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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate high school band directors’ definitions of quality music, the definitions’ impact on repertoire selection, as well as the relationship between opinions of quality and the director’s years of experience, background, and professional development activities. The following questions guided the research: (1) What is the definition of quality among high school band directors as it pertains to high school band repertoire? (2) What is the relationship between high school band directors’ definitions of quality and their selection process for high school band repertoire? (3) What is the relationship between band director’s backgrounds and professional development activities and their definition of quality repertoire? (4) What is the relationship between novice and experienced band directors’ definitions of quality repertoire as they pertain to repertoire selection processes?

Pennsylvania high school band directors who are members of PMEA were asked to respond to an on-line questionnaire to gather information about their background, level of experience, professional development activities, and their opinions about quality repertoire. The information was coded and then compared to tables that were developed by the researcher that contain pertinent information found in the literature review about characteristics of quality and factors that influence repertoire selection.

Fifty-four participants, or 40% of the total population, indicated that quality was a factor that was related to their repertoire selection process. However, the data suggests that participants’ backgrounds, years of service, school demographics, and professional development activities did not suggest consistencies among the participants who had similar definitions of quality. Educational value was listed more often than quality as a
factor that most influenced choosing music for study and performance. Participants also indicated that the level of challenge presented by the music, as well as the music’s appeal to the students and audience members were also prominent factors that were related to their repertoire selection process.

Based on the results of this study, it is suggested that individual directors investigate resources to make informed decisions when selecting music for study and performance with their ensembles. Since the data did not seem to imply a consistent relationship between the participants’ definitions of quality and professional development activities, perhaps specific sessions regarding repertoire selection and characteristics of quality should be offered at district and region workshops and state conferences. Other possibilities for delivering professional development regarding quality repertoire and repertoire selection procedures could also include courses, workshops, and/or webinars for directors to gain further understanding on this topic.
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CHAPTER I – INTRODUCTION

Selecting repertoire for high school students to study and perform is a critical decision for music educators. Many experts agree that selecting music is perhaps the most important task that music educators must face before the teaching process can begin (Apfelstadt, 2000; Battisti, 2002; Menchaca, 1995). Many questions arise as the subject of selecting repertoire is considered. Perhaps one of the most widely-discussed yet debatable aspects of repertoire selection is that of quality music. It may be assumed that better quality repertoire will help provide for quality learning experiences for students. However, is there a consensus that quality repertoire does indeed exist? How is quality defined by music educators? If quality music does exist, how is it recognized?

Reimer (1989) states:

To be successful teachers of music through performance, we must use as the core study material a rich array of pieces of music at graded levels of difficulty and in a wide variety of styles within the particular performance medium with which we are dealing. That literature is what we teach, including the expressive experience each piece offers, general musical learnings each piece fosters, skills of performance each piece helps develop, and understandings about performance itself as an essential artistic role that arises from creating each piece. (p.89)

Repertoire as Curriculum

As education becomes increasingly more standards-based, the need for a solid music curriculum has perhaps never been more evident. More specifically, in order to justify existence during the school day, performing ensembles must meet the same curricular demands as other core academic subjects, such as language arts, math, and
science. The course content of curricular performing ensembles relies heavily on the repertoire that directors choose to study and perform. The concepts and skills presented in the music become the means by which music learning takes place (Bauer, 1996).

Literature indicates that the repertoire selected for performance essentially becomes the curriculum for most high school band programs (Apfelstadt, 2000; Bauer, 1996; Fonder, 2000; Labuta, 1997; Reynolds, 2000; Sheldon, 1996). Recent articles published in practitioner journals have shared ideas on presenting curriculum-based concerts by using a variety of themes related to the National Standards for Music Education as set by MENC (now NAfME) (Apfelstadt, 2000; MENC, 1994; Russell, 2006). Fonder (2000) states that regardless of the method of curriculum development, “the choice of repertoire has to be the absolute heart of the matter” (p.8).

**Repertoire Selection**

Assuming that the band’s existence in schools today is largely dependent on the viability of the music curriculum, the process of selecting the “right” music is most essential. Literature indicates there are several factors that may influence directors’ repertoire selection (Battisti, 1995; Bauer, 1996; Jones, 2005; Mencahca, 1995). Musical aspects, such as the technical demands or the expressive qualities of the piece, as well as external factors, such as community expectations and the influence of the music industry, have been found to be influential. Additionally, directors may consider the students’ preferences, the amount of available rehearsal time, cost of the music, or programming needs as factors that affect their decision-making (Bauer; Cramer, 1997).

