

© 2016

James P. McCrann

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE MOST VALUED REPERTOIRE OF
DISTINGUISHED MIDDLE-LEVEL BAND CONDUCTORS

By

JAMES P. MCCRANN

A dissertation submitted to the
Mason Gross School of the Arts
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

Doctor of Musical Arts

Graduate Program in Music Education

Written under the direction of

Dr. William L. Berz

And approved by

New Brunswick, New Jersey

May, 2016

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

The Most Valued Repertoire of Distinguished Middle-Level Band Conductors

by JAMES P. MCCRANN

Dissertation Director:
Dr. William L. Berz

The purpose of this study is to determine the most valued repertoire of distinguished middle-level wind band conductors from across the United States and to explore how these works relate to various views on core repertoire for ensembles in this demographic. “Middle-level bands” are defined in this study as school woodwind, brass, and percussion ensembles affiliated with junior high, middle school, and high schools comprised of students ranging from grade levels six to nine. Several studies have attempted to identify a core repertoire for the wind band based primarily upon musical attributes, with little or no consideration given to the pedagogical development of student musicians. In this study, distinguished conductors of middle-level band programs, selected through the examination of several qualifiers, were surveyed to determine the actual music they programmed and deemed most beneficial. Respondents ($N = 87$) indicated their most valued repertoire, rating the works on a five-point Likert scale in the categories of artistic value, pedagogical value, likelihood of re-programming the work, and the extent they believe the work should be part of a core repertoire. Seventy of the 78 works (89.74%) on the resulting “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band” list appear to be designed for use in educational settings, suggesting that directors are influenced primarily by pedagogical considerations.

Acknowledgements

In as much as this study is the culmination of an arduous personal journey, it reflects the efforts, support, and inspiration of so many that have carried me along the way. While it is not possible to express my gratitude to everyone by name, especially to the many dedicated music educators who assisted me in the survey, my appreciation and admiration of so many is heartfelt and enduring.

No undertaking of this nature can be accomplished without the guidance and expertise of a devoted faculty, particularly the professors who taught me in the classroom and served on this dissertation committee. Foremost among them is Dr. William Berz, whose patience, wisdom, and kindness knows no bounds.

Dr. Peter Loel Boonshaft, my mentor and friend, has afforded me more opportunities than I could ever deserve and always encouraged me to pursue my studies. I am also grateful for my many beloved students at Garden City High School and Hofstra University, my teachers, friends, and colleagues who, over the years, have taught me to love learning in a way I could only hope to instill in others.

Ultimately, my family sustains me. I am forever indebted to my parents, the embodiment of positive role models. I regret that I may never fully comprehend the extent of their personal sacrifice for my benefit. I am also blessed with a brother, sisters, aunts, uncles, and grandparents who supported me in the most profound ways. Finally, whenever I seemingly lacked the strength or direction to continue, I could always draw upon the love of Kimberly and Sarah Marie-Elyse. They are my primary motivation to persevere.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables.....	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Statement of Purpose.....	5
Research Questions.....	6
Limitations.....	7
Definition of Terms.....	7
Need for the Study.....	10
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	13
Philosophical Foundations of the Wind Band and its Repertoire.....	13
Different Philosophical Views about Musical Literature in Education.....	15
Balancing Different Philosophies.....	21
The Influence of Aesthetic Philosophy on Repertoire Selection...	25
The Role of Aesthetic Philosophy in Determining “Quality” in Music.....	30
Factors Influencing Literature Selection.....	34
Initial Views of Quality in Music.....	36
Controversies and Concerns over the Quality of Music for School Bands.....	37

Table of Contents (continued)

Identifying a Core Repertoire for Band.....	47
The Core Repertoire of University Band Programs.....	59
Repertoire Studies of School and University Band Programs.....	64
A Core Repertoire for Young Bands.....	67
Chapter 3: Research Method.....	76
Development of the Survey.....	85
Timeline.....	92
Chapter 4: Results.....	93
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	149
Summary Conclusions.....	163
Implications for Music Education.....	165
Suggestions for Future Research.....	166
References.....	169
Appendix A: Sample Email Invitation to NBA Middle School Representatives.....	186
Appendix B: Sample Email to ASBDA Officers.....	188
Appendix C: Sample Email Invitation to Directors Participating in the Survey.....	190
Appendix D: Online Survey of the Repertoire of Distinguished Middle-Level Bands.....	193
Appendix E: Middle-Level Bands Performing at the Midwest Clinic 2003 – 2014.....	205

Table of Contents (continued)

Appendix F: Middle-Level Bands Performing at the *Music for All* Festival

2012 – 2014.....207

Appendix G: Mark of Excellence National, State, or Commended Winner

Middle-Level Bands 2008 – 2014.....209

Appendix H: Average Grade Levels of Most Recommended Works Based Upon

State Lists.....215

List of Tables

Table 1: Categories of Survey Respondents.....	93
Table 2: Regional Distribution of Survey Respondents.....	94
Table 3: The Number of Years of Teaching Experience of the Respondents.....	94
Table 4: Grade Levels Taught by Respondents.....	95
Table 5: The Most Important Factors Considered in Selection Repertoire.....	96
Table 6: The Genres Essential to the Repertoire of Middle-Level Band Students.....	97
Table 7: Importance of Having a Core Repertoire for Middle-Level Band.....	98
Table 8: Number of Different Works per Frequency of Recommendation.....	98
Table 9: Complete List of Recommended Works.....	99
Table 10: Composer Frequency Counts.....	123
Table 11: The Most Recommended Original Works for Winds.....	127
Table 12: The Most Recommended Folk/Folk-Influenced Works.....	130
Table 13: The Most Recommended Arrangements/Transcriptions.....	131
Table 14: The Most Recommended Marches.....	131
Table 15: The Most Recommended Works and Mean Likert Ratings.....	132
Table 16: The Graded Difficulty Level of the Most Recommended Works.....	137
Table 17: The Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band.....	141
Table 18: The Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band in Previous Studies.....	144
Table 19: Middle-Level Works in Three or More Studies Recommended Two or Fewer Times.....	163

Chapter 1: Introduction

The specific characteristics that define musical quality, especially in the education setting, elude a universal consensus. “While many music educators support the use of high-quality music and maintain that qualitative discriminations...are possible, there appears to be very little agreement in the literature with respect to the bases of these qualitative judgments” (Fiese, 1993, p. 28).

The notion of a core, high-quality band repertoire is largely an outgrowth of the aesthetic philosophy espoused by most of the leading figures in the band movement. Hanna (1963, p. 56) epitomized this when he wrote, “Music, per se, is the object.” More recently, there has been a smaller, but growing, movement challenging this status quo. Emerging music education philosophies based in part on David Elliott’s (1995) praxial principles, Randall Everett Allsup’s (2007, 2008, 2012) post-modern advocacy of democracy in the music classroom, and Estelle Jorgensen’s (1997) dialectical viewpoints call into question the criteria traditionally used to judge quality repertoire, if not the rationale for even needing one. Yet, aesthetic philosophy remains a dominant guiding force in the modern school band. Garafalo’s (2000) *Blueprint for Band*, a standard text for instrumental music education methods classes, is indicative of this. It emphasizes the structural elements of the music as a critical component of the school band curriculum.

The historical evolution of the modern day band movement accounts for much of the predilection towards aesthetic philosophy. In the United States, the band movement reached a zenith during the Gilded Age of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. During this period, professional bands toured throughout the country serving as a popular form of entertainment. Among the prominent band conductors of this era were Patrick Gilmore,

Arthur Pryor, Harold Bachman, and Edwin Franko Goldman; John Philip Sousa was, perhaps, the most notable. While Sousa attempted primarily to entertain rather than educate his audiences, he took great pride in programming transcriptions of works by the leading European composers of the time thereby enriching the cultural experience of those attending the concerts.

As professional bands declined, colleges and school ensembles began to fill the void. Many of the early figures, such as Albert Austin Harding of the University of Illinois, and William D. Revelli of the University of Michigan, programmed in ways similar to Sousa. Typical programs included marches, solos with band accompaniment, novelties, dances, and orchestral transcriptions. Gradually, a call for an original wind band repertoire began. This movement accelerated soon after World War II.

With the founding of the Eastman Wind Ensemble by Frederick Fennell in 1952, many bands began to take a different path. “Fennell believed there was a genuine need for another wind instrument organization which would combine the appropriate features of the symphony orchestra, military band and concert band with regard to performance, composition and music education” (Battisti, 2002, p. 56). While he continued to program marches, transcription, and other standard works for band, Fennell also reached out to nearly 400 composers imploring them to consider composing original works that could capitalize on the unique sonorities of his newly formed wind ensemble. “Among the first composers to respond...were Percy Grainger, Vincent Persichetti and Ralph Vaughn Williams” (Battisti, 2002, p. 57).

The generation of conductors following Fennell, including Donald Hunsberger, Frank Battisti, and H. Robert Reynolds, furthered the goal of creating original literature

for winds and percussion. This resulted in part as a reaction against the functional and entertainment orientations of bands from earlier times. The intent of these new compositions was to parallel the literature for the classical orchestra, opera, and chamber ensemble. As Price (1990) affirmed, a core repertoire comprising oft-repeated works by a historically revered group of composers has long existed for the orchestra. In evaluating more than 10,500 works performed by symphony orchestras between 1982 and 1987, he found that “64 composers account for 8,764 works, more than 83% of the total number of works performed” (Price, 1990, p. 26). Many wind band conductors view this as a model for their idiom. “With quality literature, programming for the concert band can attain an integrity equal to that of the symphony orchestra” (De Young, 1977, p. 29). This most certainly reflected an aesthetic philosophy, a line of thought still dominant in school and collegiate bands today.

The need to identify a core repertoire emerged for reasons that are both practical and idealistic. In the earlier part of the 20th century, school bands were generally extra-curricular programs. Band directors had an interest in establishing them as part of the school curriculum in order, at least in part, to maintain job security. As Stevenson (2004, p. 18) observed, “Before the band could be considered an academic subject, the course content, the literature, had to become as worthy of study as material used in other core classes.” With a dearth of high-quality original repertoire for winds and percussion, especially when compared to the orchestral and choral mediums, band directors endeavored to commission prominent composers of the day to write new works for band. The resulting burgeoning body of new repertoire made it difficult to delineate the literature that merited study as part of the school curriculum. Identifying a core repertoire

would help directors arrive at some agreement on these works, while also helping “to establish a sense of musical identity and shared tradition” (Stevenson, 2004, p. 18). How to come to such a consensus remains problematic. Hauswirth (2013, p. 8) noted that the questions about what constitutes a core repertoire persist to this day.

What exactly do we mean by core repertoire? Is it the highest quality repertoire ever written for winds (and, if so, what are the criteria)? Is it the most often played repertoire? Or is it the repertoire written by the most famous composers?

Many band conductors and scholars have attempted to identify a core repertoire for the wind band, even in spite of the multitude of philosophies, opinions, and debates on what constitutes high quality music. They have established certain standards in order to distinguish essential works from those that are fleeting. Dewey (1934, pp. 319-320), however, deems the establishment of such standards to be problematic.

There are three characteristics of a standard. It is a particular physical thing existing under specified physical conditions; it is not a value. The yardstick is a yardstick.... In the second place, standards are measures of different...lengths, weights, (or) capacities. The things measured are not values.... (A) standard define(s) things with respect to judgments, but it is not itself a mode of judgment. The standard, being an external and public thing, is applied physically.... When, therefore, the word “standard” is used with respect to judgment of works of art, nothing but confusion results.... The critic is really judging, not measuring physical fact. He is concerned with something individual, not comparative.... His subject matter is qualitative, not quantitative. There is no external and public thing, defined by law to be the same for all transactions that can be physically applied. The child who can use a yardstick can measure as well as the most experienced and mature person.... The same cannot be said of judgment of the value of an idea or the value of a work of art.

Battisti (in Berz, 2008) acknowledges a large body of music written specifically for winds, but doubts the existence of a true repertoire. He distinguishes between “literature” as works of music, and “repertoire” which constitutes a body of literature performed repeatedly, that becomes familiar to audiences. Though the standards for

inclusion of compositions in a core repertoire vary in different studies, Jones (2005, p. 60) offers a widely accepted definition.

(It is) a living and ever-evolving body of works that develops through repeated performances. As new pieces are composed, some eventually become part of that core while other pieces fall out of it through disuse. Thus, a core repertoire is not a list of pieces, but, rather, that body of works regularly performed by ensembles of a given instrumentation over extended periods of time.

From an educational standpoint, there appears to be a consensus that student musicians, band directors, and audiences alike should experience a body of high quality, time-tested literature. As these works gain familiarity through repeated performances over time, they gain acceptance as part of a core repertoire and may serve as the nucleus of a balanced approach leading to the long-term success of the wind band as a meritorious, artistic medium. “If conductors attend to their audiences through education and outreach, careful and balanced repertoire choices, creative marketing strategies, and vibrant concert-going experiences, the future should be encouraging” (Turner, 2003, p. 63).

However noble the goal of experiencing a core repertoire of great artistry and historical significance may be, a quandary emerges for younger student musicians unable to meet the musical and technical demands of this literature. Is there a body of repertoire similar in nature, yet approachable to novice musicians? Does it serve as a bridge to a more sophisticated canon of works so highly regarded in the wind band medium?

Statement of Purpose

The fundamental purpose of this study is to identify an actual body of repertoire programmed by distinguished middle-level band programs from across the country.

Although middle-level bands are typically considered part of a traditional grade 6 through

8 middle school, within the context of this study, its definition will be broadened to include grade 9 students that could be affiliated with a junior high school or high school entry level band model.

As opposing factions either promote or denigrate the use of “educational band music” in pursuit of their shared goal of elevating school band programs, it has become necessary to examine the merits and weaknesses of both viewpoints beyond mere conjecture. The goal is to ascertain whether the repertoire of programs, widely recognized as having achieved excellence, is music of “serious artistic merit,” “educational band music,” or some other description. In identifying the works gaining acceptance and familiarity through repeated performances over time, we may determine a core repertoire for developing bands, if indeed one exists. Closer examination in this area may reveal common trends that facilitate the success of these programs, and perhaps serve as a model for the larger instrumental music education community.

Research Questions

The following questions have guided the course of this study:

1. What is the most valued repertoire programmed by distinguished middle-level wind band conductors in the United States?
2. What genres encompass the preponderance of this repertoire?
3. Are these works intended primarily for educational or artistic purposes?

Specific works derived from this study could be further examined to determine a possible relationship with various views on a core repertoire for middle-level band.

Limitations

When liberated from the bounds of a performing ensemble's technical confines, composers can express their musical ideas in an uninhibited manner. With such creativity unleashed, there is a greater opportunity to produce works of serious artistic merit that may become part of a core repertoire. Consequently, the majority of works often found on recommended lists of core repertoire are quite complex and beyond the grasp of most school school-aged musicians.

Since this study endeavors to provide a relevant resource for teachers of middle-level band programs, its focus is limited in scope to compositions that can be performed by typical band students in grades six to nine in the United States. Therefore, the survey of repertoire was intended for works at the difficulty levels of 2 and 3. Although there is no universal, standard grading system used to determine the difficulty of music, a commonly accepted practice is to assign grade levels, from 1 to 6, corresponding to the experience level of the intended performers. Grade 1 is for elementary, Grade 2 is for middle school, Grade 3 is for middle and easy high school, Grade 4 is for high school, Grade 5 is for university, and Grade 6 is for professional level.

Additionally, this study only considers middle-level band programs in the United States. Programs comprised of older high school or younger elementary students were not included, as the majority of them would utilize repertoire and resources inappropriate for students of this age group and level of experience.

Definition of Terms

The term "wind band" or "band" used interchangeably in this study refers to an ensemble consisting of woodwind, brass, and percussion instruments.

“Middle-level bands” are school woodwind, brass, and percussion ensembles affiliated with junior high, middle school, and high schools comprised of students ranging from grade levels six to nine. In high schools, only ensembles comprised solely of 9th grade students were considered.

“Distinguished” or “expert” middle-level band conductors in this study have met one or more of the following criteria:

1. They have achieved national prominence as a conductor, having been frequently engaged to conduct state and regional middle-level honor bands.
2. They are in demand as guest conductors, clinicians, and/or adjudicators for middle-level bands in schools or at state festivals.
3. They are widely recognized composers of music for middle-level band with extensive experience as instrumental music educators at that level.
4. They are highly visible at state and national conferences, invited to present on issues pertaining to middle-level instrumental music education.
5. Their ensembles have routinely achieved the highest ratings at adjudicated festivals.
6. Their ensembles have been invited to perform at major state, regional, or national conferences.
7. They are authors of scholarly articles, books, and other publications on the subject of middle-level band education and related repertoire.
8. They were recommended by university conductors, educators, authors, and composers of national stature, who work extensively with the larger music education community.
9. They were recommended by other distinguished educators, who have met one or more of the aforementioned qualifications, as having comparable credentials, a distinguished reputation in their region, and the expertise to participate in the survey.

“Educational band music” describes music produced by publishing companies and written by composers intended primarily for school ensembles. Characteristics of educational band music reflect limited technical demands for the players. Such factors

include considerations of key, meter, rhythmic complexity, and independence of parts. In some pieces, the result can be an overabundance of doubling, cross-cueing, block scoring and some formulaic techniques, with ranges and keys limited to what is developmentally appropriate at various age levels. The consideration of pedagogy is often of primary interest to composers writing this type of music.

Music of “serious artistic merit” reflects the characteristics of the criteria articulated by Acton Ostling, Jr. (1978) in his study of core repertoire. These include elements of superior form, shape, craftsmanship, unpredictability, consistency in style, ingenuity, and musical validity.

“Original works for winds” are written specifically for ensembles of woodwind, brass, and percussion instruments and designed to be performed in concert settings. They have not been adapted from other instrumental mediums.

“Marches” are compositions consistent in rhythm and pulse, usually in 2/4, 6/8, or cut-time meter, which are often suitable as a musical accompaniment along a parade route. Gallops, quicksteps, and grand concert marches are included in this category.

“Transcriptions” refer to works adapted or simplified for winds from their original orchestral, organ, piano, choral, band or other mediums. They are intended to resemble the content and structure of the original work with limited alteration.

“Arrangements” refer to large-scale modifications of an original work cast into a new musical format for winds. The original composition is substantially altered in content and structure, or combined with the new thematic material of the arranger.

“Popular music” refers to music found in popular culture, including but not limited to arrangements from the rock, disco, jazz, commercial, movie, and theatrical idioms.

“Core repertoire” is a body of musical compositions, repeatedly performed over time. It has been widely regarded as containing exceptional works of serious artistic merit.

Need for the Study

While many have written about the subject of a core repertoire, the preponderance of literature consists of the opinions of recognized experts in the wind band field, including prominent conductors, composers, and educators assessing music solely based on artistic orientation. The dominant voices are those of university band directors as exemplified in a number of studies, opinion pieces, and recommended literature lists published in books like *Rehearsing the Band* (Williamson, 2008, pp. 92-104). Much of their focus is on a body of masterworks that are only approachable by more accomplished musicians, usually at the advanced high school level or beyond.

A number of studies have attempted to identify a core band repertoire and establish the criteria by which compositions are deemed to have the commensurate artistic merit to achieve this status. As with the aforementioned recommendations offered by the authorities in the band field, most of these studies identify works requiring a proficient skill set on the part of performers. In considering the implications of such studies as they apply to younger instrumental students, Hauswirth (2013, p. 8) enquires, “Does this mean there is no ‘core repertoire’ for medium level bands?”

The scarcity of scholarly research is most apparent as it pertains to repertoire for bands at the developmental level. However, there are a few studies. Hash (2005) analyzed the repertoire performed by 81 middle school concert bands from 72 schools in Illinois. He found that nearly half of the works were composed by only 10 composers, with James Swearingen accounting for 10%. Since the study was limited to only those schools participating in the 2003 Illinois Grade School Music Association Northern Division district level contests, there is insufficient evidence to make a determination about regional and national trends in repertoire selection.

A number of other research-based efforts on this subject have resulted in little more than considered opinions. The most notable ones are by Fonder (2000), Budiansky and Foley (2005), and Travis J. Weller (2010).

A cursory glance at the young band works being heavily marketed today, as well those on state and national lists, provides clues as to what can be appropriate, core repertoire for the young band. It has also helped to fuel the continuing debate over artistic quality. Moreover, there is little evidence to suggest that recent compositional and performance trends will bring about a resolution at any point in the near future. As Reynish (2009, p.12) reported about the 2009 World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles (WASBE) conference, “For the conductor at grade 3 or 4, regrettably little repertoire was on show in Cincinnati.”

Performances by high school bands across the country at conferences sponsored by professional organizations like the World Association of Symphonic Bands and Ensembles (WASBE), the National Association for Music Education (NAfME), and the Midwest Clinic, highlight a number of exemplary programs willing and able to perform

many of the recognized masterworks in the band repertoire. At the crux is a void of research dealing with the music performed by students in these programs during their formative years that helped them to achieve this level of mastery and musicianship. Additional inquiry is necessary to determine the actual body of repertoire currently integrated in the curriculum of exceptional middle-level band programs. Research aimed at answering these questions can provide valuable information to band directors of developmental programs in best meeting the essential pedagogical and aesthetic needs of their students. It can also assist university professors in better preparing future music educators for this critical role.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Philosophical Foundations of the Wind Band and its Repertoire

The importance and impact of studying high-quality music is manifest within a wide range of competing philosophies on music and music education. Dewey discussed this spectrum of beliefs:

The appeal of music – of certain grades – is much more widespread, much more independent of special cultivation, than that of any other art. And one has only to observe some musical enthusiasts of a certain kind at a concert to see that they are enjoying an emotional debauch, a release from ordinary inhibitions and an entrance into a realm where excitations are given unrestricted rein.... On the other side, there are types of music, those most prized by connoisseurs, that demand special training to be perceived and enjoyed, and its devotees form a cult so that *their* art is the most esoteric of all arts. (Dewey, 1934, pp. 247-248)

Neilson (1964, p. 27) believes that music can, “arouse all sorts of emotions. It can compel listeners to jubilation...contemplation...foreshadow impending doom or act as a comedy....” Whatever good music says or does must be sensed by conductor and performers if its message is to be revealed.” Whitwell (1998, p. 13) draws upon the sentiments of the philosophers Descartes, Chénier, Nodier, Chabanon, De Visme, and Rousseau in describing “music as an actual language of emotions.” “What music is, and has been since the most remote time, is a special language for the purpose of communicating feeling...and because the emotions are universal, and are so even before birth, all men understand this language” (Whitwell, 1999, p. 64).

Philosopher Susanne Langer views music in symbolic terms, arguing that it “...is not the cause or cure of feelings, but their logical expression. In this capacity it has the power of symbolizing ideas which our language of words cannot always express” (Kohut, 1963, p. 58).

The 1950s marked the decline of the progressive education movement. “From the military sector and the halls of Congress to...academia, the Cold War call was to turn American education to serving narrow nationalistic interests.... The comprehensive high school had never been so severely threatened since its establishment” (Tanner & Tanner, 2007, pp. 322-323). The rejection of progressive education inevitably exposed the lack of a fundamental philosophical underpinning to the field of music education.

Charles Leonhard and Allen Britton were among the first to address this concern specifically in music education. “They called for an intellectual grounding...that did not rely on ancillary, or utilitarian, values, but rather on students’ depth of understanding of music itself” (Mark & Gary, 2007, p. 417). They wanted to accentuate the inherent value of music itself rather than justify its importance by referencing the beneficial byproducts of studying music that could also be associated with a host of other scholastic endeavors. Drawing upon the inspiration of philosophers, including John Dewey, Leonard Meyer, and Susanne Langer, Leonhard and Britton based their music education philosophy on aesthetics, linking music to human emotion and the education of feeling. They deemed this essential in balancing a curriculum focused disproportionately on science, math and technology.

It was Bennett Reimer, a devotee of Langer, who in 1970 synthesized many of these ideas and his own into his groundbreaking book, *A Philosophy of Music Education*. His call for “music education as aesthetic education” served as a driving force behind many of the music education initiatives of the middle and late 20th century. The primary focus of music education was now on “the aesthetically developed individual” (Mark, 1982, p. 20). The Music Educators National Conference (MENC, presently known as

NAfME) soon adopted this mantra, spearheading initiatives over the subsequent decades that raised awareness and promoted an aesthetic foundation to music education.

The rise of aesthetic philosophy conflated with the founding of the Eastman Wind Ensemble by Frederick Fennell. His objective to promote the wind ensemble as a serious artistic medium greatly influenced conductors of both university and school bands who were in search of a philosophical direction during a tumultuous period in education. Since the lineage of so many band conductors can be traced back to this tradition, the influence of aesthetics remains a dominant force in this field, especially as it pertains to musical literature.

Different Philosophical Views about Musical Literature in Education

While aesthetic philosophy has been entrenched in music education for decades, a number of contemporary philosophers and music educators have challenged the status quo. David Elliott, a former student of Reimer, advocates a more divergent “paraxial” philosophy which “emphasizes that music ought to be understood in relation to the meanings and values evidenced in actual music making and music listening in specific cultural contexts” (Elliott, 1996, p. 14). His landmark book, *Music Matters*, questions music education as aesthetic education on the grounds that, “It neglects to consider the nature and importance of music making” (Elliott, 1996, p. 32).

Elliott uses the term “musicing” in defining the processes of performing, improvising, composing, arranging, and conducting. “Musicers” are the “practitioners” engaged in the process. He is especially critical of the aesthetic concept of musical works as entities to be revered. Such a focus not only ignores that human activity of music

making, it elevates only western art music at the exclusion of a wide variety of musical forms and practices of other world cultures.

Musicing is an important term. It serves to remind (and re-mind) us that long before there were musical compositions, there was music making in the sense of singing and playing remembered renditions and improvisations; that many cultures still view music as something people do; and that even in the West where composers and composing are essential aspects of the musical tradition, compositions remain silent until interpreted and performed by music makers. Most of all, musicing reminds us that performing and improvising through singing and playing instruments lies at the heart of MUSIC as a diverse human practice. (Elliott, 1996, p. 49)

Elliott does not denigrate the wind band as part of a music education, but offers an alternative to the prevailing philosophy to which many band directors subscribe. Bergee (1989) also challenges traditional perceptions of band programs, especially those that base their success primarily on high enrollment, increased public performances, and marching band participation. Straddling between aesthetic concerns and contemporary calls for the wholesale restructuring of school band programs, he urges smaller class sizes of no more than 29 students, organized by student skill level, and the removal of marching band as part of the curricular school day. Bergee (1989, p. 22) also advocates “a reasonable performance schedule...new technology...[and making] band classes cooperative rather than competitive.” Instituting such changes, he believes, will ensure that school band programs remain a vital part of the core curriculum.

Post-modern philosophies based upon democratic and social justice ideals are especially critical of aesthetic beliefs, even going so far as to seek the upheaval of traditional institutions of music education. This is especially true with regard to school band programs. Benedict (2008) describes the current state of the wind band as one, which “divides musical communities and obscures issues of power and control,

effectively reproducing the oppressed/oppressor relationships.” She writes, “We reproduce systems in which responsibility is not just dissuaded, but abdicated.” Even the conductor becomes oppressed “in this search for perfection.... [She is] the tool of the repertoire” (Allsup & Benedict, 2008, pp. 160-162).

Benedict relates the band to social institutions, which “have experts who function as managers of the institutional knowledge base, guardians and defenders of the status quo, and gatekeepers for controlling admission” (Allsup & Benedict, 2008, p. 163). Her implication is that music education students, or “conscripts” as she calls them, are indoctrinated into an unyielding system of unbroken traditions. They, in turn, pass on this knowledge to future generations who promulgate a perpetual, oblivious “status quo” (Allsup & Benedict, 2008, pp. 162-164).

Allsup and Benedict (2008, p. 170) maintain that the modern band culture is marred by a “culture of domination” and “fear” dictated by “pathologically narcissistic...experts who function as ‘managers’ of the institutional knowledge base.” Therefore, we must act immediately and more inclusively to break this cycle of suppression. For the very essence, if not existence, of instrumental music education is apparently at stake.

Allsup condemns the sense of control and predictability that band conductors demand from students as a result of the “governing philosophy of today’s wind ensembles and concert bands sprung more from a military ethos than...aesthetic divertissements” (Allsup & Benedict, 2008, p. 158). He believes music education to be at a crossroads where students no longer relate to the traditional practices imposed upon them. Democratic ideals hold a promising solution to this dilemma. “To foster growth,

schools must transmit and communicate important traditional values, but they must also be open to change and inclusion” (Allsup, 2007, p. 52). Such change applies even to the large ensemble setting, where Allsup champions alternative methods and repertoire.

The notion of democratic education is a complex one, more nuanced than, for example, letting members of a choir select the color of the group’s robes or giving the pep band an opportunity to vote on music. Democracy requires collaboration, and it must involve more than just adults — its practice should incorporate the rights and opinions of both teachers and students. (Allsup, 2003, p. 27)

From October 2001 through January 2002, Allsup (2003) facilitated a study of nine band students from a rural high school in New York State. Over the 11 sessions, each one lasting 2.5 hours, students participated in all facets of the activities, from establishing procedures to selecting music. One group of students decided to participate using their band instruments, the other opted for electric guitar, bass, synthesizer and drums in a quintessential rock band setting. According to Allsup, both he and the students concluded that the more contemporary format encouraged greater collaboration, creativity, freedom to explore, and enjoyment, whereas the classically-oriented group felt more restricted in those areas. What Allsup calls “the action of discovery” is vital to the democratic process in education. “When students are given space to explore freely, to work democratically, they will create (from one of their musical worlds) a context about which they are familiar, conversant, or curious” (Allsup, 2003, p. 35). In essence, the democratic approach enhances all-around musical development while promoting a sense of fairness and justice. Allsup continues to emphasize these attributes in stark contrast to the more authoritarian approach of the traditional large band setting.

Mantie (2012) expands upon many of Allsup and Benedict’s assertions. Drawing from the philosophies of power and knowledge articulated by Michel Foucault, he

addresses what he calls “an antinomy between music education and bands-as-music-education paradigms. For the Director of Bands, bands are a (or even *the*) medium *of* music education; for the professor of Music education, bands are a medium *for* music education” (Mantie, 2012, p. 76).

To bolster his argument, Mantie delves into the evolution of the school and university wind band in the United States, from its origins as a vehicle for entertainment to its current aim of seeking recognition as a medium for high art. Noting the influence of music instrument manufacturers in the post-World War I era, who were eager to sell instruments, Mantie questions the connection between school bands and music education.

What must not be assumed in this narrative is that school concert bands were originally conceived as a medium of “music education” in the sense that many people today use the term. Instead, I would argue that, in the absence of an established disciplinary base of knowledge, bands were simply appropriated by schools.... Given that so many early school bands were led by former military, amateur, and commercial musicians rooted in an entertainment ethic—one that celebrated participation, the productive use of leisure time, and the added spirit that bands contributed to the school and the community—it is hardly surprising that early school bands were not thought of as strictly pedagogical or educational entities in the sense they often are today. (Mantie, 2012, pp. 70-71)

Holz (1966) affirms this notion with his research on the early school bands and the National School Band Tournaments of the first half of the twentieth century. He writes, “The school band seems to have been accepted because, in addition to musical values, it functioned as a character-building agency, a socially suitable leisure-time activity, and a prevocational training program” (Holz, 1966, p. 19). In fact, 19 of the original 30 bands referenced by Holz were not directed by musical

specialists, but by other subject teachers who knew little of the instruments other than their own.

Mantie (2012) further asserts that university bands have moved from their more humble, inclusive, and accessible roots to a more elitist realm of higher artistic pursuits in order to justify its place in the curriculum. An entity, limited to civic and entertainment roles, was deemed too frivolous to merit serious study. In search of legitimacy, university wind conductors followed the traditional, authoritarian approach of the symphony orchestra while seeking its own canon of artistic repertoire by engaging the most notable classical composers of the time. University band programs emerged as the standard-bearer for school bands to emulate. The result has been generations of school band directors replicating what they learned from the university conductors. This is especially apparent as it pertains to choice in literature with the notion of the canon in mind.

The definition of a canon is seemingly self-evident, but continues to evolve. Derived from a concept in literature, a canon comprises a body of works traditionally regarded as preeminent. Kremp (2010, p. 1052) views the “construction of the musical canon...on two sequential processes: the formation and the reproduction of the canon.” He attributes the “formation” of the canon to the influence of cultural and economic elitists in 19th-century Europe and America who sought to distinguish certain music for the consumption of those with discrimination that is more refined. The “reproduction” refers to the narrowing of the performed repertoire to a limited number of composers and compositions that reflect such tastes, thus sustaining the viability of orchestras who could more readily tap in to the resources of an economically privileged audience. The resulting body of oft-repeated works largely reflects the Western culture and tradition.

Others assert that the definition of a canon is more broadly based. According to Huttenen (2008, p. 14):

If we think of the canon as a collection of many kinds of historical facts, it would be better to speak about several rather than one. A basic canon, a “canon of canons,” is formed by the generally accepted facts of the broad canon of Western music, exemplified at least approximately in standard textbooks. There are several others: those of national music histories, histories of musical instruments, jazz, rock, and so on. The canonization of Western music took root in the nineteenth century, but new canons are being developed all the time. Old canons may die away, but the disappearance of the one formed in the nineteenth century is very unlikely in our culture given the strong influence of nineteenth-century ideas on us.

This “strong influence” in particular continues to shape the landscape of the wind band repertory and the desire of university wind conductors to nurture the concept of a canon of works for the wind band. However, music selected primarily for its perceived artistic status is not always pedagogically suitable for developing student musicians, thereby obscuring the role of music education within the band setting.

Balancing Different Philosophies

McCathren (1984) also references the emphasis on the artistic and aesthetic nature of programming for education purposes. On the other hand, he calls for band directors to embrace the entertaining aspects of music, much as people have throughout history. “Most of the audience is there not to hear “educational experiences” but *music*. Even those interested in the educational aspects would prefer to be entertained.” He goes on to say, “Let us not confuse entertaining music with trash. Good substantial music is entertaining” (McCathren, 1984, p. 12). By “substantial music,” he is referring to music of composers such as Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, and Wagner – an undoubtedly aesthetic point of view.

Wuorinen (2000, p. 17) sharply rebukes postmodernist views, turning the tables on whom he believes should be identified as the cultural elitist.

There are the elites who lead and determine...the shape of our contemporary “culture”.... But what truly disturbs is the aping of commercial vulgarians and vulgarity by those who are supposed to know better, be better informed, have better taste and higher sensibilities – than the unthinking mob. I refer of course to those who are supposed to lead – whether they are individuals of wealth and influence, or heads of important cultural or educational institutions, or public thinkers and commenters, or (God help us) politicians.... Unfortunately, in a weird perversion of the democratic ideal, most of these leaders show their egalitarianism not in social mixing with the “masses,” but in aping their tastes.... There is a great danger that the traditional posture of university music – salubrious stuffiness – may be replaced by the vapid and inconsequential. There is the chance that various forms of scholarly silliness – usually politically driven and deeply hostile to the “elitist” idea of excellence and achievement – may undermine the typical university interest in the out-of-the-way, the progressive, and the hermetic.

Fonder (2009) finds merit in both arguments to the extent that the teaching method instills a greater passion for music and a desire to learn more. He also finds flaws in both extremes. Fonder bemoans the “maestro-centric” tradition that focuses too much on uniformity and execution, rewarding only the best and brightest individuals and ensembles with honor band festivals and conference performance opportunities. This “factory” approach is more concerned about maximizing rehearsal time, often relying upon manufactured “formulaic music that is safely scored and entering music festivals where every band is judged seemingly best-in-category” (Fonder, 2009, p. 94). While the results may appease the greater school community, Fonder questions how this can ultimately inspire a greater love of music.

On the other extreme is what Fonder (2009) refers to as the “county fair model.”

In this model, our methods are noisy, wildly varied, and perhaps a bit messy around the edges. Here the teacher follows a path more as co-explorer...and students are allowed to pursue different routes with the intent of finding an endpoint perhaps less performance-based than the above-stated factory model....

The county fair model is often a fun, reflective, yet purposeful diversion for the students.... The question here is can the students achieve a love of music and a love for learning more about it when musicianship is so ill defined and unsequenced? (Fonder, 2009, p. 94)

He proposes “the crucible” as an ideal balance between the two extremes. The crucible “...is an environment where performing and skill building coexist with the creative and aesthetic processes” (Fonder, 2009, p. 94). Although Fonder believes in a high standard of excellence in performance, it should not come at the expense of self-discovery and enjoyable learning experiences.

While the selection of high-quality repertoire remains paramount, it can potentially be detrimental when teachers exclusively impose their personal tastes on students who may not be ready to appreciate a more mature repertoire. According to Fonder, young band students may benefit from carefully selected, well-constructed educational band music in the same way as students learning to read can grasp Dr. Seuss before they are ready to appreciate Melville. Whatever the repertoire chosen, it is incumbent upon the conductor to delve deeper into the music so the students can better appreciate the meaning and structure of the work. “It is the combination of high-quality literature fused with a lively, collaborational exposure to its creation and its message that forms the band rehearsal-as-crucible experience” (Fonder, 2009, p. 96).

Another more measured philosophy is the “dialectical” approach advocated by Jorgensen (1997). According to Jorgensen, there is no singular theory, belief, or practice best suited for every circumstance in a field as diverse as music education. “The demands of each situation cannot be met by a single universal philosophy...no matter how philosophically and practically defensible it might appear to be. Rather, each music teacher must fit the right instructional approaches...unique to a particular situation”

(Jorgensen, 1997, p. 92). Communication, collaboration, understanding, flexibility, and finding common ground are more essential to unifying the profession than imposing one particular ideology over another. Jorgensen deftly navigates across the cultural divide between the likes of Allsup and Wuorinen, especially as it applies to repertoire.

I am not persuaded by the argument that classical traditions are necessarily elitist...whereas folk and popular traditions are necessarily universalistic and proletarian. Marxist attempts to equate music with social class...tend to emphasize the differences among, rather than shared qualities between, various musical traditions. Neither classical nor folk music has a corner on greatness, goodness, or rightness.... Attempts to democratize music by emphasizing popular musical culture at the expense of classical traditions are misguided.... Human genius has never been plentiful, and it is unfortunate if it is devalued by suggesting that exhibitions of quite ordinary and sometimes inferior talent are great and equally worthy of study just because they are popular. To do so is to elevate mediocrity as the ideal and even to discourage students from pursuing musical excellence. If the classical music tradition does not have a corner on greatness, we may well find musical gems among the folk and popular idioms and, conversely, quite ordinary examples of music in the classical tradition. Democratic ideals imply equality of opportunity to create rather than creative output; to confuse the two is to make a significant mistake. A teacher's search for musical repertoire necessarily includes both great and little musical traditions and seeking out that which is special. Distinctive, meaningful, and within the powers of students to realize successfully. (Jorgensen, 1997, pp. 76-77)

Without migrating too far from his aesthetic roots, Reimer (2003) has somewhat modified his staunch philosophical stance in the latest edition of *A Philosophy of Music Education: Advancing the Vision*. Similar in some ways to Jorgensen, Reimer espouses “a synergistic” method to redressing sharp divisions in music education philosophy. “A change of attitude from one of contention to one of accommodation can restore a much needed sense of community and shared values, while at the same time respecting inevitable disagreements” (Reimer, 2003, p. 32). As he goes on to discuss how a number of seemingly, diametrically opposed philosophies can find common ground, Reimer contends that passionate beliefs must neither be abandoned nor even compromised.

Indeed, he maintains his own fundamental notions, continuing to lay the aesthetic foundation that many band directors draw upon to this day.

The Influence of Aesthetic Philosophy on Repertoire Selection

WASBE presents a notable example of the preference for aesthetic philosophy in the wind band community through its ongoing efforts to define quality in band literature. Since its founding in 1981-1983, the organization has struggled with the nature of the band's repertoire. A particularly strong discussion occurred at its 1999 conference in San Luis Obispo, California, where this subject was quite contentious. Many of the leading figures of the band movement, including Frank Battisti, Frederick Fennell, Timothy Reynish, Rolf Rudin, and David Whitwell, largely defined quality in aesthetic terms. Since the 1999 conference, numerous articles have appeared in the organization's academic journal that reinforce the notion of quality defined in an aesthetic context (Andreoli, 2000; Battisti, 1999; Berz, 2000; Blomhert, 2000; Brashier, 2000; Fennell, 1999; Fonder, 2000 & 2009; Hawkins, 2009; Lyng, 2000; Misenhelter, 2000; Neilson, 2009; Somers, 2000).

Fennell (1999), in his keynote address to the WASBE Conference in California, identified four specific areas in which he envisioned a future mission for the wind band. In speaking about continued collaboration with prolific composers to create new works, recruiting expert conductors to bring them to life, broadening the goals of the WASBE organization, and examining the evolution of the wind band in the past before charting a future course, he definitively aligned his vision with aesthetic principles. Moreover, he expounded upon the university's role in this charge.

Music enjoys the freedom of art, granting all the option of choice.... Professional and educational societies...have always had a responsibility within their freedom

to present the listener – the student and the emerging player – with music as it is developing out of this freedom of art, in their own time. (Fennell, 1999, p. 8)

Arts critic, Paul Somers (2000), proposed a novel idea with the goal of propelling the wind band into greater artistic acceptance. Clearly rooted in aesthetic philosophy, Somers (2000, p. 21) calls for bands to emerge from their self-imposed “ghettos” of “well-defined parameters with graded music and an audience of family and friends who will listen...because of their connection to the person on stage, or because it is an arm of the government, or because the music is utterly populist.” He also argues against using a standardized instrumentation for all musical situations. Furthering the concept of flexible instrumentation inherent to Fennell’s model, Somers advocates for the inclusion of strings into a new medium of wind ensemble.

Consider the literature that opens up for wind players when the strings are invited in as guests. All those fabulous late Mozart piano concerti become available. It could be up to a wind ensemble to perform the Brahms *Serenade No. 2* and bring in the low strings as extras.

And also consider the literature that open for the orchestras then they meet the wind literature. It could be the opening for audiences to an appreciation of American composers rarely heard in orchestral concerts who would, by the very weight of the literature they have produced, begin to leave an impact on the audiences, which attend the new mixed ensemble of the future. (Somers, 2000, p. 20)

Speaking from the perspective of Italian wind bands, Andreoli (2000) expressed a universal concern about the state of the repertoire failing to reach a wider audience beyond educational institutions. “A repertory for band that is ‘good music’” is his proposed solution (Andreoli, 2000, p 51). Andreoli also places a great deal of responsibility on the shoulders of the conductor for not only reaching out to audiences, but educating performers on how to interpret the complexities of sophisticated, modern music.

Battisti (1999) acknowledges a practical role of the wind band in certain events and the need to select repertoire appropriate for specific functions. However, he draws a distinction between the “selection of the best repertoire” for an occasion and music of “artistic merit” (Battisti, 2000, p. 55). Selecting expressive music requires an element of taste on the part of the conductor. According to Battisti, taste can be cultivated through engagement in a wide variety of artistic endeavors, including the study of literature, philosophy, dancing, and painting.

