? ☐ Yes ☐ No

13. Are you requesting a waiver of any elements of the consent process? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   (If yes, answer questions in Part VIII, #43-44.)
Part II: Summary of Research

14.) Describe the purpose and significance of the proposed research, include sufficient background information and the specific objectives of the study. Summarize the major hypotheses. (Use non-technical language that can be understood by someone outside the discipline.)

The purpose of this study will be to gather the consensus of directors/music educators regarding various aspects of new and emergent works for the school concert band. The study will also seek to discover if relationships between the various aspects of new and emergent works exist among participants. Finally, it will seek to discover the impact of educational background and professional experience has on the perceptions of participants.

15.) Describe the study design, research methods and procedures. (Please append copies of the consent form and all measures, including interview questions and self-report questionnaires, to this form.) What are the qualifications of the individual(s) who will be collecting the data?

The researcher has developed a criteria list identifying eight aspects of concert band music from a review of scholarly literature in the subject. This criteria list will be utilized by participants in the second step of the proposed research. Prior to use by participants, an independent panel of collegiate and university band directors will evaluate the favorability of the criteria list. Because this is a new evaluation tool, it will be necessary to evaluate the reliability of such an instrument for use in this study.

Band directors belonging to an international band fraternity will be invited to participate in an online survey. The first step of the survey will collect basic demographic information from the participants. Within the second part of the survey, the participants will be asked to categorize their familiarity with the three pieces of concert band music that will be examined in the third step. In the third step of the survey, participants will evaluate 3 pieces of music for the school concert band by responding to the criteria list referenced above. To ascertain the best possible reliability, a 7-point Likert scale will be employed for this research. The final stage of the survey will give the participants an option of completing three open-ended questions in sharing additional information regarding new and emergent works for the school concert band.

The primary investigator is a philosophical doctoral candidate in music education and is completing this research as part of his dissertation.

Part III: Research Participants

16.) Briefly describe the characteristics of your population(s). Describe the ethnic background, sex, age, state of health, and the criteria for inclusion or exclusion of participants. (Include rationale for use of special classes of participants such as pregnant women, children, institutionalized mentally disabled, prisoners, or those whose ability to give voluntary informed consent may be in question.) If your population is all one gender or ethnic group, please explain.

The population will consist of high school band directors who hold membership in an international band fraternity (Phi Beta Mu). It is expected that the population will be made up of men and women between the ages of 25 and 60 years old. The mission statement of the fraternity identifies it as an ideal group to complete this survey research.

17.) Indicate the anticipated sample size.

The anticipated sample size is 200 high school band directors.

18.) Explain the recruitment process. State how potential participants will be identified and who will make the initial contact. Explain how you will ensure that recruitment and selection of participants is equitable. (Please include all recruitment materials, including scripts, flyers, and advertisements as attachments to this form.)

The international band fraternity named above will assist with the recruitment process by providing email access to the membership email directory. Participants (members of the fraternity) will receive an email scripted by the researcher and sent by a third party (fraternity's webmaster) that invites them to participate in the survey. The survey invitation will emphasize they will only be identified by a time stamp when they complete the survey.

Part IV: Risks/Benefits

19.) Identify any expected or potential risks or discomforts (including physical, psychological, social, or legal) to which participants may be exposed as a result of participation in the research project (beyond those encountered in everyday life).

Minimal risk to participants as this is survey research regarding high school band director perceptions of new concert band music.

a.) What safeguards will you use to protect the participants from these risks, as well as to protect their rights, welfare, and privacy? (Must provide a response; never answer "N/A").
Participants will only be identified by a time stamp after completing the survey. Standard background information of age, gender, educational experience, years of teaching, and state in which the participant teaches will be linked to a time stamp. Participants will not be asked for their name.

20.) Describe the anticipated benefits to individual subjects and to society expected to be gained from this project. (This should include any direct benefits to the participants as well as any generalized gain in knowledge. If there are not direct benefits to individual subjects, state that.)

Among the chief benefits to the profession will be to measure the consensus of director perceptions of new concert band music, and how background factors might also have on these perceptions. This research might also provide information to music publishers regarding directors utilizing on-line resources to evaluate new music for the school concert band.

21.) Describe the qualifications of the person administering drugs, alcohol, or nutritional supplements, or drawing blood, taking tissue samples, or giving injections. Please note:
   i. Persons doing venipuncture must provide a copy of their certification to draw blood and proof that they completed a blood-borne pathogens training course.
   ii. Retrograding venous catheters and lines can only be inserted and accessed by licensed/registered/certified medical personnel such as physicians, RNs, and EMTs. Proof of certification is required.
   iii. Arterial blood sampling can only be carried out in an appropriate medical facility such as a hospital, clinic, or the HSU Health Center. The procedure can only be carried out by qualified personnel under the direct supervision of a licensed physician.

22.) Describe any form of compensation to participants. (i.e., money, extra credit, etc. If money, extra credit, or grade is given to students who participate in the project, what opportunity for extra credit or grade is provided to students who choose not to participate?)

Please note:
   a. If the research participation affects the course grade (e.g., extra credit), then alternative opportunity for course credit is needed.
   b. For multi-phase projects, compensation should not be contingent upon completion of the whole project. Rather, some compensation should be given for each phase of the project. The nature of the compensation should be stated in the consent form.

There is no compensation offered.

23.) Research participants will be informed of the risks and benefits through:
   ☐ Consent form (Include with application)
   ☐ Verbal Script (Include with application)
   ☐ Parental Consent form for parents/guardians (required for children 18 of age and younger)
   ☐ Assent form (In addition to Parental Consent form for children 12 years of age and younger)

Part V: Informed Consent (You must include a copy of the informed consent document with application materials.
Visit the IRB website for more information about informed consent documents)

24.) Describe the consent process. Explain when and where consent will be obtained and identify who will be obtaining informed consent.

Because the research involves adults and minimal risk in an on-line survey, the initial screen of the survey will explain survey to participants. Completion of the survey will imply consent.

25.) If you will be using children under 18, explain in detail how you will obtain parental consent and assent (for children under 12) or consent (for children 12 to 18). If assent/consent will be obtained orally, supply a script of what you will say and how you will give the children the opportunity to agree to participate or decline.

