

Florida State University Libraries

Electronic Theses, Treatises and Dissertations

The Graduate School

2006

Criteria for Curricular Literature Selection Among Florida Band Directors

John D. Roseboom



The Florida State University
College of Music

Criteria for Curricular Literature Selection
Among Florida Band Directors

By John D. Roseboom

A Thesis submitted to the
College of Music
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Music Education

Degree Awarded
Summer Semester 2006

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of John D. Roseboom defended on July 5, 2006.

Bentley Shellahamer
Professor Directing Thesis

Clifford Madsen
Committee Member

Larry Gerber
Committee Member

Approved:

Don Gibson, Dean, College of Music

The Office of Graduate Studies has verified and approved the above named committee Members.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	iii
Abstract	iv
1. Introduction	1
2. Review of Literature	3
Criteria for consideration when selecting music for curricular inclusion	3
History of the band and its literature as related to the secondary schools	8
Inclusion of quality music in the school music curriculum	11
Empirical research related to music selection	13
3. Method	14
Subject Selection	14
Survey	14
Pilot Study	15
Data Collection	15
Data Analysis	15
4. Results	17
5. Discussion	21
Limitations of Study & Suggestions for Future Research	22
Appendix A: Cover Letter	23
Appendix B: Survey	25
Appendix C: Human Subjects Committee Approval	27
References	29
Biographical Sketch	31

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Percentages of Free Responses Given in Categories	17
Table 2. Percentages of Rank in All Categories	18
Table 3. High School Directors Responses in Percentage by Category	19
Table 4. Middle School Directors Responses in Percentage by Category	20
Table 5. Middle or Junior/High School Directors Responses in Percentage by Category	20

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to collect data concerning the criteria used by Florida secondary school band directors when selecting music for curricular inclusion in their wind band programs. Subjects (N=64) responded to a survey sent in the last quarter of the school year. The survey asked that the participant list four pieces selected for performance throughout the year, and to provide reasoning for their selection. A second portion asked the participant to rank the order of criteria that were identified in the research literature.

Findings indicate that the top criterion ranked among the responding Florida band directors was aesthetic value. The free response portion indicated that educational elements were the primary criterion when selecting music for curricular inclusion. A disparity was found between high school directors (n=25) and middle school directors (n=39) in that 44.0 percent of high school directors ranked aesthetic value as their top criterion, and only 8.8 percent of middle school directors ranked the same criterion as their top criterion.

The responses are in line with the data of past research and the ideas posited by authors in the professional literature.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION & STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

As in many endeavors in the field of education there seems to be a chasm between theory and practice in instrumental music education. Many times in our teacher education systems educators learn a multitude of educational theories and techniques only to abandon them once in their own classrooms. Such is true in music education. Music, having a special place in the annals of critical thought, receives much attention from philosophers (Dewey 2005, Scruton 1999). Music education has therefore, in the past century, developed its own subset philosophy. Undergraduate music education majors are introduced to these ideas (which will be named and explained later), asked to contemplate higher order veins of questioning, and then set into the world of pragmatic music teaching where the ideas and veins of questions are lost in the daily activities of running a music program in the current school climate.

An important question arises, why are pre-service teachers exposed to the philosophy of music education in the first place? Obviously, the study of philosophy is an important endeavor as it remains at the core of music education curricula. Elliot (1995) describes a philosophy as a map of a terrain. Rather than finding direction by probing and learning from our mistakes, a philosophy of music education acts as a guide through the terrain that is the daily activity of music teaching. Philosophy does not make decisions obvious; rather it helps us narrow our focus in order to make a more conscientious decision that will better affect students.

Many colleges have fine music education departments with professors that teach to the selection of high quality literature. The current study seeks to collect data concerning secondary school directors' criteria for selecting music in their own practice of teaching in order to compare it to, what the professional literature has deemed as, fundamentally sound reasons.

The purpose of the study will be to collect data concerning the criteria used by secondary school directors in Florida when selecting music for curricular inclusion in their programs. First, directors will list pieces their bands have played in the past year,

citing the reasons they selected the named pieces. Those data will be compared to the second portion which will have the directors rank the criteria listed most frequently in the professional literature. Comparisons will be made between the two portions of the survey, and comparison of ranked responses will be made among middle and high school directors.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Part of the success of the education of a student is contingent upon the curriculum set before him or her. In instrumental music education the curriculum taught to our students is based, in large part, on the literature selected for performance and study. Authorities (Camphouse 2001, Reynolds 2000, Labuta 1997, Petrella 1993, Schmalz 1990, De Young 1977, Prescott & Chidester 1939) have stated the importance of selecting the best music in order to teach the concepts and aesthetics inherent in music. It is, therefore, the purpose of this study to examine the criteria used by Florida band directors when considering musical selections for curricular inclusion.

Elliot (1995) in *Music Matters* says, “Musicianship can be taught and learned” (p.122). It is upon this premise that music educators seek out music that is best fit to teach the methods and skills related to developing the students’ sense of good music and sensitive musicianship. The current study proposes to gather data from Florida band directors concerning the criteria they use to select the literature that will be used as a tool to reach this educational end.

The amount of writing concerning literature selection criteria is scant. Within the body of literature available there are four main divisions: (1) proposed curricular literature selection criteria, (2) history of band literature, (3) call for inclusion of quality band literature in instrumental music curriculum, and (4) empirical research concerning curricular literature selection.