Blomhert (2000) largely concurs with Battisti, specifically with regard to the diligent study of music and the evolution of taste. However, he draws an important distinction between the concepts of taste and quality, noting the existence of an inherent bias when one relies solely on personal predilection when assessing artistic integrity. “As very few people advertise themselves as champions of bad taste, the “taste” in question always is considered by the individual as “good taste,” whatever this may be” (Blomhert, 2000, p. 48). The concept of quality can become even more muddled when so-called “quality” music is rendered in an unconvincing fashion, or music of suspect construction is performed with creativity and prowess. Hence, the ongoing debates about musical value.

Wuorinen (2000, p. 16) draws a distinction between entertainment, which he considers a fleeting, temporary experience of pleasure, and art, which he believes to be a more lasting, transformative experience that can include pleasure.

Entertainment is that which we can receive and enjoy passively, without effort, without our putting anything into the experience.... Art is like nuclear fusion: you have to put something into it to get it started, but you get more out of it in the end than what you put into it.

“Zoltan Kodaly once said, ‘Children should be taught with only the most musically valuable material.... They should be led to masterpieces by means of masterpieces’” (Prentice, 1986, p. 55). According to numerous music educators, conductors, composers, and scholars, choosing high-quality, expressive repertoire that promotes musical growth and aesthetic sensitivity in student musicians is a fundamental responsibility entrusted to band directors at every level of instruction (Adams, 2002; Anderson, 1973; Apfelstadt, 2000; Battisti, 1972 & 1995; Begian, 1991; Budiansky & Foley, 2005; Del Borgo, 1988; Doran, 1956; Fennell, 2008; Fonder, 2000; Gabriel, 1984; Gage, 2000; Garafalo, 1992; Grashel, 1989; Green in Terrasi, 1998; Hanna, 1963; Heidel, 2006; Jachens, 1987; Kohut, 1963; Lance, 2013; McBeth, 1990; Neilson, 1964; Neilson, 2009; Nelson, 1994; Persellin, 2000; Powell, 2009; Prentice, 1986; Reynish, 2009; Reynolds, 2000; Rocco, 1991; Sheldon, 1996). Fennell emphatically declared, “Choosing music is the single most important thing a band director can do” (Reynish, 2009, Frederick Fennell section).

Debates and discussions over repertoire selection criteria are not new and extend well beyond the boundaries of WASBE. As far back as 1932, Edwin Franko Goldman (in Welch, 1984) wrote about the need to perform works of master composers, such as Bach and Beethoven. He pointed to numerous works regularly performed by orchestras, which were originally composed for other mediums. Goldman’s advice was heeded by early school band directors as evidenced by the large number of transcriptions played at the National Band Contests.

With events like the Yale Seminar in 1963, there were numerous recommendations to improve the quality of school repertoire. Martin (1957, p. 27)

advocated criteria for finding appropriate music within the more than 150,000 works listed for school bands, orchestras, and choruses in the publishers' catalogs of that time. According to him, "There are three basic viewpoints...an evaluation of the music itself, a consideration of the functional purpose of the music is intended to serve and an understanding of the human psychology of the performers and listener."

What Reimer (2003, p. 282) defines as the "musical learnings" of students in bands is "as broad or as narrow as the selection of music they learn to perform creatively and intelligently." In line with this philosophy, Trimborn (1984) addressed concerns raised about performance-driven repertoire selection at the expense of a more conceptual emphasis on the musical elements of rhythm, melody, harmony, and texture. He surveyed Illinois high school band directors to compile exemplar lists of repertoire from which instructional units on these very elements were developed. However, the works compiled predate 1970, thus omitting the enormous output of band compositions in the subsequent decades.

According to Lisk (1996, p. 6), "Musical expression and the feeling of music have long been mysterious and elusive for student musicians." Kohut (1963, p. 59) attributes much of this to a "lack of association with good literature" and a failure on the part of teachers "to compare the composers when we play their music, to discuss elements of music theory, history of music, and perhaps a few amusing anecdotes."

Heidel (2006, p. 24) believes that directors must make repertoire selections based on "the inherent musical quality of the composition." Persellin (2000, p. 17) concurs, stating that "High-quality music lays the foundation for a sound music education...[through which] students learn more about the world around them, as well as

about themselves.” Moreover, she cautions that when inferior or inappropriate repertoire is selected, “...no amount of charisma or creative teaching can undo the initial mistake.” Gage (2000, p. 11) also believes in “Quality (art) first” asking, “Does the repertoire selected provide potential for an aesthetic response by the performers, for the conductor, and for the audience?”

Begian (1991, p. 10) identifies two concerns: “...the study and performance of great artistic literature from all periods of Western history, and the valuation of artistic musical expression...are lacking in many school band programs.” He believes that the students’ musical growth is hindered when “school bands...study and perform music of little substance.” Begian fears that such students will ultimately lose interest and drop out of band programs.

Gabriel (1984) views the creation and performance of excellent literature as a vital, ongoing renewal process. “One of the most important functions of any artistic group is to nurture the growth of its repertoire. Without new, fresh, and exciting inspirational output, any art form would soon be relegated to the museum” (Gabriel, 1984, p. 13). McBeth contends that an inextricable link exists between the quality of the repertoire and the future standing of the wind band. For it to survive as a vehicle for serious music, it must depend upon music of excellence. “Our existence as medium does not; our existence as a viable artistic medium does” (McBeth, 1989, p. 91).

The Role of Aesthetic Philosophy in Determining “Quality” in Music

The limited amount of research on the subject of aesthetics and band music has yielded mixed results. From 1971 to 1972, Lawrence Anderson conducted a study of 600 band students in six Contra Costa County, California high schools to determine if concert

band literature could raise the level of aesthetic sensitivity in the students. Using scores generated by the *Gaston Test of Musicality* and the *California Test of Aesthetic Judgments in Music*, he determined that the students exposed to concert band music “attained the primary goal of music education, i.e., the development of aesthetic sensitivity to music, and did so better than the stage band students” (Anderson, 1973, p. 24).

A later study conducted by Deborah Capperella-Sheldon in 1992 appears to contradict Anderson’s findings. Using a Continuous Response Digital Interface (CRDI), 43 non-musician, undergraduate upperclassmen and 49 undergraduate and graduate musicians indicated the degree to which they perceived an aesthetic response while listening to the *Chaconne* from Holst’s *First Suite in Eb for Military Band*. What constituted an aesthetic experience was purely at the discretion of the individual subjects. Capperella-Sheldon (1992, p. 59) surmises that, “if music educators teach for heightened awareness such that aesthetic response might be available to the student, then those who have been trained in music should have access to this response.” Yet, the results indicate relatively little difference between the two groups.

However, delving beneath the surface of the raw data uncovers a litany of responses to open-ended questions that shed additional insights. The musician group answered these questions in far greater numbers, by a ratio greater than 2:1. The comments by the musicians were more detailed and sophisticated than those provided by the non-musician group. Perhaps, the choice of a famous, standard work might have skewed the results. In the end, more questions are raised by Capperella-Sheldon than answered.

Was the selection long enough to truly allow subjects aesthetic response development? Were “peak experiences” really being achieved or was this an exercise in preference? Is there a difference between preference and the “aesthetic experience?” To what degree does musical training affect aesthetic responsiveness? This study would suggest that musicians and non-musicians react in a similar manner to this particular selection of wind band music but that their reasons for achieving these responses may be very different. What of the “profundity” of the selection itself? The music is considered by many to be an “old war horse” and retains lasting import as well as aesthetic value.... This brings to light the issue of familiarity. When does familiarity heighten aesthetic awareness and at which point does it help diminish aesthetic response? (1992, p. 67)

Bauer’s (1996) survey of 65 high school band directors from Ohio provides insight into both their aesthetic and functional mindset when choosing music. Band directors in this study reported 23 specific considerations when selecting repertoire. Ranked in order, with “1” representing the most frequently reported consideration and “23” indicating the least, are the following results:

(1) [The] band’s ability to execute the technical demands...(2) [The] band’s ability to execute the musical demands...(3) Ensemble performance concepts that can be taught.. (4) Musical stylistic concepts that can be taught...(5) Technical concepts that can be taught...(6) Type of composition (march, overture, suite, etc.)...(7) Music through which specified musical elements can be taught...(8) Choosing music that (the director feels) is standard repertoire...(9) Aesthetic response available to students through the composition...(10) Programming needs for a specific concert...(11) [The director’s] own musical preference...(12) How familiar (the director is) with other works by the composer...(13) How the composition fits into the overall curriculum of literature... (14) Theoretical and/or historical concepts that can be taught...(15) Composition’s audience appeal...(16) Historical era of the composition...(17) Choosing music representative of a particular genre...(18) Choosing music (to teach) a specific composer’s musical style...(19) Price of an arrangement...(20) [The] student’s musical preferences...(21) Choosing music representative of a particular world culture...(22) Choosing music [the director has] performed as a playing member...(23) Choosing music [the director has] previously conducted. (Bauer, 1996, p. 7)

Bauer’s study also raises concerns about the degree that artistic merit is considered, concluding that a more important criterion for selecting music is based on the

primary objectives of a specific performance rather than its long-term educational implications. He found that the most common means by which band directors chose pieces was through the promotional recordings released by the publishing companies.

However, the commercial goals of advertising new arrangements may not necessarily comply with the highest artistic standards. Promotional recordings are largely a byproduct of market influence and potential profit margins, not aesthetic philosophical concerns. As Reynolds (2000, p. 33) indicates, “Often the most superficial music is accompanied by the most sophisticated advertising and promotion.” Budiansky (2005, 2009) expressed similar sentiments, noting that band directors often succumb to the allure of repertoire due to the cleverly crafted marketing strategies of the music publishing companies rather than the artistic integrity of the music itself. Ferrin (1987, p. 63) warns that similar practices can also extend to the grading systems used by publishers whereby “economics may be more of a motivating force than the actual difficulty of the music.”

Rhodes (2013, p. 22) advises directors to “be wary of pieces with a descriptive title that are little more than a series of flashy sounds cobbled together.” Such admonitions are not new. Vagner (1958, p. 38) writes, “The evil is not in writing with a new kind of sound, but in using this as the sole criterion for the selection of band music.” Battisti (2002, p. 282) also decries these practices.

Presently, the wind band world is being greatly influenced by the music industry, which promises answers to all the challenges faced by wind band/ensemble directors. Never have there been so many “merchandise fixes” (educational aids, guides, products, etc.) offered to those working in the teaching/directing profession. Too often, this material is “entertainment instruction” packaged as education aids. While some of this material is useful, much of it is not and does not contribute to the goal of teaching music as an expressive art.

Factors Influencing Literature Selection

Heidel (2006) identified non-musical considerations that directors often make when evaluating repertoire. These include the composer's prominence, attraction to the title, and previous experiences with the music. The findings of a study by Fiese (1990) support Heidel's assertion. In this experiment, 45 undergraduate conducting students at the University of Miami ranked four obscure musical scores based on their musical quality. These results were compared to those given by recognized music authorities on the faculty. The experimental group was presented with scores that were labeled correctly with non-musical information (such as the title of the composition, date, and the composer), labeled incorrectly to purposely mislead the students, or contained no additional information whatsoever. The results not only indicated that the students' perception of musical quality differed substantially from the faculty experts, "the students provided with the incorrect non-musical information consistently demonstrated a pattern of response that would support the hypothesis that [they] tend to use nonmusical information while forming qualitative judgments" (Fiese, 1990, p. 19).

Heidel's (2006, p. 25) review of prominent studies on quality band literature provides a number of guidelines that directors can consider when selecting repertoire. He identified the eight standards used by Fiese. These include "structural unity and coherence...logical development of musical ideas...use of contrast...activity and complexity...effective use of instruments...creativity vs. predictability...interest...[and] suitability for the band medium."

Grant (1993) affirmed the importance of the quality of literature chosen in his study of the repertoire selection process of Missouri high school band directors. He found

only negligible differences in the priorities of the 210 band directors who responded, regardless of enrollment, teacher education and experience, and participation in conferences and festivals. Of greatest importance to band directors was the quality of the music and its technical accessibility to the students. Of least importance was the difficulty level assigned by the publisher and the cost of the work.

Crochet (2006) closely examined the literature selection processes of band directors to assess the influence of experience, training, and success. She used 14 factors to determine the band directors' degree of success, including festival ratings, leadership and organizational abilities, participation in professional organizations, solo festival and conference performances, and enrollment. The directors deemed more successful scored in the upper median on a survey. A similar method determined the level of training. The degree of experience correlated to the number of years teachers taught on one or more instructional levels. On a Likert scale, each of the directors ranked the extent to which they consider 18 different criteria when selecting repertoire.

Results from the 301 band directors who participated indicated significant differences between more experienced and less experienced band directors in how and why they choose their music. For example, 70% of more experienced band directors use live performance as a means of selecting music as opposed to only 17% of less experienced teachers. The more successful band directors refer to national organization and recommended repertoire lists more often. The perceived quality of the music was also a much higher priority for experienced band directors, with 61% of them relying upon the musical integrity of the composition as opposed to 31% of those with less experience. As Crochet (2006, pp. 107-108) observed:

Repertoire selection does differ as a function of experience, training, degree of success, and instructional level, and there is an interaction between teaching experience and degree of success... Less successful band directors are more concerned about music quality in the first 5 years of their career than they are after the first 5 years. More successful band director after the fifth year of teaching become highly influenced by musical quality.

Initial Views of Quality in Music

“The test of quality music,” according to Adams (2002, p. 19), “is that it continues to reveal itself with each performance and invites us to revisit itself.... [It] is not predictable, and complexity is a key factor.” Del Borgo (1988) describes quality works as being cohesive and rich with contrast and diversity in melodic material, timbre, dynamics, rhythmic material, tempo, orchestration, and harmonic ideas. Stamp (1998, p. 95) identifies several inherent characteristics including, “a variety of key centers...non-diatonic melodies...non-triadic harmony...contrast... unpredictability ... counterpoint... transitions... [and] rhythmic variety.”

Neilson (2009) believes that standards, rather than personal preference, determine music of high quality. Original, creative, and unexpected use of rhythm, melody, and harmony are the essence of well-crafted works that “sum up the best of what has gone before and...provide a point of departure for a break with tradition, paving the way for daring ideas and concepts” (Neilson, 2009, p. 139). Works that gain in acceptance and appeal by performers and audiences alike become part of a lasting repertoire.

Beyond the qualities of expressivity, range, difficulty level, cultural context, and programming considerations, Apfelstadt (2000, p. 22) favors a standards-based approach to choosing repertoire. “Fundamental principles of music selection, together with the National Standards, require that we select repertoire that goes beyond the safe, local boundaries of what students are likely to hear around them constantly.”

For the purposes of selecting repertoire when working with young student musicians, Dvorak (2000, pp. 15-16) defines high-quality music as having an “immediate level of attractiveness...balance of security and challenge...limited technical and musical expectations commensurate with the performance skills...[and] elements of musicianship, style and form.” Prentice (1986, pp. 55-56) asks herself the following questions:

Does the composition fit my ensemble? ...can I teach and conduct this piece?
...does the selection show musicianship and expression as well as teach
technique? ...will the composition be musically satisfying? ...will the students
enjoy studying the composition?

Wheeler (2007, p. 24) considers the more functional aspects of works that can meet the diverse skill sets of her students. They should contain “reasonable brass ranges and rhythms” and the introduction of “style(s) or historical period(s)...new to them.”

Drawing a parallel and a distinction between the roles of “creativity and difference” in works of artistic merit, McBeth (1990, p. 17) believes “originality does not create art, but art cannot be created without originality.” Qualitative judgments on music “go beyond mechanics. [They] must be rooted in [one’s] ability to sense direction and originality, framed in expert craft. No one element can stand alone.”

Controversies and Concerns over the Quality of Music for School Bands

Concerns about the quality of music programmed by bands have been raised for decades. Fonder (2000, p. 22) cautions directors not “to impatiently bemoan the lack of quality literature performed by today’s school bands without knowledge of the evolution of this condition.” In comparing the literature for winds composed in the middle of the 20th century to current trends, Battisti (in Berz, 2008, p. 153) noted that much of today’s music for school bands is composed not by “the best...significant, established

composers,” but by staff composers of the publishing companies releasing educational band music. Even at the dawn of the wind ensemble movement of the 1950’s and 1960’s, in which prominent composers were contributing a substantial number of new works for winds and percussion, James Neilson (1964, p. 21) criticized bands for programming banal works “of debatable musical value.” He recommended that conductors “...play music which will nourish everyone concerned and...provide entertainment and musical stimulation for the audience.”

Some believe the entertainment and utilitarian function of bands throughout history have led to a dearth of high-quality wind literature. Croft (1997, p. 40) refers to the band as “an orphan that composers generally did not care to adopt.” From the 18th century through the present, little has changed with bands that have largely “existed for function, not for art.... [They] provided such diverse services as sounding alarms, giving the time...[performing] ceremonial music, contributing to pageantry, and generally responding to any social military function that required music.”

Whitwell (1965) identified three specific formative phases in the evolution of the band repertoire. The first occurred between 1917 and 1928 “with the death of the full orchestra as a cultural force in contemporary music.” Prominent composers of this period, including Ibert, Berg, Webern, Villa Lobos, Piston, Sibelius, Poulenc, Busoni, Milhaud, Schoenberg, Stravinsky, Hindemith, Roussel, Shostakovich and Vaughn Williams contributed 49 works for winds. According to Whitwell, this first crisis stems from the failure of band conductors — influenced by the popular, entertainment driven, professional bands of that era — to “recognize or take advantage of this fertile opportunity” (Whitwell, 1965, pp. 36-37). The second was between 1938 and 1944.

During this time, substantial wind contributions were made by Prokofiev, Stravinsky, Hindemith, Barber, Milhaud, Schoenberg, Copland, Schuman, Strauss, Creston, Gould, and Riegger. Despite the emerging wind repertoire from these prolific composers, leading publications of the day overwhelmingly identified transcriptions as the most significant works for band. Whitwell sees history repeating itself again during a third crisis beginning in 1957. He questions the rationale of performing “a piece of music of so little value that it is not performed even in its own medium” (Whitwell, 1965, p. 68).

Traphagan (1970), Mercer (1972), Bryan (1972), and Berz (2000) allude to the enormous scope of diverse activities in which band programs participate. According to Bryan, band directors must have “intricate knowledge” about such unrelated demands as football halftime shows, jazz, symphonic music, and chamber works. He asks, “What fellow musician must answer the demands of so many masters? Is he to entertain the masses or to emulate his colleagues in the scholarly disciplines such as literature and philosophy, or even musicology?” (Bryan, 1972, p. 3). In this scenario, according to Mercer (1972, p. 53), “Not only is the score the curriculum, but the particular scores that are included...are determined not by educational criteria, but by happenstance, the next performance, the required festival numbers, or the particular taste of the lay audience.” Berz (2000, pp. 36-37) further elaborates on the “many functional requirements” of bands today “ranging from the circus band to the collegiate marching band; from symphony bands to mounted bands; from the wind ensemble to pep bands. Each type of group is distinct and defines its orientation according to its purposes.”

Regardless of the specific idiom or purpose, composer Warren Benson (1998, p. 39) warns against music which is “ill-conceived, badly made, pandering to the lowest

expectations and excitable technique. There is music for service...good, stirring, (and) enlivening. There is wonderfully polished music for purely popular entertainment, and then there is the pretentious...the ugly, the embarrassingly imitative.”

Kohut and Mohr-Sheahan (1991, p. 49) expressed dissatisfaction with the state of the elementary repertoire. “There is...a preponderance of synthetic music, written especially for public school use as training literature. It is questionable whether these works merit valuable rehearsal time if they are not good enough musically to be programmed at a concert.” Rosene (1981) questions why band directors waste the financial investment of school districts by purchasing so much music that becomes irrelevant within five or ten years. He recommends that directors consider the true needs of the ensemble, the long-term viability of the work, the appropriateness of the technical and musical challenges, and the ability to motivate students before determining if the piece is worth the price.

Misenhelter (2000) views this issue as a significant obstacle to wind band organizations desiring equal stature with other serious musical entities. Although he acknowledges that high-quality literature for developing bands may be difficult to find, he believes it is incumbent upon directors to seek it out. Additionally, he warns that the pressure placed on school bands to facilitate extra-musical activities, of little aesthetic musical value to the students, “can become the proverbial tail that wags the dog” (Misenhelter, 2000, p. 44).

Debates between band directors, composers, and critics over the vast output of band music and its dubious quality continue to fester. Of the 900 works he reviewed for consideration of inclusion on the Band Prescribed Music List of the Texas University

Interscholastic League, Black (1986, p. 84) observed an abundance of formulaic pieces in which “the composer duplicates a previous compositional technique in hopes of repeating the success of the original piece.” He laments what he considers an obvious profit motive in this regard. Slagley (1992, p. 172) offers an opposing viewpoint.

Since 98% of the Texas High School Honor Band finalists [from 1980 to 1989] participated in annual UIL Concert Band Contests and 95% of [them]...performed repertoire from the UIL Prescribed Music List, the UIL Prescribed Music List seems to be validated as a listing of quality repertoire for the band.

Halseth (1987) discovered that initiatives led by the CBDNA have increased the number of works for wind band exponentially. Despite its ongoing efforts to encourage music of high artistic quality, much of today’s repertoire is considered formulaic and tailored for educational purposes. Brashier (2000, p. 62) defines this so-called “educational band music” as “music that functions as a way to teach young players the fundamentals of rhythm, meter, melody, harmony, and dynamics etc.” Even as he acknowledges the growing amount of young repertoire containing increasingly sophisticated musical elements, he questions if there is a need for such a category, wondering whether time focusing on fundamentals comes at the expense of teaching expressive musicianship. Grechesky (1998, p. 25) also sees a greater number of more sophisticated compositions at the grade 3 level, but believes the preponderance of level 4 band music remaining “not much more than functional or entertaining.” Brashier (2000, p. 61) summarizes this scenario as follows: “Educational music might be good music, but good music always has educational value.”

Adams (2002, p. 18) articulated the underlying point of contention. “Band directors talk openly...about the amount of ‘junk’ music produced for bands.... Quality composers publicly complain about the programming choices made by band directors.”

Doran (1956) wonders if band directors focused their studies on technical proficiency at the expense of learning to appreciate good music. Battisti (1995, p. 16) places most of the blame on the teachers who emphasize “activity” at the expense of “serious literature.” As he, Adams (2002), Hughes (1990), Begian (1991), Fonder (2000), and Schaefer (1967) note, publishers will print only what the directors will purchase.

Sheldon (1996) believes that many novice teachers of young band students rely too heavily on the reputation of the composer, often without properly evaluating the content of the music. The difficulty, as Fonder (2000, p. 22) points out, is that “many composers over the years have written music *for* children but few have written music successfully to be played *by* them. The composers who were able to simplify their styles...while remaining recognizably themselves are rare.” His solution is to program is well-crafted arrangements and transcriptions of standard, classical repertoire, and folk music.

Speculating that composers may have approached the dilemma of creating music for younger students from the wrong perspective, Rocco (1991, p. 13) refers to a statement made by composer William Francis McBeth. “They feel that simple rhythms and conservative registers constitute approachable music. The direction should be...simplicity of mechanics as opposed to simple music.” Or as Fonder (2000, p. 29) declares, music must be both educational and artistic.

The recent controversy over the state of the band repertoire reached a fever pitch in 2005 with the publication of a column by Stephen Budiansky in the *Washington Post* entitled, “The Kids Play Great, But That Music.” In the editorial, Budiansky (2005) decried the repertoire he heard at a high school band concert.

What they play is always That Piece, as I've come to think of it. That Piece is not written by any composer you have ever heard of – not classical, not jazz, not pop, not rock, not blues, not folk, not alternative Czech heavy metal fusion, not nothing. You've never heard it on the radio, not even late at night at the bottom of the dial. It in fact exists nowhere in the known universe – except for the twilight zone of musical performance.... I wasn't prepared for the extent to which such new and original works of great mediocrity have completely supplanted the real music – classical folk, Sousa marches, American popular music, Scott Joplin rags, Broadway show tunes – that was once a staple of the American school music curriculum. And it's not a question of new vs. old: There's plenty of truly great contemporary music of all genres being written. This stuff just isn't it.

Budiansky received more than 140 responses to his column, most of which were supportive of his viewpoint. A number of other music educators and composers disputed his claim that “well-known works of recognized artistic merit” were being displaced by “made-for-school pieces.” Opponents also contended that “quality in musical composition is largely a subject of individual taste, ...the dearth of original music for wind band makes it important...to support [the] composition and performance of new works written,” and that the need to inspire students with music that meets their technical ability necessitates educational repertoire (Budiansky & Foley, 2005, p. 18).

In their 2005 study containing both quantitative and qualitative evidence, Budiansky and Foley exhibit compilations of several state band repertoire lists showing that the music of educational composers, such as James Swearingen, Robert Sheldon, and Robert W. Smith, is more prevalent than that of Mozart, Handel, Wagner, Vaughn Williams, Beethoven, Copland, and other historically recognized composers. While “it is undeniable that artistic tastes change over time, and that initial judgments of art are sometimes revised,” Budiansky and Foley (2005, p. 22) allege that educational compositions are “little more than commercial attempts to exploit an earlier formula that had proved successful for the writer in the school market.” In order to address the quality

of repertoire in school band programs for the long term, the authors suggest improved philosophical and aesthetic preparation of music education majors, a curtailment of contests, minimizing the influence of publishing companies, embracing transcriptions, holding higher expectations for new band compositions, and “to view performance in an educational setting as a means to an end – which is education – and not an end in itself” (Budiansky & Foley, 2005, p. 34).

Years removed from the publication of his infamous column, the issues raised by Budiansky remain a hot-button topic to this day. In answering his critics at the 2009 World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles (WASBE) Conference in Cincinnati, Budiansky offers “a few truths” that he believes are “self-evident.”

The purpose of the educational system is not to subsidize the aspirations or gratify the egos of want-to-be composers who cannot get their pieces performed or published elsewhere...generate profits for the music publishing industry, ...provide bragging rights to band directors and principals by garnering prizes and awards ...serve as a vehicle for advancing the wind band movement, (or to) put on arts performances.... The purpose of the educational system is to *educate*. (Budiansky, 2009, pp. 8-9)

Hawkins (2009) sees a growing rift between “repertoire fundamentalist” and school band directors who rely on educational band music. While acknowledging the importance of choosing quality literature, he strenuously disagrees that the judicious use of works developed for educational purposes relegates the school band to mere “activity” at the expense of music education or higher art. In his view, “Music exists to serve people, not vice-versa” (Hawkins, 2009, p. 105). Fleming (2001) also found that simply programming sophisticated literature does not necessarily, or by itself, heighten aesthetic awareness or equip middle school students to evaluate the artistic merit of a composition.

In referring to Mark Fonder's presentation on developing band repertoire at the 2009 WASBE Conference, Crompton (2009, p. 34) offers a tentative middle ground.

Quality literature with simpler plots and fewer syllables teach young readers the basic concepts of language that can be applied to gradually more complex literature as they develop. In this way...the occasional formulaic opus at an early age serves to teach the basic structures so that, when more complex repertoire plays with the conventions, the students have a reference point.... [However], a steady diet of these formulaic works does nothing to develop the student beyond the absolute basics.

As the debate rages on, some believe the attacks have gone too far and do a disservice to all points of view. Barton (2006, p. 33) asks, "Have we reached a point that, even if we are convinced about a piece musically, we might hesitate to play it because of the composer. Are we creating an unofficial "acceptable" and "unacceptable list of composers?" Barton describes a game he witnessed in which each of six university band directors "name(s) a piece that he was supposed to like, but really didn't." Elaborating on that observation, Barton writes, "Maybe it would be interesting to play the same game naming pieces that we really like but are not supposed to."

As Cardany (2006) indicates, repertoire choices can have a notable impact on the attitudes of the musicians in the most prestigious university band programs. Teachout (1993, p. 29) reached a similar conclusion in his study of middle school band students finding "that musical factors are weighted more heavily than are performance, referential, or environmental factors" in determining their repertoire preferences. Hopkins (2013) discusses the potential detriment to the developing band when repertoire choices are limited only to the perceived standard works. He, Dancz (1966), Spradling (1983), Jorgensen (1992), Sheldon (1996), Thompson (1998), Gage (2000), and Rogers (2004) are concerned about directors' propensity to program music beyond the grasp of their

students, erroneously basing unduly challenging repertoire selections on an infatuation with a work or a desire to raise the perceived stature of a concert program.

Spradling (1983) developed a “Suitability Guide” checklist that enables directors to assess the strengths and weaknesses of their ensembles and compare them to the technical demands of the composition. Lance and Aarhus (2013) advocate for the establishment of a process by which teachers can select repertoire that meets the technical and expressive needs of their students, both in the immediate and distant futures.

Directors may rely too much upon their college performance experiences, wind literature courses, and honor band festivals, thus choosing music beyond the technical grasp of the novice ensembles they may teach. In addition to recommending

“online...human...traditional...and personal performance resources,” when selecting repertoire, Lance and Aarhus (2013, pp. 35-36) pose the following questions to consider:

Do we choose music that is easy for us to prepare...? Do we select literature that contrasts or compliments the concepts that we have previously studied and performed in our band classes...? Does our literature allow us to develop a sonorous ensemble tone with varied harmonies or is all of the music dissonant, rhythmic, or percussive...? Are there opportunities to develop the choirs of the band through varied scoring, diverse timbres, and a variety of instrumental colors and harmonies...? Does the literature allow us (or force us) to expand the performance skills and understanding of the players on each concert through use of ornamentation, technically demanding scoring, and independence of lines...? Does our literature allow for improved artistry of the solo voice and expressive sectional playing...? Does our literature encourage our musical growth as well as that of individual players...? Does the literature stretch our students and yet not outstrip their abilities...? Does the literature improve rhythmic understanding and precision of metric shifts from all the voices, or do our students just seem to memorize the repetitive rhythmic patterns...? Does our literature explore a wide range of music from ALL periods, including orchestral transcriptions, original music for wind ensemble, and contemporary sounds...? [For what performance venue] is the purpose of our selection?

Referencing the psychological theories of Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi’s “flow” and Lev Vygotsky’s “zone of proximal development,” Hopkins (2013) illustrated a hierarchy

of music difficulty level ranging from, “Level 1 – Music does not present a good balance between challenge with skill level...(to) Level 5 – too difficult” (p. 71). According to Hopkins, most performance repertoire should be in the Level 3 range, which represents an ideal level of difficulty for the musical aptitude of the students. The zone of proximal development is at Level 4 where students are challenged to meet their highest achievable standard with appropriate teacher guidance. As Tutt (2002) observed, students do establish their own set of criteria when evaluating the merit of the works they perform which is influenced by peers, parents, and teachers. By carefully striking a balance in the overall repertoire selection, students can ultimately experience a state of flow in which they are joyfully immersed in their musical experience. It is this sense of flow that ultimately draws students to music and serves as the foundation to a successful program.

Slagley (1992, p. 173) looked to the “educational materials used by [high] school bands in Texas that have been selected as examples of the results of quality teaching... [because they] have important educational implications.” Identifying a core repertoire for developing bands by studying the literature of exemplar middle-level programs may provide a valuable reference for instrumental music educators in choosing music that is suitable and age-appropriate for developing bands.

Identifying a Core Repertoire for Band

There are numerous studies and textbooks that have chronicled an emerging body of repertoire throughout the history of the wind band (Battisti, 1995, 2002, & 2012; Battisti, Berz, & Girsberger, 2014; “Band Music Guide,” 1989; Berger, 1975; Bodiford, 2012; Cicconi, 2012; Cipolla & Hunsberger, 1997; Cooper, 2004; Dewald, 2001; Duarte, 1988; Good, 1983; Fennell, 1954; Garafolo, 2000; Goldman, 1938 & 1961; Hansen,

2005; Kreines, 1989; Leitzel, 2006; Miles, 1998-2012; Nicholson, 2009; Rehrig, 1991; Reynolds, et. al., 1975; Salzman, 2003-2012; Smith, 1986 & 2001; Smith & Stoutamire, 1979; Votta, 2003; Wallace & Corporon, 1984; Whitwell, 1965, 1972, & 2010; Winther, 2004). The aforementioned compilations are seemingly influenced largely by an aesthetic philosophical orientation. While they often allude to substantive works, they do not delineate a universally accepted core repertoire. Hunsberger (1977, p. 45) believes the identification of a core band repertoire must begin with the individual conductor.

It is the personal obligation of each serious wind band conductor...to discover that musical repertoire whose contribution will be valid. Through such an assessment, the conductor should discern a personal *basic repertoire*, which will form the cornerstone of his commitment to serious music.... A philosophy of programming should be established through which the conductor transmits his personal standards, and projects music by important composers.

Throughout the years, notable band conductors and others have publicized their personal compilations of significant wind band literature (Akey, 2010; Battisti, 1989, & 1995; Begian, 1991; Bryan, 1972; Budiansky & Foley, 2005; Dvorak, 1986, 1993, & 2000; Foster, 1999; Gabriel, 1984; Grashel, 1989; Grechesky, 1998; Hilliard, 1992; Howell, 2013; Hunsberger, 1977; Janners, 2003; Jorgensen, 1992; Kohut & Mohr-Sheahan, 1991; Lenzini, 1996; McBeth, 1995; Prentice, 1986; Reynolds, 2015; Spurlin, 2010; Wheeler, 2007; Williams, 2008). Battisti, Berz, and Girsberger (2014) discuss several compilations of graded repertoire lists developed over the past three decades. They offer recommendations of specific works representative of various historical periods and musical styles. The lists established by these authorities have distinguished certain works as part of a more prominent band repertoire.

Wilson's (1950) dissertation entitled *A Selection and Critical Survey of Music Originally Written for the Symphonic Band* was among the first of its kind. It was a

compilation and description of 68 original compositions for band. While the researcher articulated no specific criterion for inclusion, Wilson's project is a valuable resource rendered during a period when transcriptions dominated the band repertoire. Tarwater's (1958) analysis of Hindemith's *Symphony in Bb*, Vaughn Williams' *Toccata Marziale*, Persichetti's *Divertimento*, *Psalm for Band*, and *Symphony No. 6* was another early repertoire study that identified heralded works for winds and percussion. Bruning (1980, p. vii), concluding that, "a standard repertoire of quality music for wind band should be encouraged and implemented broadly in the schools," provided a conducting analysis of seven of the most prominent pieces.

Welker (1988) identified 25 of the most famous and frequently performed wind band works and established a system in which band directors could rate their experience with them. The resulting grade is supposed to gauge the director's knowledge of repertoire.

Although McBeth (as cited in Rocco, 1991, p. 15) believes that "history will determine our repertoire, not the compilation of lists today," a primary method by which band conductors have defined core works is through standardized repertoire lists. Since 1969, The National Band Association has maintained a "Selective Music List" to provide guidance on quality repertoire to band directors (Birdwell, 2006; National Band Association Website, 2013). In addition, many state music education organizations provide lists of approved musical selections for adjudicated festivals.

While scholarly research is relatively scant, a number of studies on core repertoire have been conducted (Baker, 1998; Fiese, 1987; Gaines, 1996; Gilbert, 1993; Harris & Walls, 1996; Hayward, 2004; Holvik, 1970; Hornyak, 1983; Howard, 2001; Hughes,

1990; Jones, 2005; Kish, 2005; Menghini, 1997; Ostling, 1978; Powell, 2009; Rhea, 1999; Slagley, 1992; Stevenson, 2003; Thomas, 1998; Towner, 2011 & 2013; Woike, 1987; Young, 1998).

The Ostling (1978) study has been an especially influential resource for wind conductors and researchers, particularly at the collegiate level. It is widely considered both comprehensive and definitive for its time. It has also served as the basis for other major core repertoire studies conducted by Gilbert (1993) and Towner (2011 & 2013), who both replicated its methodology. The purpose was to identify high-quality repertoire based on a criteria of 10 standards. Ostling's (1978, pp. 23-30) standards are as follows:

1. The composition has form — not a form but form — and reflects a proper balance between repetition and contrast.
2. The composition reflects shape and design, and creates the impression of conscious choice and judicious arrangements on the part of the composer.
3. The composition reflects craftsmanship in orchestration, demonstrating a proper balance between transparent and tutti scoring, and between solo and group 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 musical goals is not completely direct and obvious.
6. The composition is consistent in its 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 (that) transcends factors of historical importance, or factors of pedagogical usefulness.

In Ostling's study, 20 college band conductors were recommended to evaluate repertoire. Their selection came from 188 band conductors, representing all geographical regions of the College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA), who responded to a survey sent to 312 band conductors listed in the membership directory of the College Music Society (CMS). "The persons surveyed were asked to nominate the 10 wind band conductors who, in their judgment, most diligently sought and most consistently programmed music of serious artistic merit" (Ostling, 1978, p. 37). The 10 conductors reviewed 1,481 compositions. Of these, 314 met Ostling's 10-point criteria for inclusion on a list of core repertoire.

Gilbert (1993) replicated Ostling's study with some modifications. He redefined the term ensemble to consider works requiring 10 or more players including percussion. He also omitted marches and fanfares from consideration. In addition to the 314 pieces that Ostling determined to be of serious artistic merit, Gilbert included the 692 works that scored within 70% to 80% of the maximum points in the previous study.

An initial survey was sent to 347 college band directors representing all regions of the CBDNA. The results of this survey were used to identify the 20 evaluators of the repertoire. Of those nominated, six had participated in the Ostling study. Gilbert (1993) found that five of the evaluators were substantially more discriminating than the other ones. This may explain why a smaller percentage of works achieved the required 80% rating when compared to the Ostling survey.

Of the 1,261 works evaluated in his survey, 191 were determined to be of serious artistic merit. Fifty-two of these pieces had not been evaluated in the Ostling study, most of which were published after 1978. Composers who were represented by four or more works on the final list included Benson, Grainger, Stravinsky, Husa, Persichetti, Schwantner, Bassett, Hindemith, and Strauss. Gilbert (1993) highlighted the 143 works known to 15 or more of the evaluators, asserting that these should serve as a core repertoire especially worthy of study and performance.

The evaluators in the Gilbert study did not retain 173 of the 314 works originally designated of serious artistic merit by Ostling. “This could indicate a change in the wind band’s core repertoire from 1978 to 1993, a change in standards of quality expected, or a momentary fluctuation” (Jones, 2005, p. 64). As Gilbert (1993, p. 182) noted, “A study like this becomes dated quickly. Periodic updating in ten year increments, for example, would be appropriate if only to include the new compositions and musicological discoveries.”

Clifford Towner (2011 & 2013) conducted the most recent update of the Ostling and Gilbert studies. Using much of the repertoire in the Ostling and Gilbert studies as a basis, he modernized the survey by eliminating fanfares, transcriptions, and the

redundancies discovered in the previous research. He also included repertoire for winds composed through 2007. A panel of 18 nationally renowned wind conductors agreed to participate in this study, four of whom took part in the Gilbert survey, with two who had contributed to the original Ostling study. Towner (2011, p. 210) concluded the following:

There was agreement across the three studies with 89 of the 144 compositions.... There was agreement between the Gilbert and current study with 20 more of the 144 compositions...revealing potential additions to the core repertoire. Finally, it appears that as the wind-band repertoire grows, the standard of serious artistic merit has possibly risen. Additional repertoire may have created a higher expectation of excellence and conductors may be getting more selective.

Hughes (1990) surveyed high school band directors in Iowa asking them to evaluate a list of compositions based on whether they were familiar with a specific work, performed it, studied the score without performing it, owned the score, or owned a recording of the work. Many of the most familiar works identified in this study corresponded to those in previous and later repertoire surveys. “In a significant portion of the survey, conductors articulated their core repertoire, implying that there is a body of literature that they believe students should study” (Hughes, 1990, p. 62).

Slagley (1992) set out to narrow down a possible core repertoire of works that has proven to be successful in the high school setting. He evaluated the works performed by high school honor bands in the state of Texas between 1980 and 1989 to identify trends and to compare the results with the previous studies undertaken by Fiese (1987), Holvik (1970), and Hornyak (1983). Slagley identified 247 different pieces composed by 127 different composers. One-third of the works performed were marches, in compliance with the regulations of the festivals. The most frequently performed concert work was Claude T. Smith’s *Concert Variations*. Approximately 10% of all pieces were performed three or more times. Works by Smith, Sousa, King, Swearingen, Arnold, and Grainger were

included in almost 25% of all honor band performances. Slagley also investigated the cultural orientation of the works performed, finding that 67% of them were American, 10% British, 10% Austro-German, 3% French, 2% Italian, 2% Russian, 2% Northern European, and the rest of other national tradition. He observed the following characteristics of what might constitute an emerging core repertoire:

Based on the meta-analytic results of this study, the development of an emerging repertoire would include compositions of Percy Grainger, Paul Hindemith, Vincent Persichetti, and Alfred Reed. The list would also include compositions of John Barnes Chance, Aaron Copland, Gustav Holst, Charles Ives and Vaclav Nelhybel, as well as, Norman Dello Joio, Vittorio Giannini, Robert Jager, Howard Hanson, and Claude T. Smith. If the repertoire were to include [marches]...then compositions of John Philip Sousa, Karl L. King, Henry Fillmore, and Kenneth Alford would be included. In addition, the completed listing would include compositions reflecting a variety of cultural heritages, traditions of composers, and historical periods. (Slagley, 1992, p. 179)

In 1996, Gaines embarked on a national survey to determine if a core repertoire for high school bands existed. Combining the repertoire lists from the National Band Association and 12 other state lists, Gaines sorted through 4,938 entries to select 209 works appearing on seven or more of the lists (Gaines, 1996, p. 33). He mailed 1,576 surveys to band directors across the country who were members of the Music Educators National Conference (MENC). From the 437 responses, he concluded:

Based upon an analysis of the data, the profession does believe a core repertoire exists. The core repertoire appears to be 106 compositions in length.... The select repertoire is 52 compositions in length...and represents a more refined selection process. Band directors who select repertoire from this list can be sure that these compositions represent the more agreed familiar and important pieces upon which the high school band profession occurs.... An essential repertoire that is 17 compositions in length is (also) presented. This list [is] considered to be most appropriate and significant repertoire for high school band students. (Gaines, 1996, pp. 104-105)

It is important to note that marches were not included as part of this survey. As Gaines explained, "Band directors seem to believe that all the marches of John Philip

Sousa, Karl King, and Henry Fillmore are worth performing with high school bands” (Gaines, 1996, p. 108).

A subsequent survey of high school band directors in the state of Pennsylvania from 1996 to 1997 by Jones replicated many aspects of Gaines’ research. The results “validated Gaines’ study, and underscored Gelpi’s [1984] and Peterson’s [1986] assertions that more attention to programming...at the collegiate level is needed to help future school band directors develop skills and knowledge in order to select repertoire for their own ensembles” (Jones, 2005, p. 78).

Honas (1996) used Ostling’s methodology with a focus specifically on 1,587 chamber works written for six to nine players. Eighteen evaluators, nominated from a survey of 341 college music professors rated the works using Ostling’s criteria. They concluded that 288 of the compositions were of serious artistic merit.

Baker (1997) focused on a core repertoire of mixed chamber winds. He delimited his study to works composed for ensembles of seven to sixteen instruments with no more than 50% strings or percussion.

Menghini’s 1997 study of the new repertoire performed by bands at the Midwest Clinic from 1947 to 1996 measured the influence of this convention’s influence on the wind band repertoire. In considering the results of this study, it is important to note that bands participating in the Midwest Clinic must select part of their program from recently published compositions. The criteria for significance used was the inclusion of a work on three or more repertoire lists from the states of Florida, New York, Michigan, Texas and the National Band Association Selective Music List for Band. Menghini (1997, p. 139) identified 148 works that were found on three or more of the selected lists. Using the ten-

point criteria for artistic merit established in the Ostling (1978) and Gilbert (1993) studies, “it can be argued that approximately one in three of the works identified as significant for performance in an educational setting (can be considered to have) serious artistic merit” (Menghini, 1997, p. 139).