26.) Explain how the possibility of coercion or undue influence will be minimized in the consent process (e.g., if employer is approaching employees, instructors are approaching students, physicians are approaching patients, if compensation is involved, etc.).

Part VI: Privacy and Confidentiality of Records
27.) Will this study use or disclose protected health information from a covered entity (a covered entity is a Doctor, Clinic, Dentist, Pharmacy, Health Clinic etc... that sends transactions electronically) as defined in the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)?

☐ Not Applicable
☐ Applicant will use an HIPAA Authorization (specify type below)
☐ Form provided by covered entity
☐ Form created by applicant
☐ Applicant requests IRB waiver of Authorization

28.) Where will the signed consent forms be kept? (Consent forms must be kept in a secured location on campus, not in a private home or office.) If the study does not involve consent forms, answer "N/A".

N/A

29.) Describe specifically how you will maintain the confidentiality of the data. The data collection instrument will only register participants with a time stamp. No names will be requested in the participant background information.

30.) How will the data/results of the research be disseminated?

☐ Thesis
☐ Dissertation
☐ Public presentation
☐ Other: Specify

31.) How will the data be stored after study completion? Please be specific as to the retention or destruction of audio/video data or cell phones.

Data will be kept on the researcher's personal computer.

32.) a) If the participants' personal files (school, medical, etc.) will be read, where are the files kept (name the place e.g. doctor's office, hospital, clinic, etc.) and who will gather the information?

N/A

b) Has permission been obtained to gather this information? (Attach documentation)

N/A
c) Do the participants (and/or their parents or guardians) know that these files will be read? If no, explain.

N/A

33.) a) Will individual results or other data be disseminated to the participants (and/or their parents or guardians)?

At the conclusion of the survey, participants will have the option of providing an email address so they can receive a summary of the research results.
b) If so, explain the qualifications of the person(s) interpreting the results.
The results will be interpreted by the researcher who is completing this project as part of his dissertation.

34.) Does the proposed study involve deception? ☐ No ☑ Yes (Please complete Part VII)

Part VII: Projects Involving Deception

Describe the type of deception being used. Consider in your answer both deception by omission (an important aspect of the research is withheld from the subject) and deception by commission (the subject is misled about the true purpose of the research).

36.) Why is deception a necessary and unavoidable component of the experimental design? (Does the deception improve the internal or external validity of the study?)

37.) Has this research protocol (involving deception) been previously used? If Yes, please provide information on any actual harms to the participants and reactions of the participants to the use of deception in this research.
38.) What alternative procedures were considered that did not involve deception and why were these alternatives rejected?

39.) Since deception precludes informed consent by the subject prior to participation:
   a.) How will participants be debriefed?
   b.) Who will debrief them?
   c.) Will the debriefing of participants be:
       - Immediate (immediately following the experimental session in which deception occurs)
       - Delayed
       - Full (all deceptive aspects of the study will be revealed)
       - Partial (some deceptive aspects of the study will remain unexplained)

40.) If debriefing is delayed, why is delayed debriefing necessary and when will debriefing occur?

41.) If debriefing is partial, why is the partial debriefing necessary? Why is unexplained deception necessary? Would the subject be harmed in any way by full debriefing?

41.1) Even if the subject is partially debriefed during the study, will full debriefing occur later?

42.) Does the presence of deception increase the risk of harm to the subject?

43.) Is the respondent free to withdraw his/her data after being fully debriefed? (e.g., form like audio/video taping).
Part VIII: Request for Waiver of Elements of Informed Consent

43.) Are you requesting a waiver of the documented informed consent form for each participant?  □ Yes  □ No

Please indicate the justification for requesting this waiver:

☐ The only record linking the subject to the research would be the signed consent document and the principal risk of the research would be breach of confidentiality.

☒ The research involves only minimal risk to the subjects and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context (e.g. anonymous surveys of adults).

Note: Participants must still be provided with a written statement regarding the research that contains the required elements of informed consent. Refer to the Informed Consent Template on our website for more information.

44.) Are you requesting a waiver or alteration of any of the other required elements of informed consent?  □ Yes  □ No  (An IRB may, on occasion, approve a consent process that alters some or all of the other required elements of informed consent or waive the requirement for informed consent. The following criteria must be met: 1) The research involves no more than minimal risk; 2) waiver or alteration will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of subjects; 3) the research could not practically be carried out without waiver or alteration; and 4) when appropriate, the subjects will be provided with additional pertinent information after participation.)

a.) Provide justification for the waiver.

A waiver of informed consent is requested due to the nature of this on-line survey research, adult educators are being asked to be participants, there is minimal risk to participants, and participants will have the opportunity to acquire a summary of the research findings after they have been completed.

b.) Indicate why the proposed research presents no more than minimal risk to participants.

The proposed research involves adults taking an on-line survey. They will not be identified by name.

c.) Explain whether or not a waiver of written informed consent would adversely affect the rights and welfare of participants.

This research involves adults utilizing a criteria list to evaluate 3 pieces of music used in an educational setting. There would be no impact on the rights and welfare of the participants.

d.) Explain why it would be impracticable to carry out the research without a waiver or alteration of informed consent.

The survey is being conducted on-line to reach a larger sample from which participants can be drawn on. The sample size could exceed 900 people. Acquiring informed consent from such a large sample might prove difficult.

e.) How will pertinent information be provided to participants, if appropriate, at a later date?

Participants will have the option of receiving a summary of the results after the research has been completed by providing their email address to the researcher. This option will be presented at the conclusion of the survey.

Part IX: Conflict of Interest

45.) Do the researchers conducting this protocol have any potential conflicts of interest? Conflicts of interest may include financial or personal interest, or any condition in which the investigator’s judgment regarding a primary interest may be biased by a secondary interest. Examples include speaking and consultation fees, travel expenses, stock options, royalties, company ownership or equity, etc.)

☒ No  □ Yes (If yes, conflict of interest must be disclosed)
**Investigator Assurance**

I certify that the information provided in this application is complete and correct. I understand that as Principal Investigator, I have ultimate responsibility for the protection of the rights and welfare of human research subjects, the conduct of the study, and the ethical performance of the project.