Criteria for consideration when selecting music for curricular inclusion

In their landmark text – *Foundations and Principles of Music Education* – Leonard and House (1959) cite two major criteria to consider when selecting literature

for curricular inclusion, expressiveness and craftsmanship. Concerning expressiveness the authors state that, “All good music is expressive in that it embodies the composer’s conception of the stress-release form of the human experience.” They define craftsmanship as the element that facilitates expressiveness.

Reames (2001), and Sheldon (2000) have cited Leonard and House’s comprehensive definition of craftsmanship. Leonard and House state that the difference between “good music” and “great music” is that “great music” contains a subtlety and abstractness of expression. In good music the melody and harmony are “trite”, straightforward, and easily anticipated; rhythm and structure are regular, lacking in development and variation. Good music emphasizes one musical element, therefore, not holding the interest of the listener or performer, it does not bear repeated hearings or contact over a period of time, it takes on a meaning outside of the musical meanings (emotional or programmatic). Finally, good music has limited expressive value within itself, but may serve as a means of evoking strong feelings through associations with extra musical factors

Great music, they posit, has a subtlety in both musical ideas and treatment of those ideas. In great music, melodies require closer attention for comprehension, and ranges may be extreme. The composer writes the music in a medium and form that is best to present the “full significance of the musical idea.” Concerning harmony, the authors write that anticipation of harmonic movement is difficult due to the variety used, highly tense harmonic movement may pervade, and distant key centers are used to heighten the key relationships. Harmonic fulfillment is found in the return to the original key. All aspects (melody, rhythm, harmony, and form) are integrated into an expressive whole in which no one element predominates, but all play together in a *logical* way to aid in the expression of the music, while the music evokes general feeling states (affective response is evoked).

When considering the inclusion of programmatic music, Leonard and House suggest that program music must be evaluated on the merit of its pure musical value. If the program is the driving force for selecting a piece, the pure music (musical elements removed from the program) is not strong enough. Music that has transcended

generations of listeners is thought to have greater expressive power and musical [aesthetic] appeal.

Of this entire definition one idea seems to elide itself best with craftsmanship. The idea that germinal ideas [themes or motifs] may be developed and *varied* in countless imaginative ways. That is, “great music” takes a short idea and – through Bernstein’s (1976) processes of transformational grammar – provides enough material to create a substantial work. Such can be thought of in the case of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony.

Dvorak, Grechesky, and Ciepluch (1993) offer three main criteria for selecting music for high school bands. First the composition must exhibit a high degree of compositional craft. That is, the piece determines what students will learn from the piece, and what level of aesthetic experience they might gain. The authors add, “Only by playing the best music will students gain a knowledge of, feeling for, and appreciation of what is meaningful and what is valuable in music.” Second, compositions must contain musical constructs necessary for the development of musicianship. In other words, the music must have substance and contain material from which to teach. The material offered by the authors includes: variety of keys (major, minor, modal), variety of meters (duple, triple, combinatorial), variety of harmonic styles (traditional, contemporary, avant garde), and variety of articulation styles (smooth, light, heavy, detached, legato, etc.). The last point offered is that compositions must exhibit an orchestration that, within the restrictions associated with a particular grade level, encourage musical independence both of individuals and sections. To explain this point the authors say, “Scoring that is ‘heavy –handed,’ with thick doublings predominating, inhibits musical clarity, texture, and color that are so integral to the sounds of the band and wind ensemble.”

Otto (1971) lists several influential factors in high school band music selection. Among them are the ability level of the band, as a whole, to meet the demands of the music with respect to its (a) length, (b) range, (c) tonal demands, (d) rhythmic complexity, and (e) technical requirements (note: technical requirements last), the appropriateness for educational purposes, the diversity in periods and style represented among various selections, the degree of challenge and potential of the band to meet the challenge in a reasonable number of rehearsals, the appeal to the needs, interests, and

tastes of band members, and the appeal to the kinds of audiences with which the music will be shared.

Otto emphasizes the importance of knowing the abilities of the individual musicians within the band in order to select music that can be prepared successfully in the allotted amount of rehearsal time. In selecting literature he asserts that directors should choose music of differing periods and styles in order to insure students learn the various kinds of music available. He mentions the fine organ transcriptions of the Baroque and Classical periods, and also the orchestral transcriptions of the Romantics. He applauds the then recent (1960s & 1970s) band compositions, but advises serious score scrutiny, for those pieces are often written for college bands, but can be performed by *high quality* high school ensembles.

Finally, Otto advocates the occasional use of more demanding literature in order to provide motivation for the students and to elevate the overall ability of the band. He also mentions the literature that suits the tastes of the audience in order to generate support by the general community.

Reynolds (2000) proposes a series of questions to ask one's self when selecting repertoire that deals with knowledge of (good) new music, the repetition of old literature, performer/audience interest, technical difficulty, instrumentation, rehearsal time, balance of styles form and aesthetic mediums, and student/conductor growth.

Reynolds proposes keeping a list of performed repertoire in order to keep a record of past performances and to track the various musical elements taught via the use of certain pieces (maintaining a balance of musical styles, forms, aesthetic mediums, etc.). He suggests looking at the selected music lists of several states (Texas, Michigan, and Virginia) as well as the list kept by Music Educators National Convention. The purpose for looking at these lists is to select a core of good repertoire that the ensemble can handle.