Thomas (1998) modeled his own study on both the Ostling and Gilbert methodologies, but with a special focus on repertoire at the difficulty levels of III and IV. Twenty-eight evaluators from across the United States participated in this survey. Evaluators were chosen through the recommendation of the State Chairs of the National Band Association, each of whom was “...asked to nominate, in rank order, three individuals who they considered experts in graded wind band from their state” (Thomas, 1998, p. 35). The state chairs were also invited to serve as evaluators. They determined if the specific works met the artistic merit as outlined by Ostling and Gilbert, and if the difficulty level was appropriate for high school level students. Of the 1,379 pieces evaluated, 182 “met both artistic merit and difficulty level criteria” (Thomas, 1998, p. 108).

Williams (1998) evaluated the 460 works performed by bands in Florida Bandmasters Association festivals from 1987 to 1996 to determine the frequency of performance and degree of success associated with specific works as related to the corresponding festival scores. In addition, 24 of the works, which received the highest, lowest, and median scores in the evaluation, were selected for an additional survey in which directors indicated their rationale for selection. The quality of the music and appropriate challenging the students technically and musically were the most important

criteria for directors, while prior performance experience and reliance on promotional recordings offered by publishers were the least.

Young's (1998) dissertation looks beyond the selected repertoire. He also examined the resources used by the conductors when choosing music. He conducted a survey of 150 band directors, from across the United States, with six or more years of experience in high schools with student populations of more than 1,000. He probed directors on their perceptions of quality literature, program selections, and repertoire research methodology. The results indicate that, "...almost half of the compositions performed by the bands did not contain a notable level of quality. In addition, 46.04% of the compositions that were determined to contain a notable level of quality were not programmed by any of the conductors surveyed" (Young, 1998, p. ii). Levels of quality were based on a "Repertoire Evaluation Inventory" developed by Young in consultation with experts in wind band literature. Works achieving notable quality were determined to be of good, high, or exceptional quality based on a statistical analysis of the ratings of the respondents. Young also found that groups who performed low quality repertoire were far more likely to choose music they learned about from a publishing company. Directors, exposed to repertoire by university directors, clinics, or conventions, generally programmed high-quality music (Young, 1998, pp. 109-110).

Rhea (1999) used a modified version of the Ostling criteria and methodology to assess the artistic merit of the Level III, IV, and V works listed on the 1995-1998 Prescribed Music List of the Texas University Interscholastic League. The study was limited to this catalog of works with no additional recommendations solicited from the 20 evaluators comprised of outstanding Texas band directors. Also in contrast to the Ostling

study, transcriptions were included. Wind ensemble pieces with smaller instrumentation were excluded. Of the 372 works considered, 181 met the criteria of artistic merit. These were predominantly from the Level V category where 123 of the 169 works achieved this status. Rhea believes these pieces can serve as a foundation of outstanding literature for school bands. “In particular, the works agreed upon by fifteen or more of the evaluators should be considered the core of pieces that should be studied and performed by music educators” (Rhea, 1999, p. 50).

Suk’s (2003) study focused on the repertoire selection and performance frequency of small and medium size high school bands in Illinois. In addition to ascertaining the wind literature, he wanted to assess the impact of such factors as director experience, school location, and financial resources. He found that the varying demographics had no significant influence on the music chosen. The most performed works reflect a diversity in style including widely regarded core works by Holst, Vaughn Williams, and Sousa, popular pieces by Leroy Anderson, and what many might consider educational band compositions by Swearingen and Holsinger. Other commonly referenced composers in the study included McBeth and Claude T. Smith.

Wiggins (2013) explored and categorized the scholarly research available on works in the core repertoire. He limited the repertoire study to 107 core works identified in at least two of the three studies conducted by Ostling, Gilbert, and Towner. From these, Wiggins created a five-tier system related to the degree of research conducted on each, ranging from mere citations to doctoral dissertations. The wide variance in available scholarly research, coupled with the 19% of works in which no research has been found, indicates a need for additional research in this area.

The Core Repertoire of University Band Programs

University band programs are at the forefront of establishing the wind band as a medium of serious art music, not only in their mission to perform significant works, but also in their responsibility to train music educators. As such, a number of researchers have looked to them in seeking a potential, core repertoire. Gelpi (1984) emphasized the importance of studying significant core repertoire from various stylistic periods, including the Baroque, Classical, Romantic, and 20th Century eras, as a critical means of conductor training at the university level.

In 1966, at the behest of President Manley Whitcomb of the College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA), Holvik (1970, p. 19) conducted a study to answer the following question: “Is there an emerging repertoire for band?” He received 78 responses from 111 surveys sent to college band directors across the country, which identified the most performed works during the years 1961 to 1966. He published the list of pieces that had been performed 10 or more times and noted that, “this sort of survey should be made at regular intervals” (Holvik, 1970, p. 19).

Fiese (1987) released a study on the repertoire most performed in university bands between the years 1980 to 1985. By focusing on the frequency of repertoire, he endeavored to identify the works that “have the greatest impact on [the band] medium...[to] assess the state of the wind band repertoire in practice as opposed to theory” (Fiese, 1987, p. 17). Fiese chose university level bands because “they provide leadership in the maintenance and development of the wind band repertoire owing to the dearth of professional models, and the lack of either resources or musical maturity in high school ensembles” (Fitzgerald, 1977 in Fiese, 1987, p. 17)

Fiese developed a *Frequency of Performance Report Form* (FPRF), containing works identified in previous studies by Holvik (1970), Knight (1979), Olson (1982), and Hornyak (1983). The report was mailed to 930 college band directors in the United States and Canada. Directors were asked to identify which of the 260 works by the 103 composers on the FPRF they performed between 1984 and 1986. They could also add composers or works not listed. The results from the 325 responses indicated a strong proclivity for compositions of both the American and British traditions. Fiese's results supported the findings by Hornyak (1983).

No single repertoire common to all colleges and universities surveyed emerged from the data. However, patterns of performance of certain composers did emerge.... This would seem to support Hornyak's conclusion that conductors appear to maintain a practice of programming particular composers regularly rather than specific works. (Fiese, 1987, p. 39)

Woike's (1987) dissertation on wind band repertoire at the university level surveyed 38 college band directors to determine the works performed most frequently by university bands which he classified at four different levels, ranging from Level I bands (mostly non-music majors) to Level IV wind ensembles (mostly advanced undergraduate and graduate music majors in a flexible instrumentation setting). His survey compiled the works studied over a four-year period. Though it provides some insight into the programming practices of college bands, it falls short of identifying a core repertoire. Interestingly, it contradicts the rationale of frequent performance of works when considering core repertoire as it, "is not an adequate indicator of a composition's perceived overall artistic technical, and education merit..., 72 of the 100 most frequently performed compositions during the study do not appear within the...listing of most significant wind band compositions" (Woike, 1987, p. 50).

Peterson (1991) interviewed 28 prominent, university wind conductors to learn about their programming selection process, hoping to establish procedures and repertoire that would serve as exemplars. Casey (1993) surveyed college band programs comparable to Level I in Woike's study, compiling a list of works performed by non-auditioned college bands. He found that student participation was largely driven by enjoyment of both the music making process and the social dynamic. King (2001) expanded upon this by investigating the standards used by the directors of non-auditioned college bands in selecting their repertoire based upon the criteria established by Young (1998). The primary concern of these directors was to select appealing music that was technically achievable in a limited time. Other educational and artistic goals were considered less important, although King (2001, p. 94) noted that, "respondents who have a degree in conducting perform literature that is significantly higher in quality than respondents who have no degree in conducting." King also reported that the three most performed works in her study, Gustav Holst's Suites No. 1 and No. 2 for Military Band and Ralph Vaughn Williams' *Folk Song Suite*, were the same three most performed works in Hemberger's (1988) survey of eight of the leading university band programs. This is also similar to the findings of Gangware (1984) who surveyed prominent university wind conductors including Kenneth Bloomquist, Robert Foster, Mark Hindsley, Jack Mahan, Donald McGinnis, William Revelli, and H. Robert Reynolds. Holst, Vaughn Williams, Grainger, and Persichetti were the composers mentioned most often in this study. "According to the findings of this study, performance of high-quality wind band literature is being performed by many non-auditioned college bands...[and] is

often the same music performed by much larger, more select band programs” (King, 2001, p 110).

Hayes (1998) found a strong consensus on the importance of selecting high-quality repertoire, as well as championing new music, among renowned university conductors Battisti, Reynolds, Cramer, Strange, Croft, and Hunsberger. Hopwood (1998) chronicled the works performed at the CBDNA conventions from 1951 through 1995. Of the 1,718 works by 845 different composers, he identified the specific compositions performed 10 or more times, as well as the 128 most performed composers. By virtue of CBDNA’s ongoing efforts to establish a body of artistic wind literature, this study provides some direction of what may constitute core repertoire.

Moore (2001) surveyed the band programs in the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities in an effort to establish a core repertoire specifically of sacred works for band. Of the works considered in the survey, 121 were distinguished for their artistic merit, suitability for worship services, and emotional content.

In 2003, Kish assumed Holvik’s (1970) mantle by approximating his study to determine “if a band repertoire had indeed emerged during the past 40 years” (Kish, 2005, p. 1). Since the original list of the 78 schools Holvik surveyed was lost, Kish used the listings of performed repertoire in the *CBDNA Report* from the years 1998 to 2002 as the basis of his study. He whittled down some 11,765 performances to 143 compositions for band that appeared 15 or more times. When comparing the results to those of Holvik, Kish (2005, p. 9) concluded, “The wealth of literature available to today’s wind band is significantly greater in quantity and quality...yet the core body of literature remained

extremely similar.” The 53 compositions found in both studies, according to Kish (2005, pp. 9-10), may serve as the basis of a core repertoire.

Powell (2009) published a study on the repertoire performed by the Big Ten university wind ensembles during the years 2002 to 2006. Of the 2,106 works evaluated in the study, 1,856 were original works for band. “Consistent with Kish’s study, Grainger, Holst, and Ticheli were among the most performed composers.... Although many new works are being performed by Big Ten wind ensembles...the staple repertoire of these ensembles remains the classic canon of band works” (Powell, 2009, pp. 10-11). This is consistent with the findings of McMullian (1997) referring specifically to Christian college band programs who value repertoire of perceived high quality and artistic integrity in their program selections. Ladd (2009), however, contradicts it. He examined the works programmed by the CBDNA and the League of American Symphony Orchestra to find repertoire suitable for both mediums. In addition to cataloguing some 765 works by 290 composers, he concluded that while orchestra conductors typically rely on a more familiar group of composers, the core wind repertoire is more contemporary, evolving, and expanding. However, much of this evolving repertoire involves contemporary transcriptions of composers such as John Adams, Michael Daugherty, and Roberto Sierra.

Paul (2011) surveyed the performance practices of wind ensembles from universities in the Pac-10 Conference between 2002 and 2009. There were 1,166 performed compositions, including 26 premieres. Percy Grainger was the most popular performed composer. Holst’s *First Suite in Eb* and Ticheli’s *Blue Shades* were the most performed compositions.

Repertoire Studies of School and University Programs

Berry, Jr. (1975) compiled the repertoire performed by high school and college bands in the states of Iowa and Nebraska between 1968 and 1972. Under the categories of concert pieces, marches, and solo with band accompanist, and all classifications, he listed the most frequently performed works of this period. In addition to the expected inclusion of works by Grainger, Holst, Persichetti, and Sousa, which are often cited as part of a core repertoire, other contemporary composers well represented in the study are Giovannini, Nelhybel, Robert Pearson, and Claude T. Smith. More recent suggested repertoire lists recognize these composers less frequently. This is indicative of an evolving body of literature, much of which may not stand the test of time.

Greig (2003) analyzed the criteria used by band directors in the state of Pennsylvania when selecting repertoire for study. He further studied the extent that teaching experience, along with enrollment, influenced this decision making process, and then compared how high school and college band directors rated the artistic integrity of specific works. “A unique characteristic of this study was having the band directors rate music they had actually performed...rather than responding theoretically or hypothetically” (Greig, 2003, p. 9). Music selected specifically for adjudication purposes was also omitted allowing for a more meaningful focus on repertoire less restricted by guidelines of function. After administering a pilot study, Greig (2003, p. 29) refined the criteria used to evaluate the pieces as follows:

1. The piece exhibits the craftsmanship of a skilled composer.
2. The piece is scored for an instrumentation that fits the ensemble.
3. The piece provides opportunities for musical expression.

4. The piece fulfills specific curricular goals for musical learning.
5. The piece has audience appeal.
6. The piece has great emotional impact.
7. The piece provides appropriate technical challenge to the performer.
8. The piece is historically or culturally significant.
9. The piece was composed or arranged by a significant composer.
10. The piece has significant student appeal.
11. The piece is a logical approach to a specified form.
12. The piece provided a proper review of the technique covered in rehearsal.
13. The piece stretches the artistic experience of the student.
14. The piece stretches the artistic experience of the conductor.
15. The piece was highly recommended by a colleague.
16. The piece programmed well with the other pieces being played.

Of the 516 band directors solicited, 170 completed the survey, identifying the works they performed and the criteria used to select them. The works named five or more times served as the basis for an evaluation of 20 college band directors administered at the 2002 Pennsylvania Intercollegiate Honors Band Festival. The most important criterion identified by the high school band directors was stretching the artistic experience of the student, while doing so with the conductor ranked least important (Greig, 2003, p. 74). Teachers with the least amount of experience rated the craftsmanship of the music as a much lower priority than their counterparts with eight years of experience or more. They took technical concerns into greater consideration.

There were 13 works identified by both the college and the high school band directors. However, there were statistically significant differences between them on seven of the criteria used in selecting those works. Greig attributes this to the difference in ability level of the students. He also noted that there was a preponderance of level IV works on repertoire lists of the high school band directors, yet as the difficulty level of the music eased, the number of works considered to be of artistic merit correspondingly diminished. This corroborates the findings of King (2001). The composers of the works most often cited included James Swearingen, James Curnow, and Robert W. Smith, who have produced a vast output of music for bands at different levels of ability. They are widely recognized as composers of educational band music, unlike other frequently referenced composers in the study that included Gustav Holst, Leonard Bernstein, Malcolm Arnold, and Ralph Vaughn Williams. “Holst, for example, was mentioned 29 times with only 5 works on the list, whereas Robert W. Smith was mentioned 27 times but with 23 works on the list” (Greig, 2003, p. 77).

In Hayward’s (2004) study, 83 college and high school band directors determined a body of high-quality band literature at the grade levels III through VI for the purposes of designing content for a wind literature course. The criterion for quality literature in this study was adapted from the models of the Ostling (1978) and Gilbert (1993) research. The survey resulted in the identification of 24, grade III through VI compositions selected by 50% or more of the respondents. These could be classified as “standard literature... [or] repertoire which has gained common usage and has stood the test of time because of its quality, frequency of performance, and general acceptance by conductors and performers in wind band” (Hayward, 2004, p. 8).

In 2010, Aaron J. Backes examined the repertoire selection process of six renowned band conductors in Ohio, two from each of the middle school, high school, and collegiate levels. He concluded that, “the performance of both the standard literature and high-quality new repertoire was important to all of the directors.” All of the directors in this study also believed there to be a “core repertoire” of works that “all band directors and instrumental music students should know and learn” (Backes, 2010, p. 56). Directors in this study also lauded an increasing number of high-quality pieces available today, while warning of “poorly written new music that does not benefit the students’ growth as musicians” (Backes, 2010, p. 56).

A Core Repertoire for Young Bands

While much has been written about what may constitute a core repertoire for bands at the high school and university levels, little direction is provided for directors of bands comprised of younger students. “Since the Knight, Holvik, Hornyak, Fiese, and Smith studies were directed to mature subjects...the results may not be pertinent to school student wind bands with instrumental and technical limitations” (Slagley, p. 177).

Miller’s (2013) evaluation of grade III and IV repertoire from state lists in the southeastern United States, including Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Louisiana, Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia is perhaps the most comprehensive of its kind for middle school band. These particular states were selected based on their established grading systems of difficulty levels I through VI. For reasons of consistency, other state lists that used alternative rating systems were not included. Middle school band directors from each of the eight states ($N = 32$) were selected to participate based on years of teaching experience, success at state festivals, and for their ability to subjectively

evaluate repertoire. Additionally, 32 college band directors from across the United States participated in the study. They were members of CBDNA with performance experience at state or regional conferences and festivals, and affiliated with an institution granting four-year degrees in music education.

Ninety-nine grade III and 90 grade IV compositions were selected for this study based upon their inclusion in 40% or more of the state lists. Participants rated the artistic merit of each work on a five-point Likert Scale ranging from poor to superior. If a piece was unknown, it was scored as zero. Of the 109 works evaluated, only Frank Erickson's *Air for Band* was recognized by every participant.

In a similar fashion to Ostling and Gilbert, Miller (2013) established a weighted mean value rating corresponding to the Likert Scale, relating a score of five (superior) to 100% and four (excellent) to 80%. He used a score of 79% as the minimum needed for inclusion on the final core repertoire list. The weighted scores account for scenarios in which one or more directors are unaware of specific pieces. Given the lack of experience that college band directors would generally have with grade III and IV compositions, this adjustment allows for a more accurate evaluation for the purposes of this study. Of course, the less familiar works would require higher ratings in the survey to qualify for the final list.

Results indicate a high level of agreement among expert middle school (76 compositions; $\alpha = .98$) and college band directors (35 compositions; $\alpha = .92$). While these data show a slightly weaker level of agreement between populations, these differences were not considered large enough to invalidate the statement that evaluators were in general agreement of the level of quality assigned to each of the compositions meeting the predetermined criteria of meritorious status. An independent-samples *t*-test was conducted to compare the ratings of quality assigned to each composition by middle school and college band directors. As before, there was a significant difference between middle school ($M = 85.09$, SD

= 3.03) and college band directors ($M = 82.95$, $SD = 2.96$); $t(62) = 2.86$, $p < .01$. (Miller, 2013, p. 77)

In general, college band directors rated the quality of repertoire lower than their middle school counterparts did. The final list of works that achieved artistic merit included 50 recommended by the middle school directors, and 22 from the college directors. “Given the high quality of these works, conductors, music educators and students will benefit from analysis and performance...and may use these works as a benchmark by which quality can be observed and measured in other compositions” (Miller, 2013, p. 86). In addition, Miller produced a list of works that, while receiving high scores in artistic merit, were not familiar to enough directors.

Miller’s study is especially significant by virtue of its unique focus on the quality of grade III and IV music. While it does not account for the actual repertoire performed, it provides a rare resource for highly regarded literature approachable by bands at the middle school level. It also transcends an undue reliance solely on the repertoire from state lists. The diversity in repertoire among the various state recommendations, along with a lack of consistency in the selection criteria, is a hindrance to a unifying core repertoire of works that student musicians may benefit from regardless of geographical location.

Peterson (1986) and Cooper (1994) exposed a severe deficiency of courses in secondary performance in college music education programs. Cooper (1994) noted that 65% of the high school band directors in his survey considered their methods preparation to be only adequate, or less so. Harris and Walls (1996) attributes this line of thinking to both the lack of an identified core repertoire for young bands and the limited expertise of university professors in this specific area. Further complicating matters, as indicated by

Wareham (1968), Saville (1991), and Slagley (1992), are the inconsistencies in the criteria used to assess the level of difficulty between various state lists and conductor recommended compilations.

Ross (1972) made one of the earliest efforts to identify distinguished works geared to junior high school students. He listed 65 pieces at the grade II and III level, which he considered to be “educationally valid...within the capabilities of an average junior high band...[and of high] musical quality” (Ross, 1972, p. 33). Feldsher (1972, p. 63) offered a list of 36 works that he deemed to be “serious music of proven value” for second and third year instrumental music students.

Dvorak (1986) also addressed this deficiency with a published list of 271 works at grade levels he identified as I, II, and III, ranging in age appropriateness from beginning middle school (level I) through mature 9th and 10th grade ensembles (level III). (It should be noted that the grade levels designated by Dvorak are distinctly different from the more commonly utilized levels 1 through 6). The criteria for inclusion are as follows:

Compositions must exhibit a high degree of compositional craft...(They) must contain important musical constructs necessary for the development of musicianship. Among these...are: a variety of keys...a variety of meters...a variety of harmonic styles...[and] a variety of articulation styles.... Finally, compositions must exhibit orchestration that, within the restrictions associated with each grade level, encourage musical independence both of individuals and sections. (Dvorak, 1986, p. 9)

The Young Band Repertoire Project, under the direction of Brian Harris (1996), classified works for second and third year band students that can serve as that age group’s core repertoire. The researchers used the Texas University Interscholastic League (UIL) Prescribed Music List from 1967 to 1994 as the basis of their study. They asked 50 middle school band directors with 12 or more years of experience to evaluate the works

on their “familiarity, utility, appeal, and quality” (Harris & Walls, 1996, p. 5). This resulted in a total of 18 pieces having the potential to serve as a core repertoire for middle school students (Harris & Walls, 1996, pp. 4-5). Waguespack (2000) also used the UIL Prescribed Music Lists from 1967 to 1998, focusing on 209 compositions at the grade 1 level to provide a reference for quality literature at the beginning band level.

At the request of then MENC President Charles Hoffer, Kvet (1996, p. v) compiled “not only a list of quality literature for middle-level bands, but [found] out why experienced middle-level band educators believe these are quality selections and what specific skills they teach with each selection.” He asked each of eight prominent middle-level band directors from across the country to recommend ten such works. This resulted in a final list of 70 recommended works at difficulty levels ranging from 1 to 3.

Howard’s (2001) study also focused on the repertoire selection of middle school bands with the intention of identifying a core repertoire for developing students. He surveyed expert middle school band directors from 22 states. These teachers, with 20 or more years of experience, directed programs with a minimum enrollment of 225 students who typically performed literature at grade 3.5. The data showed that the majority of middle school band directors relied upon publisher promotional materials, live performances and other recordings to choose repertoire. It also showed that they receive little assistance in this regard from the university level. High-quality music was considered to be the most important consideration. While adaptations of folk music dominated the repertoire selections at Level I, original band compositions were chosen in greater numbers for Levels II and III. The underlying outcome of this study can be summarized as follows:

If 130 expert middle school band directors are able to reasonably and consistently agree on a core repertoire of 17 titles and a basic repertoire of an additional 29 titles, serious consideration should be accorded to the examination of such a list. (Howard, 2001, p. 103)

Stevenson (2003, p. 32) addressed the limitations he found in a number of repertoire lists specifically geared to developing bands, much of which “is based upon the nomination of a single director or small group of directors, thereby only serving to recommend a repertoire, rather than document an organically emerging repertoire.” He examined the repertoire on 25 state lists to determine the pieces most frequently listed. Using the guidelines of the National Band Association’s *Selective Music List for Bands* and the *Band Music Guide* published by *The Instrumentalist*, Stevenson compiled a database of works at each grade level.

A total of 1,270 unique titles appeared on seven or more state/association lists and were included for final consideration. Once re-graded...it was found that the final list contained 101 Grade VI works (8 percent), 293 Grade V works (23 percent), 296 Grade IV works (23 percent), 332 Grade III works (26 percent), 228 Grade II works (18 percent), and 20 Grade I works (2 percent). (Stevenson, 2003, pp. 47-48)

Robinson (1997, p. 31) proposes using recognized masterworks within a common musical genre to coordinate curriculum and instruction across numerous grade levels.

Teachers of literature and languages have long relied on an accepted canon of outstanding works as the basis for curricular content. Such excellent literature carefully sequenced in a progressive order in terms of accessibility and difficulty provides students with a full repertoire of masterworks of uncompromising quality.... Music teachers faced with the responsibility of selecting appropriate and worthwhile music for study and performance may benefit from a similar approach.

Within the framework of compositions based upon English folk songs, Robinson established criteria for selecting compositions exhibiting superior artistry and then determined an appropriate level of difficulty. He also developed a progressive programming sequence of specific pieces for students at each of the various grade levels.

Robinson (1997) encouraged the practice of extracting approachable movements from larger works and utilizing simplified adaptations that capture the integrity and character of the original masterworks.

Carney (2005) surveyed 237 middle and high school band directors in Florida to determine the influence of both suitability and quality in choosing repertoire. He determined that the experience level of the ensemble, its instrumentation, and the amount of rehearsal time were the most influential factors, ranking higher in priority than the quality of the music.

However, the *suitability* of a composition does not necessarily transfer to the *quality* of a composition. Music educators need to be aware of the many facets in the selection of literature. There is also a need to examine both the *quality* and *suitability* of literature for the sake of the students' learning and performance success. (Carney, 2005, p. 72)

Oliver (2012) compared 101 published lists of recommended wind repertoire to find out if there were enough similarities to identify a core repertoire representing all grade levels. From a total of 6,496 works, he identified a core repertoire of 126, and a smaller list of 45 in which the works appeared on 24 or more of the published lists. Although there were more grade 3 works included in the complete compilation, relatively few were identified as core pieces. In fact, levels 1, 2, and 3 constituted only 4 of the 45 pieces on the smaller list. "Stated differently...the creators of these published lists seemed to have less difficulty identifying meritorious grade 4, 5, and 6 literature, but had much greater difficulty consistently recognizing high-quality grade 1, 2, and 3 literature" (Oliver, 2012, p. 48). Rhea (1999, p. 50) further surmised, "The resources of the lower grade level make it more difficult to compose...[or] there simply is not much music of

the easier grade level in existence that is determined to meet the criteria for artistic merit.”

Thomson (2014, p. 18) interviewed seven middle school band directors from across the United States in an effort, “...to identify the most treasured grade 3 works and to reflect on what criteria should matter most in selecting repertoire.” He specifically inquired about their opinions on the most significant compositions of the past decade that have the potential to become part of a core repertoire, and also older works that are less performed but deserve more widespread attention. Among the composers, mentioned most frequently were Richard Saucedo, Brian Balmages, and Andrew Boysen, Jr. In contrast to the aforementioned concerns about a lack of quality repertoire for young bands, band director, Wendy Higdon (in Thomson, 2014, pp. 19-20) wonders whether students are always ready for such an experience:

Identifying repertoire-worthy works for middle school or junior high school bands is difficult because much of the standard repertoire at the grade 3 level is really more appropriate for high school bands, since it requires greater musical sophistication. Often a piece may qualify as a grade 3 based on technical considerations but still may not be appropriate for developing musicians.

Miles (2015) compiled one of the most comprehensive lists of recommended repertoire in the GIA Publications’ *Teaching Music Through Performance in Middle School Band*. Seven nationally renowned middle school band directors co-authored this book. In contrast to the previous ten volumes of *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band* (Miles, 1998-2015), containing more than 300 recommended works at grade levels 2 and 3, this most recent edition specifically identifies a core repertoire of 100 works for students in grades 6 to 8. Among these 100 works are 34 marches, which the authors also

contend are part of a core repertoire for middle school bands. The difficulty level of these pieces range from grades 1 through 3.5.

There are several studies providing suggested standard repertoire for middle-level bands. Although they vary significantly in their methodologies, for the purposes of this study, Dvorak (1986), Kvet (1996), Thomas (1998), Howard (2001), Stevenson (2003), Oliver (2012), Miller (2013), and Miles (1998-2015) are most relevant. These reflect the collaboration of multiple experts across various states, rather than a singular opinion. Like the Ostling (1978), Gilbert (1993), and Towner (2011) studies, they also span three decades, thereby accounting for both long-term programming trends and newly introduced repertoire. While the Thomas study emphasizes works that may be performed by high school bands, its narrowed focus on grade III and IV literature can align with many of the programming trends of distinguished middle-level programs of students in grades 6 through 9. Oliver and Stevenson's studies both go beyond the scope of middle-level repertoire, but still provide substantial lists of works for these grade levels. All of these studies utilize methodologies and expert panels in ways that differ from this research. However, the results can provide a helpful basis for comparison and identifying trends.

Chapter 3: Research Method

The fundamental purpose of this study was to identify an actual body of repertoire programmed by distinguished middle-level band conductors/teachers from across the country. This was accomplished by means of a repertoire survey. The administering of the repertoire survey was intentionally limited to middle-level instrumental music teachers who were identified as experts, as opposed to the population at large. In order to identify these distinguished band directors, a number of nationally recognized resources were utilized. Middle-level band programs that performed at the Midwest Clinic between 2003 and 2014, having achieved notoriety by virtue of their selection to an extremely competitive and prestigious venue, were one such resource. Another was the recommendations solicited from the officers of two of the most prominent professional organizations for band directors, the National Band Association and the American School Band Directors Associations. Additional subjects were chosen from ensembles recognized by two national, adjudicated competitions, the Foundation for Music Education's *Mark of Excellence* Festival and the *Music for All* Festival. Furthermore, expert middle-level band directors in attendance at the 2014 Midwest Clinic, identified through the aforementioned procedures or as recommended by conductors, authors, composers, and educators of national reputation, were surveyed at the conference. Combining these resources helped to ensure ample qualified subjects and broad based representation from various regions in the country.

Middle school ensembles that have performed at the Midwest Clinic were employed as a primary means for identifying bands of merit. The Midwest Clinic is universally recognized as a venue where only the finest school, collegiate, community,

and professional ensembles are selected to perform. As with all performing ensembles, the middle school bands presenting concerts at this conference are chosen from a large pool of international applicants by a committee of prominent instrumental music authorities in a blind review procedure. Since the selection process is both rigorous and highly competitive, bands invited to perform at the clinic can be considered noteworthy. Thirty-three middle-level band programs performed at this annual conference in Chicago, Illinois from 2003 to 2014. The bands, locations, and years they performed at the Midwest Clinic are listed in Appendix E.

Directors from each of these programs were contacted via email and asked to participate in a repertoire survey (see Appendix C). The email invitation included a link to the website Survey Monkey, where they could provide their responses. Upon following the link, subjects were brought to a page reiterating the terms of consent for participating in the study that were outlined in the email invitation (in Appendix C). In order to continue with the survey, they needed to grant their consent by selecting the “yes” option. If “no” was chosen, then consent was not granted and answers to the survey questions could not be submitted.

Although the email contained a link uniquely tied to the individual email address to help keep track of responses, participants answered the questions anonymously. Subjects were exposed to minimal risk and protected by virtue of their voluntary inclusion in the study and the anonymity of their specific answers. All procedures in this study were conducted in accordance with the protocol approved by the Rutgers University Institutional Review Board.

Fourteen directors of the 33 middle-level bands performing at the Midwest Clinic participated in the survey. Considering the vast expanse and diversity of the United States, it was determined that finding meritorious programs from a broader geographic representation would further enhance the collection of data. Identifying such programs was a more complicated matter. Without the existence of an established, widely recognized, and accurate means of assessing middle-level band programs from across the nation, additional instrumental music education authorities were consulted.

Numerous state and national music education professional organizations cater both to music educators in general, and to band directors specifically. For the purposes of this study, an organization more inclusive of middle school band directors could provide greater assistance. The National Band Association (NBA) was, therefore, a very viable option.

The NBA is a professional organization of music educators and wind conductors representing all states and regions of the United States. Founded in 1960, it is the world's largest association of its kind. It supports instrumental music educators in a number of ways, including advocacy, professional development, mentorship programs, and research. Members of the NBA work with musicians from the beginner through professional levels, including students and amateurs. Unlike other organizations, the leadership of the NBA includes a national committee of middle school representatives dedicated specifically to middle school band education.

With the goal of achieving a broad-based representation of meritorious programs from a variety of regions throughout the country, middle school representatives from the board of the NBA were consulted. Appointed to these positions by virtue of their

knowledge on regional and national standards, the NBA's middle school representatives were deemed to be authorities on middle school bands given the nature of their position in the NBA. Based upon their extensive experience and expertise, they are in a unique position to recommend additional prominent middle school instrumental music educators to take part in the repertoire survey. The NBA middle school representatives contacted were Chip DeStefano of McCracken Middle School, Illinois, Audrey Murphy of Hopewell Middle School, Georgia, and Gary Barton, a composer of middle-level band music and author who recently retired as a band director from the Baker Sixth Grade Campus in LaPorte, Texas. Chip DeStefano and Audrey Murphy were contacted by telephone in October, 2014, and subsequently via email (see Appendix A). Gary Barton was consulted in person at the 2014 Midwest Clinic. In addition to completing the repertoire survey (see Appendix C), all three experts were asked to identify and provide the contact information for additional expert middle school band directors. Those whom they identified were also contacted by email and asked to participate in the repertoire survey through the link to the Survey Monkey website.

The membership of the American School Band Directors Association (ASBDA) was identified as another viable source for expert middle school band directors to participate in the survey. ASBDA is a select, national professional organization of school band directors. The purpose of ASBDA is to enhance the wind band as a central part of the music education curriculum, promote the artistic pursuits of the medium, and recognize outstanding achievement among the practitioners in the field. In order to join ASBDA, prospective members must be endorsed by current members of the organization based on the following four requirements:

- A. Active membership shall be open to band directors of established personal and professional integrity who are actively engaged in exemplary teaching and directing, or supervision of school bands on the elementary, middle school, junior high, and/or high school levels.
- B. Paramount in consideration of a candidate, and superseding all other qualifications, should be their personal character traits and professional ethics record in their present and previous positions. Their record of service in their district and state associations shall be above question.
- C. Experience as a band director in public or private schools. A candidate must have completed a minimum of five (5) years experience in the field.
- D. Quality of Work: The work of the candidate should be evaluated on the merits of the bands consistently produced. The work of the candidate should be of exemplary quality as to command the respect of their colleagues in the state he/she represents. (www.asbda.com, 2014, "Membership Section")

The rigorous membership application also requires candidates to submit performance recordings of their band programs, which are evaluated by a committee of current ASBDA members. Based on these comprehensive and stringent criteria, members of ASBDA can be considered experts for the purposes of this study.

In order to reach out to the ASBDA middle school directors from various regions of the country, Past President Jeff Cutter was contacted via email (see Appendix B) in the fall of 2014. Through his assistance, permission was obtained from the current ASBDA National President, Blaire Callaway, to enlist ASBDA members to participate in the survey. Jeff Cutter, Past President Cynthia Swan-Egan, and National Secretary Valerie Gaffney identified potential subjects and served as a conduit for the dissemination of information pertaining to the study. They then forwarded the email invitation with the link to the survey to 110 current ASBDA members, 24 of whom consented to participate.

Though the survey was directed only to expert band directors who have achieved some level of distinction beyond those in the general population, there was a desire to

further expand the pool of subjects. Recommendations of additional survey participants came from a number of wind conductors associated with the middle-level instrumental music education community. Among them was Jermie Arnold, currently Associate Director of Bands at California State University Long Beach. He was the band director at American Fork, Utah Junior High School, where his bands were recognized at the *Music for All* Festival, performed at state and national conferences, and received numerous awards for excellence by the Utah Music Educators Conference. Jason Worzbyt is Associate Director of Bands at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. He has guest conducted numerous regional and All-State junior high school bands through the Northeast and Midwest, is an author of study guides for the *Teaching Music through Performance in Middle School Band*, is the Division 3 President of the Pennsylvania Music Educators Association, and regularly serves as a clinician and adjudicator for middle-level bands. Jim Daughters, currently director of the Cincinnati Conservatory Junior Youth Wind Ensemble, was the band director at Conner Middle School in Hebron, Kentucky. His bands were recognized by both the *Mark of Excellence* and *Music for All* festivals and selected to perform at both state and national conferences. Sue Creasap, Associate Director of Bands and Professor of Music Education at Morehead State University, is a research associate for the *Teaching Music through Performance in Band* series. She has appeared throughout the country as a conductor, clinician, and adjudicator for middle-level bands, has presented at both state and national conferences, and has received the Tennessee Band Directors *Citation of Excellence*, Women Band Directors International *Silver Baton*, and Kentucky Music Educators Association's *Award of Excellence*. Ed Lisk is a renowned conductor, author, and former member of the Midwest

Board of Directors. Dennis Fisher, Associate Director of Wind Studies at the University of North Texas, is a co-author and recording producer for *Teaching Music through Performance in Band*. Peter Boonshaft, Director of Bands at Hofstra University, a prolific guest conductor and adjudicator, and author of the *Sound Innovations* band method book, Marguerite Wilder, retired middle school band director and GIA Publications author, and Michael Sweeney, composer and Director of Band Publications for the Hal Leonard Corporation, were also helpful in this regard.

The Midwest Clinic, with its ability to draw prominent music educators from across the nation, provided a unique opportunity to make personal contact with additional band directors. Prospective subjects were chosen upon expert recommendation and only after being vetted to determine that they met the aforementioned criteria as distinguished middle-level band conductors. At the December, 2014 Midwest Clinic in Chicago, in-person discussions were held with 30 qualified conductors. Sixteen of them offered to complete the survey on site, four declined to participate, and the 10 remaining conductors asked that they be contacted by email after the conference. Two of them responded to the subsequent online survey request. Addressing the survey invitations to specific individuals rather than using generic salutations, and referencing either the personal contact made at Midwest or the individual recommending that teacher for participation in the study, steadily enhanced the data collected. This technique was also utilized in pursuing information from two other resources.

The *Music for All* National Festival, founded in 1992, provided additional prospective subjects. The festival, inspired by the National Band Contests of the early 20th century, features performances by some of the nation's foremost school music

ensembles. In 2012, a division of this festival devoted solely to middle school bands was established.

Bands are selected to participate at this festival through a rigorous application and recorded audition procedure. “The listening is “blind”—ensembles are not identified to evaluators during this process. This helps to ensure that all practices are above board. Bands cannot receive favorable treatment based upon their reputation, a personal connection to any of the adjudicators, or any possible relationship that could exist with an officer or sponsor of the organization.

Evaluators recommend the ensembles that demonstrate an exemplary level of excellence to perform at the festival (<http://www.musicforall.org>). The selection committee is comprised of a panel of nationally prominent school and collegiate wind conductors. Since there is no required literature list for this festival, directors may choose any repertoire they deem appropriate for their students. This is another desirable factor for the purposes of this study in that directors are given free rein to identify the literature they believe to be significant enough for a national venue.

Since 2012, 32 middle school bands have performed in the *Music for All* National Festival (see Appendix F). Of these 32 participating bands, six were among the schools performing at the Midwest Clinic between 2003 and 2014. This provides further validation of the high caliber of the programs associated with this event. In January 2015, personalized email invitations to participate in the repertoire survey (based upon the format of Appendix C) were sent to 26 directors of ensembles from each of the schools involved in the *Music for All* Middle School National Festival. Not included were the six that had also performed at Midwest Clinic.

An additional resource used to identify exemplar programs was The Foundation for Music Education's *Mark of Excellence/National Wind Band Honors* recorded competition. The Foundation for Music Education is non-profit organization that supports music education programs in schools. Among its activities is the sponsorship of an adjudicated festival in which high school and middle school music ensembles submit recordings that are evaluated by a panel of nationally renowned university and professional conductors. The application and selection process includes the following steps:

Submit 2 CD recordings and one set of scores of two selections. These selections may be of any level or source, but higher consideration will be given to serious works of appropriate difficulty for the school classification. Marches are appropriate but not required....

The level one adjudicator will select the top 50% to advance to level two....

The level two adjudicator will select the top 25% (half of those that advanced) as the National winners. National winners will be recognized in regional and/or national publications, at national and regional conferences, and will receive a trophy. The second 25% will receive commended status....

One work by each national winner will be selected for inclusion in the compilation recording which is provided to all entrants.
(<http://www.foundationformusiceducation.org>)

The Foundation for Music Education's *Mark of Excellence* recognizes three categories of exceptional programs, *National Winners*, *Commended Winners*, and *State Level Winners*. Bands achieving any one of these standings have distinguished themselves among the elite programs as determined by the panel of adjudicators. This is further reinforced by the fact that 16 of the bands earning one or more of these designations had also performed at the Midwest Clinic between 2003 and 2014. Seven additional bands from this pool performed in the *Music for All* Festival. Two ensembles, Bailey Middle School and Kealing Middle School, performed at all three venues. In

January, 2015, 90 directors of bands earning *Mark of Excellence* status between 2008 and 2014 (see Appendix G) were individually contacted by email and invited to take part in the repertoire survey. To avoid redundancies, the 21 directors from this category that had performed at the other venues were not sent duplicate invitations. Efforts to email the four remaining directors from the Mt. Dora, Richmond Hill, Oliver, and Cedar Bluff Middle Schools were not successful.

Despite their widespread membership and national recognition, other organizations were limited in the assistance that they could provide for this study. The membership of the National Association for Music Education (NAfME) and its affiliated state organizations is comprised of teachers in all areas of music education. While band directors are included in most states, the leaders of these organizations are often not specialists in instrumental music education, let alone at the middle school level. Beyond NAfME, there are a number of professional organizations specifically for band directors. Among the most prominent serving national memberships are the College Band Directors National Association and the American Bandmasters Association. Although there are a great many band experts affiliated with these organizations, the memberships are dominated by university wind conductors, many of whom have little contact with middle school band programs. Therefore, these organizations were not included.

Development of the Survey

In the early summer of 2014, a pilot study was conducted to assess the veracity of a survey instrument designed to collect information about the specific programming trends of middle-level band directors. Nine highly experienced middle school band directors from Long Island, New York were invited to participate in the pilot study.

Based on their feedback, minor adjustments were made in both the content and format of the survey to make the experience for the participants less complicated and their answers more informative.

The primary concern raised was with the initial requirement for subjects to indicate their 20 most valuable works for middle-level band, and then rate each piece on a Likert scale for each of four separate categories. Some in the pilot study completed this task readily but indicated that it posed somewhat of a challenge. Other directors required access to files from their past concert programs and band music libraries. A few could not complete these questions citing time constraints. With the potential that this would become too daunting or time consuming for prospective subjects in the study, the question was revised to allow respondents to offer fewer than 20 pieces if they so choose. It was determined that any repertoire suggestions deemed to be of great merit by expert band directors could be valuable for the purposes of this study, and should not be excluded simply because the respondent choose not to offer a total of 20 pieces.

In the survey (Appendix D), directors were asked to provide basic demographic information pertaining to their region of the country, years of teaching experience, education, and their process and priorities in selecting repertoire. They were then asked to list up to 20 works that they deemed to be most valuable for middle-level band students, while evaluating, on a Likert Scale, the extent to which they believed each work is of artistic and pedagogical merit. They also indicated their likelihood of programming each work again in the future, and determined the degree to which each should be included as part of a core repertoire for middle-level bands.

The criteria considered by the directors in evaluating the works was as follows:

“Artistic Value” – The director believes this piece meets the criteria for serious artistic merit, which includes elements of superior form, shape, craftsmanship, unpredictability, consistency in style, ingenuity, and musical validity beyond educational purposes.

“Pedagogical Value” – The director believes this work is effective in fostering the technical development of students in school ensembles. The piece may also include such characteristics as formulaic compositional techniques, extensive block scoring and cross-cueing, with ranges and keys limited to what is developmentally appropriate at various age levels.

“Likelihood of Repeating” indicates the extent to which the director is inclined to program this piece in the future.

“Should be Part of a Core Repertoire” – The director believes this work should be identified as an exceptional work that warrants repeated performances over time. It has emerged, or may become, part of a body of literature to which middle-level band students should be exposed on a wide-scale basis.