I agree to comply with all Kent State University policies and procedures on research involving human subjects (KSU policy #3342-3-032), as well as with all applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding the protection of human subjects in research. I agree that:

- The project will be performed by qualified personnel, according to the KSU approved protocol.
- Approval from the Institutional Review Board will be obtained prior to implementing any changes to the protocol.
- If the project involves approval/permission from other institutions, the research will not begin until permission has been obtained from those institutions.
- Legally effective informed consent will be obtained from human subjects if applicable, and documentation of informed consent will be retained in a secure environment for three years after termination of the project.
- Injuries, adverse events, and/or unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others will be reported in writing to the Kent State University IRB promptly, and no later than within 5 working days of the occurrence.
- A Continuing Review and Progress Report will be completed and submitted before the review deadline, as determined by the IRB appropriate to the degree of risk (but not less than once per year). All protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. Research must stop at the end of the approval period unless the protocol is re-approved for another term.
- All research staff, employees, and students assisting in the conduct of the research will be informed of their obligations and responsibilities in the above commitments.

I further certify that the proposed research will not begin until approval has been obtained. A signed approval letter from the Office of Research Safety and Compliance communicates IRB approval.

\[Signature of Principal Investigator\] 9/11/12

\[Signature of Co-Investigator\]  \[Date\]

**Faculty Advisor Assurance:**

I have reviewed and approved the research project described in this application. I agree to meet with the student on a regular basis to monitor study progress and assure that the well-being of subjects is adequately safeguarded. I agree to be available to assist the student investigator should any problems arise in the study.

\[Signature of Faculty Advisor\] 10/16/12

\[Date\]
**CHECKLIST: THE FOLLOWING MATERIALS MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH THE APPLICATION FOR APPROPRIATE REVIEW (Note: all items may not be necessary for the specific application)**

Double click on the box, a window will appear asking if it should be checked or unchecked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHECK IF NECESSARY:</th>
<th>FORMS SUBMITTED:</th>
<th>APPENDIX LETTER OR NUMBER (IF NOT NECESSARY, MARK “N/A”):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Completed Application (including signatures)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Recruitment script and materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Surveys, questionnaires, Interview questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Data collection materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Informed Consent Documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Audio/Visual Consent Forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Assent Statement/Script</td>
<td>(for children ≤ 12, will also need parental consent form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Debriefing Script</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Approval from other Institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Signed Investigator Assurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Training Verification/CITI certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K

SCREEN SHOTS OF ON-LINE SURVEY QUESTIONS

This portion of the appendix provides a series of screen shots that each participant viewed while contributing demographic data and evaluating the three selected concert band works. The first six screen shots specifically gathered demographic data from each of the participants. Screen Shot 7 is the introduction to the first of the three concert bands that were evaluated. This screen provides a brief description of the research study, including the Kent State University IRB protocol number. Screen Shot 8 that follows is the first page of the score. The imbedded audio player, from SoundCloud, appears at the top of the screen and appeared at the top of each page of the score that follows. After listening to the work and viewing all score images, participants began the evaluation process of the eight CBREC items and this can be seen on Screen Shot 9. Two CBREC items were evaluated per screen, and the first two CBREC items appear in Screen Shot 9. The format of the CBREC items was similar for the remaining six items, and screen shots of items three through eight have not been included for this reason.

Within the actual study following rating the works using the CBREC, the process was repeated for Piece #2 and Piece #3. The presentation of the introduction, score images, and audio player for Piece #2 and Piece #3 were crafted to the same style and appearance as Piece #1. The screen shots of the format, images, and audio player for Piece #2 and Piece #3 have not been included for this reason. Participants rated their familiarity with all three selected works on Screen Shot 10. The three open-ended questions posed to participants can be seen in order that they appeared in the study on Screen Shots 11, 12, and 13.
Participant Demographic Information

* Required

In which state do you currently teach? *
(Please select the state in which you are currently teaching/directing from the drop down list)

Texas

Which of the following most accurately represents your educational background? *
- Bachelor's Degree in Music Education
- Master's in Music (Education, Performance, Conducting, Theory)
- Master's Degree in field outside of Music (i.e. Administration, Counseling, Guidance)
- Doctoral Degree in Music (Education, Performance, Conducting, Theory)
- Doctoral Degree in field outside of Music (i.e. Administration, Counseling, Guidance)
- Other

Continue »
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Participant Demographic Information

* Required

Participant Background Information (Continued)

What is your gender? *
- Female
- Male

What is your age? *
(Please enter your age using numbers only)
39
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Participant Demographic Information

* Required

Participant Background Information (Continued)

How many years have you been teaching? *
(Please enter the total number of years you have been teaching including this year)
15

How many years have you been teaching in your current position? *
(Please enter the number of years you have been at your current position including this year)
12

« Back  Continue »
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Participant Demographic Information

* Required

Participant Background (Continued)

Which grade levels comprise the ensembles you currently teach? *
(Check any of the grade levels from which students in your ensembles are classified)
- Grade 9
- Grade 10
- Grade 11
- Grade 12

How many ensembles do you direct during as part of your academic teaching duties? *
(Consider this to be an instrumental music ensemble within a school setting that studies and performs a varied repertoire of music. It follows the standard instrumentation for a concert band. It may or may not be an auditioned group, and may range from a single player on a part to multiple players on a single part. These ensembles are comprised of students in grades 5-12)
1

How many students are in your 1st ensemble? *
(Enter the number of students who are enrolled in the first ensemble counted in the question above)
Participant Demographic Information

Participant Background (Continued)

How many students are in your 2nd ensemble?
(If you have more than one ensemble, enter the number of students enrolled in the second ensemble identified above)

How many students are in your 3rd ensemble?
(If you have more than one ensemble, enter the number of students enrolled in the third ensemble identified above)

< Back  Continue >
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Participant Demographic Information

Participant Background (Continued)

How many new pieces do you purchase on average per year for use with the ensembles you direct comprised of students in grades 9-12?
(Please consider a "new piece" to be one published within 3 years of the current academic year. The piece should be an original work for concert band, not an arrangement, transcription, or re-edition of an existing work. This piece should be a new addition to your band library.)