The American School Band Directors Association (ASBDA) has twice published a curriculum guide intended to assist band directors when developing the curriculum for their own bands. The most recent edition edited by Michael Peterson (1997) contains a section dealing with literature selection criteria. The section dealing with literature selection is subtitled *Elementary and Middle Level*. Though targeted primarily at the

middle school band director, many of the criteria mentioned can transfer to the high school selection process. The author proposes that students are capable of processing and, in turn, making good music. He also mentions that literature, being the base of the large ensemble music program, should be of quality and “appropriate depth (p. 76).”

The curriculum guide continues describing literature of questionable quality as music containing repetitive four-bar phrases, unimaginative harmonic and rhythmic structures, and basic percussion parts. “[The music] does little to inspire the young, growing, creative mind” (p. 76). It limits long-term individual growth and provides little in the way of fundamental musicianship.

The ASBDA guide also proposes a set of literature selection guidelines. The author encourages the director to select a composer who is recognized as a creative writer; examine whether your ensemble has, or has access to, the required instrumentation; look for compositions which include three and four part scoring for clarinets, trumpets and horns; percussion parts should call for mallet work and multiple percussion parts [snare, bass, cym, etc.]. “Draw a conclusion as to whether or not this composition encourages creative interpretation, look for interesting melodies and countermelodies and appropriate development of those lines, and to determine if the composition merits in-depth study by conductor and student (p. 34).

Hilliard (1992), being a composer for young bands, discusses some special considerations (and some seemingly easy-to-overlook ideas) when considering grade one and two music for curricular inclusion. He cites two major problems: (1) the director is dealing with an ensemble with limited technical capabilities, and (2) a mass quantity of new literature that creates great overturn in literature lists [plus leads to a lot of bad music]. Some directors view easier literature as one-time use music and resort to the method book as a primary source of learning. Hilliard makes the argument that the literature selected for performance should help augment the concepts presented in the method books. He also posits that many essential concepts are overlooked by the method books and can be taught through the literature. A direct correlation should be made so student learning is reinforced. Some suggested elements to consider in a young band composition are scoring, range, key, style, percussion parts, and structural elements [form]. He recommends block scoring as use for counting exercises, but warns against its

overuse in the later stages of ensemble development [lack of independent playing]. He suggests using music with variety in its texturing and offers some suggestions of good instrument combinations. He speaks of complete scoring of chords, citing the omission of the fifth as okay, so long as the third and seventh (when applicable) are present.

Mark Camphouse (2001), band director and composer offers suggestions of upper-level band literature that demonstrates musical concepts, or can be used to teach aspects of music history or theory. Among these recommendations are Tull's *Sketches on a Tudor Psalm*, Chance's *Incantation and Dance* and *Variations on a Korean Folk Song*, and the band music of Persichetti.

Camphouse bodes against cliché compositional techniques such as driving back rhythms, exact repetition without recoloring the melody and harmony, and “one-note transitions,” and predictable melodies, harmonies, and rhythms.

Composer, Elliot Del Borgo (1988) offers yet an additional set of criteria to consider when selecting music for curricular inclusion. Among these elements are musical (aesthetic) quality, style, technical challenge, audience and performer appeal, and educational value. Del Borgo speaks of variety in compositional elements as does Dvorak et al. (above). According to Del Borgo, variety should be evident among the elements of melodic material, timbres, background/foreground material (balanced material), and texture. “The interplay of textural variety is an important musical element and should be a prime factor in determining the suitability of a piece.” He also writes about the naturalness and logic of a composition. He suggests looking at a score to see if transitions in texture, tempo, mode, etc. are made at logical points in a manner that are interesting.

History of the band and its literature as related to the secondary schools

The band/wind ensemble is the newest of the three major scholastic ensembles. The choir and orchestra have long histories in which events have occurred to determine the instrumentation, and thusly, their repertoire.

Edwin Franko Goldman and his son Richard Franko Goldman are among two of the most important figures in American professional bands. R.F. Goldman (1961) wrote an extensive history of the wind band and its repertoire. In it, he draws a clear distinction between the purpose of the professional (service, community, professional, etc.) band

and the school (high school or college) band. The professional band can choose literature that best suits the entertainment of its mixed audiences. That is, it is an outward, or entertainment/audience oriented, program. In contrast, the school band needs to have an inward focus. That is, it exists for the training of aesthetic sensitivity of its musicians. [That said, the director of the school band should choose literature with an educational end in mind.] Goldman recommends allowing the parameters of the occasion guide the director in selecting literature. He cites the [then] growing body of literature for younger bands. However he cites the perceived varying quality of the music and charges the director with the task of selecting the better arrangements, though he provides no criteria.

Concert literature began to be developed in the 1920s when bands like Sousa's forewent the utilitarian function of the band (parades and outdoor ceremonies), and focused its attention on giving concerts. In the concerts the band played essentially the same repertoire from venue to venue, occasion to occasion. The audience was unsophisticated – that is they had not yet been taught what to demand – so the bands simply played the crowd favorites while gradually supplementing new repertoire. This indicates that for much of the early part of the twentieth century the literature was slow to develop, and much of the music was similar and unsophisticated by today's standards.

Historically, playing of unsophisticated literature to entertain is evident in the departure from original (French Revolution) band music. The music of Gossec, Jadin, and Berlioz was written to mimic high art music of the day. Sousa's and Goldman's bands often played much simpler marches and arrangements of popular songs in order to attract a steady audience.

As composers of new original band music changed the instrumentation of the band, new arrangements of old transcriptions were put into place. The literature appears not to have completely changed; it merely evolved slowly as the ensemble's instrumentation has developed.