The characteristics of pedagogical band music and music of serious artistic merit, by in large, appear to be mutually exclusive. For the purposes of this study, music of serious artistic merit is defined as having elements of superior form, shape, craftsmanship, unpredictability, consistency in style, ingenuity, and musical validity beyond educational purposes. Given the nature of a middle school environment, it is safe to assume that all participants would see this as obvious. This is often in contrast to music valued for pedagogical goals rather than artistic merit. In most situations, directors might be expected to categorize a piece as one or the other, but not both. To some extent, this

could be attributed to many band director authorities who have asserted that these two purposes are incompatible. However, situations may arise in which a director decides that a specific piece, despite being designed for educational purposes or having limited technical requirements, is of such superior craftsmanship that it also deserves the designation of serious artistic merit. Therefore, directors had the option of selecting both categories for an individual piece when a work clearly and overwhelmingly exhibits elements of both.

Furthermore, it might be expected that core repertoire consists almost entirely of works of serious artistic merit. However, there may be cases where a director decides that a work contains such a wealth of teaching material that it warrants exposure to middle school students on a wide-scale basis as part of a core repertoire, even if it is not deemed to be of serious artistic merit. The survey allowed for such eventualities.

The popularity of a work as evidenced by a larger number of performances is not necessarily indicative of a piece that should be considered part of a core repertoire if inclusion is designated only for truly extraordinary works. Identifying core repertoire is a subjective judgment made on the part of each individual director. The quandary is that there is no clear means of differentiating specific pieces as the core repertoire from the larger body of works evaluated.

Unlike previous repertoire studies in which evaluators rated works from a limited list prepared by the researcher, this study allowed subjects to consider any work they deemed appropriate. With the ability to choose from a pool of indefinite quantity, identifying a consensus for what constitutes a meritorious work is less tangible.

In previous studies, standards were established whereby five or more evaluators were required to agree that a work achieved meritorious status. For example, Miller (2013) required five evaluators from a panel of 32 to achieve a consensus, as did Thomas (1998) with his group of 28 adjudicators. While this was conducive to studies with a smaller number of evaluators considering a finite body of the same works, it is less effective for the specific procedures of this research.

With 87 evaluators choosing from unlimited repertoire options, the range and variety of possibilities is potentially extraordinary. Further complicating matters is the fact that recognized experts are delineating the works they have deemed to be most valuable in their highly successful teaching endeavors. This makes it difficult to invalidate any of their particular suggestions. Since identifying the programming trends of distinguished middle-level band conductors is among the goals of this research, some minimal degree of consensus was required to discern superior works among the many different titles recommended in this survey.

Regardless of potential merit, it is not practical to assert the presence of a programming trend when a work is suggested only once. In addition, while there may be pause for additional consideration given to works listed twice, there remains little evidence of wider reaching programming tendencies. Therefore, works recommended by only one or two respondents were eliminated from the final list of the “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band.”

Given the seemingly infinite range of possible answers, for three or more band directors in this survey to arrive at the same conclusion indicates a greater potential for a work to be part of a larger programming trend. Such pieces were subject to additional

measures in ascertaining their suitability as “Most Valued Repertoire.” When attempting to identify exemplar pieces, only the upper echelon was afforded the greatest consideration. In an effort to evaluate such works considered in this study, the following procedures were employed.

1. A tally was recorded for the number of times each specific work was recommended by a director as “Most Valued” in the survey.
2. Works recommended only once or twice were eliminated from contention as the “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band.”
3. Pieces recommended three or more times by respondents in this study were identified as the “Most Recommended Works” and subjected to further analysis.
4. Each of the “Most Recommended Works” was categorized under one of the following genres: an original work for winds; an arrangement or transcription; a folksong or work based on a folksong; a march.
5. A mean rating was calculated based upon the Likert scores for each piece indicated by the directors under the “artistic,” “pedagogical,” “likelihood of repeating,” and “core repertoire” categories of the survey.
6. The “Most Recommended Works” were assigned a difficulty level based on the average of grade levels that were indicated for several state lists that utilize a numerical grading system. The average score was rounded to the nearest whole number.
7. The “Most Recommended Works,” achieving a minimum mean score of 4.0 in each of the four Likert categories and ranging in difficulty level from grades 2 to 3, were included on a list of “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band.”
8. The “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band” were compared to the middle-level band pieces deemed meritorious in the Dvorak (1986), Kvet (1996), Thomas (1998), Howard (2001), Stevenson (2003), Oliver (2012), Miller (2013), and Miles (1998-2015) studies to examine how they might relate to various views on core repertoire.

Although this study does not replicate the procedures or the data analysis of previous ones, the research conducted by Ostling (1978), Gilbert (1993), Thomas (1998), Towner (2011), and Miller (2013) helped to establish a minimum score by which a work

in the current study may be considered meritorious. They set an overall average rating of 80% (79% in some of these studies) as the minimum standard for a work to be designated as having serious artistic merit. This score is akin to a mean of 4.0 or higher in the five-point Likert scale used in this survey. Using the rating standard of the previous studies as a guideline, only the recommended works that achieved a mean score of 4.0 or higher in each of “artistic,” “pedagogical,” “likelihood of repeating,” and “core repertoire” categories of the survey or higher in the category of “should be part of a core repertoire” were considered for the list of “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band.”

All works presented as “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band” are deemed to be within the technical and musical grasp of students in the corresponding age group. Although grade 2 and 3 literature is traditionally defined as middle-level difficulty, the authors of the other studies used in conjunction with this research have included works ranging between grade levels 1 and 4. Further complicating matters are the works that have been assigned different grade levels depending on the criteria used in formulating the various repertoire lists.

As noted before, attempting to assign difficulty levels to individual works is marred by inconsistent evaluations between the repertoire lists of numerous authors and states. In an effort to account for these factors and assign a more consistent graded difficulty level for each of the “Most Recommended Works” multiple state festival lists were reviewed. From various state lists that assign a numerical difficulty level, an average grade was calculated (see Appendix H). These state list ratings were accessed through the J. W. Pepper website (<http://www.jwpepper.com/sheet-music/services->

statefestival.jsp?utm_medium=internal&utm_campaign=StateFestivalLists
&utm_source=HomeBanner&utm_pos=J:Home&utm_asset=Banner).

Where the calculated average included decimals, grades above the .50 threshold were rounded up to the nearest whole number. Difficulty levels that were ambiguous or which utilized alternative grading methods were not included in the average grade calculation. One work, *Unraveling* by Andrew Boysen, Jr., did not appear on any of the state listings. The difficulty level determined by its publisher, the Neal A. Kjos Publishing Company, was used instead.

For the purposes of this study, only music with an average grade level of 2 or 3 will be considered within the technical grasp of a typical middle-level band. Works with an average grade level outside of this range were disqualified from consideration as “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band.”

Timeline

Email correspondences were initiated in the fall of 2014 and continued through early 2015. Interviews were conducted at the Midwest Clinic December 17-19, 2014. Data from all resources in this study were subsequently collected and analyzed in the winter and spring of 2015.

Chapter 4: Results

Through the combined resources of the performing bands at the Midwest Clinic, the members of ASBDA, the expert recommendations made by prominent educators and conductors, the NBA Middle School Representatives, and the national honor festivals, 342 distinguished band conductors who specialize in middle-level wind literature were invited to participate in the survey. The number of subjects within the various group categories is indicated in Table 1.

Table 1

Categories of Survey Respondents

Category	No. of Invitations	No. of Respondents
ASBDA	110	24
NBA Recommendations	14	8
Midwest: In-person Discussions	30	18
Bands Performing at the Midwest Clinic	33	14
Bands Performing at <i>Music for All</i> Festival	26	11
Bands Achieving <i>Mark of Excellence</i>	90	36
Other Expert Recommendations	39	17
Total	342	128

Of the 342 conductors invited to participate in this study, 128 agreed to the terms of consent, with 121 answering the survey questions in part or in full. Eighty-seven completed the survey by offering one or more repertoire selections. Responses were received from directors in various regions of the country as shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Regional Distribution of Survey Respondents

Answer Choices	No.	Percentage
Eastern (CT, DE, ME, MD, MA, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT, DC)	20	16.53%
North Central (IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, NE, OH, SD, WI)	35	28.93%
Southern (AL, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV)	25	20.66%
Southwestern (AR, CO, KS, MO, NM, OK, TX)	39	32.23%
Western (CA, HI, UT, AZ, NV)	1	0.83%
North Western (AK, ID, OR, WA, WY)	1	0.83%
Total	121	

The respondents were predominantly highly experienced practitioners as evidenced by the number of years of teaching experience indicated in Table 3.

Table 3

The Number of Years of Teaching Experience of the Respondents

Years of Teaching Experience	No.	Percentage
20 or More	63	52.5%
15 – 19	18	15.0%
10 – 14	22	18.33%
5 – 9	15	12.5%
Less than 5	2	1.67%
Total	120	

Most of the teachers surveyed hold advanced college degrees. While 35 respondents (28.93%) have a Bachelor's degree, 44 (36.36%) received a Master's degree. Another 36 (29.75%) have pursued additional graduate work. Six respondents (4.96%) hold terminal degrees.

The vast majority of teachers were experienced in teaching students in grades 6, 7, and 8. A much smaller percentage taught 9th grade as would be expected with the current preponderance of middle-level schools aligning with the grade 6 to 8 middle school philosophy. Table 4 shows the number and percentage of respondents who teach each of the levels between grades 6 and 9.

Table 4

Grade Levels Taught by Respondents

Grade Levels Taught	No.	Percentage
Grade 6	107	91.45%
Grade 7	109	93.16%
Grade 8	113	96.58%
Grade 9	40	34.19%

Respondents were asked to rank, in order of importance, four different factors when making their programming decisions. These included artistic considerations, pedagogical considerations, the appeal of the music to the students, and the appeal of the music to the audience. Directors were very closely divided between artistic and pedagogical considerations. The appeal of the music to students was ranked third. Consideration for the audience was overwhelmingly considered to be least important. Weighted average scores and ranked vote totals are indicated in Table 5. The highest

weighted score reflects the most preferred choice, or the category ranked first. The top choice was assigned a weight of 4, the second choice a weight of 3, the third choice a weight of 2, and the fourth choice a weight of 1. The following formula was used to calculate weighted average scores, where “w” equals the weight of the ranked position and “x” equals the response count for the answer choice:

$$\frac{x_1w_1 + x_2w_2 + x_3w_3 + x_4w_4}{\text{Total Number of Respondents}}$$

Table 5

The Most Important Factors Considered in Selecting Repertoire

Value Factors	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Rank 4	Weighted Score
Artistic	56 46.28%	54 44.63%	7 5.79%	4 3.31%	3.34
Pedagogical	59 48.76%	48 39.67%	9 7.44%	5 4.13%	3.33
Student Appeal	4 3.31%	18 14.88%	91 75.21%	8 6.61%	2.15
Audience Appeal	2 1.65%	1 .83%	14 11.57%	104 85.95%	1.18

Total Respondents = 121

The surveyed directors largely agreed that original works for winds and marches were the most important musical genres for middle-level band students to experience. To a lesser extent, transcriptions, American folk music, and world music were valued. Popular music, while ranked lowest among the musical genres to include in performed repertoire, was still considered important by the majority of the band directors. Table 6 shows the Likert scores associated with various genres of repertoire and their importance

to middle-level band students. “Weighted Average” is listed under the heading “Wt. Avg.”

Table 6

The Genres Essential to the Repertoire of Middle-level Band Students

Genre	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5	Total	Wt. Avg.
Original	0 0%	1 .87%	11 9.57%	44 38.26%	59 51.30%	115	4.40
Marches	0 0%	2 1.67%	7 5.83%	47 39.17%	64 53.33%	120	4.44
Transcriptions	2 1.67%	6 5.00%	32 26.67%	56 46.67%	24 20.00%	120	3.78
Popular	7 5.83%	14 11.67%	34 28.33%	55 45.83%	10 8.33%	120	3.39
American Folk	0 0%	2 1.69%	26 22.03%	69 58.47%	21 17.80%	118	3.92
World Music	0 0%	5 4.20%	28 23.53%	70 58.82%	16 13.45%	119	3.82

Surveyed directors overwhelmingly agreed that a core repertoire for middle-level bands is essential. Core repertoire was defined as a body of exceptional works that warrant repeated performances over time and wide-scale exposure to middle-level band students. Ninety-percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed of its importance. Less than 3% disagreed with this notion. The full percentages are listed in Table 7.

Table 7

Importance of Having a Core Repertoire for Middle-Level Band

Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5	Total	Wt. Avg.
0	3	9	41	67		
0%	2.5%	7.50%	34.17%	55.83%	120	4.43

The works that should comprise a core repertoire for middle-level bands varied greatly among the 87 directors who made recommendations. After analyzing the data and culling pieces that were ambiguously labeled or could not be authenticated by title or composer, a total of 1,354 recommendations of 774 different works remained for consideration. The diversity of the repertoire ranges from the recommendation of one work by 18 different respondents, to 550 different works listed only once. Table 8 illustrates the number of different works listed at each level of frequency.

Table 8

Number of Different Works per Frequency of Recommendation

Frequency of Recommendations	No. of Different Works per Frequency
1	550
2	92
3	59
4	30
5	13
6	11
7	5
8	4
9	1
19	1
11	4
12	1
16	2
18	1

Some pieces were listed under more than one arranger and, therefore, counted as separate compositions. These included *Fairest of the Fair*, *Amparito Roca*, *Lincolnshire Posy*, *Barnum and Bailey's March*, *Colonel Bogey March*, *Rough Riders*, and *Washington Post*. Table 9 indicates the complete list of suggested works and number ("No.") of recommendations sorted by frequency and then alphabetized by title.

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Kentucky 1800</i>	Clare Grundman	18
<i>Air for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	16
<i>American River Songs</i>	Pierre La Plante	16
<i>On a Hymnsong of Philip Bliss</i>	David Holsinger	12
<i>A Childhood Hymn</i>	David Holsinger	11
<i>A Longford Legend</i>	Robert Sheldon	11
<i>Cajun Folk Songs</i>	Frank Ticheli	11
<i>Overture For Winds</i>	Charles Carter	11
<i>Simple Gifts Four Shaker Songs</i>	Frank Ticheli	10
<i>Three Ayres from Gloucester</i>	Hugh Stuart	9
<i>Balladair</i>	Frank Erickson	8
<i>Joy</i>	Frank Ticheli	8
<i>Moscow 1941</i>	Brian Balmages	8
<i>Themes from Green Bushes</i>	Percy Grainger/L. Daehn	8
<i>Ancient Voices</i>	Michael Sweeney	7
<i>Arabian Dances</i>	Brian Balmages	7
<i>J. S. Jig</i>	Brant Karrick	7
<i>The Red Balloon</i>	Anne McGinty	7
<i>Undertow</i>	John Mackey	7
<i>Butterfly's Ball</i>	Ryan Fraley	6
<i>Canto</i>	William Francis McBeth	6
<i>Celtic Air and Dance</i>	Michael Sweeney	6
<i>Concord</i>	Clare Grundman	6
<i>Courtly Airs & Dances</i>	Ron Nelson	6
<i>Ghost Fleet</i>	Robert Sheldon	6
<i>Our Kingsland Spring</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	6

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Peregrin: A Traveler's Tale</i>	Douglas Akey	6
<i>Prelude and Fugue in Bb Major</i>	J. S. Bach /R. Moehlmann	6
<i>Sparks</i>	Brian Balmages	6
<i>Variations on a Korean Folk Song</i>	John Barnes Chance	6
<i>As Summer Was Just Beginning</i>	Larry Daehn	5
<i>Blue and Green Music</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	5
<i>Chorale and Shaker Dance</i>	John Zdechlik	5
<i>Portrait of a Clown</i>	Frank Ticheli	5
<i>Prairie Songs</i>	Pierre La Plante	5
<i>Prelude, Siciliano and Rondo</i>	Malcolm Arnold/Paynter	5
<i>Prestissimo</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	5
<i>Symphonic Dance No. 3 "Fiesta"</i>	James Clifton Williams	5
<i>The Tempest</i>	Robert W. Smith	5
<i>Toccata for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	5
<i>Tricycle</i>	Andrew Boysen, Jr.	5
<i>Unraveling</i>	Andrew Boysen, Jr.	5
<i>Yorkshire Ballad</i>	James Barnes	5
<i>A Prehistoric Suite</i>	Paul Jennings	4
<i>A Walk in the Morning Sun</i>	Pierre La Plante	4
<i>Abracadabra</i>	Frank Ticheli	4
<i>Alligator Alley</i>	Michael Daugherty	4
<i>British Isles Suite</i>	Larry Daehn	4
<i>Caprice</i>	William Himes	4
<i>Chant and Jubilo</i>	William Francis McBeth	4
<i>Chorale and Shaker Dance II</i>	Anne McGinty	4
<i>Country Wildflowers</i>	Larry Daehn	4
<i>Creed</i>	William Himes	4
<i>Down a Country Lane</i>	Aaron Copland/M. Patterson	4
<i>Down by the Salley Gardens</i>	Michael Sweeney	4
<i>Dreams and Fancies</i>	Timothy Broege	4
<i>Horkstow Grange</i>	Percy Grainger/M. Sweeney	4
<i>Incantation and Dance</i>	John Barnes Chance	4
<i>La Madre de Los Gatos</i>	Brian Beck	4
<i>Nathan Hale Trilogy</i>	James Curnow	4
<i>Psalm 42</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	4

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Rhythm Machine</i>	Timothy Broege	4
<i>Rites of Tamburo</i>	Robert W. Smith	4
<i>Shenandoah</i>	Frank Ticheli	4
<i>Shepherd's Hey</i>	Percy Grainger	4
<i>Sinfonia VI</i>	Timothy Broege	4
<i>Suite in Minor Mode</i>	Dmitri Kabalevsky/ Siekmann/Oliver	4
<i>Suite Provencale</i>	Jan van der Roost	4
<i>Summer Dances</i>	Brian Balmages	4
<i>The Great Locomotive Chase</i>	Robert W. Smith	4
<i>Two British Folk Songs</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	4
<i>West Highlands Sojourn</i>	Robert Sheldon	4
<i>With Quiet Courage</i>	Larry Daehn	4
<i>2nd Suite in F Major</i>	Gustav Holst	3
<i>A Song of Hope</i>	James Swearingen	3
<i>All the Pretty Little Horses</i>	Anne McGinty	3
<i>Allied Honor March</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	3
<i>American Folk Rhapsody No. 2</i>	Clare Grundman	3
<i>American Song Settings No. 2</i>	Joseph Kreines	3
<i>An Irish Rhapsody</i>	Clare Grundman	3
<i>Apparitions</i>	Brian Balmages	3
<i>Arabian Dances</i>	Roland Barrett	3
<i>Bandology</i>	Eric Osterling	3
<i>Battle Pavane, The</i>	T. Susato/Bob Margolis	3
<i>Black Forest Overture</i>	Michael Sweeney	3
<i>Blue Ridge Overture</i>	Frank Erickson	3
<i>Blue Ridge Saga</i>	James Swearingen	3
<i>Colonial Airs & Dances</i>	Robert Jager	3
<i>Crystal City Overture</i>	John Edmondson	3
<i>Cumberland Cross</i>	Carl Strommen	3
<i>Deir In De</i>	Warren Barker	3
<i>Early One Morning</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>Earthdance</i>	Michael Sweeney	3
<i>Fanfare, Ode and Festival</i>	Bob Margolis	3
<i>Fantasy on a Fiddle Tune</i>	Pierre La Plante	3

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Fantasy on a Japanese Folk Song</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	3
<i>Festivo</i>	Vaclav Nelhybel	3
<i>Flourish for Wind Band</i>	Ralph Vaughan Williams	3
<i>Folk Song Suite</i>	Ralph Vaughan Williams	3
<i>Fortress</i>	Frank Ticheli	3
<i>Hudson River Suite</i>	John O'Reilly	3
<i>Into the Clouds</i>	Richard Saucedo	3
<i>Joy Revisited</i>	Frank Ticheli	3
<i>Korean Folk Rhapsody</i>	James Curnow	3
<i>Linden Lea</i>	R. Vaughan Williams/Stout	3
<i>March of the Belgian Paratroopers</i>	Pierre Leemans/J. Swearingen	3
<i>Nordic Sketches</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>Nottingham Castle</i>	Larry Daehn	3
<i>Overture on a Minstrel Tune</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>Pevensey Castle</i>	Robert Sheldon	3
<i>Pictures at an Exhibition</i>	Modest Mussorgsky/Sweeney	3
<i>Polly Oliver</i>	Thomas Root	3
<i>Prospect</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>Rain</i>	Brian Balmages	3
<i>Rhosymedre</i>	R. Vaughan Williams/Beeler	3
<i>Rhythm of the Winds</i>	Frank Erickson	3
<i>Rhythms and Riffs</i>	Brian Balmages	3
<i>Rikudim</i>	Jan van der Roost	3
<i>Sea Song Trilogy</i>	Anne McGinty	3
<i>Serengeti Dreams</i>	Robert W. Smith	3
<i>Slavonic Folk Suite</i>	Alfred Reed	3
<i>Sonatina for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	3
<i>A Song for Friends</i>	Larry Daehn	3
<i>Spoon River</i>	Percy Grainger/R. Sheldon	3
<i>Spoon River</i>	Percy Grainger/G. C. Bainum	3
<i>Suite from Bohemia</i>	Vaclav Nelhybel	3

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Symphony No. 4</i>	Andrew Boysen, Jr.	3
<i>The Headless Horseman</i>	Timothy Broege	3
<i>Third Suite</i>	Robert Jager	3
<i>Valdres</i>	J. Hanssen/Arr. Not Specified	3
<i>Variation Overture</i>	James Clifton Williams	3
<i>Voices in the Sky</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	3
<i>A Little French Suite</i>	Pierre La Plante	2
<i>A Renaissance Revel</i>	T. Susato/Singleton	2
<i>A Sailor's Odyssey</i>	David Bobrowitz	2
<i>A Tallis Prelude</i>	Douglas Akey	2
<i>A Tribute to Grainger</i>	Chalon Ragsdale	2
<i>All Ye Young Sailors</i>	Pierre La Plante	2
<i>Amazing Grace</i>	Frank Ticheli	2
<i>Amazing Grace</i>	William Himes	2
<i>American Song Settings No. 3</i>	Joseph Kreines	2
<i>Among the Clouds</i>	Brian Balmages	2
<i>Anasazi</i>	John Edmondson	2
<i>Annabel Lee</i>	Douglas Wagner	2
<i>Appalachian Morning</i>	Robert Sheldon	2
<i>As Winds Dance</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	2
<i>At the Crossroads</i>	Robert W. Smith	2
<i>Atlantis</i>	Anne McGinty	2
<i>Australian Up Country Tune</i>	Percy Grainger/G. Bainum	2
<i>Beyond the Seven Hills</i>	Michael Sweeney	2
<i>Black Granite III</i>	James Hosay	2
<i>Brookpark Overture</i>	James Swearingen	2
<i>By Loch and Mountain</i>	Robert W. Smith	2
<i>Candide Suite</i>	L. Bernstein/C. Grundman	2
<i>Capriol Suite</i>	Peter Warlock/R. Longfield	2
<i>Chant and Tribal Dance</i>	David Shaffer	2
<i>Chester Variations</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	2
<i>Children's March</i>	Percy Grainger/D. Wagner	2
<i>Chorale and Fugue in F Major</i>	J. S. Bach/L. Daehn	2
<i>Choreography</i>	Robert Sheldon	2

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Circus Days</i>	Karl King	2
<i>Early English Suite</i>	Walter Finlayson	2
<i>English Masters Suite</i>	Philip Gordon	2
<i>Fantasia on the Dargason</i>	Gustav Holst/Michael Story	2
<i>Fantasy on American Sailing Songs</i>	Clare Grundman	2
<i>First Suite in Eb</i>	Gustav Holst	2
<i>Flight of Eagles</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	2
<i>Forest Brook Overture</i>	Erik Morales	2
<i>Friends of Freedom</i>	Timothy Loest	2
<i>Garden of the Black Rose</i>	Robert Sheldon	2
<i>Ginger Marmalade</i>	Warren Benson	2
<i>Grant County Celebration</i>	Mark Williams	2
<i>Greensleeves</i>	Alfred Reed	2
<i>Havendance</i>	David Holsinger	2
<i>Images of Ireland</i>	Brian Balmages	2
<i>Imperium</i>	Michael Sweeney	2
<i>In Dulci Jubilo</i>	John Zdechlik	2
<i>In The Shining of the Stars</i>	Robert Sheldon	2
<i>Into the Storm</i>	Robert W. Smith	2
<i>Joyance</i>	Bruce Pearson	2
<i>Jubilations</i>	Bruce Pearson	2
<i>Korean Folk Song Medley</i>	James Ployhar	2
<i>Little Suite for Band</i>	Clare Grundman	2
<i>Lullabye</i>	Randall Standridge	2
<i>Majestica</i>	Brian Balmages	2
<i>March of the Buccaneers</i>	Victor Flowers	2
<i>Marching Song</i>	Gustav Holst/John Moss	2
<i>Meadowlands</i>	James MacBeth	2
<i>Mini Suite</i>	Morton Gould	2
<i>Nettleton</i>	Johnnie Vinson	2
<i>Normandy Beach</i>	John Edmondson	2
<i>Norwegian Folk Song Suite</i>	Frank Erickson	2
<i>Of Dark Lords and Ancient Kings</i>	Roland Barrett	2
<i>Old Home Days</i>	Charles Ives/Elkus	2

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Pageant</i>	Vincent Persichetti	2
<i>Praises</i>	William Francis McBeth	2
<i>Renaissance Festival and Dances</i>	Bruce Pearson	2
<i>Renaissance Suite</i>	T. Susato/James Curnow	2
<i>Russian Sailors' Dance</i>	R. Gliere/M. Williams	2
<i>Salvation is Created</i>	Pavel Tchesnokoff/ Houseknecht	2
<i>Shackleford Banks</i>	Jay Bocook	2
<i>Shaker Variants</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	2
<i>Sinfonia IV</i>	Timothy Broege	2
<i>Songs of Old Kentucky</i>	Brant Karrick	2
<i>Summer Resounding</i>	Brian Balmages	2
<i>Symphonic Overture</i>	Charles Carter	2
<i>The Forge of Vulcan</i>	Michael Sweeney	2
<i>The Old Red Mill</i>	Brant Karrick	2
<i>The Rowan Tree</i>	Randall Standridge	2
<i>The Sphinx</i>	Gary P. Gilroy	2
<i>The Water is Wide</i>	James Swearingen	2
<i>They Led My Lord Away</i>	Adoniram Gordan/F. Allen	2
<i>Through Courageous Eyes</i>	Brian Balmages	2
<i>Train Heading West</i>	Timothy Broege	2
<i>Triton Fanfare</i>	Robert W. Smith	2
<i>Ukrainian Bell Carol</i>	Richard Saucedo	2
<i>Under an Irish Sky</i>	Larry Neeck	2
<i>Variations on Scarborough Fair</i>	Calvin Custer	2
<i>Voodoo Dance</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	2
<i>Winter on Emerald Bay</i>	Alan Lee Silva	2
<i>Within the Castle Walls</i>	Brian Balmages	2
<i>2nd Suite in F Major Movement II</i>	Gustav Holst	1
<i>1812 Overture</i>	P. I. Tchaikovsky/ M. Williams	1
<i>2001 A March Odyssey</i>	David Shaffer	1
<i>A Christmas Auld Lang Syne</i>	James Swearingen	1
<i>A House Divided</i>	Brian Balmages	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>A Hymn for Band</i>	Hugh Stuart	1
<i>A Journey Down Niagara</i>	Christopher Tucker	1
<i>A March on the King's Highway</i>	Pierre La Plante	1
<i>A Mighty Fortress</i>	Andrew Balent	1
<i>A Purcell Suite</i>	Henry Purcell/Boyd	1
<i>A Quest for the Black Knight</i>	Timothy Loest	1
<i>A Quiet Rain</i>	Walter Cummings	1
<i>A Visit from St. Nicholas</i>	Len Orcino	1
<i>Accolade</i>	William Himes	1
<i>Aces of the Air (March)</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	1
<i>Activity March</i>	Harold Bennett/ Larry Clark	1
<i>Adagio for Winds</i>	Larry Daehn	1
<i>Adrenaline Engine</i>	Randall Standridge	1
<i>Adventures</i>	Jared Spears	1
<i>African Adventure</i>	Robert Sheldon	1
<i>African Festival</i>	Quincy Hilliard/ C. Elledge/ B. Pearson	1
<i>African Marching Song</i>	John O'Reilly	1
<i>Air and Allegro</i>	John Edmondson	1
<i>Air and March</i>	Henry Purcell/Gordon	1
<i>Aladdin</i>	Paul Jennings	1
<i>Alamo March</i>	Karl King	1
<i>All Aboard</i>	Nathan Farrell	1
<i>Allegro Molto</i>	W. A. Mozart/Thornton	1
<i>Alpha Squadron</i>	Greg Hillis	1
<i>Amazing Grace</i>	Sean O'Loughlin	1
<i>Amazing Grace</i>	John Edmondson	1
<i>America from West Side Story</i>	L. /M. Brown	1
<i>American Folk Rhapsody No. 3</i>	Clare Grundman	1
<i>American Folk Rhapsody No. 4</i>	Clare Grundman	1
<i>American Folk Trilogy</i>	Anne McGinty	1
<i>American Song Settings No. 1</i>	Joseph Kreines	1
<i>American Verses</i>	Timothy Broege	1
<i>Americans We</i>	H. Fillmore/A. Balent	1
<i>An Australian Sea Ballad</i>	Robert Sheldon	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Ancient Air and Dances</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	1
<i>And the Fire Raged</i>	Ted Ricketts	1
<i>And to All a Good Night</i>	Robert W. Smith	1
<i>Andante Grazioso</i>	W. A. Mozart/Thornton	1
<i>Antecedium</i>	Ed Huckleby	1
<i>Anything Goes</i>	Cole Porter/Douglas Wagner	1
<i>Apache Lullaby</i>	Michael Colgrass	1
<i>Apollo Fanfare</i>	Robert W. Smith	1
<i>Appalachian Hoedown</i>	Scott Watson	1
<i>Appalachian Suite</i>	Paul Murtha	1
<i>Arietta</i>	Frank Erickson	1
<i>Arioso</i>	James Clifton Williams	1
<i>Artifact</i>	Matthew Schoendorff	1
<i>As I Gaze from the High Mountain</i>	Patrick Burns	1
<i>As If On Wings</i>	Tracy Behrman	1
<i>As the Robin to the Meadow</i>	Todd Stalter	1
<i>Ash Grove</i>	Heskel Brisman	1
<i>Ashlawn Echoes</i>	Robert W. Smith	1
<i>Asian Folk Rhapsody</i>	Richard Saucedo	1
<i>At Sunrise</i>	Rob Romeyn	1
<i>At Twilight</i>	Robert Sheldon	1
<i>Ave Maria</i>	Franz Biebl/Robert Cameron	1
<i>Ave Verum Corpus</i>	W. A. Mozart/Mark Williams	1
<i>Aventura</i>	James Swearingen	1
<i>Awakening Hills</i>	Richard Saucedo	1
<i>Aztec Fire</i>	Jay Bocook	1
<i>Ballad for Chris</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	1
<i>Banddances</i>	Nelson Keys	1
<i>Bartok Variations</i>	Timothy Broege	1
<i>Battle of the Samurai</i>	Timothy Loest	1
<i>Beethoven's Ninth</i>	L. v. Beethoven/P. Lavender	1
<i>Belle Qui Tiens Ma Vie</i>	Bob Margolis	1
<i>Ben Franklin and the Art of Music</i>	Robert W. Smith	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Bennett March Book</i>	Larry Clark	1
<i>Big Sky Overture</i>	Philip Sparke	1
<i>Big Sky Roundup</i>	Robert Sheldon	1
<i>Big Top Rag</i>	E. Bischmann/N. Contorno	1
<i>Black is the Color</i>	Robert Sheldon	1
<i>Black Wolf Run</i>	John Higgins	1
<i>Blue and the Gray</i>	Clare Grundman	1
<i>Blue Mountain Saga</i>	Stephen Bulla	1
<i>Blue Ridge Impressions</i>	Brian Balmages	1
<i>Blue Ridge Reel</i>	Brian Balmages	1
<i>Bombasto</i>	Orin Farrar/Andrew Balent	1
<i>Bosnian Folk Songs</i>	Fred Allen	1
<i>Brass in the Basement</i>	Larry Neeck	1
<i>Breakstone</i>	Ronald Fallas	1
<i>Brick Street Encounte</i>	Richard Saucedo	1
<i>Bucimis</i>	Bob Lipton	1
<i>Bugler's Dream (Olympic Fanfare)</i>	Leo Arnaud, arr. Paul Lavender	1
<i>Caccia</i>	Norman Dello Joio	1
<i>Cafe 512</i>	Ryan George	1
<i>Canarios Fantasia</i>	Douglas Akey	1
<i>Candlelight Carol</i>	John Rutter/Jay Dawson	1
<i>Canterbury Overture</i>	Anne McGinty	1
<i>Canticle</i>	Jack Stamp	1
<i>Canyon Winds</i>	Sean O'Loughlin	1
<i>Carnival of the Animals</i>	C. Saint-Saëns/J. Curnow	1
<i>Carpathian Sketches</i>	Robert Jager	1
<i>Cavata</i>	William Francis McBeth	1
<i>Cayuga lake Overture</i>	Michael Sweeney	1
<i>Celebration and Psalm</i>	Robert Sheldon	1
<i>Celebration for Winds</i>	John Edmondson	1
<i>Celebration of Life</i>	Ralph Hultgren	1
<i>Celebration Tribalesque</i>	Randall Standridge	1
<i>Celtic Air and Dance No. 2</i>	Michael Sweeney	1
<i>Chant and Fire Ritual</i>	Tyler Grant	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Chant and Savage Dance</i>	Brian Balmages	1
<i>Chant Rituals</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	1
<i>Chester</i>	William Billings/E. Osterling	1
<i>Chester Overture</i>	William Schumann	1
<i>Chorale and Canon</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	1
<i>Chorale Episode</i>	Arthur Frackenpohl	1
<i>Chorale from Jupiter</i>	Gustav Holst/J. Curnow	1
<i>Christmas at the Movies</i>	John Moss	1
<i>Christmas Suite</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	1
<i>Cliff Island Suite</i>	Robert Jager	1
<i>Coast Guards March</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	1
<i>Coldwater Crossing</i>	Michael Sweeney	1
<i>Colliding Visions</i>	Brian Balmages	1
<i>Colors of a New Day</i>	Aaron Meacham	1
<i>Concert Overture in G Minor</i>	Clifford Lillya	1
<i>Connemara Sketches</i>	Chester Osborne	1
<i>Contradance</i>	Larry Clark	1
<i>Conundrum</i>	Robert Sheldon	1
<i>Counterbalance</i>	Todd Stalter	1
<i>Courtly Festival</i>	David Gordon	1
<i>Creepy Crawlies</i>	Michael Story	1
<i>Crestar Overture</i>	Paul Cook	1
<i>Cross Gate</i>	James Barnes	1
<i>Crown Imperial March</i>	William Walton/Jay Bocook	1
<i>Dance Antiqua</i>	Chris Sharp	1
<i>Dance of the Harlequins</i>	Larry Clark	1
<i>Dances from Terpsichore</i>	M. Praetorius/Fenske	1
<i>Danses de Fantaisie</i>	Jacob de Haan	1
<i>Dark Fortress</i>	Rob Grice	1
<i>Darklands March</i>	Randall Standridge	1
<i>David's Lyre</i>	Leroy Osmon	1
<i>Day of Glory</i>	John Cacavas	1
<i>Daydream</i>	Timothy Mahr	1
<i>Declaration and Dance</i>	Larry Clark	1
<i>Dedicatory Overture</i>	James Clifton Williams	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Denbridge Way</i>	James Swearingen	1
<i>Devil Dance</i>	John Kinyon	1
<i>Devonshire Overture</i>	James Ployhar	1
<i>Doctor Rock</i>	Steven V. Frank	1
<i>Don Pedro</i>	Johan Nija	1
<i>Dorian Dance</i>	David Gorham	1
<i>Dr. Rockenstein</i>	arr. Steve Hodges	1
<i>Dragon Slayer</i>	Rob Grice	1
<i>Dreamsong</i>	Richard Saucedo	1
<i>Steppes of Russia</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	1
<i>Eagle Mountain Overture</i>	Robert Sheldon	1
<i>Earl of Salisbury</i>	William Byrd/A. Frackenpohl	1
<i>Echoes of a Russian Cathedral</i>	Ken Singleton	1
<i>Eclipsys</i>	Sean O'Loughlin	1
<i>El Camino Real</i>	Alfred Reed/R. Longfield	1
<i>El Capitan March</i>	J. P. Sousa	1
<i>El Espiritu De Valencia</i>	Robert W. Smith	1
<i>Electricity</i>	Brian Balmages	1
<i>Encanto</i>	Robert W. Smith	1
<i>Endless Rainbows</i>	Brian Balmages	1
<i>Engines of Resistance</i>	Larry Clark	1
<i>English Folk Trilogy</i>	Anne McGinty	1
<i>Epinicion</i>	John Paulson	1
<i>Escapada</i>	David Moore	1
<i>Escape Velocity</i>	J. Compello	1
<i>Etowah</i>	Brian Balmages	1
<i>Eventide</i>	Matt Conaway	1
<i>Ever More Distant</i>	Douglas Akey	1
<i>Exaltation</i>	James Swearingen	1
<i>Excellentia Overture</i>	David Shaffer	1
<i>Fa Una Canzona</i>	Orazio Vecchi/Larry Daehn	1
<i>Fanfare and Flourishes 2</i>	James Curnow	1
<i>Fanfare for a New Age</i>	Michael Story	1
<i>Fanfare for the Common Man</i>	Aaron Copland/ Robert Longfield	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Fanfare for the Third Planet</i>	Richard Saucedo	1
<i>Fanfare Pastorale & Serenade</i>	Robert Starer	1
<i>Fanfare, Song and Fugue</i>	Jack Stamp	1
<i>Fantasia on a Theme by Thomas Tallis</i>	R. Vaughan Williams/ J. Bocook	1
<i>Fantasy on an African American Spiritual</i>	B. Preuninger	1
<i>Fantasy on Barbara Allen</i>	Fred Allen	1
<i>Fate of the Gods</i>	Steven Reineke/ Matt Conaway	1
<i>Festival</i>	Frank Erickson	1
<i>Festival Overture</i>	Alfred Reed/James Curnow	1
<i>Festive Scenario</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	1
<i>Fields of Clover</i>	Randall Standridge	1
<i>Fiesta Espanola</i>	Timothy Loest	1
<i>Fire Dance</i>	Douglas Akey	1
<i>Fire Dance</i>	David Shaffer	1
<i>First Suite in Eb</i>	Gustav Holst/M. Sweeney	1
<i>Flight of Valor</i>	James Swearingen	1
<i>Folk Songs from the British Isles</i>	Douglas Wagner	1
<i>Folklore for Band</i>	Jim Andy Caudill	1
<i>For the New Day Arisen</i>	Steven Barton	1
<i>Fortis</i>	Gary Gazlay	1
<i>Foundry</i>	John Mackey	1
<i>Freedom's Light</i>	James Swearingen	1
<i>French Masters Suite</i>	Philip Gordon	1
<i>From the Realms of Glory</i>	Patrick Roszell	1
<i>Furioso</i>	Robert W. Smith	1
<i>Gallito</i>	S. Lope Gonzalo	1
<i>Gates of Destiny</i>	Gary Fagan	1
<i>Gathering in the Glen</i>	Michael Sweeney	1
<i>Gentle Winds</i>	Timothy Loest	1
<i>Georgian Suite</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	1
<i>Glen Crossing</i>	Todd Stalter	1
<i>Grand Finale</i>	J. S. Bach/Philip Gordon	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Greek Folk Song Suite</i>	Franco Cesarini	1
<i>Greensleeves: A Fantasia for Band</i>	R. Vaughan Williams/ Robert W. Smith	1
<i>Greenwillow Portrait</i>	Mark Williams	1
<i>Grizzly Bear Rag</i>	Timothy Broege	1
<i>Gypsy Dance</i>	David Compello	1
<i>Gypsydance</i>	David Holsinger	1
<i>Hadrian's Wall</i>	Robert W. Smith	1
<i>Harvesting the Fields of Russia</i>	Elena Roussanova Lucas	1
<i>Havasus Falls</i>	Jeremy Bell	1
<i>Heartbeat Five</i>	Gary P. Gilroy	1
<i>Heartland Overture</i>	William Himes	1
<i>Heaven's Light</i>	Steven Reineke	1
<i>Hebrew Folk Song Suite No. 1</i>	Leroy Osmon	1
<i>Hebrew Folk Song Suite No. 2</i>	Leroy Osmon	1
<i>Hebrides Suite</i>	Clare Grundman	1
<i>Held Still in the Quick of Grace</i>	Jack Stamp	1
<i>High School Cadets March</i>	J. P. Sousa/Michael Story	1
<i>High Water Mark</i>	Michael Sweeney	1
<i>Highbridge Excursions</i>	Mark Williams	1
<i>Highlights from SHREK 2</i>	Michael Brown	1
<i>Homeward Bound</i>	Marta Keen/Brant Karrick	1
<i>Huron Trail</i>	Sean O'Loughlin	1
<i>Hymn for Band</i>	Hugh Stuart	1
<i>Hymn of Praise</i>	A. Bruckner/Philip Gordon	1
<i>Iberian Escapades</i>	Robert Sheldon	1
<i>Imani</i>	Sean O'Loughlin	1
<i>In All Its Glory</i>	James Swearingen	1
<i>In Darkest Night</i>	Barry Kopetz	1
<i>In Heaven's Air</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	1
<i>In Honor of the Fallen</i>	Barry Milner	1
<i>In the Forest of the King</i>	Pierre La Plante	1
<i>In the Valley of the Ancients</i>	Michael Story	1
<i>In This Quiet Place</i>	Robert Sheldon	1
<i>Incantation and Ritual</i>	Brian Balmages	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Incantations</i>	Robert W. Smith	1
<i>Inglesina</i>	David Delle Cese/J. Bourgeois	1
<i>Inperium</i>	Michael Sweeney	1
<i>Invention No. 1</i>	Joel Blahnik	1
<i>Invercargill</i>	Alex Lithgow/C. Custer	1
<i>Irish Festival</i>	Quincy Hilliard	1
<i>Irish Folk Song Suite</i>	Frank Erickson	1
<i>Irish Gig for Young Feet</i>	Travis Weller	1
<i>Ironclads</i>	William Owens	1
<i>It Don't Mean a Thing</i>	Duke Ellington/Eric Osterling	1
<i>Jaguar (concert march)</i>	Eric Osterling	1
<i>Japanese Fantasy</i>	Frank Erickson	1
<i>Japanese Prints</i>	Robert Jager	1
<i>Japanese Tune</i>	Soichi Konagaya	1
<i>Jasmine Flower</i>	Douglas Wagner	1
<i>Jefferson County Overture</i>	John O'Reilly	1
<i>John Williams Trilogy</i>	John Williams/John Moss	1
<i>Joseph and the Amazing Technicolor Dreamcoat</i>	Andrew Lloyd Webber/Michael Sweeney	1
<i>Journey into Diablo Canyon</i>	David Shaffer	1
<i>Jupiter from "The Planets"</i>	Gustav Holst/Mark Williams	1
<i>Jupiter from "The Planets"</i>	G. Holst/Story/Smith	1
<i>Kago-me, Kago-me</i>	Akiro Toda	1
<i>Kaleidos</i>	Anne McGinty	1
<i>Kaleidoscope</i>	John O'Reilly	1
<i>Kenya Contrasts</i>	William Himes	1
<i>Khan</i>	Julie Giroux-West	1
<i>Kiefer's Special</i>	William Kiefer/T. Rhea	1
<i>Kindred Spirits</i>	Brian Balmages	1
<i>King Cotton</i>	J. P. Sousa/Andrew Balent	1
<i>Kingsfold March</i>	Victor Flowers	1
<i>Kitty Hawk 1903</i>	William Owens	1
<i>Knights of Dunvegan</i>	Richard Meyer	1
<i>Korean Folk Song</i>	Ralph Gingery	1
<i>La Banda Nascente</i>	Berado Sbraccia/F. Fennell	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>La Volta</i>	William Byrd/Fenske	1
<i>Largo</i>	Antonin Dvorak/Chris Sharp	1
<i>Lassus Trombone</i>	Henry Fillmore/Schissel	1
<i>Last Ride of the Pony Express</i>	Robert W. Smith	1
<i>Legend of Devil's Lake</i>	Michael Sweeney	1
<i>Let Evening Come</i>	Robert Sheldon	1
<i>Lexington March</i>	John Edmondson	1
<i>Liberty March</i>	John Edmondson	1
<i>Lightning</i>	Todd Stalter	1
<i>Lincoln Celebration</i>	Timothy Johnson	1
<i>Lion of Lucerne</i>	James Curnow	1
<i>Little English Suite</i>	Clare Grundman	1
<i>Llwyn Onn</i>	Brian Hogg	1
<i>Lo, How A rose E'er Blooming</i>	Larry Kerchner	1
<i>London Town</i>	Gay Holmes Spears	1
<i>Londonderry Air (Danny Boy)</i>	Jack Bullock	1
<i>Lords of Greenwich</i>	Robert Sheldon	1
<i>Lucid Dreams</i>	David Gillingham	1
<i>Lux Aurumque</i>	Eric Whitacre	1
<i>Lyric Prelude</i>	James Curnow	1
<i>Majestia</i>	James Swearingen	1
<i>March and Procession of Bacchus</i>	Leo Delibes/M. Williams	1
<i>March Chromatica</i>	Mark Williams	1
<i>March for a Rainy Day</i>	John O'Reilly	1
<i>March from the First Suite in Eb</i>	Gustav Holst/Michael Story	1
<i>March Grandioso</i>	Roland Seitz	1
<i>March of Freedom</i>	John Edmondson	1
<i>March of the Belgium Parachutists</i>	Pierre Leemans/Wiley	1
<i>March of the Irish Guard</i>	James Ployhar	1
<i>March on the King's Highway</i>	Pierre La Plante	1
<i>March Zuma</i>	John O'Reilly	1
<i>Marches of the Armed Forces</i>	Michael Sweeney	1
<i>Maritime March</i>	John O'Reilly	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Marriage of Figaro</i>	W. A. Mozart/E. Slocum	1
<i>May Day in Red Square</i>	C. Prentice & B. Lambrecht	1
<i>Mazama</i>	Jay Chattaway	1
<i>Medallion Overture</i>	William Himes	1
<i>Medley from Phantom of the Opera</i>	Michael Sweeney	1
<i>Meeting at Tryon Palace</i>	Richard Saucedo	1
<i>Message on the Rock</i>	Robert Sheldon	1
<i>Miniature Chorale and Fugue</i>	Charles Carter	1
<i>Modal Song and Dance</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	1
<i>Molly on the Shore</i>	Percy Grainger	1
<i>Momentations</i>	Jared Spears	1
<i>Morning Mist</i>	Robert Sheldon	1
<i>Mosswood Lullaby</i>	Brian Beck	1
<i>March to Castle Rock</i>	Steve Hodges	1
<i>Mount Vernon March</i>	John Edmondson	1
<i>Music for A Celebration</i>	Anne McGinty	1
<i>Music for the King's Delight</i>	Pierre La Plante	1
<i>Music from Carmen</i>	G. Bizet/R. Saucedo	1
<i>Mystic Legend</i>	Anne McGinty	1
<i>Mythos</i>	Christopher Bernotas	1
<i>Nemo-Susato</i>	Jan van der Roost	1
<i>Nevermore</i>	Brian Balmages	1
<i>Newcastle March</i>	Johnnie Vinson	1
<i>Nicaea</i>	William Himes	1
<i>Night Cries</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	1
<i>Night on Bald Mountain</i>	M. Mussorgsky/M. Sweeney	1
<i>Northern Saga</i>	Gene Milford	1
<i>Northpointe Fantasy</i>	James Swearingen	1
<i>Not Afraid to Dream</i>	Brian Balmages	1
<i>Novena</i>	James Swearingen	1
<i>O Magnum Mysterium</i>	M. Lauridsen/Reynolds	1
<i>O Waly Waly</i>	Jay Bocook	1
<i>Occasional Suite</i>	Eric Osterling	1
<i>October</i>	Eric Whitacre	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Odysseus and The Sirens</i>	Dana Wilson	1
<i>Old Churches</i>	Michael Colgrass	1
<i>Old Irish Tune</i>	Larry Daehn	1
<i>Olympia</i>	Brian Balmages	1
<i>On The Merrimack</i>	Andrew Boysen, Jr.	1
<i>Orange Bowl</i>	Henry Fillmore	1
<i>Orion</i>	Jan van der Roost	1
<i>Our Yesterdays Lengthen Like Shadows</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	1
<i>Outback Fantasy</i>	Michael Story	1
<i>Overture in Bb</i>	Caeser Giovannini	1
<i>Overture on a Shaker Tune</i>	John Higgins	1
<i>Overture on Norse Theme</i>	James Ployhar	1
<i>Overture to Die Meistersinger</i>	R. Wagner/Eric Osterling	1
<i>Pachelbel's Canon</i>	J. Pachelbel/P. Lavender	1
<i>Palmetto Fantasy</i>	Cedric Adderly	1
<i>Papercut</i>	Alex Shapiro	1
<i>Parade of the Wooden Warriors</i>	Adam Gorb	1
<i>Passacaglia in Eb</i>	Marcel Frank	1
<i>Pathways</i>	Michael Oare	1
<i>Peace Jubilee</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	1
<i>Peacemaker March</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	1
<i>Peer Gynt Suite</i>	Edvard Grieg/Charles Sayre	1
<i>Phantom Ship</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	1
<i>Picador March</i>	J. P. Sousa/Andrew Balent	1
<i>Picture at an Exhibition - Great Gate</i>	Modest Mussorgsky/Larry Clark	1
<i>Pinnacle</i>	Rob Grice	1
<i>Pirates</i>	Travis Weller	1
<i>Plaza de Toros</i>	Mark Williams	1
<i>Polyphonic Suite</i>	Charles Carter	1
<i>Pomp and Circumstance March No. 4</i>	Edward Elgar/ M. Retford and Alfred Reed	1
<i>Pony Express</i>	Christopher Bernotas	1
<i>Pop Culture</i>	Robert Sheldon	1
<i>Praises</i>	Jared Spears	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Prelude and Fugue in D minor</i>	J. S. Bach /R. Moehlmann	1
<i>Prelude and Fuguetta</i>	G. Handel/E. Osterling	1
<i>Pride & Glory March</i>	Ken Harris/Norman Lee	1
<i>Procession of the Nobles</i>	N. Rimsky-Korsakov/ J. Bocook	1
<i>Quad City Stomp</i>	Michael Sweeney	1
<i>Radiant Moonbeams</i>	David Gillingham	1
<i>Rampage</i>	Todd Stalter	1
<i>Ramsgate March</i>	Carl Strommen	1
<i>Redemption</i>	Rosano Galante	1
<i>Regenesis</i>	John Higgins	1
<i>Renaissance Masters Suite</i>	arr. Philip Gordon	1
<i>Renegade Dances</i>	David Shaffer	1
<i>Resting in the Peace of His Hands</i>	John Gibson	1
<i>Return of the Monarchs</i>	Victor Lopez	1
<i>Rhapsody in Blue</i>	George Gershwin/ Michael Story	1
<i>Rhenish Folk Festival</i>	Albert O. Davis	1
<i>Rhythm Games</i>	Timothy Broege	1
<i>Rhythm of the Spheres</i>	Erik Morales	1
<i>Rhythm Stand</i>	Jennifer Higdon	1
<i>Riders For the Flag</i>	J. P. Sousa/F. Fennell	1
<i>Riders to Stonehenge</i>	Gregory B. Rudgers	1
<i>Rising Star</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	1
<i>Rivers</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	1
<i>Romanian Dances</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	1
<i>Romantic Ballad</i>	Thomas Doss	1
<i>Royal Coronation Dances</i>	Bob Margolis	1
<i>Russian Christmas Music</i>	Alfred Reed/Michael Story	1
<i>Sailor's Odyssey</i>	David Bobrowitz	1
<i>Salute to the Duke</i>	Michael Sweeney	1
<i>Salvation is Created</i>	P. Tchesnokoff/M. Brown	1
<i>Sang!</i>	Dana Wilson	1
<i>Sarabande and Polka</i>	Malcolm Arnold/Paynter	1
<i>Scenes from Terezin</i>	Jack Stamp	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Sea Songs</i>	Ralph Vaughan Williams	1
<i>Seagate Overture</i>	James Swearingen	1
<i>Seconds Out</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	1
<i>Selections from HAIRSPRAY</i>	Marc Shaiman/Ted Ricketts	1
<i>Shadow Rituals</i>	Michael Markowski	1
<i>Shepherd's Hey</i>	P. Grainger/C. De Stefano	1
<i>Shipwrecked</i>	Ryan Nowlin	1
<i>Short Suite</i>	Joseph Kreines	1
<i>Silver Eagles Take Flight</i>	Gabriel Musella	1
<i>Silver Jubilee Overture</i>	John Edmondson	1
<i>Silverbrook</i>	Michael Sweeney	1
<i>Sinfonietta</i>	Ingolf Dahl	1
<i>Skin and Bones</i>	Michael Story	1
<i>Sleigh Ride by Leroy Anderson</i>	Leroy Anderson	1
<i>Snakes!</i>	Thomas Duffy	1
<i>Soaring!</i>	Erik Morales	1
<i>Soldier's Procession and Sword Dance</i>	Bob Margolis	1
<i>Song for a Winter Moon</i>	Walter Cummings	1
<i>Song for Hope</i>	Michael Sweeney	1
<i>Song for Winds</i>	Charles Carter	1
<i>Song of the Blacksmith</i>	Gustav Holst/Timothy Loest	1
<i>Song of the Telegraph</i>	David Shaffer	1
<i>Southern Heritage March</i>	Mark Williams	1
<i>Southwinds</i>	Douglas Court	1
<i>Spectral Landscapes</i>	Sean O'Loughlin	1
<i>Spiritual from Symphony 5 1/2</i>	Don Gillis/G. Bainum	1
<i>Spontaneous Combustion</i>	Robert Sheldon	1
<i>Stampede</i>	Brian Balmages	1
<i>Starsplitter Fanfare</i>	Brian Balmages	1
<i>Strange Humors</i>	John Mackey	1
<i>Streets and Inroads</i>	Timothy Broege	1
<i>Structures</i>	Roland Barrett	1
<i>Suite for Band</i>	Charles Smith	1
<i>Suite Francais</i>	Darius Milhaud	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Suite of Old American Dances</i>	Robert R. Bennett/ James Curnow	1
<i>Summer Nights</i>	W. Casey/Jacobs/Vinson	1
<i>Summit Fanfare</i>	William Owens	1
<i>Sun Cycles</i>	Brian Balmages	1
<i>Sundance</i>	Quincy Hilliard	1
<i>Suspended Animation</i>	Patrick Burns	1
<i>Swing Low, Sweet Chariot</i>	Steve Rouse	1
<i>Symphonette for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	1
<i>Symphony in Bb</i>	Paul Hindemith	1
<i>Synergies</i>	Robert Sheldon	1
<i>Tales from Deep Space One</i>	Jared Spears	1
<i>Tame the Savage Sea</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	1
<i>Tango Disappearing</i>	Timothy Broege	1
<i>Tanoen Echoes</i>	Robert W. Smith	1
<i>Te Deum</i>	Philip Sparke	1
<i>The American Way March</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	1
<i>The Argonauts</i>	James Curnow	1
<i>The Black Horse Troop</i>	J. P. Sousa/F. Fennell	1
<i>The Blue Orchid</i>	William Owens	1
<i>The Christmas Truce of 1914</i>	G. Holst/Gruber/Story	1
<i>The Conquest of Genghis Khan</i>	Michael Story	1
<i>The Earl of Oxford's March</i>	William Byrd/Mark Williams	1
<i>The Earl of Salisbury - Pavane & Galliard</i>	William Byrd/A. Frackenpohl	1
<i>The Footlifter</i>	Henry Fillmore	1
<i>The Great Locomotive Chase</i>	Robert W. Smith	1
<i>The Great Steamboat Race</i>	Robert W. Smith	1
<i>The Light of Dawn</i>	James Swearingen	1
<i>The Lion King - Broadway Selections</i>	Jay Bocook	1
<i>The Little Mermaid</i>	Alan Menken/Jay Bocook	1
<i>The Lost Lady Found</i>	Percy Grainger/ M. Sweeney	1
<i>The Mansions of the Lord</i>	Glennie-Smith/Michael Brown	1
<i>The Monster in the Closet</i>	Robert Longfield	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>The New World</i>	A. Dvorak/M. Story	1
<i>The Nutcracker Suite</i>	P. I. Tchaikovsky/P. Lavender	1
<i>The Original Thirteen (concert march)</i>	William Billings/ James Ployhar	1
<i>The Quest</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	1
<i>The Red River Valley</i>	Pierre La Plante	1
<i>The Road Unknown</i>	Richard Meyer	1
<i>The Seal Lullaby</i>	Eric Whitacre	1
<i>The Sinfonians</i>	James Clifton Williams/ Jay Bocook	1
<i>The Star Wars Saga</i>	John Williams/Michael Story	1
<i>The Tenth Planet</i>	Michael Story	1
<i>The Thunderer</i>	J. P. Sousa	1
<i>The Thunderer</i>	J. P. Sousa/ Jay Bocook	1
<i>The Voyageurs</i>	Pierre La Plante	1
<i>The Witch and the Saint</i>	Steven Reineke	1
<i>Themes from "Orpheus"</i>	Jacques Offenbach/M. Williams	1
<i>Themes from 1812 Overture</i>	P. I. Tchaikovsky/J. Vinson	1
<i>Themes from The Planets</i>	G. Holst/D. E. Wagner	1
<i>Three Chinese Miniatures</i>	Robert Jager	1
<i>Three English Dances</i>	John Boyd/Stone	1
<i>Three Folk Tunes</i>	Gustav Holst/Douglas Wagner	1
<i>Three Kentucky Sketches</i>	John O'Reilly	1
<i>Three Phrases from Yugoslav Folk Songs</i>	Daniel Bukvich	1
<i>Three Songs from Sussex</i>	Hugh Stuart	1
<i>Three Stars of Tennessee</i>	Gary P. Gilroy	1
<i>Thunderbird A Mystic Legend</i>	Rob Grice	1
<i>To Challenge the Sky and Heaven Above - R. W. Smith</i>	Robert W. Smith	1
<i>Too Beautiful for Words</i>	Rob Grice	1
<i>Triumph</i>	Alan Lee Silva	1
<i>Trombone King</i>	Karl King	1
<i>Tudor Sketches</i>	William Owens	1
<i>The New World</i>	A. Dvorak/M. Story	1
<i>The Nutcracker Suite</i>	P. I. Tchaikovsky/P. Lavender	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Tunbridge Meadows</i>	Mark Williams	1
<i>Twinkle Variants alla Marcia</i>	Hugh Whaley	1
<i>Two English Dances</i>	John O'Reilly	1
<i>Two Hebrew Folk Songs</i>	Norman Ward	1
<i>Two Moods</i>	Clare Grundman	1
<i>Two Renaissance Sketches</i>	Todd Stalter	1
<i>Two Russian Folk Songs</i>	Ralph Gingery	1
<i>Valley of the Nile</i>	Robert Washburn	1
<i>Variant on an Old English Carol</i>	Robert W. Smith	1
<i>Variations on an English Folk Song</i>	Claude Smith	1
<i>Variations on Theme of Robert Schumann</i>	Robert Jager	1
<i>Vertigo</i>	Christopher Bernotas	1
<i>Vesuvius</i>	Frank Ticheli	1
<i>Visigoths</i>	Sean O'Loughlin	1
<i>Visionaries</i>	Ryan George	1
<i>Volcano</i>	Matthew Schoendorff	1
<i>Voyages on a Rowing Song</i>	William Himes	1
<i>Wagon Trail</i>	Julie Giroux-West	1
<i>Welcome! (March)</i>	Harold Bennett	1
<i>Wellington Overture</i>	Barry Kopetz	1
<i>West Side Story</i>	Leonard Bernstein/Jay Bocook	1
<i>What A Wonderful World</i>	G. Weiss/Thiele/R. Longfield	1
<i>When the Stars Began to Fall</i>	Fred Allen	1
<i>Where the Sun Breaks Through the Mist</i>	Michael Sweeney	1
<i>While I Watch the Yellow Wheat</i>	Larry Daehn	1
<i>Whirlwind</i>	Jodie Blackshaw	1
<i>Willy Wonka and The Chocolate Factory</i>	Leslie Bricusse/ Newley/Robert Longfield	1
<i>Windsong</i>	Mark Williams	1
<i>Windsongs</i>	David Shaffer	1
<i>Ye Banks and Braes O'Bonnie Doon</i>	Percy Grainger/Michael Sweeney	1