< Back  Submit
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Piece #1

This piece of concert band music is being utilized for a research study conducted by Travis J. Walker, a doctoral candidate in music education from Kent State University, and it has been approved by the Kent State Institutional Review Board (IRB #12.324). This study, Perspectives on emergent wind band literature: Understanding the views of high school band directors in the instrumental setting, will focus on a national sample of high school band directors and their perceptions of various aspects of new works for the high school concert band.
Screen Shot 8 - Introductory Score Image with SoundCloud Player
Screen Shot 9 - Introductory Screen for Rating of Piece #1 Using the CBREC

Concert Band Repertoire Evaluation Criteria (CBREC) - Piece #1

Please use the following criteria list to evaluate the piece you viewed and listened to on the previous page. When you have finished your evaluation of all eight aspects, be sure to hit the Submit button prior to advancing to the next screen. We will begin with Melodic Craftsmanship & Harmonic Language.

1) Melodic Craftsmanship*
The composition displays expert craftsmanship and clearly conceived ideas in the melodic material. This includes presence of counter-melodies, and melodic material that is genuine, original, and able to hold interest without being repetitious.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Very Strongly Disagree ◉◉◉◉◉◉◉◉ Very Strongly Agree

2) Harmonic Language*
The composition utilizes an imaginative harmonic language suitable to the style of the piece. The harmonic language demonstrates balance, direction, and sensitivity in its progressions.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Very Strongly Disagree ◉◉◉◉◉◉◉◉ Very Strongly Agree

Screen Shot 10 - Familiarity of Selected Works by Participants

Open-ended questions regarding new and emergent concert band works.

The following questions are optional for research participants to answer. The first question asks
ance to share their familiarity with the three works reviewed in this study. The remaining
questions are related to the evaluation of new and emergent works. As there may be opinions and
views not able to be expressed regarding new and emergent works through responses using the
CBREC, these questions provide participants an opportunity to share additional perspectives.

Were you familiar with any of the three pieces evaluated in this study?

Please answer this question based upon previous experience with the piece. This may or may not
include hearing the piece in one of your ensembles. Past experience may only include hearing the
work at a conference or music festival, while some participants may have no previous experience
with these works.

| Piece #1 (Rest by Frank | Yes - I have Yes - I have No - I have     |
| Ticket) | released this | heard this piece | not heard this     |
| Piece #2 (Lux Aurumque by | piece with one | in a different setting | piece prior to     |
| Eric Whitacre) | of my ensembles | | evaluating it in   |
| Piece #3 (Elements by Brian | | | this study.     |
| Haimages) | | | |
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Screen Shot 11 – First open-ended questions for participants

**Open-ended questions regarding new and emergent concert band works.**

What aspects do you primarily examine when considering a new and emergent work for use with your concert band?
(This question is optional. Please limit answers to 100 words or less)

[Box for text input]
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Screen Shot 12 – Second open-ended questions for participants

**Open-ended questions regarding new and emergent concert band works.**

What is your view regarding the value of rehearsing and performing new and emergent concert band works with your ensemble?
(This question is optional. Please limit answers to 100 words or less)

[Box for text input]

[Back] [Continue]
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Open-ended questions regarding new and emergent concert band works.

What aspects do you believe contributes to a piece being able to sustain repeated programming over time and eventually move into the "core or standard repertoire"?
(This question is optional. Please limit answers to 100 words or less. Consider "core or standard repertoire to be a collection or listing of music suitable for study and performance by a school band that has been subject to multiple evaluations and has established a consistent programming record over time. The works are considered to be familiar, have a high level of compositional craft, pedagogical value, and have also retained aesthetic and artistic merit."
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APPENDIX L

SUMMARY OF OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES FROM DIRECTORS

QUESTION #1: What aspects do you primarily examine when considering a new and emergent work for use with your concert band?

Director #1, Age 46 – Melody, Use of rhythm, meter & tempo, Instrument Ranges and Demands on Individual Sections

Director #2, Age 39 - Musical validity and educational value, Musical fit for current personnel in ensemble (ability), Programming, Student appeal or ability to embrace, Audience appeal

Director #3, Age 38 - Appropriate for ensemble instrumentation, melodic interest and ingenuity, compelling and able to hold interest in all aspects of music

Director #4, Age 38 – My chief consideration is the difficulty level of the individual parts compared to the strengths and weaknesses of my band. Some works are selected to stretch them as musicians, others to put them in the best possible situation for success.

Director #5, Age 48 - Can I develop musicianship with my students through rehearsal and performance of the piece? This takes into account developing executive technical and expressive skills within the ensemble. Our instrumentation also is considered against the demands of the score. In some cases I only have one student per part in various sections year to year.

Director #6, Age 47 - Does the piece fit my band? What musical elements would I like to emphasize in a semester? Do I think the piece would be fun/interesting to play and would my kids like it?

Director #7, Age 46 - Does the piece have creative and unique textures? Does the melody have a strong presence and does it stay with you? Will my band be able to develop the necessary skills to perform it? Will the ensemble and the audience be able to forge a connection with the work based upon the presence of certain programmatic elements?

Director #8, Age 55 - DYNAMISM. WE ARE NOT SELECTING MUSIC FOR NAP TIME AT A GERIATRIC HOSPITAL. In all of the time spent on these three pieces perhaps two minutes would hold the interest of healthy high school aged students. The snob appeal of this type of music does not travel far in the minds of the young or their parents. At best it sounds like original movie music of the mid twentieth century. Most of it sounds like self-indulgent composers trying to dress the next emperor. I am looking for emotionally hard-hitting music like The Witch and The Saint, for example. Wow, no wonder the Band option is losing appeal.

Director #9, Age 50 - Harmonic intrigue, timbre/scoring uniqueness, interesting percussive colors, expressive demand to develop emotional investment.
Director #10, Age 45 - I attend to the basic elements present in the work (melody, harmony, rhythm, timbre) to determine if the piece will 1) line up with the strengths of my band, 2) provide good learning opportunities to develop musicianship.