Fredrick Fennell (1995) was the founder of the modern wind ensemble. This ensemble was first conceived at the Eastman School of Music and began, unlike its parent ensemble – the concert band – with a predetermined, yet flexible instrumentation in mind. That is, the ensemble was to isolate the orchestral wind section, but still be

flexible so that composers would not feel hindered by the instrumentation available or demanded.

Croft (1997) summarizes this idea and its impact on scholastic ensembles in saying that the evolution of the band has driven the writing of better – more advanced and better crafted – music for the wind and percussion medium.

The Fennell model of the wind ensemble sought to strip away the stereotype of the band (an organization conceived in function) in lieu of an organization dedicated to the performance of aesthetically driven literature. That is, the band, since its creation, served for military function and, more recently, serves as sporting entertainment. With the wind ensemble (one player per part) composers could write music for a purely wind and percussion medium knowing that the musicians could accurately perform their parts, much like their orchestral counterparts.

The secondary schools followed this idea in order to boost their art, but have since strayed from its original inception, now calling smaller, more elite groups, wind ensembles, though they do not adhere to Fennell’s original idea.

Most of the highly regarded literature for the band has come since the 1952 premiere of the Eastman Wind Ensemble. This includes Benson’s *Solitary Dancer*, Grainger’s *Hill Songs* and *Lincolnshire Posy*, and Milhaud’s *Suite Française*.

McBeth (1989), a composer and pedagogue of the wind band, wrote a short memoir in which he reflected on the rise, and seeming fall, of wind band music. “... what’s new is wonderful if we don’t forget what’s old.”

McBeth states that the orchestra has more artistic viability due to its literature. He likens it to the French horn having higher stature than the euphonium. He gives a brief history of the composition of new band music in the 60s and 70s, stating that new music came about because of composition competitions. In the new century McBeth beseeches conductors to seek commissions from composers that don’t normally write for the band. This will bring fresh vitality and new musical ideas. He goes on to condemn music of the 80s calling it candy, show tune music, rewrites of Mahler at its hardest.

Berry (1975) published a survey of band literature performed by high school and college bands in Iowa and Nebraska. Most of the music performed in the observed time

frame can be considered significant literature. Of that literature, about half was new during the observed time frame.

Inclusion of quality music in the school music curriculum

The need for quality literature is evident. Many articles found in trade magazines, written by well-respected authorities in the band field, not only make this assertion, but make the responsibility that of the band director.

Prescott and Chidester (1939) assert that, “Intelligent selection of music for any medium comes from extensive experience and knowledge of the whole field.” This text is dated in that it states that most of the band literature consists of orchestral transcriptions, though it applauds the composition of original band music. “... the band leader must rely upon the composite experience and knowledge of others as expressed in lists released by music teacher’s associations and publishers. The band leader must discern value of the piece by use of score study and reference recording, and ask colleagues when he is in doubt” (p.112).

Sheldon (2000) conducted a study that closely replicates the last comments by Prescott. In three studies, subjects (pre-service and in-service instrumental music educators) studied new pieces of band music by anonymous composers and were asked to consider the quality/craftsmanship and report on how much time they spent focusing on certain aspects of the score (e.g. melody, rhythm, harmony, technical-portions, instruments, expression, form/phrases, texture, everything, and nothing). The study indicated that both pre-service and in-service teachers focused on similar elements of the music for similar amounts of time, thus indicating that pre-service teachers are equally adept at making curricular choices as in-service teachers. Those who listened to the music judged it more favorably for quality and craftsmanship than did those in the silent study condition.

Reynolds (2000) wrote an even more definitive statement, “The literature *is* the curriculum.” Reynolds emphasizes our purpose of helping individual students get a good music education. “... for only through total immersion in music of lasting quality can we engage in aesthetic experiences of breadth and depth.” He speaks to the difficulty of selecting good repertoire year after year, stating that it does not get easier as the years of

experience accrue. “The music you choose becomes, in large part, the curriculum that your students follow toward a sound music education. If you believe that music education means much more than improvement of technical skills, then the quality of music played will be essential to the education of your students” (p. 32).

Reynolds describes concerts as a forum for sharing the students’ musical preparation and education. He, much like Goldman, defines the difference between selecting music for the professional group and the school group. Professionals choose music with the audience affect in mind, the purpose of music education is the opposite, we must have the performer affect ahead of the audience affect. In order to focus the greatest amount of energy on the musical aspects of the repertoire, most selections should be in the technical limits of the ensemble. Music should be selected for stretches of technique from time to time, but most of the music should be within the abilities of the ensemble in order to glean the most musical results.

Reynolds adds, “More good music is available now than at any other time. There is also a considerable amount of bad music, buyer beware. Do not buy music because it is heavily advertised and promoted, buy it because it has lasting musical values (p.32).”

De Young (1977) stresses the importance of selecting quality literature for the band, for the literature is the main means through which the student will learn the enduring lessons (aesthetics) of music. He suggests many texts that offer titles of good literature. He says that instrumental technique, ear training, knowledge of composers, theory, and history are all necessary, but are “pre-musical,” as they function to inform the instinct before the process of “recreating” the composition.

De Young stresses selecting literature on the basis of aesthetic quality rather than technical development. As well, he advocates for selecting music of aesthetic quality over music of entertaining value. The director, he says, controls the [musical] expectations of the audience by the quality of the programming over a period of time. He also stipulates that through the programming of quality literature the band can one day achieve the level of integrity known by the symphony orchestra.