Table 9

Complete List of Recommended Works (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Fairest of the Fair</i>	J. P. Sousa/Michael Story	1 (4 Total/4 Versions)
<i>Fairest of the Fair</i>	J. P. Sousa/David Shaffer	1 (4 Total/4 Versions)
<i>Fairest of the Fair</i>	J. P. Sousa/Larry Clark	1 (4 Total/4 Versions)
<i>Fairest of the Fair</i>	J. P. Sousa	1 (4 Total/4 Versions)
<i>Amparito Roca</i>	Jaime Texidor	2 (4 Total/2 Versions)
<i>Amparito Roca</i>	Jaime Texidor/Winter	2 (4 Total/2 Versions)
<i>Lincolnshire Posy</i>	Percy Grainger	2 (3 Total/2 Versions)
<i>Lincolnshire Posy</i>	P. Grainger/M. Sweeney	1 (3 Total/2 Versions)
<i>Barnum and Bailey's March</i>	Karl King/Jerry Bruebaker	1 (2 Total/2 Versions)
<i>Barnum and Bailey's March</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	1 (2 Total/2 Versions)
<i>Colonel Bogey March</i>	K. Alford/A. Balent	1 (2 Total/2 Versions)
<i>Coloney Bogey March</i>	K. Alford/M. Willams	1 (2 Total/2 Versions)
<i>His Honor</i>	H. Fillmore	1 (2 Total/2 Versions)
<i>His Honor</i>	H. Fillmore/A. Balent	1 (2 Total/2 Versions)
<i>Rough Riders</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	1 (2 Total/2 Versions)
<i>Rough Riders</i>	Karl King	1 (2 Total/2 Versions)
<i>Washington Post</i>	J. P. Sousa/Andrew Balent	1 (2 Total/2 Versions)

The pieces recommended by the respondents reflected the work of 266 different composers, ranging from 136 singular listings to the citation of Brian Balmages 61 times. Names of composers listed multiple times are listed in order of their frequency in Table 10. Where different versions or arrangements of a work are recommended, only the original or primary composer is indicated.

Table 10

Composer Frequency Counts

Composer	Frequency
Brian Balmages	61
Frank Tichelli	51
Pierre La Plante	50
Robert Sheldon	49
Frank Erickson	45
Michael Sweeney	44
Clare Grundman	40
Robert W. Smith	39
Percy Grainger	33
Samuel R. Hazo	30
David Holsinger	26
Larry Daehn	26
Anne McGinty	25
Timothy Broege	25
Elliot Del Borgo	24
James Swearingen	22
Karl King	21
Gustav Holst	19
Charles Carter	16
William Himes	16
John Edmondson	15
Ralph Vaughan Williams	15
Andrew Boysen, Jr.	14
J. P. Sousa	14
William Francis McBeth	13
Hugh Stuart	12
Brant Karrick	11
Douglas Akey	11
James Clifton Williams	11
James Curnow	11
John O'Reilly	11
Richard Saucedo	11

Table 10

Composer Frequency Counts (continued)

Composer	Frequency
Robert Jager	11
J. S. Bach	10
John Barnes Chance	10
David Shaffer	9
Jan van der Roost	9
John Mackey	9
Mark Williams	9
Alfred Reed	8
Henry Fillmore	8
Randall Standridge	8
John Zdechlik	7
Joseph Kreines	7
Michael Story	7
Sean O'Loughlin	7
T. Susato	7
Bob Margolis	6
Bruce Pearson	6
James Barnes	6
Malcolm Arnold	6
Roland Barrett	6
Ron Nelson	6
Ryan Fraley	6
Timothy Loest	6
Todd Stalter	6
Vaclav Nelhybel	6
Aaron Copland	5
Brian Beck	5
Eric Osterling	5
James Ployhar	5
Jay Bocook	5
Larry Clark	5
Modest Mussorgsky	5
Paul Jennings	5
Rob Grice	5
William Owens	5

Table 10

Composer Frequency Counts (continued)

Composer	Frequency
Carl Strommen	4
Dmitri Kabalevsky	4
Douglas Wagner	4
Erik Morales	4
Gary P. Gilroy	4
Jack Stamp	4
Jaime Texidor	4
Jared Spears	4
Leonard Bernstein	4
Michael Daugherty	4
Philip Gordon	4
Pierre Leemans	4
W. A. Mozart	4
William Byrd	4
Alan Lee Silva	3
Christopher Bernotas	3
David Bobrowitz	3
Eric Whitacre	3
Fred Allen	3
Johaness Hanssen	3
John Higgins	3
Johnnie Vinson	3
Larry Neeck	3
Leroy Osmon	3
P. I. Tchaikovsky	3
Pavel Tchesnokoff	3
Quincy Hilliard	3
Steven Reineke	3
Thomas Root	3
Victor Flowers	3
Warren Barker	3
Adoniram Gordan	2
Antonin Dvorak	2
Barry Kopetz	2
Calvin Custer	2

Table 10

Composer Frequency Counts (continued)

Composer	Frequency
Chalon Ragsdale	2
Charles Ives	2
Dana Wilson	2
David Gillingham	2
Gary Gazlay	2
Henry Purcell	2
James Hosay	2
James MacBeth	2
John Williams	2
Julie Giroux-West	2
Kenneth Alford	2
Matthew Schoendorff	2
Michael Colgrass	2
Morton Gould	2
Patrick Burns	2
Peter Warlock	2
Philip Sparke	2
Ralph Gingery	2
Reinhold Gliere	2
Richard Meyer	2
Ryan George	2
Steve Hodges	2
Travis Weller	2
Vincent Persichetti	2
Walter Cummings	2
Walter Finlayson	2
Warren Benson	2
William Billings	2

There were 132 works listed three or more times in the survey. They include a wide variety of original works for winds, arrangements and transcriptions, folk music, and to a lesser extent, marches. With works possessing characteristics of multiple genres, the researcher determined the most appropriate classification. Complications arose when

attempting to draw a clear distinction between some arrangements and transcriptions, as well as folk music and original works largely influenced or inspired by folk music. Since a definitive classification for several works could be up for debate, singular genres of “Arrangements/Transcriptions” and “Folk/Folk-Influenced Music” were established, in addition to “Original Works for Winds” and “Marches.”

Of “The Most Recommended Works,” there were 373 recommendations of “Original Works for Winds” comprised of 78 different selections, followed by 171 recommendations of 37 different works of “Folk/Folk-Influenced Music.” There were 12 “Arrangements/Transcriptions” and 59 total recommendations under this category. Only three “Marches,” with 11 total citations, were among the most recommended works. Tables 11 through 14 indicate “The Most Recommended Works” by genre, sorted by number of recommendations and alphabetized by title.

Table 11

The Most Recommended Original Works for Winds

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Air for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	16
<i>On a Hymn of Philip Bliss</i>	David Holsinger	12
<i>A Longford Legend</i>	Robert Sheldon	11
<i>Overture For Winds</i>	Charles Carter	11
<i>Three Ayres from Gloucester</i>	Hugh Stuart	9
<i>Balladair</i>	Frank Erickson	8
<i>Joy</i>	Frank Ticheli	8
<i>Moscow 1941</i>	Brian Balmages	8
<i>Ancient Voices</i>	Michael Sweeney	7
<i>Arabian Dances</i>	Brian Balmages	7
<i>J. S. Jig</i>	Brant Karrick	7
<i>The Red Balloon</i>	Anne McGinty	7
<i>Undertow</i>	John Mackey	7
<i>Butterfly's Ball</i>	Ryan Fraley	6
<i>Canto</i>	William Francis McBeth	6

Table 11

The Most Recommended Original Works for Winds (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Concord</i>	Clare Grundman	6
<i>Courtly Airs & Dances</i>	Ron Nelson	6
<i>Ghost Fleet</i>	Robert Sheldon	6
<i>Our Kingsland Spring</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	6
<i>Peregrin: A Traveler's Tale</i>	Douglas Akey	6
<i>Sparks</i>	Brian Balmages	6
<i>As Summer Was Just Beginning</i>	Larry Daehn	5
<i>Blue and Green Music</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	5
<i>Portrait of a Clown</i>	Frank Ticheli	5
<i>Symphonic Dance No. 3 "Fiesta"</i>	James Clifton Williams	5
<i>The Tempest</i>	Robert W. Smith	5
<i>Toccata for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	5
<i>Tricycle</i>	Andrew Boysen, Jr.	5
<i>Unraveling</i>	Andrew Boysen, Jr.	5
<i>Yorkshire Ballad</i>	James Barnes	5
<i>A Prehistoric Suite</i>	Paul Jennings	4
<i>A Walk in the Morning Sun</i>	Pierre La Plante	4
<i>Abracadabra</i>	Frank Ticheli	4
<i>Alligator Alley</i>	Michael Daugherty	4
<i>Caprice</i>	William Himes	4
<i>Chant and Jubilo</i>	William Francis McBeth	4
<i>Creed</i>	William Himes	4
<i>Dreams and Fancies</i>	Timothy Broege	4
<i>Incantation and Dance</i>	John Barnes Chance	4
<i>La Madre de Los Gatos</i>	Brian Beck	4
<i>Nathan Hale Trilogy</i>	James Curnow	4
<i>Rhythm Machine</i>	Timothy Broege	4
<i>Rites of Tamburo</i>	Robert W. Smith	4
<i>Sinfonia VI</i>	Timothy Broege	4
<i>Suite Provencale</i>	Jan van der Roost	4
<i>Summer Dances</i>	Brian Balmages	4
<i>The Great Locomotive Chase</i>	Robert W. Smith	4
<i>With Quiet Courage</i>	Larry Daehn	4
<i>A Song for Friends</i>	Larry Daehn	3
<i>A Song of Hope</i>	James Swearingen	3
<i>Apparitions</i>	Brian Balmages	3
<i>Arabian Dances</i>	Roland Barrett	3

Table 11

The Most Recommended Original Works for Winds (continued)

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Bandology</i>	Eric Osterling	3
<i>Black Forest Overture</i>	Michael Sweeney	3
<i>Blue Ridge Overture</i>	Frank Erickson	3
<i>Blue Ridge Saga</i>	James Swearingen	3
<i>Crystal City Overture</i>	John Edmondson	3
<i>Cumberland Cross</i>	Carl Strommen	3
<i>Earthdance</i>	Michael Sweeney	3
<i>Festivo</i>	Vaclav Nelhybel	3
<i>Flourish for Wind Band</i>	Ralph Vaughan Williams	3
<i>Fortress</i>	Frank Ticheli	3
<i>Hudson River Suite</i>	John O'Reilly	3
<i>Into the Clouds</i>	Richard Saucedo	3
<i>Joy Revisited</i>	Frank Ticheli	3
<i>Nottingham Castle</i>	Larry Daehn	3
<i>Pevensey Castle</i>	Robert Sheldon	3
<i>Rain</i>	Brian Balmages	3
<i>Rhythm of the Winds</i>	Frank Erickson	3
<i>Rhythms and Riffs</i>	Brian Balmages	3
<i>Rikudim</i>	Jan van der Roost	3
<i>Serengeti Dreams</i>	Robert W. Smith	3
<i>Sonatina for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	3
<i>Symphony No. 4</i>	Andrew Boysen, Jr.	3
<i>The Headless Horseman</i>	Timothy Broege	3
<i>Third Suite</i>	Robert Jager	3
<i>Variation Overture</i>	James Clifton Williams	3
<i>Voices in the Sky</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	3

Table 12

The Most Recommended Folk/Folk-Influenced Works

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Kentucky 1800</i>	Clare Grundman	18
<i>American Riversongs</i>	Pierre La Plante	16
<i>Cajun Folk Songs</i>	Frank Ticheli	11
<i>Themes from Green Bushes</i>	Percy Grainger/L. Daehn	8
<i>Celtic Air and Dance</i>	Michael Sweeney	6
<i>Variations on a Korean Folk Song</i>	John Barnes Chance	6
<i>Chorale and Shaker Dance</i>	John Zdechlik	5
<i>Prairie Songs</i>	Pierre La Plante	5
<i>British Isles Suite</i>	Larry Daehn	4
<i>Chorale and Shaker Dance II</i>	John Zdechlik	4
<i>Country Wildflowers</i>	Larry Daehn	4
<i>Down by the Salley Gardens</i>	Michael Sweeney	4
<i>Horkstow Grange</i>	Percy Grainger/M. Sweeney	4
<i>Shenandoah</i>	Frank Ticheli	4
<i>Shepherd's Hey</i>	Percy Grainger	4
<i>Two British Folk Songs</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	4
<i>West Highlands Sojourn</i>	Robert Sheldon	4
<i>All the Pretty Little Horses</i>	Anne McGinty	3
<i>American Folk Rhapsody No. 2</i>	Clare Grundman	3
<i>American Song Settings No. 2</i>	Joseph Kreines	3
<i>An Irish Rhapsody</i>	Clare Grundman	3
<i>Colonial Airs & Dances</i>	Robert Jager	3
<i>Deir In De</i>	Warren Barker	3
<i>Early One Morning</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>Fantasy on a Fiddle Tune</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>Fantasy on a Japanese Folk Song</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	3
<i>Folk Song Suite</i>	Ralph Vaughan Williams	3
<i>Korean Folk Rhapsody</i>	James Curnow	3
<i>Linden Lea</i>	R. Vaughan Williams/Stout	3
<i>Nordic Sketches</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>Overture on a Minstrel Tune</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>Polly Oliver</i>	Thomas Root	3
<i>Sea Song Trilogy</i>	Anne McGinty	3
<i>Second Suite in F Major</i>	Gustav Holst	3
<i>Slavonic Folk Suite</i>	Alfred Reed	3
<i>Spoon River</i>	Percy Grainger/R. Sheldon	3
<i>Suite from Bohemia</i>	Vaclav Nelhybel	3

Table 13

The Most Recommended Arrangements/Transcriptions

Title	Composer	No.
<i>A Childhood Hymn</i>	David Holsinger	11
<i>Simple Gifts Four Songs</i>	Frank Tichelli	10
<i>Prelude and Fugue in Bb Major</i>	J. S. Bach /R. Moehlmann	6
<i>Prelude, Siciliano and Rondo</i>	Malcolm Arnold/John Paynter	5
<i>Down a Country Lane</i>	Aaron Copland/M. Patterson	4
<i>Psalms 42</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	4
<i>Suite in Minor Mode</i>	Dmitri Kabalevsky/Siekman/Oliver	4
<i>Fanfare, Ode and Festival</i>	Bob Margolis	3
<i>Pictures at an Exhibition</i>	Modest Mussorgsky/M. Sweeney	3
<i>Prospect</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>Rhosymedre</i>	R. Vaughan Williams/Beeler	3
<i>The Battle Pavane</i>	T. Susato/Bob Margolis	3

Table 14

The Most Recommended Marches

Title	Composer	No.
<i>Prestissimo</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	5
<i>Allied Honor March</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	3
<i>March of the Belgian Paratroopers</i>	Pierre Leemans/J. Swearingen	3

Based upon a five-point Likert scale, respondents rated the pieces they recommended in each of the following categories: artistic value (A); pedagogical value (P); the likelihood they would repeat a work (R); and the extent they believe the work should be part of a core repertoire (C). The mean score was calculated from all respondents in each category. The results are listed in Table 15 by frequency of recommendation and then alphabetized.

Table 15

The Most Recommended Works and Mean Likert Ratings

Title	Composer	No.	A	P	R	C
<i>Kentucky 1800</i>	Clare Grundman	18	4.5	4.72	4.5	4.72
<i>Air for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	16	4.81	4.81	4.81	4.69
<i>American Riversongs</i>	Pierre La Plante	16	4.5	4.69	4.69	4.75
<i>On a Hymnsong of Philip Bliss</i>	David Holsinger	12	5	4.92	4.83	4.92
<i>A Childhood Hymn</i>	David Holsinger	11	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
<i>A Longford Legend</i>	Robert Sheldon	11	4.27	4.55	4.55	4.36
<i>Cajun Folk Songs</i>	Frank Ticheli	11	4.36	4.64	4.18	4.55
<i>Overture For Winds</i>	Charles Carter	11	4.45	4.73	4.64	4.64
<i>Simple Gifts Four Shaker Songs</i>	Frank Tichelli	10	4.3	4.7	4.5	4.67
<i>Three Ayres from Gloucester</i>	Hugh Stuart	9	4.75	4.88	4.63	4.75
<i>Balladair</i>	Frank Erickson	8	5	5	5	5
<i>Joy</i>	Frank Ticheli	8	4	4.5	4.5	4.25
<i>Moscow 1941</i>	Brian Balmages	8	3.75	4.13	4.25	3.88
<i>Themes from Green Bushes</i>	Percy Grainger/L. Daehn	8	4.75	4.63	4.5	4.5
<i>Ancient Voices</i>	Michael Sweeney	7	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.57
<i>Arabian Dances</i>	Brian Balmages	7	4.29	4.29	4	4
<i>J. S. Jig</i>	Brant Karrick	7	4	4.43	4.43	3.71
<i>The Red Balloon</i>	Anne McGinty	7	4.57	4.71	4.43	4.57
<i>Undertow</i>	John Mackey	7	3.71	4	4.14	3.57
<i>Butterfly's Ball</i>	Ryan Fraley	6	3.67	4	4	3.83
<i>Canto</i>	William Francis McBeth	6	3.8	4	4.4	4.6
<i>Celtic Air and Dance</i>	Michael Sweeney	6	4.5	4.67	4.5	4.5
<i>Concord</i>	Clare Grundman	6	4.83	4.83	4.33	4.5
<i>Courtly Airs & Dances</i>	Ron Nelson	6	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.2
<i>Ghost Fleet</i>	Robert Sheldon	6	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.83
<i>Our Kingsland Spring</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	6	4.33	4.5	4.5	4.33
<i>Peregrin: A Traveler's Tale</i>	Douglas Akey	6	4	4.6	4.6	4
<i>Prelude and Fugue in Bb Major</i>	J. S. Bach /R. Moehlmann	6	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.5
<i>Sparks</i>	Brian Balmages	6	4.33	4.17	4.17	4.17
<i>Variations on a Korean Folk Song</i>	John Barnes Chance	6	4.33	4.5	4.17	4.33

Note. No. = Number of Recommendations; A = Artistic Value; P = Pedagogical Value; R = the likelihood the respondent will repeat the work; C = the extent to which the respondent believes the work should be part of a core repertoire.

Table 15

The Most Recommended Works and Mean Likert Ratings (continued)

Title	Composer	No.	A	P	R	C
<i>As Summer Was Just Beginning</i>	Larry Daehn	5	5	5	5	5
<i>Blue and Green Music</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	5	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.2
<i>Chorale and Shaker Dance</i>	John Zdechlik	5	4.8	4.4	4	4.4
<i>Portrait of a Clown</i>	Frank Ticheli	5	4.2	4.6	4.4	5
<i>Prairie Songs</i>	Pierre La Plante	5	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.8
<i>Prelude, Siciliano and Rondo</i>	Malcolm Arnold/Paynter	5	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8
<i>Prestissimo</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	5	4.25	4.5	4.25	4.25
<i>Symphonic Dance No. 3 "Fiesta"</i>	James Clifton Williams	5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
<i>The Tempest</i>	Robert W. Smith	5	3.2	4	4.4	3.6
<i>Toccata for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	5	5	5	5	5
<i>Tricycle</i>	Andrew Boysen, Jr.	5	4.5	4.5	4.75	4.25
<i>Unraveling</i>	Andrew Boysen, Jr.	5	4.2	4.6	4.6	4.2
<i>Yorkshire Ballad</i>	James Barnes	5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
<i>A Prehistoric Suite</i>	Paul Jennings	4	5	5	5	5
<i>A Walk in the Morning Sun</i>	Pierre La Plante	4	4.25	4.25	4	3.75
<i>Abracadabra</i>	Frank Ticheli	4	4	4.5	4.5	4.5
<i>Alligator Alley</i>	Michael Daugherty	4	4.25	5	4.75	4.5
<i>British Isles Suite</i>	Larry Daehn	4	4.33	4.33	4	4.33
<i>Caprice</i>	William Himes	4	4	4.67	4.67	4.33
<i>Chant and Jubilo</i>	William Francis McBeth	4	4.5	4.5	4.75	4.75
<i>Chorale and Shaker Dance II</i>	Anne McGinty	4	4.5	4.5	4.75	4.5
<i>Country Wildflowers</i>	Larry Daehn	4	4.5	4.25	4.25	4.5
<i>Creed</i>	William Himes	4	5	5	5	5
<i>Down a Country Lane</i>	Aaron Copland/ M. Patterson	4	5	4.33	4.33	4.33
<i>Down by the Salley Gardens</i>	Michael Sweeney	4	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75
<i>Dreams and Fancies</i>	Timothy Broege	4	4.67	4.67	5	5
<i>Horkstow Grange</i>	Percy Grainger/ M. Sweeney	4	5	5	4.67	4.67
<i>Incantation and Dance</i>	John Barnes Chance	4	4.75	4.75	4.5	4.25
<i>La Madre de Los Gatos</i>	Brian Beck	4	4.25	4.5	5	4
<i>Nathan Hale Trilogy</i>	James Curnow	4	4	4.5	4.25	4.25

Note. No. = Number of Recommendations; A = Artistic Value; P = Pedagogical Value; R = the likelihood the respondent will repeat the work; C = the extent to which the respondent believes the work should be part of a core repertoire.

Table 15

The Most Recommended Works and Mean Likert Ratings (continued)

Title	Composer	No.	A	P	R	C
<i>Psalm 42</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	4	4.75	4.25	4.75	4.25
<i>Rhythm Machine</i>	Timothy Broege	4	5	4.67	5	5
<i>Rites of Tamburo</i>	Robert W. Smith	4	4.25	4.25	4	4.33
<i>Shenandoah</i>	Frank Ticheli	4	4.75	4.5	4.5	4.5
<i>Shepherd's Hey</i>	Percy Grainger	4	5	5	4.75	5
<i>Sinfonia VI</i>	Timothy Broege	4	4.67	4.67	4.67	5
<i>Suite in Minor Mode</i>	Dmitri Kabalevsky/ Siekman	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.25
<i>Suite Provencale</i>	Jan van der Roost	4	4.5	4.75	4.5	4.5
<i>Summer Dances</i>	Brian Balmages	4	4.5	4.5	3.5	3.75
<i>The Great Locomotive Chase</i>	Robert W. Smith	4	3.75	3.75	4.25	3.25
<i>Two British Folk Songs</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	4	4	4.25	4.25	4.25
<i>West Highlands Sojourn</i>	Robert Sheldon	4	4	5	4.5	4.75
<i>With Quiet Courage</i>	Larry Daehn	4	5	5	5	4.75
<i>A Song of Hope</i>	James Swearingen	3	4.33	3.67	4	3.67
<i>All the Pretty Little Horses</i>	Anne McGinty	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Allied Honor March</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	3	4	4.33	4.33	4.67
<i>American Folk Rhapsody No. 2</i>	Clare Grundman	3	4	4	4.5	4.5
<i>American Song Settings No. 2</i>	Joseph Kreines	3	5	5	5	5
<i>An Irish Rhapsody</i>	Clare Grundman	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Apparitions</i>	Brian Balmages	3	4.67	4.33	4.67	3.67
<i>Arabian Dances</i>	Roland Barrett	3	2.67	3.67	4	3.33
<i>Bandology</i>	Eric Osterling	3	4	4	4	4.5
<i>Black Forest Overture</i>	Michael Sweeney	3	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.33
<i>Blue Ridge Overture</i>	Frank Erickson	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Blue Ridge Saga</i>	James Swearingen	3	4.33	4.67	4	4
<i>Colonial Airs & Dances</i>	Robert Jager	3	5	5	4.67	4.67
<i>Crystal City Overture</i>	John Edmondson	3	4	4.67	4.67	4.67
<i>Cumberland Cross</i>	Carl Strommen	3	4.33	4.67	4.33	4.33
<i>Deir In De</i>	Warren Barker	3	4	3.67	4	4
<i>Early One Morning</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Earthdance</i>	Michael Sweeney	3	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.33

Note. No. = Number of Recommendations; A = Artistic Value; P = Pedagogical Value; R = the likelihood the respondent will repeat the work; C = the extent to which the respondent believes the work should be part of a core repertoire.