Director #11, Age 45 - I consider whether the work has a distinctive voice that my students have not experienced. I consider is there an actual reason to use the piece and does the piece fulfill that reason. I consider the amount of rehearsal time I can commit to a work and if it is time well spent for my students and our audience.

Director #12, Age 42 - I exam composer names. Some composer names I associate with great writing that is artistic and also is valuable for teaching situations. Some composers just seem to want to impress themselves. I also think about my own band and whether we can learn the music in time for a concert or if it is for a festival or contest.

Director #13, Age 46 - I examine the musical skill required by the score and compare that against the abilities of my students. The melodic and rhythmic material give me a lot of information about if my group can develop the necessary skills while studying this music. I examine use of rhythm and ranges on instruments.

Director #14, Age 54 - I first look for unique and interesting melodies that have been carefully crafted and are memorable. I carefully examine technical demands of the work, as well as the instrumentation required to see if it will be a good fit for the ensembles that I direct.

Director #15, Age 32 - I like pieces contain unique textures and unique use of instruments. It separates the music students encounter in their lives outside of school and make the experience in concert band unique. I also like to consider music that offers contrasts in expressive musical elements - dynamics, articulations, orchestration.

Director #16, Age 56 - I listen for melodies that are instantly singable and memorable. I also listen for unique textures that do not sound contrived or overly like a film score.

Director #17, Age 42 - I look for melody and harmony that is easy to listen to. Then I look at instrumentation...especially french horn and oboe. Are their options for doubling etc...Instrumentation and ability is not always perfect unless in a festival setting.

Director #18, Age 52 - I often rely on reviews to separate the wheat from the chaff and then study intensely

Director #19, Age 41 - I primarily consider the technical requirements first, followed by the scoring and/or sonority of the piece. I question whether my kids will enjoy learning from it and whether it suits the ensemble. Of course, none of it matters if I don't enjoy the piece.

Director #20, Age 33 - I select music based upon instrumentation that best fits my group as well as overall emotional impact of the music. Additionally, I select pieces which I feel will advance my groups musically.
Director #21, Age 43 - I think about my own band's strengths and weaknesses first, and then analyze the music from that standpoint first. Our instrumentation and ability (that we currently have and can develop) are of primary importance in my situation when considering a new work. I try to find melodies and textures that are interesting to the students and will keep them engaged without being overwhelming.

Director #22, Age 42 - I try to compare the technical and expressive demands with the abilities and available players of my own band. Great melodies are important too, but if my band is not developed or enough or lacks some necessary instrumentation I avoid choosing a work.

Director #23, Age 55 - I want a piece that my students will be able to learn good musical values. Does the piece offer complicated harmonies that the performer must listen and evaluate their part with that of other performers. I want a piece that will inspire my students to become better performers as well as better listeners.

Director #24, Age 41 - Instrumentation required, ranges, and use of rhythm.

Director #25, Age 55 - Instrumentation, and the facility level that would be required to perform it. Solo opportunities, as well as the basic range for all instruments. The musical style of the work, as to how it fits in with the programming, as well as its educational value. The value of the work monetarily. Is it able to be programmed again in the future, or is it just currently popular?

Director #26, Age 50 - Interesting lines for all sections to play. Unique timbre combinations and programmatic elements.

Director #27, Age 51 - Is the piece in a realistic difficulty level? Will the students learn musical and nonmusical things from the performance of the piece? Can the musician be expected to grow as a performer because of the piece. Can the audience connect with the piece?

Director #28, Age 50 – Melody, Instrumentation of group.

Director #29, Age 36 - Of primary importance is the melodic line. I also consider if it is in the ability range of my students, and if we have the necessary instrumentation to play the piece with sincerity.

Director #30, Age 54 - Presence of good melodic material. Opportunities to challenge all sections of the band. Unique textures/artistic opportunities.

Director #31, Age 55 - Required instrumentation, Opportunity for all sections to contribute, Unique moments in timbre and texture

Director #32, Age 45 - Structure - harmonic, rhythmic, ranges, percussion involvement, musical ingredients, style, programming needs/variety, student interest in the work after reading a couple times, playing to the strengths and challenges of the group (both are good), musicality

Director #33, Age 43 - Student appeal to the work is important. It is easier to teach and help students grow if they "buy in" to the work. I also examine how each section is called upon to perform various
technical/musical demands. Does the work offer all sections a chance to contribute, not necessarily the melody, but perform interesting lines?

Director #34, Age 54 - Suitability for the ensemble and potential for musical growth among the student musicians.

Director #35, Age 64 - Texture - is it unique? Melody - is it memorable? Instrumentation - does it fit my ensemble? Interest - will hold student attention without overwhelming them, will it reach & excite the audience? Teachable - does the piece offer opportunities to develop both technique and expression?

Director #36, Age 49 - The music I choose should always challenge my students. There should be elements that can be used from prior learning, but there should be several new elements or twists that are presented. Balance of instrumentation is important. I like to use sound examples of pieces to recruit players for parts that need covered. Students should be exposed to the traditional and contemporary forms of literature.

Director #37, Age 64 - The playing range for my students, the rhythmic complexity, the maturity necessary by my students to play the selection successfully. How much rehearsal time it would take to make the performance ready.

Director #38, Age 38 - The title and concept of the piece are important first considerations. I examine the melodic material, and use of rhythms/meters/tempos. I don't worry about the demands of the instrumentation as all my groups are relatively well-balanced, and if I need extra players I can borrow from one of the other ensembles.

Director #39, Age 57 - Thematic Integrity, Counterpoint, Architecture, Modulation, Aesthetic Persuasiveness

Director #40, Age 46 - Tuneful melodies, appropriateness in instrumentation for my ensemble, ability to realize musical goals for the ensemble through study & performance.

Director #41, Age 46 - Use of instrument color. Texture throughout the ensemble. Chordal and harmonic elements. Solo parts and ranges. Style and rhythmic presentation. Contrast in moods. Use of the percussion family. Level of difficulty form the ensemble.

Director #42, Age 59 - What will it teach my ensemble? Emotional content and sincerity. Audience appeal and performer appeal.

Director #43, Age 54 - While the context for where the piece will be performed will influence this, on a basic level I always examine how the melody is treated and used. Something that is unique and catches the ear may be of value to study with an ensemble. I also examine the instruments used & orchestration, part ranges, and the use of percussion.