Labuta (1997) “demands” the inclusion of good quality literature in the band program “in order to teach musicianship.” He cites “carefully selected literature” as the “basic material through which musicianship is developed. Students study content of

music, therefore it must possess the elements to be taught (timbre, musical elements, form, and style). “The music presents the problems, the solutions develop musicianship.” Like Reynolds, Labuta asserts that, “Concerts should be logical outgrowth of classroom learning (p. 13).”

Empirical research related to music selection

Sheldon (2000), as mentioned above, studied the elements band directors chose as their focus when selecting music for curricular inclusion in three test conditions. The study indicates that there is no statistical difference between the amount of time pre-service and in-service directors spent focusing on the same elements. This suggests that band directors are wired, from early in their careers, to be sensitive to the elements that are inherent in good music.

Reames’ (2001) research most closely relates to the current study. Reames’ study surveyed Virginia choral directors to gather data related to the appropriate literature for high school beginning choirs. Relating the study’s criteria to Jansen (1995) eighty-nine percent of the directors surveyed responded that they considered both aesthetic and technical elements when selecting literature for beginning choirs. Ninety-four percent of respondents considered both aesthetic and technical elements when selecting music for advanced choirs. This disparity is not large, and makes sense, upon seeing that there is a higher percentage of consideration of technical elements when selecting music for beginning choirs, and no consideration of technique when selecting for advanced choirs.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

Subject Selection

From the 2006 Florida Bandmasters Association (FBA) Directory, 350 participants were selected at random by drawing numbers from a pool of over 900 names using the random number generator tool found on Microsoft Excel XP Professional. Each participant was mailed, via the United States Postal Service, an envelope containing an introductory letter (Appendix A), a survey, and a stamped return envelope. Subjects responding (N=64) were then assigned a unique four digit code to maintain anonymity in the data collection and analysis process. Of the 350 surveys sent, 18.2 percent were returned completed with the appropriate informed consent.

Survey

The survey (Appendix B) was constructed to: 1) gather demographic information including the county in which the director teaches, secondary level they teach, years of teaching experience, highest college degree held, and number of concert bands in their program, 2) gather nominal data in a free-response format, and 3) allow the director to rank the specified criteria in the order they use when selecting literature for curricular inclusion.

The free response portion asked that the director list the four most recent titles selected for curricular inclusion along with the composer and reasons for selecting the compositions. The ranked portion listed six criteria (Audience Consideration, Aesthetic Value, Technical Value, Composer Reputation, Student Considerations, Educational Elements) drawn from the research literature and expert interviews. The criteria were randomly ordered to account for presentation bias. Subjects were asked to rank the criteria in the order they used when selecting literature for curricular inclusion in their programs.

Responses from the first portion were categorized into one of the six criteria listed in the second portion. Data collected in the second portion were collected and analyzed.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to test for the readability and use of the survey. Subjects (n=10) were members of the researcher's home FBA district. Each was given a copy of the survey, with a cover letter explaining the survey and its purpose. After completion of the survey, subjects were given a comment form to list their concerns regarding readability and use of the survey and instructions.

Subjects reported that the survey's directions and questions were clear and easy to understand. Grammatical errors were identified and corrected for the final survey. Two subjects asked that there be more room to write in the "Reasons" section of the free response portion, this too was adjusted in the final survey.

Data Collection

The subjects chosen for the survey (N=350) were mailed their survey, cover letter and return envelope in the last quarter of the school year. This particular time frame was chosen to allow for bands to be exposed to more literature after the festival seasons – the time in which many directors say they do their most intensive teaching of musical concepts.

Responses were received for a period of four weeks after the initial mailings with follow up correspondences made to selected subjects that had not yet returned their survey.

Data Analysis

Upon closure of the data receipt window, data from the demographic and ranked portions were placed in an Excel database for analysis.

Data from the free-response portion were read and categorized into the six criterion listed above. Responses dealing with programming and audience appreciation – including comments along the lines of, "well known piece" – were considered for the *Audience Consideration* category. Comments dealing with instrument colors, musical line or phrase, balance, blend, sound, expressivity, "musical demand," or any comment that mentioned the piece was "art music" were considered for the *Aesthetic Value* category. Responses were considered for the *Technical Value* category if they contained

ideas dealing with building technique, characteristic sound, featuring technique in certain sections, playability, and range. The *Composer Reputation* category was filled with comments labeling the piece as significant literature, or need to teach a particular composer. Comments dealing with interest of the students, motivation of the students, characterizing the piece as “fun to play,” or featuring a solo player were categorized as dealing with *Student Consideration*. Finally, comments that identified specific educational concepts or ideas (e.g. meter, style, history, etc.), or that were listed as a “teaching piece” were categorized under the *Educational Elements* portion.

A tally was kept of the responses and a chi square test for goodness of fit was performed based on the observed number of responses in each category.

Data in the ranked portion were collected and set in an Excel database. Percentages of responses were gathered and analyzed, distinguishing between middle school and high school directors.

CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS

Answers given in the free response portion were categorized into the six listed criteria. Of the 341 responses given, 35.1 percent, or 120 responses, dealt with educational elements (see table 1). Of the responses grouped into this category, most listed the specific elements that were taught in the music. Many dealt with the teaching of style, form, history, etc. in the particular pieces.