Table 15

The Most Recommended Works and Mean Likert Ratings (continued)

Title	Composer	No.	A	P	R	C
<i>Fanfare, Ode and Festival</i>	Bob Margolis	3	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67
<i>Fantasy on a Fiddle Tune</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	3.5	4.5	4	4.5
<i>Fantasy on a Japanese Folk Song</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	3	4.33	4	3.67	3.33
<i>Festivo</i>	Vaclav Nelhybel	3	4.67	4.33	4.33	5
<i>Flourish for Wind Band</i>	Ralph Vaughan Williams	3	5	5	4.33	5
<i>Folk Song Suite</i>	Ralph Vaughan Williams	3	4.67	4.67	5	4.33
<i>Fortress</i>	Frank Ticheli	3	3.67	4.33	4	4.67
<i>Hudson River Suite</i>	John O'Reilly	3	4.67	4.67	4.67	5
<i>Into the Clouds</i>	Richard Saucedo	3	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.33
<i>Joy Revisited</i>	Frank Ticheli	3	4.67	5	4.33	4
<i>Korean Folk Rhapsody</i>	James Curnow	3	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.33
<i>Linden Lea</i>	R. Vaughan Williams/Stout	3	5	4.5	5	5
<i>March of the Belgian Paratroopers</i>	Pierre Leemans/J. Swearingen	3	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.33
<i>Nordic Sketches</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Nottingham Castle</i>	Larry Daehn	3	4	4.33	4.67	4.33
<i>Overture on a Minstrel Tune</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Pevensey Castle</i>	Robert Sheldon	3	3.33	4.33	4.33	4
<i>Pictures at an Exhibition</i>	M. Mussorgsky/Sweeney	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Polly Oliver</i>	Thomas Root	3	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.33
<i>Prospect</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4
<i>Rain</i>	Brian Balmages	3	4	3.33	4.33	3.67
<i>Rhosymedre</i>	R. Vaughan Williams/Beeler	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Rhythm of the Winds</i>	Frank Erickson	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Rhythms and Riffs</i>	Brian Balmages	3	4.33	4.33	4.67	4.33
<i>Rikudim</i>	Jan van der Roost	3	4.67	5	4.67	4.67
<i>Sea Song Trilogy</i>	Anne McGinty	3	3.67	4.67	5	4.67
<i>Second Suite in F Major</i>	Gustav Holst	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Serengeti Dreams</i>	Robert W. Smith	3	3.67	4.33	4.67	4
<i>Slavonic Folk Suite</i>	Alfred Reed	3	5	5	4.5	5
<i>Sonatina for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	3	5	5	5	5
<i>A Song for Friends</i>	Larry Daehn	3	5	5	5	5

Note. No. = Number of Recommendations; A = Artistic Value; P = Pedagogical Value; R = the likelihood the respondent will repeat the work; C = the extent to which the respondent believes the work should be part of a core repertoire.

Table 15

The Most Recommended Works and Mean Likert Ratings (continued)

Title	Composer	No.	A	P	R	C
<i>Spoon River</i>	Percy Grainger/R. Sheldon	3	4.33	4.33	4	4.33
<i>Spoon River</i>	Percy Grainger/G. Bainum	3	4.33	4.33	4	4.5
<i>Suite from Bohemia</i>	Vaclav Nelhybel	3	4.5	5	4.5	5
<i>Symphony No. 4</i>	Andrew Boysen, Jr.	3	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.33
<i>The Battle Pavane</i>	T. Susato/ Bob Margolis	3	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.67
<i>The Headless Horseman</i>	Timothy Broege	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Third Suite</i>	Robert Jager	3	4.67	5	4.33	4.67
<i>Valdres</i>	J. Hanssen/ Arr. Not Specified	3	4.67	4.33	4.33	4.33
<i>Variation Overture</i>	James Clifton Williams	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Voices in the Sky</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	3	4.67	4	4	4

Note. No. = Number of Recommendations; A = Artistic Value; P = Pedagogical Value; R = the likelihood the respondent will repeat the work; C = the extent to which the respondent believes the work should be part of a core repertoire.

The “Most Recommended Works” were assigned a graded difficulty level based on the average rating each received from multiple state lists. Johannes Hanssen’s *Valdres* was eliminated from further consideration because none of the respondents indicated a specific edition. There are at least four different arrangements of the work at varying levels of difficulty, and there is no way to ascertain the intentions of the respondents. Works are sorted by grade level and then ordered by their frequency of recommendation in Table 16.

Table 16

The Graded Difficulty Level of the Most Recommended Works

<u>Title</u>	<u>Composer</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Concord</i>	Clare Grundman	5
<i>Variations on a Korean Folk Song</i>	John Barnes Chance	5
<i>Chorale and Shaker Dance</i>	John Zdechlik	5
<i>Symphonic Dance No. 3 "Fiesta"</i>	James Clifton Williams	5
<i>Incantation and Dance</i>	John Barnes Chance	5
<i>Folk Song Suite</i>	Ralph Vaughan Williams	5
<i>Rikudim</i>	Jan van der Roost	5
<i>Second Suite in F Major</i>	Gustav Holst	5
<i>Third Suite</i>	Robert Jager	5
<i>A Longford Legend</i>	Robert Sheldon	4
<i>Cajun Folk Songs</i>	Frank Ticheli	4
<i>Simple Gifts Four Shaker Songs</i>	Frank Tichelli	4
<i>Themes from Green Bushes</i>	Percy Grainger/L. Daehn	4
<i>J. S. Jig</i>	Brant Karrick	4
<i>Undertow</i>	John Mackey	4
<i>Courtly Airs & Dances</i>	Ron Nelson	4
<i>Ghost Fleet</i>	Robert Sheldon	4
<i>Prelude, Siciliano and Rondo</i>	Malcolm Arnold/Paynter	4
<i>Toccata for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	4
<i>Unraveling</i>	Andrew Boysen, Jr.	4
<i>Chant and Jubilo</i>	William Francis McBeth	4
<i>Chorale and Shaker Dance II</i>	John Zdechlik	4
<i>Shenandoah</i>	Frank Ticheli	4
<i>Shepherd's Hey</i>	Percy Grainger	4
<i>Sinfonia VI</i>	Timothy Broege	4
<i>Suite Provencale</i>	Jan van der Roost	4
<i>Summer Dances</i>	Brian Balmages	4
<i>An Irish Rhapsody</i>	Clare Grundman	4
<i>Colonial Airs & Dances</i>	Robert Jager	4
<i>Fantasy on a Japanese Folk Song</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	4
<i>Festivo</i>	Vaclav Nelhybel	4
<i>Flourish for Wind Band</i>	Ralph Vaughan Williams	4
<i>Fortress</i>	Frank Ticheli	4
<i>Joy Revisited</i>	Frank Ticheli	4
<i>Rhosymedre</i>	R. Vaughan Williams/Beeler	4
<i>Spoon River</i>	Percy Grainger/R. Sheldon	4

Table 16

The Graded Difficulty Level of “The Most Recommended Works” (continued)

<u>Title</u>	<u>Composer</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Spoon River</i>	Percy Grainger/G. Bainum	4
<i>Symphony No. 4</i>	Andrew Boysen, Jr.	4
<i>Kentucky 1800</i>	Clare Grundman	3
<i>American Riversongs</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>On a Hymnsong of Philip Bliss</i>	David Holsinger	3
<i>Overture For Winds</i>	Charles Carter	3
<i>Three Ayres from Gloucester</i>	Hugh Stuart	3
<i>Arabian Dances</i>	Brian Balmages	3
<i>Butterfly's Ball</i>	Ryan Fraley	3
<i>Peregrin: A Traveler's Tale</i>	Douglas Akey	3
<i>Prelude and Fugue in Bb Major</i>	J. S. Bach /R. Moehlmann	3
<i>Sparks</i>	Brian Balmages	3
<i>As Summer Was Just Beginning</i>	Larry Daehn	3
<i>Blue and Green Music</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	3
<i>Prairie Songs</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>Prestissimo</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	3
<i>Tricycle</i>	Andrew Boysen, Jr.	3
<i>Yorkshire Ballad</i>	James Barnes	3
<i>A Walk in the Morning Sun</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>Abracadabra</i>	Frank Ticheli	3
<i>Alligator Alley</i>	Michael Daugherty	3
<i>British Isles Suite</i>	Larry Daehn	3
<i>Creed</i>	William Himes	3
<i>Down a Country Lane</i>	Aaron Copland/M. Patterson	3
<i>Dreams and Fancies</i>	Timothy Broege	3
<i>Horkstow Grange</i>	Percy Grainger/M. Sweeney	3
<i>La Madre de Los Gatos</i>	Brian Beck	3
<i>Nathan Hale Trilogy</i>	James Curnow	3
<i>Rhythm Machine</i>	Timothy Broege	3
<i>Rites of Tamburo</i>	Robert W. Smith	3
<i>Suite in Minor Mode</i>	Dmitri Kabalevsky/Siekmann	3
<i>The Great Locomotive Chase</i>	Robert W. Smith	3
<i>West Highlands Sojourn</i>	Robert Sheldon	3
<i>With Quiet Courage</i>	Larry Daehn	3
<i>Allied Honor March</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	3
<i>American Folk Rhapsody No. 2</i>	Clare Grundman	3

Table 16

The Graded Difficulty Level of “The Most Recommended Works” (continued)

<u>Title</u>	<u>Composer</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Apparitions</i>	Brian Balmages	3
<i>Arabian Dances</i>	Roland Barrett	3
<i>Bandology</i>	Eric Osterling	3
<i>Blue Ridge Overture</i>	Frank Erickson	3
<i>Blue Ridge Saga</i>	James Swearingen	3
<i>Cumberland Cross</i>	Carl Strommen	3
<i>Deir In De</i>	Warren Barker	3
<i>Early One Morning</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>Earthdance</i>	Michael Sweeney	3
<i>Fanfare, Ode and Festival</i>	Bob Margolis	3
<i>Fantasy on a Fiddle Tune</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>Hudson River Suite</i>	John O'Reilly	3
<i>Into the Clouds</i>	Richard Saucedo	3
<i>Linden Lea</i>	R. Vaughan Williams/Stout	3
<i>March of the Belgian Paratroopers</i>	Pierre Leemans/J. Swearingen	3
<i>Nordic Sketches</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>Overture on a Minstrel Tune</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>Polly Oliver</i>	Thomas Root	3
<i>Prospect</i>	Pierre La Plante	3
<i>Rain</i>	Brian Balmages	3
<i>Rhythm of the Winds</i>	Frank Erickson	3
<i>Slavonic Folk Suite</i>	Alfred Reed	3
<i>Sonatina for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	3
<i>Suite from Bohemia</i>	Vaclav Nelhybel	3
<i>The Battle Pavane</i>	T. Susato/Bob Margolis	3
<i>The Headless Horseman</i>	Timothy Broege	3
<i>Variation Overture</i>	James Clifton Williams	3
<i>Voices in the Sky</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	3
<i>Air for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	2
<i>A Childhood Hymn</i>	David Holsinger	2
<i>Balladair</i>	Frank Erickson	2
<i>Joy</i>	Frank Ticheli	2
<i>Moscow 1941</i>	Brian Balmages	2
<i>Ancient Voices</i>	Michael Sweeney	2
<i>The Red Balloon</i>	Anne McGinty	2
<i>Canto</i>	William Francis McBeth	2

Table 16

The Graded Difficulty Level of “The Most Recommended Works” (continued)

<u>Title</u>	<u>Composer</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Celtic Air and Dance</i>	Michael Sweeney	2
<i>Our Kingsland Spring</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	2
<i>Portrait of a Clown</i>	Frank Ticheli	2
<i>The Tempest</i>	Robert W. Smith	2
<i>A Prehistoric Suite</i>	Paul Jennings	2
<i>Caprice</i>	William Himes	2
<i>Country Wildflowers</i>	Larry Daehn	2
<i>Down by the Salley Gardens</i>	Michael Sweeney	2
<i>Psalms 42</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	2
<i>Two British Folk Songs</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	2
<i>A Song for Friends</i>	Larry Daehn	2
<i>All the Pretty Little Horses</i>	Anne McGinty	2
<i>American Song Settings No. 2</i>	Joseph Kreines	2
<i>Black Forest Overture</i>	Michael Sweeney	2
<i>Crystal City Overture</i>	John Edmondson	2
<i>Korean Folk Rhapsody</i>	James Curnow	2
<i>Pevensey Castle</i>	Robert Sheldon	2
<i>Pictures at an Exhibition</i>	Modest Mussorgsky/M. Sweeney	2
<i>Rhythms and Riffs</i>	Brian Balmages	2
<i>Sea Song Trilogy</i>	Anne McGinty	2
<i>Serengeti Dreams</i>	Robert W. Smith	2
<i>A Song of Hope</i>	James Swearingen	1
<i>Nottingham Castle</i>	Larry Daehn	1

To determine the repertoire that is most valued for middle-level band students specifically, only grade 2 and 3 literature was considered to be at the appropriate technical level. The “Most Recommended Works” within this range of difficulty, achieving a mean score of 4.00 in all four of the Likert categories were considered “The Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band” in this study. *A Walk in the Morning Sun*, *Butterfly’s Ball*, *The Great Locomotive Chase*, *Apparitions*, *Arabian Dances* (Barrett), *Deir in De*, *Fantasy on Fiddle Tune*, *Rain*, *Moscow 1941*, *Canto*, *The Tempest*,

Pevensey Castle, *Sea Song Trilogy*, and *Serengeti Dreams* failed to meet this *a priori* threshold. The “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band” consists of 78 works. Fifty-five of these pieces are grades 3, and 23 are grade 2. They are listed in Table 17 by grade level, the number of recommendations ordered from highest to lowest, and then alphabetized.

Table 17

The Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band

Title	Composer	Gr.	No.	A	P	R	C
<i>Kentucky 1800</i>	Clare Grundman	3	18	4.5	4.72	4.5	4.72
<i>American Riversongs</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	16	4.5	4.69	4.69	4.75
<i>On a Hymn song of Philip Bliss</i>	David Holsinger	3	12	5	4.92	4.83	4.92
<i>Overture For Winds</i>	Charles Carter	3	11	4.45	4.73	4.64	4.64
<i>Three Ayres from Gloucester</i>	Hugh Stuart	3	9	4.75	4.88	4.63	4.75
<i>Arabian Dances</i>	Brian Balmages	3	7	4.29	4.29	4	4
<i>Peregrin: A Traveler's Tale</i>	Douglas Akey	3	6	4	4.6	4.6	4
<i>Prelude and Fugue in Bb Major</i>	J. S. Bach /R. Moehlmann	3	6	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.5
<i>Sparks</i>	Brian Balmages	3	6	4.33	4.17	4.17	4.17
<i>As Summer Was Just Beginning</i>	Larry Daehn	3	5	5	5	5	5
<i>Blue and Green Music</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	3	5	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.2
<i>Prairie Songs</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	5	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.8
<i>Prestissimo</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	3	5	4.25	4.5	4.25	4.25
<i>Tricycle</i>	Andrew Boysen, Jr.	3	5	4.5	4.5	4.75	4.25
<i>Yorkshire Ballad</i>	James Barnes	3	5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
<i>Abracadabra</i>	Frank Ticheli	3	4	4	4.5	4.5	4.5
<i>Alligator Alley</i>	Michael Daugherty	3	4	4.25	5	4.75	4.5
<i>British Isles Suite</i>	Larry Daehn	3	4	4.33	4.33	4	4.33
<i>Creed</i>	William Himes	3	4	5	5	5	5
<i>Down a Country Lane</i>	Aaron Copland/M. Patterson	3	4	5	4.33	4.33	4.33

Note. Gr. = Grade Level; No. = Number of Recommendations; A = Artistic Value; P = Pedagogical Value; R = the likelihood the respondent will repeat the work; C = the extent to which the respondent believes the work should be part of a core repertoire.

Table 17

The Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band (continued)

<u>Title</u>	<u>Composer</u>	<u>Gr.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>C</u>
<i>Dreams and Fancies</i>	Timothy Broege	3	4	4.67	4.67	5	5
<i>Horkstow Grange</i>	Percy Grainger/M. Sweeney	3	4	5	5	4.67	4.67
<i>La Madre de Los Gatos</i>	Brian Beck	3	4	4.25	4.5	5	4
<i>Nathan Hale Trilogy</i>	James Curnow	3	4	4	4.5	4.25	4.25
<i>Rhythm Machine</i>	Timothy Broege	3	4	5	4.67	5	5
<i>Rites of Tamburo</i>	Robert W. Smith	3	4	4.25	4.25	4	4.33
<i>Suite in Minor Mode</i>	Dmitri Kabalevsky/Siekmann	3	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.25
<i>West Highlands Sojourn</i>	Robert Sheldon	3	4	4	5	4.5	4.75
<i>With Quiet Courage</i>	Larry Daehn	3	4	5	5	5	4.75
<i>Allied Honor March</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	3	3	4	4.33	4.33	4.67
<i>American Folk Rhapsody No. 2</i>	Clare Grundman	3	3	4	4	4.5	4.5
<i>Bandology</i>	Eric Osterling	3	3	4	4	4	4.5
<i>Blue Ridge Overture</i>	Frank Erickson	3	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Blue Ridge Saga</i>	James Swearingen	3	3	4.33	4.67	4	4
<i>Cumberland Cross</i>	Carl Strommen	3	3	4.33	4.67	4.33	4.33
<i>Early One Morning</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Earthdance</i>	Michael Sweeney	3	3	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.33
<i>Fanfare, Ode and Festival</i>	Bob Margolis	3	3	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67
<i>Hudson River Suite</i>	John O'Reilly	3	3	4.67	4.67	4.67	5
<i>Into the Clouds</i>	Richard Saucedo	3	3	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.33
<i>Linden Lea</i>	R. Vaughan Williams/Stout	3	3	5	4.5	5	5
<i>March of the Belgian Paratroopers</i>	Pierre Leemans/J. Swearingen	3	3	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.33
<i>Nordic Sketches</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Overture on a Minstrel Tune</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Polly Oliver</i>	Thomas Root	3	3	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.33
<i>Prospect</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4
<i>Rhythm of the Winds</i>	Frank Erickson	3	3	5	5	5	5

Note. Gr. = Grade Level; No. = Number of Recommendations; A = Artistic Value; P = Pedagogical Value; R = the likelihood the respondent will repeat the work; C = the extent to which the respondent believes the work should be part of a core repertoire.

Table 17

The Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band (continued)

<u>Title</u>	<u>Composer</u>	<u>Gr.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>C</u>
<i>Slavonic Folk Suite</i>	Alfred Reed	3	3	5	5	4.5	5
<i>Sonatina for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	3	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Suite from Bohemia</i>	Vaclav Nelhybel	3	3	4.5	5	4.5	5
<i>The Battle Pavane</i>	T. Susato/Bob Margolis	3	3	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.67
<i>The Headless Horseman</i>	Timothy Broege	3	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Variation Overture</i>	James Clifton Williams	3	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Voices in the Sky</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	3	3	4.67	4	4	4
<i>Air for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	2	16	4.81	4.81	4.81	4.69
<i>A Childhood Hymn</i>	David Holsinger	2	11	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
<i>Balladair</i>	Frank Erickson	2	8	5	5	5	5
<i>Joy</i>	Frank Ticheli	2	8	4	4.5	4.5	4.25
<i>Ancient Voices</i>	Michael Sweeney	2	7	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.57
<i>The Red Balloon</i>	Anne McGinty	2	7	4.57	4.71	4.43	4.57
<i>Celtic Air and Dance</i>	Michael Sweeney	2	6	4.5	4.67	4.5	4.5
<i>Our Kingsland Spring</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	2	6	4.33	4.5	4.5	4.33
<i>Portrait of a Clown</i>	Frank Ticheli	2	5	4.2	4.6	4.4	5
<i>A Prehistoric Suite</i>	Paul Jennings	2	4	5	5	5	5
<i>Caprice</i>	William Himes	2	4	4	4.67	4.67	4.33
<i>Country Wildflowers</i>	Larry Daehn	2	4	4.5	4.25	4.25	4.5
<i>Down by the Salley Gardens</i>	Michael Sweeney	2	4	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75
<i>Psalm 42</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	2	4	4.75	4.25	4.75	4.25
<i>Two British Folk Songs</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	2	4	4	4.25	4.25	4.25
<i>A Song for Friends</i>	Larry Daehn	2	3	5	5	5	5
<i>All the Pretty Little Horses</i>	Anne McGinty	2	3	5	5	5	5
<i>American Song Settings No. 2</i>	Joseph Kreines	2	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Black Forest Overture</i>	Michael Sweeney	2	3	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.33
<i>Crystal City Overture</i>	John Edmondson	2	3	4	4.67	4.67	4.67
<i>Korean Folk Rhapsody</i>	James Curnow	2	3	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.33
<i>Pictures at an Exhibition</i>	Modest Mussorgsky/Sweeney	2	3	5	5	5	5
<i>Rhythms and Riffs</i>	Brian Balmages	2	3	4.33	4.33	4.67	4.33

Note. Gr. = Grade Level; No. = Number of Recommendations; A = Artistic Value; P = Pedagogical Value; R = the likelihood the respondent will repeat the work; C = the extent to which the respondent believes the work should be part of a core repertoire.

The works included in this study's "Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band" were compared to the lists developed by Dvorak (1986), Kvet (1996), Thomas (1998), Howard (2001), Stevenson (2003), Oliver (2012), Miller (2013), and Miles (1998-2015) to see which were deemed meritorious across multiple studies. Sixteen of these failed to appear on any of these literature lists. Twenty-three were cited once. Three works, *Kentucky 1800*, *Three Ayres from Gloucester*, and *Air for Band*, were the most referenced with each appearing on six different studies. The complete comparative results are listed in Table 18.

Table 18

The Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band in Previous Studies

<u>Title</u>	<u>Composer</u>	<u>Gr.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>K</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>MS</u>
<i>Kentucky 1800</i>	Clare Grundman	3	18		x		x	x	x	x	x	
<i>American Riversongs</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	16					x		x	x	
<i>Overture for Winds</i>	Charles Carter	3	11	x				x	x	x	x	
<i>Three Ayres from Gloucester</i>	Hugh Suart	3	9	x	x			x	x	x	x	
<i>Arabian Dances</i>	Brian Balmages	3	7								x	
<i>Peregrin: A Traveler's Tale</i>	Douglas Akey	3	6					x			x	
<i>Prelude and Fugue in Bb Major</i>	J. S. Bach /R. Moehlmann	3	6			x		x	x	x	x	
<i>Sparks</i>	Brian Balmages	3	6									
<i>As Summer Was Just Beginning</i>	Larry Daehn	3	5					x			x	
<i>Blue and Green Music</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	3	5									

Note. "Gr." = Average Grade Difficulty Level; "No." = Number of times the works were recommended in the current study; "D" = Dvorak (1986); "K" = Kvet (1996); "T" = Thomas (1998); "H" = Howard (2001); "S" = Stevenson (2003); "O" = Oliver (2012); "M" = Miller (2013); "G" = Miles (1998 -2015); MS = GIA Publications Teaching Music Through Performance in Middle School Band (2015).

Table 18

The Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band in Previous Studies (continued)

<u>Title</u>	<u>Composer</u>	<u>Gr.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>K</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>MS</u>
<i>Prairie Songs</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	5					x			x	
<i>Prestissimo</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	3	5									x
<i>Tricycle</i>	Andrew Boysen, Jr.	3	5								x	
<i>Yorkshire Ballad</i>	James Barnes	3	5		x			x	x	x	x	
<i>Abracadabra</i>	Frank Ticheli	3	4								x	
<i>Alligator Alley</i>	Michael Daugherty	3	4								x	
<i>British Isles Suite</i>	Larry Daehn	3	4					x				
<i>Creed</i>	William Himes	3	4					x			x	
<i>Down a Country Lane</i>	Aaron Copland/M. Patterson	3	4					x		x	x	
<i>Dreams and Fancies</i>	Timothy Broege	3	4		x			x			x	
<i>Horkstow Grange</i>	Percy Grainger/M. Sweeney	3	4									x
<i>La Madre de Los Gatos</i>	Brian Beck	3	4								x	
<i>Nathan Hale Trilogy</i>	James Curnow	3	4		x		x	x				
<i>Rhythm Machine</i>	Timothy Broege	3	4	x	x			x				x
<i>Rites of Tamburo</i>	Robert W. Smith	3	4					x				
<i>Suite in Minor Mode</i>	D. Kabalevsky/ Siekman	3	4	x	x			x	x	x		
<i>West Highlands Sojourn</i>	Robert Sheldon	3	4					x				x
<i>With Quiet Courage</i>	Larry Daehn	3	4								x	

Note. "Gr." = Average Grade Difficulty Level; "No." = Number of times the works were recommended in the current study; "D" = Dvorak (1986); "K" = Kvet (1996); "T" = Thomas (1998); "H" = Howard (2001); "S" = Stevenson (2003); "O" = Oliver (2012); "M" = Miller (2013); "G" = Miles (1998-2015); MS = GIA Publications Teaching Music Through Performance in Middle School Band (2015).

Table 18

The Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band in Previous Studies (continued)

<u>Title</u>	<u>Composer</u>	<u>Gr.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>K</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>MS</u>
<i>Allied Honor March</i>	Karl King/J. Swearingen	3	3									
<i>American Folk Rhapsody No. 2</i>	Clare Grundman	3	3	x				x	x	x		
<i>Bandology</i>	Eric Osterling	3	3								x	
<i>Blue Ridge Overture</i>	Frank Erickson	3	3					x			x	
<i>Blue Ridge Saga</i>	James Swearingen	3	3					x				
<i>Cumberland Cross</i>	Carl Strommen	3	3					x	x		x	x
<i>Early One Morning</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	3					x			x	
<i>Earthdance</i>	Michael Sweeney	3	3									
<i>Fanfare, Ode, and Festival</i>	Bob Margolis	3	3	x			x		x		x	
<i>Hudson River Suite</i>	John O'Reilly	3	3					x				
<i>Into the Clouds</i>	Richard Saucedo	3	3									x
<i>Linden Lea</i>	R. Vaughan Williams/Stout	3	3					x	x	x	x	
<i>March of the Belgian Paratroopers</i>	Pierre Leemans/J. Swearingen	3	3									x
<i>Nordic Sketches</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	3									
<i>Overture on a Minstrel Tune</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	3	x							x	
<i>Polly Oliver</i>	Thomas Root	3	3					x		x	x	
<i>Prospect</i>	Pierre La Plante	3	3					x			x	

Note. "Gr." = Average Grade Difficulty Level; "No." = Number of times the works were recommended in the current study; "D" = Dvorak (1986); "K" = Kvet (1996); "T" = Thomas (1998); "H" = Howard (2001); "S" = Stevenson (2003); "O" = Oliver (2012); "M" = Miller (2013); "G" = Miles (1998 -2015); MS = GIA Publications Teaching Music Through Performance in Middle School Band (2015).

Table 18

The Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band in Previous Studies (continued)

<u>Title</u>	<u>Composer</u>	<u>Gr.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>K</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>MS</u>
<i>Rhythm of the Winds</i>	Frank Erickson	3	3					x				
<i>Slavonic Folk Suite</i>	Alfred Reed	3	3					x				
<i>Sonatina for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	3	3				x	x	x			
<i>Suite from Bohemia</i>	Vaclav Nelhybel	3	3	x	x			x			x	
<i>The Battle Pavane</i>	T. Susato/B. Margolis	3	3	x		x		x	x		x	
<i>The Headless Horseman</i>	Timothy Broege	3	3	x	x			x			x	
<i>Variation Overture</i>	James Clifton Williams	3	3	x	x				x		x	
<i>Voices in the Sky</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	3	3									
<i>Air for Band</i>	Frank Erickson	2	16	x	x		x	x	x		x	
<i>On a Hymn song of Philip Bliss</i>	David Holsinger	2	12					x		x	x	
<i>A Childhood Hymn</i>	David Holsinger	2	11					x			x	
<i>Balladair</i>	Frank Erickson	2	8	x				x	x		x	
<i>Joy</i>	Frank Ticheli	2	8								x	
<i>Ancient Voices</i>	Michael Sweeney	2	7					x			x	
<i>The Red Balloon</i>	Anne McGinty	2	7					x			x	
<i>Celtic Air and Dance</i>	Michael Sweeney	2	6									x
<i>Our Kingsland Spring</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	2	6									
<i>Portrait of a Clown</i>	Frank Ticheli	2	5		x			x			x	
<i>A Prehistoric Suite</i>	Paul Jennings	2	4			x						
<i>Caprice</i>	William Himes	2	4					x				

Note. "Gr." = Average Grade Difficulty Level; "No." = Number of times the works were recommended in the current study; "D" = Dvorak (1986); "K" = Kvet (1996); "T" = Thomas (1998); "H" = Howard (2001); "S" = Stevenson (2003); "O" = Oliver (2012); "M" = Miller (2013); "G" = Miles (1998 -2015); MS = GIA Publications Teaching Music Through Performance in Middle School Band (2015).

Table 18

The Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band in Previous Studies (continued)

<u>Title</u>	<u>Composer</u>	<u>Gr.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>K</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>MS</u>
<i>Country Wildflowers</i>	Larry Daehn	2	4					x				
<i>Down by the Salley Gardens</i>	Michael Sweeney	2	4									
<i>Psalm 42</i>	Samuel R. Hazo	2	4									
<i>Two British Folk Songs</i>	Elliot Del Borgo	2	4					x				
<i>A Song for Friends</i>	Larry Daehn	2	3									
<i>All the Pretty Little Horses</i>	Anne McGinty	2	3					x			x	
<i>American Song Settings No. 2</i>	Joseph Kreines	2	3									
<i>Black Forest Overture</i>	Michael Sweeney	2	3									
<i>Crystal City Overture</i>	John Edmondson	2	3					x				
<i>Korean Folk Rhapsody</i>	James Curnow	2	3								x	
<i>Pictures at an Exhibition</i>	M. Mussorgsky/ M. Sweeney	2	3									
<i>Rhythms and Riffs</i>	Brian Balmages	2	3									

Note. "Gr." = Average Grade Difficulty Level; "No." = Number of times the works were recommended in the current study; "D" = Dvorak (1986); "K" = Kvet (1996); "T" = Thomas (1998); "H" = Howard (2001); "S" = Stevenson (2003); "O" = Oliver (2012); "M" = Miller (2013); "G" = Miles (1998 -2015); MS = GIA Publications Teaching Music Through Performance in Middle School Band (2015).

Chapter 5: Discussion

The fundamental purpose of this study is to identify an actual body of repertoire programmed by distinguished middle-level band conductors from across the country. The goal is to discover the specific compositions, genres of music, and composers that have contributed to the success of programs widely recognized as having achieved excellence. Delimiting the survey sample to directors of exemplar programs is intended to yield authoritative recommendations of works that can serve as a reference for other middle-level band programs in the general population.

The first question guiding the course of this study pertains to the actual repertoire programmed by distinguished middle-level wind band conductors in the United States. While efforts were made to garner information from all areas of the country, responses from the Western regions were nominal. The regional response rate might reflect a concentration of distinguished band programs in the Midwestern and Southern areas of the United States. More than 60% of the directors that responded came from schools in the North Central (28.93%) and Southwestern regions (32.23%). Bands from these regions, the state of Texas particularly, participate in the select venues, used to screen quality programs for this study, at a much higher rate than do their counterparts in other regions. For example, 14 of the responding directors had performed at the Midwest Clinic, two of them more than once between 2003 and 2014. This should not imply there is a shortage of outstanding programs in other regions. Distant geographical location, the cultural and educational priorities of the school communities, and financial considerations can all have an impact on accessibility to such venues. Limited recommendations of programs from the Western states as well as their general lack of

participation in the Midwest Clinic and the national festivals cited in this study, curtailed the number of responses (1.66% of total responses) from this region. Representation from the Eastern (16.53%) and Southern (20.66%) areas accounted for the remaining 37.19% of responses. The high response rate from a variety of regions helps to provide a more global view on the issue of performed repertoire.

Directors were almost evenly divided among their programming priorities between artistic (weighted average of 3.34) and pedagogical (weighted average of 3.33) considerations. Both were of far greater concern than student and audience appeal. Delving further into this subject, it became apparent that conductors placed a higher value on the pedagogical value of the music. Of the 132 most recommended works in this study, the mean artistic rating was 4.48, lower than the mean pedagogical rating of 4.58. At first glance, this seems to support Budiansky and Foley's (2005, p. 20) assertion that, "...there is substantial evidence that school band directors are often more comfortable making technical and pedagogic judgments than aesthetic ones when it comes to choosing pieces." However, there is no clear evidence from this data that directors are uncomfortable with exercising aesthetic judgment. There is an apparent need for them to consider curriculum and performance mandates when choosing literature.

Furthermore, the most experienced teachers, with careers spanning 20 or more years, were most interested in the pedagogical value of the music they selected. Thirty-five respondents in this demographic ranked this their highest priority, as opposed to 28 indicating artistic value. Teachers with 15 to 19 years of experience were split evenly, with eight choosing both artistic and pedagogical concerns as their foremost consideration. Teachers with less than 10 years of experience chose artistic over

pedagogical concerns by a margin of 20 to 15. This contradicts Crochet (2006) who concluded that the perceived quality of the music was a much higher priority for experienced band directors in repertoire selection, with 61% of them relying upon the musical integrity of the composition as opposed to 31% of those with less experience. Crochet also indicated that musical quality was of greater concern to band directors considered more successful.

This disparity may be attributed to the current study's limitation to a small, select population of teachers of middle-level band students, a restriction not utilized by Crochet (2006) who studied band directors of all grade levels. Compared to their middle-level counterparts, expert teachers of advanced ensembles at high school and college levels are less constrained by technical concerns and are more free, and perhaps more expected, to pursue works of higher artistic merit. Teachers of developing students are, by nature, more dependent on music that facilitates skill development. Additional study on the correlation between teaching experience and repertoire selection could provide more insight on this subject.

What is clear is that middle-level band directors have access to, and value, an extraordinary variety of pieces. Of the 1,354 compositions recommended as most valuable in this survey, there were 774 different titles. More than 71% (550) of these were suggested only once, with 6.79% (92) appearing twice. This reflects a wide range of programming decisions as well as opinions about valuable repertoire. It may also be indicative of the teachers' partiality to newer publications, reliance on promotional materials, or the more flexible orchestration of many of these works that better suit programs with limited instrumentation. Consequently, it also lends more credence to the

relatively small number of works (132) recommended three or more times in this study. When three or more expert respondents, who have expressed such a vast array of opinions, arrive at a level of agreement on a limited number of pieces, there is an inherent value worthy of further exploration.

The fleeting characteristic of the middle-level band repertoire has also become apparent in this study. Brian Balmages was by far the most referenced composer (61 recommendations) in the survey. Yet, only one of his “Most Valued” works, *Arabian Dances*, was listed in a prior repertoire study of the nine used for point of comparison. Robert Sheldon, whose works were recommended 49 times in this study, had only one middle-level piece qualify as “Most Valued Repertoire.” His *West Highland Sojourn* appeared on just two different lists. Michael Sweeney, with 44 recommended works total, had seven pieces on the “Most Valued” list. Only three of these were cited in the recent GIA Publications repertoire lists, and one appeared in Stevenson’s study. Robert W. Smith, who ranked eighth with 39 recommendations, had one composition on the “Most Valued” list, also cited by Stevenson. None of the “Most Valued” works composed by Sheldon, Sweeney, and Smith appeared on any of the repertoire lists prior to 2001.

Frank Ticheli was cited 51 times in this study. Three of his “Most Valued” works appeared on eight of the additional studies, beginning with Kvet’s in 1996. Pierre La Plante appeared 50 times in these survey results and had six “Most Valued” works previously listed on the additional studies. His *Overture on a Minstrel Tune* dates back 29 years to Dvorak’s compilation. Clare Grundman was among the most referenced composers across the studies. He appeared 40 times in this latest survey, and 10 times with two “Most Valued” works on the additional repertoire lists. Yet, none of the “Most

Valued” works by Ticheli, La Plante, or Grundman in this study was included on the most recent GIA Publications’ core repertoire list for middle school band. In fact, only six “Most Valued” works from the current study are also included in that 2015 compilation.

In no way should these results diminish the merit of the GIA list, or those of Kvet, Thomas, and Howard who had the least number of corresponding pieces. In fact, there are substantial disparities in content between all of these lists, as would be expected with the different methodologies, authors, and literature resources involved. This is consistent with the findings of Ostling (1978), Gilbert (1993), and Towner (2011) whose results varied with the passage of time, newly introduced repertoire, and the programming trends of the day. With regard to the current study, the strong and more recent emergence of works by Balmages, Sheldon, and Sweeney reflects a propensity on the part of the directors to place a high value on recent releases, as well as more traditional repertoire.

Despite the wide variety of individual pieces recommended, there were only 21 different composers, cited 15 or more times, responsible for almost half (49.23%) of the entire output. Three composers, Brian Balmages (61 citations), Frank Ticheli (51 citations), and Pierre La Plante (50 citations) accounted for almost 12% of these. Balmages alone was responsible for 4.5% of the recommended works. This supports the general findings of Hash (2005) in the sense that there is a commonality of sources and styles of the music programmed. His study of Illinois middle school bands found that almost half the performed selections represented the work of only 10 composers. Almost 10% of the compositions evaluated by Hash were the works of James Swearingen, (who

was referenced as a primary composer 22 times in the current study), and nearly 30% were composed within three years of their performance.

The findings of this study are also similar to the conclusions offered by Budiansky and Foley (2005). Their compilation of several state band repertoire lists showed that the music of what they refer to as “educational composers,” such as James Swearingen, Robert Sheldon, and Robert W. Smith, is more prevalent than that of Mozart, Handel, Wagner, Vaughn Williams, Beethoven, Copland, and other historically recognized composers. Of the 22 most frequently recommended composers in this study, only Ralph Vaughan Williams (15 citations), Gustav Holst (19 citations), Karl King (21 citations), and Percy Grainger (33 citations) may be considered historically significant.

All of the remaining composers are predominantly associated with music composed for school band programs. Only Clare Grundman (40 citations) and Frank Erickson (45 citations) are no longer active composers as they are deceased. It should be noted that Frank Ticheli (51 citations) and Timothy Broege (25 citations) have achieved prominence for their work in other musical mediums.

It is apparent that the directors of the most distinguished middle-level bands in this study highly value and utilize the work of composers and publishers who gear their products to school band programs. They do not use them exclusively as they integrate the music of more historically prominent composers, such as Bach, Holst, Grainger, and Vaughan Williams, and folk song arrangements, but to a lesser degree. Furthermore, in contrast to the findings of Hash (2005), the works they value most tend to be older than three years and more diverse in style.

Among the recommended pieces were several that are clearly beyond the technical grasp of typical middle-level band students. Grade 5 and 6 works, such as Grainger's *Lincolnshire Posy* and Dahl's *Sinfonietta*, are outliers. Such responses could be attributed to a misunderstanding of the question whereby teachers may have considered most valuable repertoire in general without specific consideration for middle-level band students. The relatively large number of works suggested above grade 3 may also be indicative of the advanced level of the ensembles these teachers direct. Many of them are able to perform very challenging literature. However, this is not practical when accounting for the musical concerns of most students in grades 6 through 9.

When narrowing the focus of the most valued literature in this study to grades 2 and 3, the vast majority of pieces were at the higher difficulty level. Of these 78 works, 55 were grade 3 compared to 23 grade 2. This is consistent with the findings of King (2001), Greig (2003), and Oliver (2012) who found a similar depreciation in the number of works deemed meritorious at the less challenging grade levels. Directors of highly accomplished programs, having the capacity to program demanding literature, may value such works accordingly.

The second research question deals with the genres of music that encompass the preponderance of this repertoire. Based on the weighted averages derived from the Likert scores of the responding directors, marches (4.44) were rated as the most essential genre of music for middle-level band students to experience. This was followed by original works for winds (4.40), American folk music (3.92), world music (3.82), transcriptions (3.78), and popular music (3.39).

The “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band” of this study largely includes original works for winds, followed by arrangements and transcriptions, and folk song and folk-influenced adaptations. Only three marches met the “Most Valued Repertoire” criteria in this study. No popular music qualified.

Since the respondents in this study rated marches as the most important musical genre for their students to experience, one might speculate that more of them would be included in the final “Most Valued Repertoire” list. This was not the case. James Swearingen’s arrangements of Karl King’s *Prestissimo* and *Allied Honor*, and Pierre Leemans’ *March of the Belgian Paratroopers* were the only ones that met the necessary criteria. Original works for winds, ranked second highest in importance, were by far the most prevalent of the suggested repertoire.

Marches are somewhat of an enigma when it comes to literature studies. While they are widely considered of critical importance to the wind band repertoire, a number of studies omit them altogether for consideration. Some proponents of the wind ensemble view marches as part of the entertainment tradition of bands. In addition, many state sponsored lists do not include marches, even those that require them performed at adjudicated festivals. In many cases, the march is a non-graded component, so directors have a great deal of discretion in this area. Perhaps these tendencies have crept into the mindset of band directors at large.

In this study, two respondents recommended marches in general as part of a core repertoire without offering any explicit titles. This general lack of specificity is apparent in the data of this study, where there is a cultural tendency to lump all marches together into a category all of its own. There is little consensus on what particular marches should

be distinguished over others. The fact that only three Swearingen editions of marches achieved “Most Valued” status in this study should give pause to middle-level band directors looking to program works of superior quality in this genre.

Among this study’s “Most Valued Repertoire” are 37 works rooted in folk music, with 17 of American descent, 14 from the British Isles, three from other European nations, and three from Asia. While many of these pieces are arrangements of folk songs, others are better described as free adaptations with compositional development and added complexity that transcend the nature of the original folk song. Such approaches are usually not found in simpler compositions. The number of folk-influenced pieces is small in comparison to the total number of works on the “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band,” as is the number of arrangements and transcriptions. Both genres are considered moderately important to program based upon the Likert ratings of the directors.

Though considered the least significant when compared to the other categories referred to in this study, the majority of directors deemed popular music an essential part of the repertoire that should be experienced by middle-level band students. Yet, not one specific popular work came close to reaching “Most Valued” status. Most directors chose not to recommend a single popular arrangement. Perhaps to them, the genre of popular music is important for its appeal or for its indirect pedagogical benefits, but they believe individual popular songs do not rise to the level of sophistication that is expected of core repertoire. Another possible factor is the relatively brief amount of time that many such pieces remain popular within the context of the latest fads and societal trends.

The third research question deals with the nature of the music and its intended purpose. Although many authors have called into question the widespread use of music they ubiquitously classify as “educational music,” distinguishing this from so-called “authentic” or “artistic” repertoire is inherently problematic. For one thing, it presupposes the mindset and the intentions of the composer. At best, it is a matter of subjectivity. While a definitive classification is elusive, some distinction can be made when considering how the composers have achieved the preponderance of their recognition. Some of the composers of the “Most Valued Repertoire” are more historically significant. Other contemporary composers are renowned for their major works in the music field at large, although they may have a very limited number of works geared towards younger players. Michael Colgrass and Jennifer Higdon are two prime examples. Both Pulitzer Prize winning composers have written middle-level compositions. In this survey, works by Colgrass were recommended twice, with Higdon referenced once. This is in contrast to those who are best known for their contributions to literature widely programmed in school band programs.

The data in this study indicates that the “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band” is predominantly the product of composers most widely recognized in the music education community. Of the 78 pieces in this study’s “Most Valued Repertoire,” 70 (89.74%) fit this description. Only eight (10.26%) of these works were originally written by composers whose music largely transcends school music programs, including Bach, Daugherty, Vaughan Williams, Grainger, Mussorgsky, Kabalevsky, Copland, and Susato.

Even as the directors in this study appear closely divided between educational and artistic considerations in selecting their music, they most often gravitate to what they deem most effective in the classroom. This is not to say that artistic integrity is not important or that the educational works lack such merit. Simply, pedagogical content seems paramount.

Directors in this survey overwhelmingly proclaimed the importance of a core repertoire for middle-level bands. Of the 120 survey respondents, 67 (55.83%) indicated the strongest possible agreement on the five-point Likert scale. Another 41 (34.17%) rated their level of agreement as 4 out of 5. Nine (7.5%) were neutral, three (2.5%) disagreed, and no one strongly disagreed with this sentiment. The Weighted Likert Average of agreement was 4.43 out of 5. This is consistent with the findings of Backes (2010). While directors largely agree on the importance of a core repertoire for middle-level band, there are widespread opinions on the specific works that should constitute a core repertoire. This becomes apparent in comparing the “Most Valued Repertoire” with other views on a core repertoire for middle-level band.