QUESTION #2:
What is your view regarding the value of rehearsing and performing new and emergent concert band works with your ensemble?
Director #1 - Students may have a chance to connect with a living composer, Programmatic elements may enhance rehearsal discussion, Great opportunities to compare works against older works.

Director #2 - Important to balance "classic literature" with new works

Director #3 - Offers opportunity to extend musical concepts beyond rehearsal hall, connect with living composer, allows students to connect with contemporary society

Director #4 - Melodic and harmonic languages are greatly expanded in newer works. Rhythms infuse lots of different styles. Many of them sound incredible and give students a great opportunity to explore new music.

Director #5 - This can be a great way to connect with a composer that is alive. Some new music is really engaging and interesting. A lot of it though is not worthy of study because it so contrived or culturally insensitive. The few gems that are worth the purchase seem to be well-crafted, and it allows us to extend discussions about the band music to beyond our rehearsal hall to other parts of the school and society.

Director #6 - It is imperative to the art form. While I love the standard pieces for wind band, there has to be a place for the new standard pieces in programming.

Director #7 - I choose very carefully - the best newer works are really stellar. They provide a contrast to traditional marches, folk song settings, and the classic band "overture". I wouldn't do any of the ones in this study - the first two meander and go nowhere, and the final selection's melodies are too short to be memorable.

Director #8 - I use it for about 10% of the music rehearsed and performed, choosing examples which do not bring ridicule to the whole idea of new music, and choosing those which are relevant to the maturity of the students involved.

Director #9 - I admittedly have gravitated toward new emergent works, as I believe it has challenged not only myself as an educator, but also the persona of the ensembles I have taught. Obviously, a well-rounded curricula investigates literature representing several historical periods, but I try to find diverse repertoire matching those elements of instrumental music which have endured the ages.

Director #10 - I use many new works for sight-reading purposes, but rarely for performance. I like to see if a newer work emerges from a contest list or a festival program down the road before I commit to programming it with my group.

Director #11 - I try to rehearse new works on a consistent basis, balanced with established works of merit. However, many pieces are "new" to my students.

Director #12 - The right piece can be pretty valuable experience. For example, there was a lot of craft in the first two pieces, but lacked real connection with a concert band full of public school students. The third piece with its different movements are dramatic, and exciting, but I wonder if kids can connect to it. Some new works are valuable to connect with other subject areas, or help build an effective theme concert that the audience is engaged by.
Director #13 - While there are pieces of questionable merit that are published each year, many works are exciting, creative, and stretch the imagination of the students in recreating them.

Director #14 - New works present exciting options for programming, but they also provide extra-musical aspects that can help connect band with other parts of the curriculum and outside subjects.

Director #15 - Melodically, and rhythmically newer works are much more advanced which presents value to challenge students in that regard. Harmonically though - many works are stagnant borrowing too much from film scores. Timbre and orchestration are sometimes very creative - again though you can hear certain composers trying to borrow from film work.

Director #16 - Some of my students have met composers through honor bands - none of the ones in this study - and makes it a lasting impression and connection with them, which helps sustain their interest and love of music. Some of the newer works have great teaching moments that help directors address musicianship concepts with the large ensemble.

Director #17 - Some provide great ways to teach certain musical concepts and ideas. Others provide great ways to connect to other parts of the curriculum. A few are exceptionally good artistic pieces (not like the ones in this study).

Director #18 - I am a bit of a traditionalist. I want performance and audience to be able to enjoy/relate to what they hear and play as well as challenge them. I am not a big fan of ultra non melodic songs and very dissonant harmony that doesn't follow some traditional theory.

Director #19 – I don’t do anything because it’s new.

Director #20 - I place a high value on performing newer works, especially those that have been actually composed rather than being written to sell. I enjoy introducing new works to my students and colleagues, and I enjoy the challenge of continually learning new repertoire.

Director #21 - I think the value of new, quality literature, is paramount to the continued evolution of performance-based programs found in the public school setting.

Director #22 - The value is to see how they compare against the "masterworks". I program one older masterwork per year. It's nice to compare something from the core against something new. For instance, the third piece seems to follow a classical symphony form of sorts - it would be neat to compare that against Second Suite in F.

Director #23 - Newer works seem to connect better with students because of extra-musical effects and programmatic elements. Students seem to respond better to music they can relate to.

Director #24 - I want my students to have the knowledge of new music and where it is going. I also want my students to have a divergent repertoire. They need to know the new music as well as the old classics and transcriptions.
Director #25 - New works have different challenges than older works. The difference in timbre, rhythm, and harmony alone make some of them very engaging and appealing.

Director #26 - Very valuable. I use it as a sight reading opportunity, and then as a teachable moment to interpret the composition as our own. Building a library is the responsibility of a director. It should contain the "standards" and also continue with new works that can stand the test of time.

Director #27 - Provides contrast against older works and traditional styles. Also connects students to living composers many who use websites and social media.

Director #28 - I am not as concerned about the piece being new as I am about it being of quality.

Director #29 – It is important.

Director #30 - They can provide a change of piece from standard marches, overtures, chorales, and pop transcriptions. They are sometimes very imaginative.

Director #31 - Opportunities to extend the music to other subject areas or outside school subjects. When available, students can connect to a living composer.

Director #32 - Students can sometimes meet the composer (through honor bands), Students get to play unique works that interesting elements, Keeps directors fresh by demanding score study and preparation to properly communicate the music to our students

Director #33 - We like it. "You tube" helps immensely these days. I can get a few pieces on approval, hand them out, and listen or watch a performance before playing them. I give an analysis or outline of the piece to the students before they hear it.

Director #34 - It provides nice contrast to older works. Sometimes it allows them to see how wind band music has evolved - how treatment of certain instruments has changed over time.

Director #35 - Very valuable, as long as works are quality literature.

Director #36 - Some are really good. The first two in this study were pretty mundane. Lots of pretty chords, but not very interesting and the melody line lacked direction. The final work hits on a number of different areas and offers a variety of musical concepts that can be addressed.