Table 1. *Percentages of Free Responses Given in Categories*

Free												
Response	Audience		Aesthetic		Technical		Composer		Student		Educational	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
	32	9.3	65	19.0	50	14.6	60	5.8	54	15.8	120	35.1

As seen in Table 1, responses dealing with aesthetic consideration were second among specified criteria categories. As stated before, these were comments that dealt with the musical line, phrasing, sound, balance, blend, and expressivity. Responses dealing with student considerations (student motivation, student reaction, featuring a solo or group of students, etc.) received the third most comments with 15.8 percent. Responses dealing specifically with technical development or technical display, including finger facility and player range, received 14.6 of overall comments. Comments dealing with audience appeal or programming received 9.3 of total responses. Responses that dealt with the reputation of, or study of a specified composer received 5.8 percent of all comments.

In collecting data where directors ranked the six criteria listed, one third of all respondents listed aesthetic elements as their top criterion (see Table 2.)

Table 2. *Percentages of Rank in All Categories*

All Respondents N=64													
	Audience		Aesthetic		Technical		Composer		Student		Educational		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Rank 1	4	6.2	21	32.8	16	25.0	4	6.2	4	6.2	19	29.6	
Rank 2	4	6.2	14	21.8	18	28.1	5	7.8	11	17.1	15	23.4	
Rank 3	5	7.8	20	31.2	13	20.3	8	12.5	16	25.0	16	25.0	
Rank 4	11	17.1	6	9.3	10	15.6	8	12.5	13	20.3	4	6.2	
Rank 5	25	39.0	5	7.8	5	7.8	7	10.9	12	18.7	5	7.8	
Rank 6	11	17.1	6	9.5	0	0	20	31.2	6	9.3	6	9.3	

Educational elements received nearly the same amount as aesthetic considerations with 29.6 percent listing it as their first criterion. One quarter of respondents listed Technical considerations as their top priority. Audience considerations, Composer reputation, and student considerations were all listed by 6.2 percent of the respondents as their top choice.

Composer reputation was listed by 31.2 percent of respondents as their last choice among the criteria selected. Audience consideration was the last choice of 17.1 percent of respondents. Aesthetic elements, student considerations, and educational elements were all listed by about 9 percent of respondents as their last choice and no respondents listed technical elements as their last choice.

Among high school band directors (n=25), an overwhelming 44 percent listed aesthetic elements as their top criterion when selecting literature for curricular inclusion (see table 3).

Table 3. *High School Directors Responses in Percentage by Category*

HS n=25	Audience		Aesthetic		Technical		Composer		Student		Educational	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1	4	16.0	11	44.0	3	12.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	6	24.0
2	1	4.0	5	20.0	9	36.0	3	12.0	4	16.0	4	16.0
3	1	4.0	14	16.0	4	16.0	3	12.0	6	16.0	6	16.0
4	5	20.0	0	0.0	6	24.0	5	20.0	5	20.0	1	4.0
5	10	40.0	1	4.0	2	8.0	1	4.0	5	20.0	4	16.0
6	3	12.0	3	12.0	0	0.0	11	44.0	3	12.0	2	8.0

Another 24 percent listed educational elements as the top priority. Sixteen percent listed audience consideration as their first choice in literature selection. Twelve percent responded as considering technical demands first in curricular literature selection. The two remaining categories – composer reputation and student considerations – both had four percent of respondents list them as a top criterion.

Likewise, an overwhelming 44 percent of high school directors listed composer reputation as the lesser priority. Audience consideration, aesthetic elements, and student considerations were each mentioned as the sixth priority of respondents, and no high school band director listed technical elements as their lowest priority.

Among middle school band directors, over one third, or 38.2 percent, listed technical considerations as their top priority when selecting literature for their developing bands (see Table 4). Educational elements were listed among 32.3 of respondents as their first criteria. Aesthetic elements, Composer reputation, and Student considerations each received 8.8 percent of respondents’ top choice. No middle school director listed audience considerations as their top priority.

Table 4. *Middle School Directors Responses in Percentage by Category*

MS n=39	Audience		Aesthetic		Technical		Composer		Student		Educational	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1	0	0.0	7	8.8	13	38.2	3	8.8	3	8.8	11	32.3
2	2	5.8	8	23.5	9	26.4	1	2.9	6	17.6	11	32.3
3	4	11.7	6	17.6	8	23.5	5	14.7	7	20.5	7	20.5
4	4	11.7	6	17.6	3	8.8	9	26.4	8	23.5	1	2.9
5	15	44.1	4	11.7	2	5.8	3	8.8	6	17.6	1	2.9
6	6	17.6	1	2.9	0	0.0	5	14.7	3	8.8	4	11.7

Five respondents taught at both middle and high school or at junior/senior high schools. Among those five, three listed aesthetic elements as their top criteria, and 2 listed audience consideration as their lowest priority (see table 5).

Table 5. *Middle or Junior/High School Directors Responses in Percentage by Category*

H/M n=5	Audience		Aesthetic		Technical		Composer		Student		Educational	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1	0	0.0	3	60.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	40.0
2	1	20.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	3	60.0	0	0.0
4	2	40.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	40.0
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	1	20.0	0	0.0
6	2	40.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	2	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

In reviewing the data, it can be seen that nearly a third of band directors responding ranked aesthetic value as their first criterion when selecting music for curricular inclusion. This response falls in line with data reported by Reames (2001), and ideas posited by Reynolds (2000), and Leonhard & House (1959). Another 29.6 percent declared educational elements as their first criterion in selecting music for curricular inclusion. This response falls in line with ideas posited by Camphouse (2001), Dvorak et al. (1993), and DeYoung (1977). The third highest ranked criterion, at a response rate of 25.0 percent, was technical value. This data falls in line with the data of Reames (2001), the ideas of Hilliard (1992), and Otto (1971).