In this survey, there were 1,354 recommendations of 774 different compositions that directors suggested could serve as possible core repertoire. Given the expertise and experience of the vast majority of participants, any number of these warrant some degree of consideration. To distinguish the few pieces from the many that could serve as core repertoire, the potential must exist for superior artistic integrity, pedagogical value, and repeated performances over time. As Adams (2002, p.19) observed, “high-quality music continues to reveal itself with each performance and invites us to revisit itself.”

Directors from across the country were asked to recommend compositions in the abstract, rather than choose from a predetermined list. For this reason, arriving at a level of agreement in this survey was very difficult to achieve. Consequently, when some consensus was reached, the results were more compelling. Three or more recommendations of a specific work were the predetermined threshold for further examination to take place.

There were 132 works recommended three or more times, constituting the highest 17.03% of the total number. This established a very clear line of demarcation from the remaining 643 pieces. It was also consistent with the selectivity of several previous studies when compared to the percentage of evaluated works rated as meritorious or achieving select status by Ostling (21.2%), Gilbert (15.15%), Gaines (24.88%), Honas (18.15%), Thomas (13.56%), Howard (18.82%), and Stevenson (13.16%). The mean percentage of such works in these studies is 17.85%.

Works achieving “Most Valued” status were the most recommended and highest rated in this study. While the number of recommendations achieved by a piece is indicative of both its value and the programming trends of exemplar programs, this in itself may be insufficient to distinguish a possible core repertoire. In addition, the mean Likert ratings only tell part of the story as they are subject to greater volatility when associated with a fewer number of recommendations.

To view these works within the context of a possible core repertoire, it is helpful to consider the test of time by virtue of their inclusion on multiple repertoire studies over the past three decades. Doing so helped to account for pieces lauded more for the popularity of recent trends than their readiness to assume a status among core repertoire.

For example, as noted earlier, emerging composer Brian Balmages was the most referenced in this study by a substantial margin. This might be attributed to the intense marketing of his music. Yet, only three of his works survived the scrutiny to merit inclusion on the “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band.” Of these, only one was included on one of the previous repertoire studies.

When applying the “test of time” to the “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band,” there are certain works that emerge as particularly noteworthy. *Kentucky 1800*, the most cited piece in the current study with 18 recommendations, was also deemed meritorious on six previous lists dating back to 1996. *Air for Band*, with 16 recommendations, also appeared in six previous studies, as did *Three Ayres from Gloucester* (nine recommendations). Works listed on five of these studies include *Overture for Winds* (11 recommendations), *Prelude and Fugue in Bb Major* (six recommendations), *Yorkshire Ballad* (five recommendations), *Suite in a Minor Mode* (three recommendations), and *The Battle Pavane* (three recommendations). *Balladair*, recommended by eight directors in the current study, was listed on four of the core repertoire lists. Other works included on four of the lists include *Rhythm Machine* (four recommendations), *American Folk Rhapsody No. 2*, *Cumberland Cross*, *Fanfare Ode and Festival*, *Linden Lea*, *Suite from Bohemia*, and *The Headless Horseman* (three recommendations each).

The question of whether these 16 distinctive works, or any of those included in this study’s “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band,” are part of a core repertoire is not a simple yes or no. The data does suggest that there is a highly regarded body of literature, frequently performed, and to some extent, repeated over time. These

“Most Valued” works can serve as exemplar programming options of proven pedagogical value. Many directors, but certainly not all, believe that middle-level band students should experience this music.

If we are to accept Jones’ (2005, p. 60) premise that a core repertoire is not a list of pieces, but a body of works regularly performed over extended periods of time and subject to change with newly introduced repertoire, then any such related literature list can only be a temporary proposition. To the extent that this “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band” list conveys the music actually performed rather than opined, the practice over the theory, it becomes a snapshot of a particular body at a specific point in time. It is more than a mere list of pieces. It is a set of practices proven effective for many distinguished school band programs. What it is not, however, is a permanent panacea. As with all repertoire studies, periodic updates are essential to account for new ideas, compositions, and performance practices.

Due to the procedures outlined in this study, works recommended less than three times were disqualified from consideration as “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band.” Among these were six grade 2 and 3 pieces appearing in three or more of the core repertoire lists referenced in this study for point of comparison. Despite only receiving 2, 1, and sometimes 0 recommendations in the current study, their inclusion on three or more of the meritorious lists of multiple studies over several years warrants further examination to ascertain their continued relevance as part of a core repertoire for middle-level band. These compositions, along with grade levels, the number of times recommended in the current study, and the additional repertoire lists in which they appear, are listed in Table 19.

Table 19

Middle-Level Works in Three or More Studies Recommended Two or Fewer Times

<u>Title</u>	<u>Composer</u>	<u>Gr.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>K</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>MS</u>
<i>American Folk Rhapsody No. 1</i>	Clare Grundman	3	0	x				x	x	x	x	
<i>If Thou Be Near</i>	J. S. Bach/ Moehlman	3	0			x		x	x			
<i>Mini Suite</i>	Morton Gould	2	2	x				x	x		x	
<i>Ave Verum Corpus</i>	W. A. Mozart/ M. Williams	2	1					x	x	x	x	
<i>Early English Suite</i>	Walter Finlayson	2	2	x	x			x	x		x	
<i>Belle Qui Tiens Ma Vie</i>	Bob Margolis	2	1	x	x			x	x	x	x	

Note. "Gr." = Average Grade Difficulty Level; "No." = Number of times the works were recommended in the current study; "D" = Dvorak (1986); "K" = Kvet (1996); "T" = Thomas (1998); "H" = Howard (2001); "S" = Stevenson (2003); "O" = Oliver (2012); "M" = Miller (2013); "G" = Miles (1998 -2015); MS = GIA Publications Teaching Music Through Performance in Middle School Band (2015).

Summary Conclusions

The results of this study can best be summarized as follows:

1. There were 1,354 recommendations of 774 different compositions deemed most valued by 87 distinguished middle-level band conductors from across the United States.
2. There appears to be a "Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band" of 78 works that are highly respected for their artistic merit, pedagogical value, have been oft-repeated in performance, and most likely will be programmed in the future.
3. These works are valuable to directors of some of the most distinguished middle-level school band programs in the country and considered integral to their success.

4. The works included on this “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band” largely reflect the opinions of the participants in this specific study, with greater veracity associated with those appearing on previous core repertoire lists. Of these, 16 works are especially notable having appeared on four or more previous core repertoire studies. As in all of the studies cited here, there are expected differences between lists influenced by the time of the research, the methodologies, and the participants involved.

5. The preponderance of these works (89.74%) programmed by distinguished middle-level bands appears to have been designed for use in educational settings, suggesting that directors are primarily influenced by pedagogical considerations, even though they consider the artistic merit of the music to be very important.

6. There is a vast array of literature, and a wide variety of musical genres, available to directors of middle-level band programs. Overwhelmingly, original works for winds are the most important staple of the repertoire. Marches, in general, are also very highly regarded as a musical genre, but few individual works are distinguished. American folk songs and world music are valued, but programmed less frequently. Directors generally believe that students should experience popular music, but do not equate the integrity of individual popular pieces with that of the symphonic works they value most highly.

7. The “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band” proposed in this study, whether or not it is accepted by music educators, can provide insight into the programming trends of some of the most highly regarded middle-level band programs in the nation. Choosing from the literature included on this list can provide a solid foundation for students in developing middle-level band programs at large.

Implications for Music Education

The fundamental implication of this study for music education pertains to the programming choices of music educators. As Reimer (2003, p. 282) noted, “A repertoire focusing on the tried and true will certainly serve an important purpose in providing a needed foundation.” Transcending the inherently controversial label of “core repertoire,” the works suggested in this study can be considered “the tried and true.” Choosing from this literature can provide a solid foundation for students in middle-level band programs at large. To that extent, the “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band” can serve as an additional resource in this area. Furthermore, music educators need not relegate their repertoire decision to the specific pieces on the list. These works can also provide a model for the artistic and pedagogical content that directors can look for in other compositions they may wish to program.

Beyond the current practitioners, the resources derived from this study may also be helpful to students majoring in music education at the university level. College wind literature courses cover the staples of the repertoire, but as noted earlier, often fall short when it comes to music accessible to younger students. Awareness of the repertoire and programming trends of highly successful school band programs from across the nation could be invaluable to the next generation of band directors.

What this study does not adequately address are the concerns raised by Budiansky and others about the developing band students’ lack of exposure to a repertoire that they consider more historically and culturally relevant. As Reimer (2003, p. 82) likewise asserted, “...exploration of divergent styles and types of music is also necessary if the broad range of musical experiencing available through performance in the standard

ensembles is to be enjoyed and found instructive.” Regardless of how valuable or revered the resulting repertoire of this study may be considered, it falls short in so much as a band director is also a music educator. If students were to experience this “Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band” exclusively, there is barely a 10% chance that they would encounter the music of Bach, Grainger, Vaughan Williams, and other historically significant composers. They would miss out, altogether, on many others including Mozart, Haydn, Brahms, and Beethoven, let alone significant marches, popular music, and world music. That is why any core or recommended repertoire list must be used judiciously.

With such glaring weaknesses exposed in this study, it should be incumbent upon music educators to seek more diverse, cultural, and historic repertoire to supplement original works for winds. If the demand exists, publishing companies will undoubtedly strive to meet it. Perhaps they would further engage many of the most recommended and prominent composers of this study to adapt these musical genres for greater accessibility to school band programs. While some may argue that such repertoire should displace the music largely created for educational purposes, the results of this study suggest that a carefully constructed balance between the two may best serve the needs of student musicians.

Suggestions for Future Research

If Budiansky and others are correct, student musicians heavily exposed to “educational music” at the expense of other genres will ultimately experience a disconnect from their musical and cultural heritage. This could negatively affect their lifelong appreciation for and participation in music. Whether or not this is true is

theoretical. Future longitudinal studies in this area could be very enlightening. A study of students' long-term engagement with music, comparing those heavily exposed to the historical and cultural music advocated by Budiansky with those who largely experienced educational music, would be extremely informative to educators assessing their programming options.

Works recommended less than three times in the survey were disqualified from consideration as the "Most Valued Repertoire for Middle-Level Band." Future studies could further evaluate such works that appeared in multiple core repertoire lists referenced for point of comparison in this study. This may help to ascertain their continued relevance as part of a possible core repertoire for middle-level band. Additional surveys utilizing the open-ended questions of this study could corroborate, supplement, or contradict the findings here. Works that achieved "Most Valued Repertoire" status could be subject to the similar scrutiny of previous studies where panels of experts judged the extent that they are of serious artistic merit.

This study relied upon the data provided by conductors of distinguished programs. Another interesting point of comparison could include a sampling of directors from programs that reflect average achievement levels. What are the similarities and differences in their repertoire choices? To what extent could the literature selection result in different levels of perceived success?

Acknowledging the dearth of participating programs from the Western regions of the United States in this study, similar research focused on the middle-level bands from that area could yield results that may or may not be consistent with the rest of the country. It might also help to explain their lack of participation in the nationally

recognized venues that were used to select band programs for this study, other than the simple conjecture of geographically related challenges.

The programs and directors serving as the basis for this study have distinguished themselves on a national level. Could supplementing, expanding, or replacing their oft-used “educational” repertoire with the “culturally relevant” repertoire advocated by Budiansky and others have a measurable impact on their success? Would their level of achievement improve, regress, or remain the same? Additional research in this area could shed some light.

As in all repertoire studies, periodic assessment is required to account for new works, contemporary trends, and long-term performance practices. Considering the sheer breadth and scope of newly introduced middle-level band works in this contemporary era, a study of this nature should take place minimally at five-year intervals. Ultimately, a core repertoire is never finalized, its relevance woven inextricably to that of the music it encompasses.

References

- Abril, C. (2006). Music that represents culture: selecting music with integrity. *Music Educators Journal*, 93(1), 38-45.
- Adams, B. (2002). Evaluating literature: a band director responsibility. *National Band Association Journal*, 43(2), 18-21.
- Akey, D. (2010). Standard repertoire for young band. Retrieved June 24, 2015 from <http://www.aboda.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/standardrepertoire.pdf>
- Allsup, R. E. (2003). Mutual learning and democratic action in instrumental music education. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 51(1), 24-37.
- Allsup, R. E. (2007). Democracy and one hundred years of music education. *Music Educators Journal*, 93(5), 52-56.
- Allsup, R. E., & Benedict, C. (2008). The problems of band, an inquiry into the future of instrumental music education. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 16, 156-173.
- American School Band Directors Association. (2014). *About ASBDA*. Retrieved May 6, 2014 from <http://www.asbda.com>.
- Anderson, L. (1993). Do bands really contribute to aesthetic sensitivity. *Journal of Band Research*, 9(2), 22-24.
- Andreoli, A. (2000). The quest for good music. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 7, 50-51.
- Apfelstadt, H. (2000). First things first. *Music Educators Journal*, 87(1), 19-22.
- Backes, A. (2010). *A multiple case study of six exemplary band directors repertoire Selection processes* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://etd.ohiolink.edu/view.cgi/Backes%20Aaron%20J.pdf?bgsu1268079057>
- Baker, J. L. (1997). *Mixed-wind chamber ensembles and repertoire: A status study of selected institutions of higher learning* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9801245)
- Barton, G. (2006). The debate on quality in band literature. *National Band Association Journal*, 47(2), 33, 36.
- Battisti, F. L. (1972). A high school wind ensemble program. *The Instrumentalist*, 26, 30-32.

- Battisti, F. L. (1989). My view of the wind repertoire 1900-59. *The Instrumentalist*, 44(3), 12-17, 05.
- Battisti, F. L. (1989). My view of the wind repertoire 1960-74. *The Instrumentalist*, 44(4), 16-20.
- Battisti, F. L. (1989). My view of the wind repertoire 1975-89. *The Instrumentalist*, 44(5), 19-22, 36.
- Battisti, F. L. (1995). Growing excellence in band literature. *The Instrumentalist*, 49(7), 16-20, 77.
- Battisti, F. L. (1995). *The 20th century American wind band/ensemble*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music Publications.
- Battisti, F. L. (1999). A taste for quality. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 6, 54-56.
- Battisti, F. L. (2002). *The winds of change, the evolution of the contemporary American wind band/ensemble and its conductor*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music Publications.
- Battisti, F. L. (2012). *The winds of change II, the new millenium*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music Publications.
- Battisti, F. L., Berz, W., & Girsberger, R. (2014). *Sourcebook for wind band and instrumental music*. Delray Beach, Florida: Meredith Music Publications.
- Bauer, W. (1996). The selection of concert band music by high school band directors. *Update*, 15(1), 4-9.
- Begian, H. (1991). Standards of excellence for band repertoire. *The Instrumentalist*, 45(6), 10-13, 55.
- Benson, W. (1998). On being emotionally moved at a band concert. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 5, 38-43.
- Bergee, M. (1989). Reform for the band program. *Music Educators Journal*, 7, 18-23.
- Berger, K. (1962). *Band music guide*. Evanston, IL. The Instrumentalist Company.
- Berry, Jr., L. (1975). A survey of band literature performed by the high schools and colleges of Iowa and Nebraska from 1968 – 1972. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 41, 58-60.

- Berz, W. (2000). Evaluating music in a multifaceted band world. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 7, 31-40.
- Berz, W. (2008). The state of the literature. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 15, 148-156.
- Birdwell, Cody. (2006). The selective music lists: valuable repertoire resources for all NBA members. *National Band Association Journal*, 46(3), 51-53.
- Black, D. (1986). Wanted quality band literature. *The Instrumentalist*, 41(1), 84.
- Blomhert, B. (2000). Quality in music, some thoughts. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 7, 48-49.
- Bodiford, K. G. (2012). *Evolution of contemporary college wind band repertoire and programming in the United States: 1800 —2010* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3550013)
- Brashier, J. (2000). The quest for good music: perspective from a university conductor. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 7, 61-63.
- Bruning, E. H. (1980). *A survey and handbook of analysis for the conducting and interpretation of seven selected works in the standard repertoire for wind band* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8120740)
- Bryan, P. (1972). The state of the repertoire: some observations and suggestions. *Journal of Band Research*, 9(1), 3-8.
- Budiansky, S. (2005). The kids played great but that music. Retrieved October 5, 2009, from <http://www.budiansky.com/wpost.html>
- Budiansky, S. (2009). Talk to WASBE Conference in Cincinnati. Retrieved October 5, 2009, from http://www.budiansky.com/music_files/budiansky%20wasbe%20journal%202009.pdf
- Budiansky, S. & Foley, T. (2005). The quality of repertoire in school music programs: literature review, analysis, and discussion. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 12, 17-39.
- Capperella-Sheldon, D. A. (1992). Self-perception of aesthetic experience among musicians and non-musicians in response to wind band music. *Journal of Band Research*, 28(1), 57-71.

- Cardany, B. M. (2006). *Attitudes toward repertoire and the band experience among participants in elite university wind band programs* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3210109).
- Casey, P. F. (1993). *A status study of nonselective concert bands at selected colleges and universities* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9401225).
- Carney, P. K. (2005). *Rankings and ratings of literature selection criteria among Florida public school wind band conductors* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3216579)
- Cicconi, C. M. (2012). *Band music, a handbook, a comprehensive catalog of band music written since 1995*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at Scholarly Repository
http://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1728&context=oa_dissertations
- Cipolla, F. & Hunsberger, D. (1994). *The wind ensemble and its repertoire: Essays on the fortieth anniversary of the Eastman Wind Ensemble*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1994.
- Cooper, L. (1994). *A study of core repertoire for the preparation of instrumental music educators* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9417232)
- Cooper, L. (2004). *Teaching band and orchestra*. Chicago, IL: GIA Publications.
- Crochet, L. S. (2006). *Repertoire selection practices of band directors as a function of teaching experience, training, instructional level, and degree of success* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3215250)
- Croft, J. (1997). The influence of literature on the development of bands. *The Instrumentalist*, 51(11), 40-55.
- Crompton, M. (2009). The developing band: responsible repertoire choices. *WASBE World*, 1(1), 34.
- Dancz, R. (1964). Selecting music for competition. *The Instrumentalist*, 18(6), 34-36.
- Darling, J. (2008). An overview of selected titles for wind band. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 15, 83-103.

- Del Borgo, E. A. (1988). Selecting quality literature for bands and orchestras. *The Instrumentalist*, 43(4), 22-26.
- Dewald, B. L. (2001). *The manuscript concert band works of the Goldman Band Library* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3018639)
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York, NY: Penguin Publishing.
- De Young, D. (1977). Music literature for band and wind ensembles. *Music Educators Journal*, 64(4), 26-29.
- Doran, J. (1956). A question of taste in high school band music. *Music Educators Journal*, 42(6), 55-58.
- Duarte, L. (1988). *Band music that works*. Burlingame, CA: Contrapuntal Publications.
- Duskin (1972). Transcriptions, choosing the best. *The Instrumentalist*, 27(4), 61-62.
- Dvorak, T. L. (1986). *Best music for young band*. Brooklyn, New York: Manhattan Beach Music.
- Dvorak, T. L. (1993). *Best music for high school band*. Brooklyn, NY: Manhattan Beach Music.
- Dvorak, T. L. (2000). *Best music for beginning band*. Brooklyn, New York: Manhattan Beach Music.
- Elliott, D. J. (1995). *Music matters, a new philosophy of music education*. New York, NY: Oxford Press.
- Feldsher, H. (1972). Successful music for the young band. *The Instrumentalist*, 26(10), 63-64.
- Fennell, F. (1954). *Time and the winds*. Kenosha, WI: Leblanc Publications.
- Fennell, F. (1999). Keynote address. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 6, 7-10.
- Fennell, F. (2008). *A conductor's interpretative analysis of masterworks for band*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music Publications.
- Ferrin, C. (1987). Selecting music for school ensemble. *The Instrumentalist*, 42(2), 61-63.
- Fiese, R. K. (1987). College and university wind band repertoire. *Journal of Band Research*, 23(1), 17-42.

- Fiese, R. K. (1990). The effects of nonmusical cues on the rankings of musical scores by undergraduate conducting students based on judgments of quality. *Journal of Band Research*, 25(2), 13-21.
- Fiese, R. K. (1993). An examination of public secondary school band directors' qualitative judgments. *Journal of Band Research*, 28(2), 27-36.
- Fjeld, M. W. (1959). *A survey and evaluation of music performed in public concert by Indiana high school bands* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 5906578)
- Fleming, R. L. (2001). *The relationship between performing in a "sophisticated" band program and the ability to judge "sophisticated" wind band literature* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3014347)
- Fonder, M. (2000). Educational quality vs. artistic quality in band literature. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 7, 22-30.
- Fonder, M. (2009). A factory, a county fair, or a crucible. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 16, 93-98.
- Foster, R. (1999). The finest band works of the past fifty years. *The Instrumentalist*, 53(6), 77-84.
- Foundation for Music Excellence. (2015). *Mark of Excellence National Wind Band Honors Registration Packet*. Retrieved June 2, 2015 from <http://www.foundationformusiceducation.org/mark-of-excellence>.
- Gabriel, A. (1984). New Concert Repertoire. *The Instrumentalist*, 39(5), 13-15.
- Gage, S. (2000). The importance of repertoire selection for the band director. *National Band Association Journal*, 41(2), 11-14.
- Gaines, D. A. (1996). *A core repertoire of concert music for high school band: a Descriptive study* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9635974)
- Gangware, E. (1984). Music, what's the best. *The School Musician Director and Teacher*, 56, 5-11.
- Garafalo, R. (1992). *Guide to band masterworks*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music Publications.
- Garafalo, R. (2000). *Blueprint for band*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music Publications.

- Gelpi, L. R. (1984). *College wind band programming: a suggested curriculum for undergraduate training* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8429828)
- Gilbert, J. W. (1993). *An evaluation of compositions for wind band according to specific Criteria of serious artistic merit: A replication and update* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9334685)
- Goldman, R. (1938). *The band's music*. New York, NY: Pitman Publishing Corporation.
- Goldman, R. (1961). *The wind band; its literature and technique*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Grant, G. S. (1993). *An evaluation by Missouri high school band directors of criteria used to select concert band music* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9423970)
- Good, M. (1983). A select bibliography of original concert band music, part II. *Journal of Band Research*, 19(1), 26-51.
- Grashel, J. (1989). Enrich the repertoire of your mid-level band. *Music Educators Journal*, 76(2), 45-46.
- Grechesky, R. (1998). Masterworks for grade 4 bands. *The Instrumentalist*, 53(2), 25-30.
- Greig, R. T. (2003). *Selection criteria ratings of performed music by high school band Directors in the state of Pennsylvania, and a comparison of ratings by collegiate band directors on selected works* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3124466)
- Halseth, R. E. P. (1987). *The impact of the College Band Directors National Association on wind band repertoire* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8721952)
- Hanna, D. (1963). Revolving repertoire for college band. *The Instrumentalist*, 18(4), 56.
- Hansen, R. (2005). *The American wind band a cultural history*. Chicago, IL: GIA Publications.
- Harris, B.P., & Walls, K.C. (1996). Young band repertoire project: a descriptive study of the subjective quality of potential core works. *Texas Music Education Research*. Retrieved December 4, 2009, from http://www.tmea.org/080_College/Research/har1996.pdf

- Hash, Philip M. (2005). Middle school band contest repertoire in northern Illinois: analysis and recommendations. Retrieved November 21, 2012, from <http://www.stthomas.edu/rimeonline/vol3/hash.htm>
- Hauswirth, F. (2013). WASBE and the core repertoire. *WASBE World*, 5(3), 8.
- Hawkins, B. (2009). Repertoire, a means to an end. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 16, 104-107.
- Hayes, C. D. (1998). *Six highly successful band conductors, and the development of their band programs* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9904846).
- Hayward, C. (2004). *A course in band literature based on a standard repertoire developed from the opinions of selected collegiate and secondary school band directors* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from http://etd.ohiolink.edu/sendpdf.cgi/Hayward%20Carol%20M.pdf?acc_num=osu1085879695
- Heidel, R. M. (2006). Selecting music, the search for the perfect piece. *National Band Association Journal*, 47(2), 24-26.
- Hemberger, G. J. (1988). Wind repertoire project. Unpublished manuscript. University of Colorado School of Music, Boulder, CO.
- Hilliard, Q. (1992). Choosing literature for young bands. *The Instrumentalist*, 46(6), 11-13, 23.
- Holvik, K. M. (1970). An emerging band repertory, a survey of the members of the College Band Directors National Association. *Journal of Band Research*, 6(2), 19-24.
- Holz, E. (1966). The national school band tournament of 1923 and its bands. *Journal of Band Research*, 3(1), 17-21.
- Honas, K. G. (1996). *An evaluation of compositions for mixed-chamber winds utilizing six to nine players: Based on Acton Ostling's study, "an evaluation of compositions for wind band according to specific criteria of serious artistic merit"* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9701851)
- Hopkins, M. (2013). Programming in the zone, repertoire selection for the large ensemble. *Music Educators Journal*, 99(4), 69-74.
- Hopwood, B. K. (1998). *Wind band repertoire: Programming practices at conventions of the College Band Directors National Association* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9825771)

- Hornyak, R. (1983). *The repertoire of the college and university band, 1975-1982*. Unpublished Manuscript. Paper presented at the College Band Directors National Association Conference, Atlanta, GA (March 19, 1983).
- Howard, R. (2001). *Repertoire selection practices and the development of a core repertoire for the middle school concert band* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3039773)
- Howell, Jr., C. (2013). *Chamber winds in the high school band: what, why, when, and how*. Handout for Florida Music Educators Association Conference. Retrieved December, 4, 2013 from <http://flmusiced.org/FLmusicApps/Sessions/Handouts/2013/ChamberWindsInHSBand.pdf>
- Hughes, B. (1990). Survey of band repertoire. *The Instrumentalist*, 45(4), 60-65.
- Hunsberger, D. (1977). Repertoire for wind conductors. *The Instrumentalist* 32(2), 44-46.
- Huttunen, M. (2008). The Historical Justification of Music. *Philosophy Of Music Education Review*, 16(1), 3-19.
- Instrumentalist Company. (1996). *Band music guide (9th ed.): Alphabetical listing of titles and composers of all band music*. Northfield: IL: The Instrumentalist Company.
- Jachens, D. (1987). The pedagogical approaches of eight important mid-western band conductors during the late 1920's and 1930's. *Journal of Band Research*, 22(2), 44-54.
- Janners, E. (2003). Reference books on band music. *The Instrumentalist*, 58(5), 52-56.
- Jones, P. (2005). A review of dissertations about concert band repertoire with applications for school and collegiate bands. *Journal of Band Research*, 40(2), 60-83.
- Jorgensen, E. (1997). *In search of music education*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Jorgensen, R. (1992). Picking and programming good music. *Band Director's Guide*, 6(4), 33-36.
- J. W. Pepper & Sons, Inc. (n.d.). *State and festival lists*. Retrieved November 17, 2015 from http://www.jwpepper.com/sheet-music/services-state-festival.jsp?utm_medium=internal&utm_campaign=StateFestivalLists&utm_source=HomeBanner&utm_pos=J:Home&utm_asset=Banner

- Kremp, P. (2010). Innovation and Selection: Symphony Orchestras and the Construction of the Musical Canon in the United States (1879-1959). *Social Forces*, 88(3), 1051-1082.
- King, R. E. (2001). *The quality and technical difficulty of repertoire performed by non-auditioned, small college bands and the criteria considered in the selection of this literature* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3022512)
- Kish, D. (2005). A band repertoire has emerged. *Journal of Band Research*, 41(1), 1-12.
- Knight, J. (1979). *Graphic analyses of the conducting techniques for irregular meters and non metrical organizations found in selected twentieth-century band literature* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Baton Rouge.
- Kohut, D. (1963). Aesthetics and music evaluation: separating the wheat from the chaff. *The Instrumentalist*, 46(4), 49-50, 52.
- Kohut, D. & Mohr-Sheahan, K. (1991). Selected elementary band literature. *The Instrumentalist*, 46(4), 49-52.
- Kreines, J. (1989). *Music for a concert band: A selective annotated guide to band literature*. Tampa, FL: Florida Music Service
- Kvet, E. (1996). *Instructional literature for middle-level band*. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Lance, E. & Aarhus, C. (2013). Building better musicians through thoughtful literature selection. *National Band Association Journal*, 53(4), 34-37.
- Ladd, J. S. (2009). *An annotated bibliography of contemporary works programmable by wind band and orchestra* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3385327)
- Leitzel, (2006). *The history and development of the american public school concert band, (1920 – 1941) and its influence on concert band repertoire* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3227365)
- Lenzini, C. (1996). Emerging band classics. *The Instrumentalist*, 51(4), 17-22, 27.
- Lisk, E. S. (1996). *Intangibles of music performance*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music Publications.

- Lyng, P. (2000). The quest for good music. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 7, 41-43.
- Mantie, R. (2012). Bands and/as music education antinomies and the struggle for legitimacy. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 20(1), 63-81.
- Mark, M. (1982). The evolution of music education philosophy from utilitarian to aesthetic. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 30(1), 15-21.
- Mark, M. & Gary, C. (2007). *A history of music education (3rd edition)*. Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield Publishers.
- Martin, F. (1957). Repertoire selection. *The School Musician*, 27, 59-60.
- McBeth, F. W. (1989). The band – artistic viability through literature. *The Instrumentalist*, 43(6), 92.
- McBeth, F. W. (1990). Perceiving music, personal evaluation of quality in music. *The Instrumentalist*, 45(5), 16-17.
- McBeth, F. W. (1995). The evolving band repertoire. *The Instrumentalist*, 50 (1), 20-23.
- McCathren, D. (1984). Programming – the key to a successful concert. *The School Musician Director and Teacher*, 56, 12-14.
- McMullian, N.E. (1997). *Music selection and concert programming of concert bands and wind ensembles in the Coalition of Christian Colleges and Universities* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9817853)
- Menghini, CT (1997). *New music, originally composed for the wind band medium performed at the Mid-West International Band and Orchestra Clinic, 1947-1996: Frequency of appearance in selected state and national music lists* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9819726)
- Mercer, J. (1972). Is the curriculum the score--or more? *Music Educators Journal*, 58(6), 51-53.
- Miller, Jeffrey Lee, II. (2013). *An evaluation of quality in compositions for school band (grades III and IV): A regional study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3596545)
- Miles, R. (Ed.). (1998-2015). *Teaching music through performance in band, volumes 1-10*. Chicago, IL: GIA Publications.

- Miles, R. (Ed.). (2015). *Teaching music through performance in middle school band*. Chicago, IL: GIA Publications.
- Misenhelter, D. (2000). Desperately seeking status. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 7, 44-47.
- Moore, P. A. (2001). *An identification of a sacred repertoire for wind band and rationale for its performance in worship contexts by wind bands in the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3004893)
- Music for All National Festival. (2015). *Application and adjudicators*. Retrieved January 9, 2015 from <http://www.musicforall.org>.
- National Band Association. (2013). *Selective music list*. Retrieved December 2, 2013 from <http://www.nationalbandassociation.org/selections.html>.
- Neilson, J. (1964). The aesthetics of programming. *Journal of Band Research*, 1(1), 21-28.
- Neilson, J. (2009). Quality in music. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 16, 139-140.
- Nelson, R. B. (1994). Aesthetics in the band room. *Music Educators Journal*, 80(4), 24-27.
- Nicholson, C. (2009). *Great music for wind band, a guide to the top 100 works in grades iv, v, vi*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music Publications.
- Oliver, T. W. (2012). A comparison and analysis of published lists of recommended wind band literature. *Journal of Band Research*, 47(2), 43-63.
- Olson, R. H. (1982). A core repertoire for the wind band. *Journal of Band Research*, 18(1), 11-15.
- Ostling, A. E., Jr. (1978). *An evaluation of composition for wind band according to Specific criteria of serious artistic merit* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 7822438)
- Ostling, A. E. Jr., (1979). College band repertoire. *The Instrumentalist*, 33(12), 20-22.
- Paul, T. A. (2011). Pac-Ten wind ensemble programming trends. *Journal of Band Research*, 47(1), 49-55.
- Persellin, D. (2000). The importance of high-quality literature. *Music Educators Journal*, 87(1), 17-18.

- Peterson, D. L. (1986). *The university band: Its repertoire and the prospective music educator*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8702945)
- Peterson, S. G. (1991). *A survey of concert programming techniques employed by selected college and university wind conductors in the United States*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9130771)
- Prentice, B. (1986). Selecting music for young bands. *The Instrumentalist*, 41(2), 55-58.
- Price, H. (1990). Orchestral programming 1982-1987: An indication of musical taste. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 106, 23-35.
- Powell, S. (2009). Recent programming trends of Big Ten university wind ensembles. *Journal of Band Research*, 44(2), 1-12.
- Rehrig, W. (1991). *The heritage encyclopedia of band music: Composers and their music*. Waterville, OH: Integrity Press.
- Reimer, B. (2003). *A philosophy of music education, advancing the vision (3rd ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Reynolds, H. R. (2015). Easier band repertoire. Retrieved June 24, 2015 from <http://nzcba.org/newsite/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/ReynoldsEasierRe.pdf>
- Reynolds, H. R. (2000). Repertoire is the curriculum. *Music Educators Journal*, 87(1), 31-33.
- Reynolds, H. R., Corporon, E., McMurray, A., DeRusha, S. Grechesky, R. (1975). *Wind ensemble literature*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Bands.
- Reynish, T. (2009). Repertoire. Retrieved October 5, 2009 from <http://www.timreynish.com/repsecschool.html>
- Reynish, T. (2009). The good – the bad – the ugly. *WASBE World*, 1(1), 12-18.
- Rhea, T. B. (1999). *An evaluation of wind band compositions in the Texas public school setting according to specific criteria of artistic merit* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9929178)
- Rhodes, S. (2013). Finding high-quality music. *The Instrumentalist*, 68(2), 22-24, 46-47.
- Robinson, M. (1997). A progressive repertoire, the English folk song. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 4, 31-44.

- Rocco, R. (1991). Band music and the paper-plate mentality. *The Instrumentalist*, 46(5), 12-15.
- Rogers, R. (2004). Music selection for the high school band. *Tennessee Musician*, 57(1), 28-31.
- Rosene, P. (1981). Why not purchase quality music for your bands? *The Instrumentalist*, 35(6), 96.
- Ross, C. (1972). Successful repertoire for the junior high school band. *The Instrumentalist*, 27(2), 33.
- Salzman, T. (2003-2012). *A composer's insight, volumes 1-5*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music Publications.
- Saville, K. (1991). Divergent music lists. *The Instrumentalist*, 46(3), 50-53.
- Schaefer, W. (1967). Is there an emerging band repertoire? *The Instrumentalist*, 21(9), 50-52.
- Schmalz, P. (1990). Improving band literature. *The Instrumentalist*, 45(3), 54-58.
- Sheldon, D. A. (1996). Preservice and in-service teachers' perceptions of band music content and quality using self-report and behavioral measures. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 48(1), 10-25.
- Sheldon, D. (1996). Selecting music for beginning and developing bands. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 6(1), 6-15.
- Slagley, C. L. (1992). *A comparative study of the performed repertoire of Texas high school honor bands, 1980-1989* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9130771)
- Smith, N. & Stoutamire A. (1979). *Band music notes*. San Diego, CA: Neil A. Kjos Music Company.
- Smith, N. (1986). *March music notes*. Lake Charles, LA: Program Notes Press.
- Smith, N. (2001). *Program notes for band*. Chicago, IL: GIA Publications.
- Somers, P. (2000). Band games. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 7, 19-21.
- Spradling, R. (1983). Selecting the right composition. *The Instrumentalist*, 37(13), 14-15.

- Spurlin, C. (2010). Chamber wind literature for developing bands. Handout for the Alabama Music Educators Association Conference. Retrieved December 4, 2013 from http://www.alabamamea.org/Clinic_Handouts/Chamber%20Wind%20Handout.pdf
- Stevenson, J. (2003). *A survey and meta-analysis of selective wind band/ensemble music lists for the purpose of determining core repertoire at all difficulty levels* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Peabody Conservatory of Music, Baltimore, MA.
- Stevenson, J. (2004). Most Recommended Band Music On 25 States' Selective Lists. *The Instrumentalist*, 59(2), 18-22.
- Suk, R. (2003). *Repertoire selection practices of class B and C Illinois high school bands* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (UMI No. 3101976).
- Stamp, J. (1998). Composing music that educates. In R. Miles (ed.), *Teaching music through performance in band, Vol. 2*. Chicago, IL: GIA Publications.
- Tanner, D. & Tanner, L. (2007). *Curriculum development, theory into practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Tarwater, W. H. (1958). *Analysis of seven major band compositions of the twentieth-century* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 5901119)
- Teachout, D. J. (1993). The importance of musical environmental performance and referential factors on junior high band students preference for performance literature. *Contributions to Music Education*, 1(20), 25-31.
- Terrasi, S. (1998). Creating history with new repertoire: an interview with Gary Green. *The Instrumentalist*, 52(6), 14-17.
- Thomas, R. D. (1998). *An evaluation of compositions for wind band, grades III and IV, according to specific criteria of artistic merit* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9834949)
- Thomson, J. (1998). The repertoire is the curriculum. *The Instrumentalist*, 53(4), 10-13.
- Thomson, J. (2014). Some great music for middle school bands. *The Instrumentalist*, 68(7), 18-21, 45-46.
- Traphagan, W. (1970). The wind ensemble, a quest for identity. *The Instrumentalist*, 24(6), 46-47.

- Trimborn, T. J. (1984). *The classification of compositions for the development of model instructional units for the purpose of teaching the musical concepts of rhythm, melody, harmony, or texture to high school band students* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8502447)
- Towner, C. N. (2011). *An evaluation of composition for wind according to specific criteria of serious artistic merit: a second update* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3465178)
- Towner, C. N. (2013). A core repertoire based upon set criteria of serious artistic merit. *Journal of Band Research*, 48(2), 50-75.
- Turner, C. J. (2003). The wind band concert: a bleak future? A qualitative study. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 10, 48-65.
- Tutt, K. J. (2002). *High school band members criteria for evaluating performed music: A collective case study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3077596)
- Vagner, R. (1958). A basic band repertory. *The Instrumentalist*, 13(4), 38.
- Votta, M. (2003). *The wind band and its repertoire*. Miami, FL: Warner Bros. Publications.
- Waguespack, G. E. (2000). *A review of grade one (1) band literature found on the university interscholastic league list of prescribed music for band from 1967 to 1998* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9988366)
- Wallace, D. & Corporon, E. (1984). *Wind ensemble band repertoire*. Greeley, CO: University of Northern Colorado Bands.
- Wareham, D. E. (1967). *The development and evaluation of objective criteria for grading band music into six levels of difficulty* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 6812014).
- Welch, M. (1984). The Goldman band library (part I). *Journal of Band Research*, 19(2), 26-30.
- Welker, G. (1988). Band director's report card: rate your repertoire. *The Instrumentalist*, 43(4), 77-78.
- Weller, T. (2010). Choosing repertoire for middle school band. Retrieved from <http://travisjweller.com/2010/04/07/choosing-repertoire-for-middle-school-band/>

- Wheeler, S. (2007). Great works for middle school bands. *The Instrumentalist*, 62(2), 24-28, 51.
- Whitwell, D. (1965). Three crises in band repertoire. *The Instrumentalist*, 19(8), 36-37, 69-70.
- Whitwell, D. (1972). *A new history of wind music*. Evanston, IL: The Instrumentalist Company.
- Whitwell, D. (1998). Introductory thoughts on the role of emotion in early music. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 5, 5-17.
- Whitwell, D. (1999). The quest for good music. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 6, 64-65.
- Whitwell, D. (2010). *A concise history of wind music*. Austin, TEXAS: Whitwell Publications.
- Whitwell, D. (1982-2012). *The history and literature of the wind band and wind Ensemble, volumes 1-13*. Austin, TEXAS: Whitwell Publications.
- Wiggins, T. D. (2013). *Analytical research of wind band core repertoire*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3596604)
- Williams, K. E. (1998). *Rationale for selecting wind band literature: A decade of performance frequency and festival adjudication* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9839779)
- Wilson, J. M. (1950). *A selection and critical survey of music originally written for the symphonic band* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 0173204)
- Winther, R. (2004). *An annotated guide to wind chamber music for six to eighteen players*. Miami, FL: Warner Bros.
- Wuorinen, C. (2000). An elevated wind music. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, 7, 15-18.
- Young, C. S. (1998). *The quality of repertoire chosen by high school wind band conductors and the resources and criteria used to choose this literature* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9911293)

Appendix A:

Sample Email Invitation to NBA Middle School Band Representatives

Dear _____:

As a long-time member of the National Band Association, I am reaching out to the organization for assistance in research that I hope will be beneficial to many of its members. Along with my work as a band director at Hofstra University and Garden City High School in New York, I am also a doctoral candidate in music education and wind conducting at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, New Jersey. I am currently working on a doctoral dissertation entitled, *The Bridge to the Core Repertoire: Programming Trends of Distinguished Middle-Level Bands*. Your expertise can be of great assistance in conducting and sharing research that can be beneficial to developing instrumental music programs.

In addition to requesting your participation in this study, I would greatly appreciate your help in identifying approximately 10 or more directors of the most accomplished school bands with students in grades 6 through 9. They may be located within your region or anywhere in the nation. These directors will also be contacted for the purposes of completing an online survey on repertoire and programming practices.

The study procedure is in the form of an email invitation with a link that will bring participants to the website www.SurveyMonkey.com. In the survey, respondents are asked to answer a few questions pertaining to repertoire selection, and then list up to 20 of their most valued works for middle-level band students. It will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

If you are able to assist me, please email me the names, email addresses, and school affiliations of leading experts on middle-level band programs that you believe would be appropriate for this study. My email address is jamespmccrann@aol.com, and I can also be reached at 516-457-3898. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Thank you very much for your time and assistance in this matter, and best wishes for much continued success with your students.

Sincerely,

James P. McCrann

Appendix B:

Sample Email to ASBDA Officers

Dear (ASBDA President/Past-President/Secretary):

My name is James P. McCrann, I am a doctoral candidate in music education and wind conducting at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, N.J., and a band director at Hofstra University and Garden City High School in New York. I am writing with regard to a research study that I am conducting in conjunction with my doctoral dissertation entitled, *The Bridge to the Core Repertoire: Programming Trends of Distinguished Middle-Level Bands*. The main purpose of this research is to determine if a core repertoire for middle-level band programs (consisting of students in grades 6, 7, 8, and/or 9) exists, perhaps one that can serve as a programming model for school bands across the nation.

I wanted to explore the possibility of conferring with the members of the American School Band Directors Association who have taught students in grades 6 through 9. Based on the experience and expertise of the membership of ASBDA, these teachers can offer unique insight, which I hope, can ultimately serve as an invaluable resource for members of ASBDA and middle-level band directors at large.

I wish to invite ASBDA middle-level band directors to join a group of their counterparts from other highly accomplished middle school band programs across the country (already identified through other means) to participate in an online survey of repertoire. In the survey, respondents are asked to answer a few questions pertaining to repertoire selection, and then list up to 20 of their most valued works for middle-level band students. It will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

This research is anonymous meaning that I will record no information that could identify participants. Those agreeing to take part in the study will be assigned a link with a random code that is tied to this survey and their email address. Names will appear only on a list of subjects, and will not be linked to the assigned code number. There will be no way to associate responses with an individual. There are no foreseeable risks to this study, participation is voluntary, and participants are free not to answer any questions with which they are uncomfortable. All procedures are under the approval of the Rutgers University Institutional Review Board.