Director #37 - New works must be presented, listened to and rehearsed. The foundations of melody and harmony are all derived from the same theory, but we cannot get stuck in a rut of just the old standards. The "new generation" must be given attention.

Director #38 - This is the only way the ensemble can grow musically. Yes you need to play works that are standards, but with the new composers and music that is now becoming available, it is really exciting.
Director #39 - Some new works really have great concepts that allow the ensemble to make connections with other parts of the curriculum or the outside world. Not all standard repertoire allows for such connections without a lot of work by the director in planning.

Director #40 - There is great value in pursuing excellent new music. Students recognize that they are partners in exploring the musical frontier.

Director #41 - A few new works on each concert provides nice contrast. Sometimes though new works are contrived and insulting, yet other works go too far the other way and speak only to the composer. It is hard to find a balanced work that is artistic yet sensible, satisfying yet stretching, and emotionally recognizable without being completely sappy or unreachable by a HS musician. These are just kids who have trouble identifying their own emotions from time to time.

Director #42 - A great way to introduce new styles of composing and compare to some of the older gems at that same level.

Director #43 - Some newer works are very unique and creative. Exploring this music can be refreshing for students to get away from the predictability of their pop music. Additionally the opportunity to have students connect to a living composer is a unique experience that helps them understand the piece better, which in turn helps them perform the piece better.

Director #44, Age 45 - Some are really good, creative, and imaginative. They provide a real change of pace for a typical concert, and a unique style to include when programming.

QUESTION #3: What aspects do you believe contributes to a piece being able to sustain repeated programming over time and eventually move into the “core or standard repertoire”?

Director #1 - The melody must be memorable. It must provide some type of emotional connection and lift. It must be able to develop musicians technically and also raise their aesthetic awareness in performance.

Director #2 - Melodic content, Context or purpose of composition, Musical feeling of reward by performers

Director #3 - Melodic interest, and overall the general aesthetic/artistic feelings generated by performance of the work. Additionally it will be necessary for an established conductor to give the piece repeat performances as many repertoire lists are controlled by a select few conductors.

Director #4 - These pieces have to prove themselves valuable from a teaching perspective. They must also prove themselves to be valuable from an artistic stand point. Can this piece raise our appreciation of music while helping grow our students skills (technical, intellectual, and artistic)? It is a fine line to balance, and while I like many new works not all of them meet this criteria.

Director #5 - It must be memorable. It must be sincere. It must have an emotional impact of some sort. It must be engaging for the ensemble. It must be interesting for the audience. It must challenge the ensemble without overwhelming it.
Director #6 - The piece has to be of value to the performer, listener, and conductor. Melody, harmony, and rhythmic interest are also paramount to the piece being considered a core piece.

Director #7 - A piece must have artistic opportunity that heightens the intellect and emotions of the conductor, ensemble and audience. It also must push the musicians to acquire useful musical skills. Finally, higher education conductors must learn this music and share it at festival honor bands. Making a contest list doesn't make a piece standard repertoire.

Director #8 - Highly crafted melodies, countermelodies and timeless harmony which results in apparent simplicity.

Director #9 – NO RESPONSE

Director #10 - I think the biggest aspect is how popular it is with directors and ensembles. We are responsible for programming new works repeatedly because the students enjoy them. Repeated study and programming contribute to a new core repertoire being formed. Still, some new works - though pedagogically useful as you put it - pale when compared to works from 1900-1950.

Director #11 - Standard repertoire are works that many people have found worth the time and effort required to prepare the piece. The musical rewards of the core repertoire are apparent and are considered to be important steps in the musical development of our students. At the highest level, these works touch the listener in ways that change their perceptions of life.

Director #12 - The piece has to get to the people who manage repertoire and contest lists. Repeated use for concerts or festivals would also help a work sustain interest. The state lists also provide a way to see if a work is really worth investing in.

Director #13 - The piece has to leave a lasting impact through its aesthetic side, or through its technical side. If it can somehow do both, it will be long remembered and programmed by other bands.

Director #14 - People must be able to recognize the music and it must they must be emotionally connected to it. The surge of emotions connected to any style of music is important, and how a piece makes someone feel has a lot to do with its longevity. Band music is no different.

Director #15 - The melodies must be memorable, fresh, creative, and unique. This is why we remember the Chaconne from 1st suite. The harmonies must be logical, and complement the melody - Persichetti was great at this. Timbre and orchestration must extend existing usage and be creative without being contrived - this is what separates Alfred Reed from Robert W. Smith. This is why Boysen and Camphouse are exciting, and Curnow and Swearingen are not.

Director #16 - The biggest thing is to get repeated performances in major venues like contests, or honor bands. The more exposure and well known a work becomes the better chance it has to move into the core repertoire. Plus, it will need to be accepted by college and university conductors as many of them contribute to/create core rep lists.
Director #17 - It takes more than the publishing houses telling us how great the works are. The publishers do a disservice to many great works by always promoting the same works by best-selling composers. Directors need to carefully select new works for artistic and educational reasons to share with their ensembles.

Director #18 - I believe musical foundation where you can teach, theory, traditional harmonic structure and voice leading with a little coaching...where you can easily show students how and why it all fits together....Put that with a tone, harmonic and expression example that when performed correctly leaves and emotional response from performers and audience.

Director #19 – Beyond me, sorry.

Director #20 - Core repertoire becomes such because of the value placed on it by conductors who continue to program the work. Some consideration must be given to the challenge the work offers to the ensembles and the conductors, whether technical or musical. There are a great number of "core" pieces I don't want to work on, and there are those I enjoy teaching and introducing to a new generation. I don't know if it's relative to the question, but I grow weary of the "snobs" who choose a work's value on the basis of the composer or of the publisher.

Director #21 - In addition to being challenging, "core or standard repertoire" stands the test of time based on the emotional responses such pieces generate. So many "new" pieces are little more than cookie cutter compositional exercises, churned out to make a profit.

Director #22 - The piece has to demonstrate some artistic value - the music should ennoble all who interact with it. The piece also has to require the students to become competent musicians that can meet the demands of the work. Finally I think the piece needs exposure over time. Any work of art takes time to be absorbed before people can finally appreciate it for when it was created, why it was created, and what makes it valuable.