Consultation of recommended lists of repertoire can also be a technique used by band directors’ for selecting repertoire. Many types of lists exist ranging from an
individual expert band director’s recommendations (Battisti, 1995) to compilation studies of several directors’ suggestions and/or state recommended lists (Begian, 1991; Gaines, 1996; Hughes, 1990; Olson, 1982; Stevenson, 2004). Entire books of recommended pieces are also available (Dvorak, Grechesky, & Ciepluch, 1993; Miles, 1997; Kvet, 1996; Williamson, 1998).

Many of these lists use the terms “core” or “essential” implying that students and/or musicians should experience the music contained within these lists. However, the use of these lists is somewhat controversial. The sources are not always based upon a definite consensus, but rather are based upon the opinions of the compilers and evaluators of the repertoire selections (Gaines, 1996). Since the 1960’s, the band community has been commissioning works by the world’s greatest composers to add to the band repertoire (Battisti, 1995). Some of the music on the recommended lists today reflects the music from this movement. Also, much of the music contained on these lists is usually music that was originally composed for band. A recommended list from 40 years ago might contain other sources of repertoire such as orchestral transcriptions and/or march music (Gaines). More recently, march music has been listed as a separate genre in the overall construct of band repertoire and therefore is not often considered by experienced professionals on recommended lists.

When considering the factors that influence directors’ processes of repertoire selection, studies show that certain factors may be given more attention than others. In a study completed in Ohio, Bauer (1996) concluded that the top three techniques used by directors for choosing music were: (1) listening to publishers’ promotional recordings, (2) browsing in music stores, and (3) consulting the Ohio State Music Education
Association’s contest list. While these could be effective ways to select repertoire, it is unclear if any of the three answers directly address quality in the selection process. Bauer (1996) concludes, “Once the decisions regarding the curriculum’s goals and objectives have been made, the key to putting the curriculum into action is the music literature chosen by the teacher” (p.9).

Issues of Quality

Regardless of the processes and criteria band directors use to select repertoire, one theme resounds in the literature – the use of quality music for study and performance is absolutely essential. Persellin (2000) states, “High quality music lays the foundation for a sound music education.” (p.17) Hayward (2006) comments, “the repertoire studied will determine the course of the student’s musical development. Through the study of quality literature, the student learns musical skills, develops discriminatory skills, and also learns and experiences musical concepts as well” (p.3). Begian (1991) writes “The study and performance of good music is what attracts students to a band program” (p.10). Perhaps the importance of quality literature is best summarized by Reynolds (2000) “…we must strive to select the finest repertoire, for only through immersion in music of lasting quality can we engage in aesthetic experiences of breadth and depth” (p. 31).

However, the term quality itself may be interpreted in many ways. There are philosophies in music education that argue that quality repertoire does not exist. Elliot (1995) states “Music is never a matter of musical works alone, and musical works are never a matter of formal elements, auditory designs, or sound patterns alone” (p. 129). In Elliot’s view, music is a matter of context and cultural influence. He continues “…different musical works present different dimensions and different combinations of
musical dimensions to listen for. In addition, different musical practices around the world have different ways of organizing musical designs, musical expressions of emotion, and musical representations” (p.155).

Attempting to define quality is difficult and it is often easier to describe characteristics of quality. Webster’s Dictionary defines quality as a degree or grade of excellence or worth. Although it seems directors can agree upon music that is considered to be quality, there is little agreement on the basis of these judgments (Fiese, 1993). The literature indicates several ideas or characteristics that various music experts use when describing the term quality as it pertains to band repertoire. Some of the more widely accepted characteristics include music that has solid craftsmanship, possessing a balance of variety and repetition, and musical interest (Del Borgo, 1988). Some other notable features of quality include music that demonstrates rhythmic vitality, harmonic imagination, consistency in style and expression, consistency in quality throughout its length, and emotional impact (Hayward, 2006). Quality music may also demonstrate a musical validity that transcends factors of historical importance, or factors of pedagogical usefulness (Cramer, 1997; Fonder, 2000; Hayward, 2006). Renowned composer W. Francis McBeth (1990) summarizes the issues of quality music by stating that there are two constants in all music with artistic intent – direction and originality. “Great music is never a succession of acceptable progressions but a journey of sound to somewhere” (p.16).