These three responses combined constitute 87.4 percent of the responding Florida band directors' top criteria. This can be seen as positive for the students in the ensembles. This would infer that wind music is being selected for, what is seen in the research literature as, sound reasons. This is one means of implying that sound musical reasoning is taking place when selecting music for performance.

It is important to note that aesthetic value was ranked first among the six criteria listed. The importance lies in the fact that aesthetic value is the most mentioned criteria among the experts listed in the *Review of Literature*. This bodes strongly that Reamer's (2002) idea of Music Education as Aesthetic Education is seen by many to be the pervasive philosophy in modern music education. This could infer that sound, aesthetically-based ideas are being taught in teacher education programs and being carried into classroom practice.

When data are examined on an individual basis by level of school, a disparity is evident among the top criteria selected. At the high school level, 44.0 percent of directors ranked aesthetic value as their top criterion. In contrast, only 8.8 percent of middle school directors selected aesthetic criteria as their top criterion when selecting music for curricular inclusion. Rather, over one third [38.2 percent] of middle school respondents indicated that criteria related to the technical value of a piece was their top priority.

It can be speculated that this disparity is due to a difference in focus depending upon the level being taught. That is, the focus of many middle school directors seems to be the building of technique that is necessary to access “higher level” literature. Whereas the focus of the high school band is to hone the technical skills developed at the middle school level and apply them to more aesthetically accessible literature.

It should also be noted that educational elements are also ranked higher among middle school directors. This could infer that middle school teachers are more active in their thought process concerning the selection of music to demonstrate a specific concept, or set of concepts.

Another disparity in response should be noted. Aesthetic value was the top criteria of the combined groups. Yet, in the free response portion of the survey nearly twice as many (120) comments were listed concerning specific educational elements. This provides insight that the majority of teachers might select their literature based on the elements they feel necessary to teach, or that, upon reflection of their selection process, they see more clearly the educational elements possessed within a piece.

The data would seem to indicate that good choices are being made in the band rooms of certain Florida band directors concerning the selection of literature. Directors seem to be cognizant of the aesthetic, technical, and educational values of pieces of music, and are selecting music for curricular inclusion primarily based on those criteria, which are in line with the ideas found in the body of professional literature.

Limitations of Study & Suggestions for Future Research

This study was limited, primarily, by the low survey-response rate (18.2 percent). For follow up procedures, the current study employed one mass e-mail to all selected participants. Future studies may want to consider better and more persistent follow up techniques such as individual phone calls and a higher frequency of e-mails. Also, an internet-based version of the survey would allow for a more convenient response interaction, thus yielding a higher response rate allowing for broader generalizations.

Data in this study were descriptive. Future studies may want to include some form of statistical test that would provide more definitive data and allow for more generalized discussion.

APPENDIX A
COVER LETTER

Dear Selected Participant,

I am a graduate student under the direction of Dr. Bentley Shellahamer in the College of Music at Florida State University. I am conducting research to determine the selection criteria used by Florida band directors when selecting concert music for their bands.

Your participation will involve the completion and return of the attached survey, please include the signed consent form below. Your participation in this study is voluntary and your time is greatly appreciated. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study, there will be no penalty. The results of this research study may be published, but your name will not be used.

Although there will be no direct benefit to you, the possible benefits of your participation is to gain further insight as to why we, band directors, select the music we select for our ensembles.

In completing this survey, please list four titles from your literature you selected this year for study in your program. In the second portion you will be asked to rank criteria identified in previous research literature. Please do not rank any two or more criteria as equal (no ties). Upon completion (5-10 minutes) please return the survey and the consent form attached below in the enclosed envelope.

If you have any questions concerning this research, please call me at (352) 347-1179 or john.roseboom@marion.k12.fl.us or Dr. Bentley Shellahamer in the College of Music (850) 644-3885 or bshella@mail.fsu.edu

I thank you for your time, as I understand its value.

Sincerely,

John D. Roseboom, Director of Bands Belleview High School

Please sign and detach the below portion, and be sure to include it in your return mailing.

I give my consent to participate in the above study. I understand the my name will be omitted in the findings, and any information provided will remain confident to the extent allowed by law.

_____ (signature) _____ (date)

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Instructional Review Board, through the Vice President for the Office of Research at (850) 644-8633.

APPENDIX B
SURVEY

Please complete the following demographic information before continuing

MS <input type="checkbox"/>	HS <input type="checkbox"/>	County _____	Years of Experience _____
Highest Degree Held _____		Number of Bands in your program _____	
FBA Classification _____			

Please fill in the 5 portions below with your most recent titles selected for curricular inclusion. Please provide the Title, Composer, and Reasons for selecting it to include in your educational program.