I would greatly appreciate any thoughts or suggestions that you might have about including members of the ASBDA in this research. As much as I would value the knowledge that members of the ASBDA can offer, I do understand that there may be circumstances that could make this request unfeasible for your organization. Please feel free to contact me at this email address, jamespmccrann@aol.com, or call my cell phone at 516-457-3898 with any questions, concerns, or advice that you may have. I am open to any ideas that could facilitate this study. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

James P. McCrann

Appendix C:

Sample Email Invitation to Directors Participating in the Survey

Dear Director:

My name is James P. McCrann, I am a doctoral candidate in music education and wind conducting at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, N.J., and a band director at Hofstra University and Garden City High School in New York. I am writing to invite you to participate in a research study that I am conducting in conjunction with my doctoral dissertation entitled, *The Bridge to the Core Repertoire: Programming Trends of Distinguished Middle-Level Bands*.

The purpose of this research is to determine if a core repertoire for middle-level bands (encompassing students in grades 6, 7, 8, and/or 9) exists and to identify successful practices of distinguished programs like yours. As the director of a band program of national distinction, you are one of approximately 200 expert music teachers recommended to participate in this study. The unique insight that you provide can be of invaluable assistance to developing band programs throughout the nation.

The following link will bring you to an online survey pertaining to your repertoire selection. It will take approximately 15 minutes to complete:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/middlelevelrepertoire>

When you click on the link to the online survey, you will be brought to a preliminary set of instructions reiterating the terms of consent. You will be asked, “Do you understand and agree to the terms of consent in this study?” You must click on “Yes” in order to participate. If “No” is selected, then consent is not granted and responses to the questions cannot be submitted.

This research is anonymous meaning that I will record no information about you that could identify you. This means that I will not record your name, address, phone number, date of birth, etc. If you agree to take part in the study, you will be assigned a link with a random code that is tied to this survey and your email address. Your name will appear only on a list of subjects, and will not be linked to the code number that is assigned to you. There will be no way to link your responses back to you. Therefore, data collection is anonymous.

The research team and the Institutional Review Board at Rutgers University are the only ones that will be allowed to see the data, except as may be required by law. If a report of this study is published, or the results are presented at a professional conference, only group results will be stated. All study data will be kept for three years and then deleted or destroyed.

There are no foreseeable risks to participation in this study. Possible benefits may include the opportunity to provide important insight to developing middle-level band programs and their directors on the methods and materials that have proven to be successful in your program. However, you may receive no direct benefit from taking part in this study.

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate, and you may withdraw at any time during the study procedures without any penalty to you. In addition, you may choose not to answer any questions with which you are not comfortable.

If you have any questions about the study or study procedures, do not hesitate to contact me via email at jamespmccrann@aol.com, or by telephone at 516-457-3898.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the IRB Administrator at Rutgers University at:

Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey
Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
3 Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8559

Tel: 848-932-0150

Email: humansubjects@orsp.rutgers.edu

Thank you very much for your time and consideration in this study, and best wishes for much continued success with your program.

Sincerely,

James P. McCrann

Appendix D:

Online Survey of the Repertoire of Distinguished Middle-Level Bands

Survey of the Repertoire of Distinguished Middle Level Bands

1. Introduction

Dear Director:

As the director of a band program of national distinction, you are one of a small group of teachers recommended to participate in a study on the core repertoire for middle level bands. This survey is part of a doctoral dissertation on the repertoire and practices of exemplary programs like yours. The unique insight that you provide can be of invaluable assistance to developing band programs throughout the nation.

The following survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. You are asked to answer questions pertaining to your selection of repertoire, and then to recommend 20 of your most valued works on the basis of their pedagogical and artistic value.

If you agree to participate, please accept the terms of consent before continuing on to the survey. Thank you very much for your time and consideration in this study.

Sincerely,

James P. McGrann
DMA Candidate
Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ

**Survey of the Repertoire of Distinguished Middle Level Bands
**

*** The Terms of Consent for participation in this survey are as follows:**

This research is anonymous meaning that I will record no information about you that could identify you. This means that I will not record your name, address, phone number, date of birth, etc. Your name will appear only on a list of subjects, and will not be linked to the code number that is assigned to you. There will be no way to link your responses back to you. Therefore, data collection is anonymous.

The research team and the Institutional Review Board at Rutgers University are the only ones that will be allowed to see the data, except as may be required by law. If a report of this study is published, or the results are presented at a professional conference, only group results will be stated. All study data will be kept for three years and then deleted or destroyed.

There are no foreseeable risks to participation in this study. Possible benefits may include the opportunity to provide important insight to developing middle school band programs and their directors on the methods and materials that have proven to be successful in your program. However, you may receive no direct benefit from taking part in this study.

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate, and you may withdraw at any time during the study procedures without any penalty to you. In addition, you may choose not to answer any questions with which you are not comfortable.

Do you understand and agree to the terms of consent for this study? Please choose "yes" to continue on to the survey. If you choose "no," consent is not granted to participate in this study.

☐ YES

☐ NO

Survey of the Repertoire of Distinguished Middle Level Bands

2. Background Information

In what region do you teach?

- ☐ EASTERN (CT, DE, ME, MD, MA, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT, DC)
- ☐ N. CENTRAL (IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, NE, OH, SD, WI)
- ☐ SOUTHERN (AL, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV)
- ☐ SOUTHWESTERN (AR, CO, KS, MO, NM, OK, TX)
- ☐ WESTERN (CA, HI, UT, AZ, NV)
- ☐ NORTHWESTERN (AK, ID, MT, OR, WA, WY)

How many years have you taught?

- ☐ 0-4 ☐ 5-9 ☐ 10-14 ☐ 15-19 ☐ 20+

What is the highest degree you have attained?

- ☐ Bachelors
- ☐ Artist Diploma
- ☐ Masters
- ☐ Masters + additional credits
- ☐ Doctorate

What grade levels do you teach? (check all that apply)

- ☐ Grade 6 ☐ Grade 7 ☐ Grade 8 ☐ Grade 9

From the selections below, please rank in order, from highest (1) to lowest (4) priority, the most important factors you consider in selecting repertoire.

<input type="text"/>	Artistic (musical) value of the music
<input type="text"/>	Pedagogical (educational) value of the music
<input type="text"/>	Appeal of the music to the students
<input type="text"/>	Appeal of the music to the audience (parents, administrators, community members etc.)

Survey of the Repertoire of Distinguished Middle Level Bands

3. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following:

Original works for winds and percussion are an essential part of the repertoire that should be experienced by middle level band students.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Marches are an essential part of the repertoire that should be experienced by middle level band students.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Transcriptions (adapted or simplified from orchestral or band mediums) are an essential part of the repertoire that should be experienced by middle level band students.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Popular music (including arrangements of rock, jazz, movie, theater, and commercial music) are an essential part of the repertoire that should be experienced by middle level band students.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

American folk music is an essential part of the repertoire that should be experienced by middle level band students.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Music from other world cultures is an essential part of the repertoire that should be experienced by middle level band students.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

It is important to have a core repertoire for middle level bands (a body of exceptional works that warrant repeated performances over time and wide-scale exposure to middle level band students).

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Survey of the Repertoire of Distinguished Middle Level Bands

4. Your 20 Most Valued Works for Middle Level Band

Please list your 20 most valuable works for middle-level band student (or as many as you deem appropriate up to 20). Middle-level band students include those in grades 6, 7, 8, and/or 9.

For each, list the title of the piece and the composer/arranger in the comment box.

Based upon your personal knowledge and opinion of each, indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics.

"Artistic Value" – The director believes this piece meets the criteria for serious artistic merit, which includes elements of superior form, shape, craftsmanship, unpredictability, consistency in style, ingenuity, and musical validity beyond educational purposes.

"Pedagogical Value" – The director believes this work is effective in fostering the technical development of students in school ensembles. The piece may also include such characteristics as formulaic compositional techniques, extensive block scoring and cross-cueing, with ranges and keys limited to what is developmentally appropriate at various age levels.

"Likelihood of Repeating" indicates the extent to which the director is inclined to program this piece in the future.

"Should be Part of a Core Repertoire" – The director believes this work should be identified as an exceptional work that warrants repeated performances over time. It has, or will emerge as part of a body of literature to which middle level band students should be exposed on a wide-scale basis.

WORK #1: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

5. Work #2

WORK #2: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

6. Work #3

WORK #3: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

7. Work #4

WORK #4: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

8. Work #5

WORK #5: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

9. Work #6

WORK #6: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

10. Work #7

WORK #7: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics.

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

11. Work #8

WORK #8: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics.

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

12. Work #9

WORK #9: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics.

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

13. Work #10

WORK #10: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

14. Work #11

WORK #11: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

15. Work #12

WORK #12: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

16. Work #13

WORK #13: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

17. Work #14

WORK #14: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

18. Work #15

WORK #15: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

19. Work #16

WORK #16: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

20. Work #17

WORK #17: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

21. Work #18

WORK #18: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

22. Work #19

WORK #19: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

23. Work #20

WORK #20: In the comment box, please list the title and composer/arranger of a work you deem most valuable. Indicate the extent of the correlation between the work and each of the following characteristics:

	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Highest
Artistic Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pedagogical Value	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of Repeating Piece	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Should be Part of a Core Repertoire	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

List Title and Composer/Arranger

24. Thank You

Thank you very much for your participation in this survey!

Appendix E

Middle-Level Bands Performing at the Midwest Clinic 2003 - 2014

1. Aledo Middle School Honor Winds, Aledo, Texas in 2013
2. Antoinette Reading Junior High School Honors Band, Richmond, Texas in 2014
3. Bailey Middle School Wind Ensemble, Austin, Texas in 2004
4. Beaumont Middle School Symphonic Band, Lexington, Kentucky in 2005
5. Canyon Ridge Middle School Honor Band, Austin, Texas in 2014
6. Cedar Park Middle School Symphonic Band, Cedar Park, Texas in 2007
7. Cinco Ranch Junior High School Honors Band, Katy, Texas in 2004 and 2012
8. Clarksville Middle School Wind Ensemble, Clarksville, Maryland in 2009
9. Claughton Middle School Symphonic Band, Houston, Texas in 2011
10. Clint Small Middle School Wind Ensemble, Austin, Texas in 2008
11. Coyle Middle School Honors Band, Rowlett, Texas in 2003
12. Creekside Middle School Wind Symphony, Carmel, Indiana in 2013
13. Cross Timbers Middle School Honors Band, Grapevine, Texas in 2011
14. Doerre Intermediate School Honor Band, Klein, Texas in 2006
15. Downing Middle School Symphonic Band, Flower Mound, Texas in 2005
16. Farmington Junior High Symphonic Band, Farmington, Utah in 2011
17. Faubion Middle School Symphonic Band, McKinney, Texas in 2012
18. Forbes Middle School Honors Band, Georgetown, Texas in 2009
19. George Junior High School Symphonic Band, Rosenberg, Texas in 2014
20. Grisham Middle School Honors Band, Austin Texas in 2003, 2008, and 2013
21. Henry Middle School Honors Band, Cedar Park, Texas in 2010

22. Hill Country Middle School Symphonic Band, Austin, Texas in 2006
23. Indian Springs Middle School Band, Keller, Texas in 2014
24. Kealing Middle School Wind Ensemble, Austin, Texas in 2010
25. Krimmel Intermediate School Symphonic Band, Spring, Texas in 2009
26. Mabry Middle School Symphonic Band, Marietta, Georgia in 2007
27. Maryville Intermediate School 6th Grade Wind Ensemble, Maryville, Tennessee
in 2007
28. McCracken Middle School Symphonic Band, Skokie, Illinois in 2006 and 2013
29. North Ridge Middle School Honors Band, North Richland Hills, Texas in 2005
30. Rising Starr Middle School Symphonic Band, Fayetteville, Georgia in 2003 and
2008
31. Shadow Ridge Middle School Honor Winds, Flower Mound, Texas in 2012
32. Tapp Middle School Symphonic Band, Powder Springs, Georgia in 2004
33. West Ridge Middle School Wind Ensemble, Austin, Texas in 2010

Appendix F

Middle-level Bands Performing at the *Music for All Festival*, 2012 - 2014

1. Bailey Middle School, Spring, Texas
2. Brandenburg Middle School, Garland, Texas
3. Bumpus Middle School, Birmingham, Alabama
4. Charleston County School for the Arts Middle School, North Charleston,
South Carolina
5. Clarendon Hills Middle School, Clarendon Hills, Illinois
6. Clay Middle School, Carmel, Indiana
7. Conner Middle School, Hebron, Kentucky
8. Coyle Middle School, Rowlett, Texas
9. Deerpark Middle School, Austin, Texas
10. Dickerson Middle School, Marietta, Georgia
11. Durham Middle School, Acworth, Georgia
12. Farmington Junior High School, Farmington, Utah
13. First Colony Middle School, Sugar Land, Texas
14. Fort Settlement Middle School, Sugar Land, Texas
15. Gifford Middle School, Vero Beach, Florida
16. Griffin Middle School, The Colony, Texas
17. Harpool Middle School, Lantana, Texas
18. Hendrix Junior High School, Chandler, Arizona
19. Hightower Trail Middle School, Marietta, Georgia
20. Hill Country Middle School, Austin, Texas

21. Hopewell Middle School, Milton, Georgia
22. Kealing Middle School, Austin, Texas
23. Lamar Middle School and Fine Arts Academy, Austin, Texas
24. Mason Middle School Symphonic Winds, Mason, Ohio
25. North Middle School, Radcliff, Kentucky
26. Pizitz Middle School, Vestavia Hills, Alabama
27. Rising Starr Middle School, Fayetteville, Georgia
28. River Trail Middle School, Johns Creek, Georgia
29. Riverwatch Middle School, Suwanee, Georgia
30. Sartartia Middle School, Sugar, Land, Texas
31. Simpson Middle School, Marietta, Georgia
32. Waller Junior High School, Waller, Texas

Appendix G

Mark of Excellence National, State or Commended Winner

Middle-level Bands 2008 - 2014

1. Aledo Middle School Honor Winds, Aledo, Texas
2. Alvin Junior High Symphonic Band, Alvin, Texas
3. American Fork Junior High Wind Ensemble, American Fork, Utah
4. Arbor Creek Middle School Honors Band, Carrollton, Texas
5. Bailey Middle School Wind Ensemble, Austin, Texas
6. Bayside Intermediate School Symphonic I Band, League City, Texas
7. Beaumont Middle School Band, Lexington, Kentucky
8. Beck Junior High Symphonic Band, Katy, Texas
9. Beckendorff Junior High Honor Band, Katy, Texas
10. Bonham Middle School Symphonic Band, Amarillo, Texas
11. Bottenfield MS Band, Adamsville, Alabama
12. Brown Middle School Symphonic Band, Forney, Texas
13. Byrd MS Symphonic I Band, Duncanville, Texas
14. Canyon Junior High Honors Band, Canyon, Texas
15. Canyon Ridge Middle School Honor Band, Austin, Texas
16. Canyon Vista Middle School Honors Band, Austin, Texas
17. Carroll Middle School Wind Ensemble, Southlake, Texas
18. Cedar Park Middle School Symphonic Ban, Cedar Park, Texas
19. Cedar Valley Middle School Honors Band, Austin, Texas
20. Chisholm Trail Honor Band, Round Rock, Texas

21. Clint Small Middle School Wind Ensemble, Austin, Texas
22. Coakley Middle School Symphonic Band, Harlingen, Texas
23. Cobb Middle School Symphonic Band, Frisco, Texas
24. Cockrill Middle School Symphonic I Band, McKinney, Texas
25. Conner Middle School Symphonic Band, Hebron, Kentucky
26. Cook Middle School Symphonic I Band, Houston, Texas
27. Coppell Middle School North Honor Winds, Coppell, Texas
28. Creek Valley Middle School Honor Winds, Carrollton, Texas
29. Creekwood Middle School Symphonic Band, Kingwood, Texas
30. Cross Timbers Middle School Honors Band, Grapevine, Texas
31. Danny Jones Middle School Honors Band, Mansfield, Texas
32. DeSoto West Middle School Wind Symphony, DeSoto, Texas
33. Dickerson Middle School Symphonic Band, Marietta, Georgia
34. Discovery Middle School 8th Grade Band, Granger, Indiana
35. Dodgen Middle School 8th Grade Band, Marietta, Georgia
36. Doerre Intermediate School Band, Klein, Texas
37. Dowell Middle School Symphonic I Band, McKinney, Texas
38. Downing MS Symphonic Band, Flower Mound, Texas
39. Dulles Middle School Honor Band, Sugar Land, Texas
40. Cedar Bluff Middle School Festival Band, Knoxville, Tennessee
41. Ennis Middle School Wind Ensemble, Ennis, Texas
42. Falcon Cove Middle School Wind Ensemble I, Weston, Florida
43. Faubion Middle School Wind Ensemble, McKinney, Texas

44. Flour Bluff Jr. High Honors Band, Corpus Christi, Texas
45. Forbes Middle School Honors Band, Georgetown, Texas
46. Fort Settlement Middle School Honors Band, Sugar Land, Texas
47. Fossil Hill Middle School Honor Band, Fort Worth, Texas
48. Fowler Middle School Symphonic Band, Plano, Texas
49. Glenn C Jones Middle School Honor Band, Buford, Georgia
50. Gorzycki Middle School Wind Ensemble, Austin, Texas
51. Grisham Middle School Honors Band, Round Rock, Texas
52. Hedrick Middle School Honors Band, Lewisville, Texas
53. Henry Middle School Honors Band, Cedar Park, Texas
54. Hernandez Middle School Honor Wind Ensemble, Round Rock, Texas
55. Hightower Trail 8th Grade Symphonic Band, Marietta, Georgia
56. Jackson Middle School Band, San Antonio, Texas
57. Joaquin Miller Middle School Advanced Band, San Jose, California
58. John F. Dulles Middle School Honor Band, Sugar Land, Texas
59. Kealing Middle School Wind Ensemble, Austin, Texas
60. Kelly Lane Middle School Wind Ensemble, Pflugerville, Texas
61. Knox Junior High Wind Ensemble, The Woodlands, Texas
62. Lake Jackson Intermediate Symphonic Band, Lake Jackson, Texas
63. League City Intermediate Band, League City, Texas
64. Leander Middle School Symphonic Band, Leander, Texas
65. Longfellow Middle School Symphonic Band, Falls Church, Virginia
66. Lopez Middle School Honors Band, San Antonio, Texas

67. Madisonville Junior High School Concert Band, Madisonville, Louisiana
68. Maus Middle School Band Wind Ensemble, Frisco, Texas
69. McCullough Junior High School Wind Ensemble, The Woodlands, Texas
70. McKamy Middle School Honor Winds, Flower Mound, Texas
71. McMeans Junior High School Symphonic Band, Katy, Texas
72. Mountainside Middle School 8th Grade Band, Scottsdale, Arizona
73. Murphy Middle School Symphonic Band, Murphy, Texas
74. Niu Valley Middle School Concert Band, Honolulu, Hawaii
75. Nolan Ryan Junior High Wind Ensemble, Pearland, Texas
76. North Richland Middle School Honors Band, N. Richland Hills, Texas
77. North Ridge Middle School Select Band, North Richland Hills, Texas
78. Oliver Middle School Advanced Band, Nashville, Tennessee
79. Pioneer Heritage Middle School Symphonic Band, Frisco, Texas
80. R. B. Stewart Middle School Band, Zephyrhills, Florida
81. Ranch View Middle School 8th Grade Band, Highlands Ranch, Colorado
82. Reynolds Middle School Wind Symphony, Prosper, Texas
83. Rice Middle School Wind Ensemble, Plano, Texas
84. Richardson North Junior High School Symphonic Band, Richardson, Texas
85. Rickey C. Bailey Middle School Symphonic Band, Spring, Texas
86. Riverwatch Middle School Symphonic Band, Suwanee, Georgia
87. Roach Middle School Wind Ensemble, Frisco, Texas
88. Robinson Middle School Symphonic Band, Plano, Texas
89. Rockport-Fulton Middle School Band, Rockport, Texas

90. Roma Middle School Symphonic Winds, Roma, Texas
91. Running Brushy Middle School Honors Band , Cedar Park, Texas
92. Sangaree Middle School Band, Ladson, South Carolina
93. Sartartia Middle School Wind Ensemble, Sugar Land, Texas
94. Schimelpfenig Middle School Wind Ensemble, Plano, Texas
95. School for the Creative and Performing Arts MS Band, Lexington, Kentucky
96. Shadow Ridge Middle School Honor Winds, Flower Mound, Texas
97. Space Center Intermediate School Symphonic Ban, Houston, Texas
98. Spillane Middle School Symphonic Band, Cypress, Texas
99. Stafford Middle School Honor Band, Frisco, Texas
100. Stone Middle School Honor Band, Paris, Texas
101. T.A. Howard Middle School Honor Band, Mansfield, Texas
102. Tejada Middle School Wind Ensemble, San Antonio, Texas
103. The Classical Center at Brandenburg Middle School Honors Band, Garland, Texas
104. Trinity Springs Middle School Honors Band, Keller, Texas
105. Vista Heights Middle School Advanced Band, Moreno Valley, California
106. Walsh Middle School Honor Band, Round Rock, Texas
107. Warren Middle School Honors Band, Forney, Texas
108. Washington Irving Middle School Honor Band, San Antonio, Texas
109. Westbrook Intermediate School Band, Friendswood, Texas
110. Wester Middle School Symphonic Band, Frisco, Texas
111. Westover Park Junior High School Honors Band, Amarillo, Texas
112. Wiley Middle School Symphonic Band, Leander, Texas

- 113. Willow Wood Junior High School Honor Band, Tomball, Texas
- 114. York Junior High School Wind Ensemble, Spring, Texas
- 115. Young Junior High School Symphonic Band, North Richland Hills, Texas

Appendix H

Average Grade Levels of “The Most Recommended Works” Based Upon State Lists

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Kentucky 1800</i>	AR	2.00
	FL	3.00
	GA	3.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	2.00
	LA	2.00
	MA	2.00
	MD	3.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	3.00
	NY	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	2.00
	TX	2.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	2.56

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Air for Band</i>	AR	1.00
	FL	3.00
	GA	3.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	3.00
	MA	2.00
	MD	3.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	3.00
	NY	2.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	2.00
	TX	1.00
	VA	2.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	2.33

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>American Riversongs</i>	FL	4.00
	IA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	3.00
	MN	2.00
	NC	4.00
	NY	3.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	4.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	3.31

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>On a Hymnsong of Philip Bliss</i>	AR	2.00
	FL	3.00
	GA	4.00
	IA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	3.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	3.07

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>A Childhood Hymn</i>	FL	2.00
	GA	3.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	2.00
	LA	2.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>A Childhood Hymn (continued)</i>	MD	2.00
	NC	2.00
	SC	2.00
	TN	2.00
	TX	2.00
	VA	2.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	2.08

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>A Longford Legend</i>	FL	4.00
	GA	5.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	5.00
	NC	5.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	5.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	5.00
	Average	4.30

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Cajun Folk Songs</i>	FL	4.00
	GA	4.00
	IA	4.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	4.00
	MN	2.00
	NC	4.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	4.00
	Average	3.67

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Overture for Winds</i>	AR	3.00
	FL	3.00
	GA	4.00
	IA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	MA	3.00
	MD	4.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	4.00
	NY	3.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	4.00
	Average	3.40

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Simple Gifts Four Shaker Songs</i>	FL	3.00
	GA	5.00
	IA	3.00
	KS	4.00
	MD	4.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	5.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	3.64

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Three Ayres from Gloucester</i>	AR	2.00
	FL	3.00
	GA	4.00
	IA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	MA	4.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Three Ayres from Gloucester</i> (Continued)	MD	3.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	4.00
	NY	3.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	3.00
	Average	3.20

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Balladair</i>	AR	1.00
	GA	2.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	2.00
	MA	2.00
	MD	3.00
	NC	3.00
	NY	2.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	2.00
	TX	2.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	2.29

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Joy</i>	FL	2.00
	GA	3.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	2.00
	MD	2.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	2.00
	TX	2.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	2.44

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Themes from Green Bushes</i>	FL	5.00
	GA	5.00
	IA	4.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	4.00
	MN	2.00
	NC	4.00
	NY	3.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	5.00
	TX	4.00
	VA	4.00
	Average	4.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Moscow 1941</i>	KS	3.00
	LA	2.00
	MD	2.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	2.00
	TX	2.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	2.44

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Ancient Voices</i>	GA	2.00
	LA	1.00
	NC	2.00
	SC	2.00
	TN	2.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	1.00
	Average	1.86

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Arabian Dances</i>	MN	2.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00
	Average	3.25

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>J. S. Jig</i>	NC	5.00
	TX	3.00
	Average	4.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>The Red Balloon</i>	GA	2.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	2.00
	LA	2.00
	MD	2.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	2.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	2.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	2.27

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Undertow</i>	GA	4.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	4.00
	NC	5.00
	TN	5.00
	TX	4.00
	Average	4.33

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Butterfly's Ball</i>	GA	2.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	4.00
	TX	3.00
	Average	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Canto</i>	AR	1.00
	GA	2.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	1.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	3.00
	NY	3.00
	SC	2.00
	TN	2.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	2.33

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Celtic Air and Dance</i>	FL	1.00
	GA	2.00
	KS	2.00
	NC	2.00
	SC	2.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	1.83

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Concord</i>	FL	4.00
	GA	5.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	4.00
	MD	4.00
	NC	5.00
	SC	5.00
	TN	5.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Concord (continued)</i>	TX	4.00
	VA	5.00
	Average	4.50

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Courtly Airs & Dances</i>	FL	5.00
	GA	4.00
	IA	4.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	4.00
	MN	2.00
	NC	5.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	5.00
	TX	4.00
	VA	5.00
	Average	4.09

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Ghost Fleet</i>	GA	4.00
	LA	3.00
	NC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00
	Average	3.60

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Our Kingsland Spring</i>	GA	3.00
	LA	2.00
	SC	2.00
	TX	2.00
	Average	2.25

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Peregrin: A Traveler's Tale</i>	FL	3.00
	GA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	MD	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Peregrin: A Traveler's Tale (continued)</i>	NC	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	4.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	3.11

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Prelude and Fugue in Bb Major</i>	AR	3.00
	FL	3.00
	GA	4.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	MA	3.00
	MD	3.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	3.00
	NY	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	3.07

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Sparks</i>	GA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	2.00
	MD	3.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	2.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Variations on a Korean Folk Song</i>	AR	4.00
	FL	5.00
	GA	5.00
	IA	4.00
	KS	5.00
	LA	4.00
	MA	4.00
	MD	5.00
	MN	2.00
	MS	6.00
	NC	5.00
	NC	6.00
	NY	5.00
	SC	5.00
	TN	5.00
	TX	4.00
	VA	5.00
	Average	4.65

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>As Summer Was Just Beginning</i>	FL	3.00
	GA	3.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	3.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	4.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	3.08

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Blue and Green Music</i>	LA	3.00
	MD	4.00
	TX	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	3.25

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Chorale and Shaker Dance</i>	AR	4.00
	FL	5.00
	GA	5.00
	IA	4.00
	KS	5.00
	LA	4.00
	MA	4.00
	MD	5.00
	MN	2.00
	MS	6.00
	NC	5.00
	NY	5.00
	SC	5.00
	TN	5.00
	TX	4.00
	Average	4.53

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Portrait of a Clown</i>	FL	2.00
	GA	2.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	2.00
	LA	2.00
	MA	2.00
	MD	2.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	2.00
	VA	2.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	2.23

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Prairie Songs</i>	GA	4.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	3.00
	NY	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	VA	4.00
	Average	3.22

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Prelude, Siciliano and Rondo</i>	AR	4.00
	FL	5.00
	GA	5.00
	IA	4.00
	KS	5.00
	LA	3.00
	MA	3.00
	MD	5.00
	MN	2.00
	NC	5.00
	NY	5.00
	SC	5.00
	TN	5.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	5.00
	Average	4.27

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Prestissimo</i>	KS	3.00
	Average	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Symphonic Dance No. 3 "Fiesta"</i>	AR	4.00
	FL	5.00
	GA	5.00
	IA	4.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Symphonic Dance No. 3 "Fiesta"</i> (continued)	KS	5.00
	LA	4.00
	MD	5.00
	MS	6.00
	NC	6.00
	NY	6.00
	SC	5.00
	TN	5.00
	TX	4.00
	Average	4.92

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>The Tempest</i>	GA	2.00
	KS	2.00
	MD	1.00
	NC	2.00
	SC	2.00
	TN	2.00
	VA	2.00
	WV	1.00
	Average	1.75

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Toccata for Band</i>	AR	3.00
	FL	4.00
	GA	4.00
	IA	3.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	3.00
	MA	3.00
	MD	4.00
	MN	3.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	5.00
	NY	4.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	5.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Toccata for Band</i> (continued)	Average	3.69

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Tricycle</i>	GA	4.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	2.00
	MD	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	2.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Unraveling</i> (*grade based on level from Kjos Publications)	Unlisted	*3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Yorkshire Ballad</i>	AR	2.00
	FL	3.00
	GA	3.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	2.00
	MD	3.00
	MN	3.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	3.00
	NY	2.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	2.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	2.73

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>A Prehistoric Suite</i>	KS	2.00
	MD	1.00
	NC	2.00
	SC	2.00
	TN	2.00
	VA	2.00
	WV	1.00
	Average	1.71

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>A Walk in the Morning Sun</i>	GA	4.00
	LA	3.00
	TX	3.00
	Average	3.33

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Abracadabra</i>	GA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	3.00
	Average	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Alligator Alley</i>	GA	4.00
	LA	3.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00
	Average	3.50

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>British Isles Suite</i>	FL	3.00
	GA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	1.00
	MD	3.00
	NC	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>British Isles Suite (continued)</i>	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	2.78

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Caprice</i>	GA	2.00
	LA	2.00
	NC	2.00
	SC	2.00
	TN	2.00
	VA	3.00
	Average	2.17

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Chant and Jubilo</i>	AR	3.00
	FL	4.00
	GA	4.00
	IA	3.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	3.00
	MA	3.00
	MD	4.00
	MN	2.00
	NC	5.00
	NY	4.00
	SC	5.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	5.00
	Average	3.73

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Chorale and Shaker Dance II</i>	GA	4.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	4.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	4.00
	SC	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Chorale and Shaker Dance II (continued)</i>	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	VA	4.00
	Average	3.67

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Country Wildflowers</i>	FL	2.00
	GA	3.00
	KS	2.00
	MD	2.00
	NC	2.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	2.00
	VA	3.00
	Average	2.38

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Creed</i>	GA	3.00
	KS	2.00
	LA	2.00
	MD	2.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	2.67

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Down a Country Lane</i>	FL	3.00
	IA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	3.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Down a Country Lane (continued)</i>	VA	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	3.18

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Down by the Salley Gardens</i>	FL	2.00
	GA	2.00
	LA	2.00
	NC	2.00
	SC	2.00
	TX	2.00
	Average	2.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Dreams and Fancies</i>	GA	3.00
	IA	3.00
	LA	2.00
	MD	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	VA	4.00
	Average	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Horkstow Grange</i>	GA	3.00
	MD	3.00
	Average	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Incantation and Dance</i>	AR	4.00
	FL	5.00
	GA	6.00
	IA	5.00
	KS	5.00
	LA	4.00
	MA	4.00
	MD	6.00
	MD	6.00
	NC	6.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Incantation and Dance (continued)</i>	NY	6.00
	SC	6.00
	TN	5.00
	TX	4.00
	VA	6.00
	Average	5.20

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>La Madre de Los Gatos</i>	LA	3.00
	TX	3.00
	Average	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Nathan Hale Trilogy</i>	FL	3.00
	GA	3.00
	MD	3.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Psalm 42</i>	LA	2.00
	NC	2.00
	WV	1.00
	Average	1.67

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Rhythm Machine</i>	GA	3.00
	IA	2.00
	LA	2.00
	MD	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	VA	3.00
	Average	2.71

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Rites of Tamburo</i>	GA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	MD	3.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	2.00
	TN	3.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	2.75

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Shenandoah</i>	FL	4.00
	GA	5.00
	IA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	4.00
	MN	2.00
	NC	4.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	4.00
	Average	3.58

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Shepherd's Hey</i>	IA	5.00
	LA	4.00
	OK	4.00
	SC	5.00
	Average	4.50

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Sinfonia VI</i>	FL	4.00
	GA	4.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Sinfonia VI (continued)</i>	MD	4.00
	NC	4.00
	NY	3.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	4.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	3.54

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Suite in Minor Mode</i>	FL	3.00
	GA	3.00
	KS	2.00
	LA	2.00
	MD	2.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	2.67

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Suite Provencale</i>	IA	4.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	3.00
	LA	4.00
	NC	4.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	5.00
	TX	4.00
	VA	4.00
	Average	4.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Summer Dances</i>	GA	4.00
	IA	4.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	4.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Summer Dances (continued)</i>	MD	5.00
	NC	5.00
	SC	5.00
	TN	5.00
	TX	4.00
	Average	4.44

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>The Great Locomotive Chase</i>	NC	4.00
	TN	3.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Two British Folk Songs</i>	GA	2.00
	KS	2.00
	LA	2.00
	MD	2.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	2.00
	TN	2.00
	TX	2.00
	VA	2.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	2.10

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>West Highlands Sojourn</i>	FL	3.00
	GA	3.00
	IA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	2.00
	LA	3.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	4.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>West Highlands Sojourn (continued)</i>	VA	4.00
	Average	3.25

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>With Quiet Courage</i>	IA	3.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	4.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	3.00
	Average	3.25

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>A Song of Hope</i>	FL	1.00
	LA	1.00
	SC	2.00
	TX	1.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	1.40

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>All the Pretty Little Horses</i>	FL	2.00
	GA	2.00
	KS	2.00
	LA	1.00
	MD	2.00
	NC	2.00
	SC	2.00
	TN	2.00
	TX	1.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	1.91

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Allied Honor March</i>	KS	3.00
	Average	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>American Folk Rhapsody No. 2</i>	AR	3.00
	FL	4.00
	GA	4.00
	IA	3.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	3.00
	MA	3.00
	MN	2.00
	MN	2.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	3.00
	Average	3.23

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>American Song Settings No. 2</i>	FL	2.00
	Average	2.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>An Irish Rhapsody</i>	FL	4.00
	GA	4.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	3.00
	MA	3.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	4.00
	NY	4.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	3.00
	TN	4.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	3.54

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Apparitions</i>	GA	3.00
	MD	2.00
	SC	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Apparitions (continued)</i>	Average	2.67

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Arabian Dances</i>	GA	3.00
	MD	2.00
	SC	3.00
	Average	2.67

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Bandology</i>	KS	3.00
	TN	3.00
	Average	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Black Forest Overture</i>	MD	2.00
	NC	2.00
	SC	2.00
	TN	2.00
	TX	2.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	2.14

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Blue Ridge Overture</i>	FL	2.00
	KS	2.00
	LA	2.00
	MD	2.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	2.60

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Blue Ridge Saga</i>	GA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	2.00
	NC	4.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	2.00
	VA	4.00
	Average	3.13

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Colonial Airs & Dances</i>	AR	4.00
	FL	5.00
	GA	5.00
	IA	4.00
	KS	5.00
	LA	3.00
	LA	4.00
	NC	5.00
	SC	5.00
	TN	5.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	5.00
	Average	4.42

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Crystal City Overture</i>	AR	2.00
	GA	2.00
	KS	2.00
	NY	2.00
	SC	2.00
	TN	3.00
	VA	2.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	2.13

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Cumberland Cross</i>	FL	3.00
	GA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	2.00
	MD	3.00
	NC	4.00
	NY	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	2.00
	VA	3.00
	Average	2.91

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Deir In De</i>	GA	4.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	4.00
	TX	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	3.29

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Early One Morning</i>	LA	2.00
	NC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	2.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	2.60

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Earthdance</i>	GA	4.00
	KS	3.00
	MD	3.00
	TN	3.00
	Average	3.25

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Fanfare, Ode and Festival</i>	GA	4.00
	KS	3.00
	MD	3.00
	TN	3.00
	Average	3.25

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Fantasy on a Fiddle Tune</i>	LA	3.00
	NC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00
	Average	3.50

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Fantasy on a Japanese Folk Song</i>	LA	4.00
	MD	4.00
	NC	4.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	4.00
	Average	4.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Festivo</i>	AR	3.00
	FL	4.00
	GA	4.00
	IA	3.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	4.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	4.00
	NY	4.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	VA	4.00
	Average	3.69

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Flourish for Wind Band</i>	AR	3.00
	GA	3.00
	IA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	4.00
	MA	4.00
	MD	3.00
	NC	4.00
	NY	4.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	5.00
	Average	3.67

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Folk Song Suite</i>	AR	3.00
	FL	5.00
	GA	5.00
	IA	4.00
	KS	5.00
	LA	5.00
	MA	4.00
	MD	5.00
	NC	5.00
	NY	5.00
	SC	5.00
	TN	5.00
	TX	3.00
	TX	5.00
	VA	5.00
	Average	4.60

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Fortress</i>	AR	3.00
	FL	4.00
	GA	5.00
	IA	4.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	3.00
	MA	4.00
	MD	4.00
	MN	2.00
	NC	4.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	4.00
	Average	3.71

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Hudson River Suite</i>	AR	2.00
	GA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	MD	3.00
	NC	4.00
	NY	3.00
	TN	3.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Into the Clouds</i>	KS	2.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	Average	2.67

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Joy Revisited</i>	GA	4.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	3.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	3.00
	Average	3.57

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Korean Folk Rhapsody</i>	KS	2.00
	LA	1.00
	MD	2.00
	NC	2.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	1.00
	VA	2.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	2.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Linden Lea</i>	AR	2.00
	FL	3.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	2.00
	MD	3.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TX	2.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	2.55

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>March of the Belgian Paratroopers</i>	KS	3.00
	Average	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Nordic Sketches</i>	LA	1.00
	NC	3.00
	NY	3.00
	TN	3.00
	VA	4.00
	Average	2.80

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Nottingham Castle</i>	LA	1.00
	NC	2.00
	TX	1.00
	WV	1.00
	Average	1.25

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Overture on a Minstrel Tune</i>	FL	3.00
	LA	2.00
	NC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	2.00
	Average	2.60

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Pevensey Castle</i>	GA	2.00
	IA	2.00
	LA	1.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	2.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	1.00
	VA	3.00
	Average	2.13

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Pictures at an Exhibition</i>	FL	2.00
	NC	2.00
	SC	3.00
	Average	2.33

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Polly Oliver</i>	AR	3.00
	FL	3.00
	GA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	3.00
	MN	3.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	3.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	4.00
	VA	3.00
	Average	3.17

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Prospect</i>	AR	1.00
	IA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	3.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TX	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	2.78

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Rain</i>	MD	2.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	Average	2.75

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Rhosymedre</i>	FL	4.00
	GA	5.00
	IA	3.00
	KS	4.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Rhosymedre (continued)</i>	LA	5.00
	MA	4.00
	MD	4.00
	NC	4.00
	NY	3.00
	SC	5.00
	TN	4.00
	TX	4.00
	TX	5.00
	VA	3.00
	Average	4.07

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Rhythm of the Winds</i>	AR	2.00
	GA	3.00
	KS	2.00
	MD	3.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	3.00
	VA	4.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Rhythms and Riffs</i>	TN	2.00
	Average	2.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Rikudim</i>	GA	5.00
	IA	4.00
	LA	4.00
	MD	5.00
	SC	5.00
	TN	6.00
	TX	4.00
	VA	4.00
	Average	4.63

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Sea Song Trilogy</i>	FL	2.00
	GA	2.00
	KS	2.00
	LA	1.00
	MD	2.00
	NC	2.00
	SC	2.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	1.00
	VA	2.00
	Average	1.90

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Second Suite in F</i>	AR	3.00
	FL	5.00
	GA	6.00
	IA	4.00
	KS	5.00
	LA	4.00
	MA	4.00
	MD	5.00
	MS	6.00
	NC	6.00
	NY	6.00
	SC	6.00
	TN	5.00
	TX	4.00
	VA	5.00
	Average	4.93

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Serengeti Dreams</i>	GA	2.00
	LA	1.00
	NC	2.00
	SC	2.00
	TX	1.00
	VA	2.00
	WV	1.00
	Average	1.57

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Slavonic Folk Suite</i>	AR	3.00
	FL	3.00
	GA	4.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	4.00
	MN	3.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	4.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	3.00
	Average	3.21

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Sonatina for Band</i>	FL	3.00
	GA	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	1.00
	MD	3.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	VA	3.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	2.80

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
A Song for Friends	FL	1.00
	GA	2.00
	MD	2.00
	NC	2.00
	SC	2.00
	TN	2.00
	VA	2.00
	WV	1.00
	Average	1.75

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Spoon River</i> - arr. Bainum	KS	4.00
	Average	4.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Spoon River</i> - arr. Sheldon	GA	4.00
	LA	4.00
	TX	4.00
	Average	4.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Suite from Bohemia</i>	AR	2.00
	FL	3.00
	GA	4.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	3.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	3.00
	NY	3.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	3.00
	VA	4.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	3.07

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Symphony No. 4</i>	GA	5.00
	IA	3.00
	KS	5.00
	MN	2.00
	TN	4.00
	Average	3.80

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>The Battle Pavane</i>	AR	2.00
	FL	3.00
	GA	2.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	2.00
	MD	3.00
	NC	3.00
	NY	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	2.00
	VA	2.00
	Average	2.54

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>The Headless Horseman</i>	GA	3.00
	LA	1.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	VA	3.00
	Average	2.67

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Third Suite</i>	AR	4.00
	FL	5.00
	GA	6.00
	IA	4.00
	KS	4.00
	LA	3.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Third Suite (continued)</i>	LA	4.00
	MD	5.00
	MN	2.00
	NC	6.00
	NY	6.00
	SC	5.00
	TN	5.00
	TX	4.00
	VA	6.00
	Average	4.60

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Variation Overture</i>	AR	2.00
	GA	4.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	2.00
	MA	4.00
	MD	3.00
	MN	3.00
	NC	4.00
	NY	4.00
	SC	4.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	2.00
	VA	3.00
	Average	3.07

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Voices in the Sky</i>	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	3.00
	SC	4.00
	TX	3.00
	Average	3.20

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>American Folk Rhapsody No. 1</i>	AR	3.00
	FL	4.00
	GA	4.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	MA	3.00
	NC	4.00
	SC	4.00
	TX	3.00
	VA	4.00
	Average	3.50

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>If Thou Be Near</i>	AR	3.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	3.00
	MD	4.00
	TN	3.00
	Average	3.20

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Mini Suite</i>	AR	1.00
	FL	3.00
	GA	2.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	2.00
	MD	3.00
	NC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	2.00
	VA	3.00
	Average	2.45

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Ave Verum Corpus</i>	FL	2.00
	LA	2.00
	TX	2.00
	Average	2.00

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Early English Suite</i>	AR	2.00
	FL	2.00
	GA	2.00
	KS	2.00
	LA	2.00
	MA	2.00
	NC	3.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	2.00
	WV	3.00
	Average	2.30

<u>Piece</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<i>Belle Qui Tiens Ma Vie</i>	FL	3.00
	GA	2.00
	IA	2.00
	KS	3.00
	LA	2.00
	MA	1.00
	MD	2.00
	NC	3.00
	SC	2.00
	TN	3.00
	TX	2.00
	VA	2.00
	WV	2.00
	Average	2.23