Director #23 - A piece needs to have multiple performances over time. For that to happen, the basic elements need to be well conceived and appealing - melody, harmony, rhythm, and timbre. It has to have a proven use record at honor bands and make it onto state contest lists as well.

Director #24 - Like all music that tends to be repeated, new literature must inspire emotions within the listener. It has to have a melody that the audience can leave humming.

Director #25 - A new work must distinguish itself through unique combinations of other basic musical elements. Standard literature has many songs with great melodies - I think that is the most important characteristic.

Director #26 - The audience appeal and reaction. The students love for the selection. It should be a challenge, but comes together with performance satisfaction. Some selections that sound difficult, but they really lay pretty well on most instruments. Pieces that are difficult, just to be difficult, abstract, and "longer than they are tall", will probably not get a repeat performance.
Director #27 - Repeat performances of good quality help, but I think the most important thing that moves a new work to core status its ability to provide artistic and teachable moments. Sometimes a piece can teach musicians how to be artists. The piece has to be able to go beyond other works of similar lengths, tonality, and style.

Director #28 - If the students have a quality musical experience with the song, then I am apt to program it again. If this continues to happen each time I program it, then it eventually becomes standard repertoire for me.

Director #29 - Melody, Individual parts written that compliment my ensemble

Director #30 - They must exhibit great melodies. They must be logical in their form. The pieces in this study don't really develop melodically, and don't stick with you. The great pieces that are core repertoire have instantly singable melodies.

Director #31 - Does the piece have melodic material that is timeless? Does the piece engage the conductor & the ensemble? Does the piece retain a fresh sound that helps it stand out from others?

Director #32 - Bands must give repeat performances of works that are deserving. I have done all three works in this study - popular right now, but this will not last. The melodic material must be strong and engaging - these works don't have it. The textures must be unique - the last piece has moments of that.

Director #33 - We pass pieces around our conference when we think other school programs can handle something or would like to try it. Our conference has high school enrollments of 88 - 122 students. We are everything - Concert, Marching, Pep Band, as well as conference Solo/Ensembles and Concert Band. We play for a variety of things and are always preparing for the next event. Time is a factor in everything.

Director #34 - Certainly core rep has been able to sustain repeated programming because it is valuable in many different ways. There artistic, technical, and emotional reasons for reasons why a piece is considered core. The best core works answer to all three aspects - like First Suite.

Director #35 - The work should continue to "reveal itself" - contain depth of compositional style and elements that continue to challenge and engage both performers and listeners.

Director #36 - The piece has to be able to speak to 3 different groups - conductors, ensembles, and audiences. Additionally, conductors are going to have to champion the composers of this music as adding a legitimate voice to wind band music. There is some disdain for "educational composers" but the fact is they are writing some very compelling music that is very unique. Why shouldn't band be a unique experience in the school curriculum? We (as directors) have a part to play in deciding the new core repertoire that will emerge as we make program choices.

Director #37 - I believe student/performer engagement has a lot to do with it. If it challenges them, and they succeed in learning it....then it is a piece that can be reused when trying to present the same goals to other groups as they go through the program, but constant repetition is not a must...we must always be open the new music that is presented each year.
Director #38 - The excitement it brings to the musician to play it each time it is rehearsed. It should move the musician and the director emotionally.

Director #39 - Lots of pieces being written today were inspired by works of previous generations - which is great, but also contributes to the sameness in sound of many band works in the modern era. Great melodies, clever use of rhythm, unique textures and timbres will win the day to a piece moving from new to standard rep.

Director #40 - Artistic merit regardless of the technical difficulty.

Director #41 - Core repertoire gets repeat programming because it responds to the people who study it and listen to it at a performance. The music has a point, is tuneful, and can stand on its own technical and artistic merit without being propped up by programmatic aspects or worse yet being a transcription. Two of the works here were transcriptions of choral works that are popular now but won't be classical later.

Director #42 – The development of the musician and the listener.

Director #43 - High level of compositional craft, have learning value and artistic merit, audience and performer appeal and are aesthetically beautiful.

Director #44, Age 54 - It must be a memorable work. The composer must have created something that retains a timeless feel - that though you hear it the first time or the 50th, it retains a freshness and vigor that is unmatched. The interplay of the various musical elements separate the trivial works of our generation from the true gems.

Director #45, Age 45 - Very few composers today are writing music that will be able to achieve core status. Not everything Ticheli writes is a slam dunk piece for band - Rest is okay. The first two works attempted to be very lyrical and moving, but lacked some sincerity. Music with sincere material that is memorable, exciting, and creative will gather repeat performances. Over time the repeat performances change perceptions of directors of newer works and they become part of the core.

Director #46, Age 52 - The music must hold the attention of the conductor, ensemble, and audience. It must have beautiful texture, and have a unique sound.

Director #47, Age 47 - The strength of all the composer's works will have an impact. I was familiar with all three in this study, as they are well-known and these works received a great deal of exposure at recent honor festivals that I attended. The works must be artistically challenging and meaningful, and yet must develop the technical skills of the students.

Director #48, Age 34 - Transcriptions do not belong in band core repertoire.
APPENDIX M

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED WITHIN THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RRP</strong></td>
<td>Repertoire Review Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBREC</strong></td>
<td>Concert Band Repertoire Evaluative Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MC</strong></td>
<td>Melodic Craftsmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HL</strong></td>
<td>Harmonic Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RV</strong></td>
<td>Rhythmic Vitality and Tempo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TO</strong></td>
<td>Timbre and Orchestration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FS</strong></td>
<td>Formal Structure and Balance/Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PU</strong></td>
<td>Pedagogical Usefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES</strong></td>
<td>Emotional Impact and Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L</strong></td>
<td>Longevity and Promise for Repeated Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DG\geq50</strong></td>
<td>Director Group 50 Years of Age and Older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DGY&lt;50</strong></td>
<td>Director Group Younger than 50 Years of Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTTM</strong></td>
<td>Directors Teaching Two or More Ensembles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTOE</strong></td>
<td>Directors Teaching One Ensemble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCG</strong></td>
<td>Non-Comment Group (of Directors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CG</strong></td>
<td>Comment Group (of Directors)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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