Title _____	Composer _____
Reason for Inclusion _____	

Title _____	Composer _____
Reason for Inclusion _____	

Title _____	Composer _____
Reason for Inclusion _____	

Title _____	Composer _____
Reason for Inclusion _____	

Numer the following items 1-6 (1=Highest, 6=Lowest) in order of priority when normally selecting music for curricular inclusion in your band program.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetic Value -- The piece is suitable for teaching students about the art of music
<input type="checkbox"/>	Audience Consideration -- The piece is something that the audience will easily enjoy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Technical Value -- The piece is suitable for expanding the technique of students
<input type="checkbox"/>	Composer Reputation -- The piece is written by a composer whose music is respected
<input type="checkbox"/>	Students Consideration -- The piece is something that the students will easily enjoy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Educational Elements -- The piece is suitable to teach a specific concept

Thank you for your time and assistance. This information will not be shared with anyone, and all information is confidential. If you would like to know the results, please make contact in the coming months using the information on the cover letter.

Sincerely,
John D. Roseboom

APPENDIX C

HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE APPROVAL



Office of the Vice President For Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2742
(850) 644-8673 · FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 7/18/2006

To:

John Roseboom
3001 SE Lake Weir Avenue, #1414
Ocala, FL 34471

Dept.: **MUSIC SCHOOL**

From: **Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair**

Re: **Use of Human Subjects in Research**
Curricular Literature Selection Criteria Among Florida Band Directors

The forms that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Exempt per 45 CFR § 46.101(b) 2 and has been approved by an accelerated review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which may be required.

If the project has not been completed by **4/18/2007** you must request renewed approval for continuation of the project.

You are advised that any change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the project to the Committee for approval. Also, the principal investigator must promptly report, in writing, any unexpected problems causing risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: B. Shellahamer
HSC No. 2006.0298

REFERENCES

- Adams, Bobby (2002) Evaluating literature: A band director's responsibility. *National Band Association Journal*, 43 (3) 18-21.
- Bernstein, Leonard (1976). *The Unanswered Question: Six Talks at Harvard*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Berry, D. (1975). A survey of band literature performed by the high schools and colleges of Iowa and Nebraska from 1968-1972. *Council for Research in Music Education Bulletin*, 41 (1) 18-21.
- Camphouse, M. (2001). Programming good literature for audiences and students. *Instrumentalist*, 56 (3), 40, 42, 44, 106.
- Croft, J. C. (1997). The influence of literature on the development of bands. *Instrumentalist*, 51 (11), 40.
- Dewey, John (2005). *Art as Experience* (4th edition). Perigee Trade, New York, NY.
- Del Borgo, E. A. (1988). Selecting quality literature for bands and orchestras. *Instrumentalist*, 43 (4), 22.
- De Young, D. (1977). Music literature for band and wind ensembles. *Music Educators Journal*, 64 (4), 26.
- Dvorak, T., Grechesky, R., Ciepluch, G. (1993), *Best Music for High School Band*. Manhattan Beach Music, Brooklyn, NY.
- Elliot, David (1995), *Music Matters*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Fennell, Fredrick (1995), *Time and the Winds*. Leblanc Educational Publishing, Elkhart, In.
- Goldman, Richard F., (1961) *The Wind Band*. Allyn and Bacon, Boston.
- Hilliard, Q. (1992). Choosing literature for young bands. *Instrumentalist*, 46 (6), 10.
- Labuta, Joseph, (1997) *Teaching Musicianship in the High School Band*, Merideth, Ft. Lauderdale, FL.
- Leonhard, C., House, R. (1959). *Foundations and Principles of Music Education* McGraw-Hill New York, NY.

- Madsen, C.K, Madsen C.H. (1998) *Teaching/Discipline: A Positive Approach for Educational Development*, Contemporary Publishing Company, Raleigh, NC.
- McBeth, W. F. (1989). The band—artistic viability through literature. *Instrumentalist*, 43 (6), 92.
- Otto, Richard A., *Effective Methods for Building the High School Band*. 1971, Parker Publishing Co., West Nyack, NY.
- Peterson, Michael (ed.), *The New ASBDA Curriculum Guide*. 1997, Belwin,-Mills, Allentown, PA.
- Petrella, N. (1993). How to select timpani literature. *Music Educators Journal*, 80 (3), 37-39.
- Prescott, G.R., Chidester, L.W. (1939), *Getting Results with School Bands*. Carl Fischer & Paul A. Schmidt Music, New York/Minneapolis.
- Reamer, Bennett (2002), *A Philosophy of Music Education*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- Reames, R. R. (2001). High school choral directors' descriptions of appropriate literature for beginning high school choirs. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 49, 122-135.
- Reynolds, H. Robert, (2000). Repertoire is the curriculum. *Music Educators Journal*, July 31-33.
- Schmalz, P. (1990). Improving band literature. *Instrumentalist*, 45 (3), 36.
- Scruton, Roger, (1999). *Aesthetics of Music*. Oxford University Press USA, Chicago, IL.
- Sheldon, D.A. (2000). Pre-service and in-service teacher's perceptions of band music content and quality using self-report and behavioral measures. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 48 (1), 10-25.
- Thomson, W. (1967). Music literature in high school: the Yale curriculum development project. *Music Educators Journal*, 53 (7), 35-37.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

John D. Roseboom, a native of Daytona Beach, Florida, completed the Bachelor of Music Education degree at Stetson University in DeLand, Florida under the guidance of major professor Bobby Adams. Upon graduation, he assumed the position of director of bands at both Belleview Middle School and Belleview High School. There he was responsible for teaching beginning band, advanced band, and chorus at the middle school; while teaching concert band, marching band, jazz band, percussion, guitar, instrument techniques, and reading at the high school. In the fall of 2006, he will begin duties as director of bands at Sarasota High School in Sarasota, Florida.