The issue of quality repertoire has been debated when comparing music referred to as educational and music of artistic merit. Fonder (2000) describes educational music or a “good teaching piece” as “…one with a purpose and value aimed at developing
musical skills” (p.1). It can be contended that music of high quality can meet the educational objectives as well as serve as a catalyst for students to gain meaningful insights into themselves as developing musicians, as well as a meaningful understanding of music as an expressive art (Fonder; Persellin, 2000). Persellin continues, “…music should not only reinforce our ensembles’ strengths, but also stretch them in some way. Good quality music is durable and can stand up to intense rehearsal. Music of excellence has vitality, originality, and musical integrity. It introduces students to new musical ideas, styles, composers, and places of origin” (p. 17). This statement would imply that quality music can meet both the curricular demands discussed earlier and develop artistic expression.

Need for the Study

There are many concerns regarding the selection of quality repertoire. First, there seems to be a disparity between what band directors agree is quality repertoire and what music is being chosen for performance with their ensembles (Hughes, 1990). Undergraduate experiences do not always allow for connections to be made between the inherent musical aspects of a piece and the realities of time constraints, budgets, scheduling, etc. faced by practicing teachers (Bauer & Berg, 2001). Research indicates that the music programmed by many high school band directors is not written by composers who are recognized for quality repertoire (Stevenson, 2004). Battisti (1995) points out that many younger high school band musicians are not experiencing notable repertoire. Hughes (1990) and Battisti (2005) also argue that many music programs seem to have a misguided focus. They contend too much emphasis is placed on marching band, community events, and contest competitions that take away from opportunities for
students to improve performance skills and develop an understanding of high quality literature.

The music industry has also been a source of controversy when it comes to repertoire selection. Band directors argue that publishers are marketing music of poor quality. However, the publishers contend that they produce what consumers purchase. Consequently, it would seem logical for directors to buy and perform music that is considered to be of quality regardless of what the publishers offer (Begian, 1991; Hughes 1990).

It has been suggested that more professional development and perhaps better teacher training could assist directors in choosing quality repertoire (Hayward, 2006). Smith & Haack (2000) state, “Choosing to continue broadening and deepening skills and understandings can benefit teachers personally, intellectually, musically, and pedagogically” (p.29). Experiences such as attending state music conferences and honors festivals, as well as the Midwest Band and Orchestra Clinic, can allow teachers to gain insight into rehearsal techniques, score study, and conducting applications of great wind repertoire as demonstrated by skilled conductors. Also interacting with colleagues and sharing new ideas can assist in exploring new literature and learning more “tricks of the trade” (Conway, Hibbard, Albert & Hourigan, 2005). Reynolds (2000) recommends several professional development ideas that band directors can do to find out more about quality repertoire. He suggests networking with colleagues, studying scores, attending workshops and conferences, reading books, journals, reviews, and the Sunday edition of the *New York Times*. He also suggests that directors investigate repertoire that not only affects their day-to-day teaching, but also repertoire that indirectly affects their teaching.
Learning more about the entire music profession and making art part of everyday life will help to make an informed director.

**Purpose Statement**

Although the topic of quality repertoire is frequently discussed in practitioner journals, little research has investigated directors’ perceptions of quality repertoire. The purpose of this study is to investigate high school band directors’ definitions of quality music, their definitions’ impact on repertoire selection, as well as the relationship between opinions of quality and the director’s years of experience, background, and professional development activities.

**Research Questions**

1. How do high school band directors define quality as it pertains to high school band repertoire?
2. What is the relationship between high school band directors’ definitions of quality and their selection process for high school band repertoire?
3. What is the relationship between band directors’ backgrounds and their definition of quality repertoire?
   3a. Does the type of school where they teach affect this relationship?
   3b. Does the function of age and years of experience affect this relationship?
4. What is the relationship between types of professional development activities and band directors’ definitions of quality repertoire?
   4a. Does coursework affect this relationship?
   4b. Does attendance at workshops and conferences affect this relationship?
4c. Does performance and/or private study affect this relationship?

4d. Does membership in other professional music organizations affect this relationship?

**Definitions**

The term high school band director will refer to Pennsylvania high school band directors teaching during the 2007-2008 school year who are members of the Pennsylvania Music Educators Association (PMEA).

**Limitations**

The generalizability of this study is limited to high school band directors in Pennsylvania who are members of PMEA.

This study is attempting to find the relationships of quality repertoire selection and teacher background and professional development activities. This study does not address issues of appropriateness related to repertoire selection.
CHAPTER II – REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to investigate high school band directors’ definitions of quality music, their definitions’ impact on repertoire selection, as well as the relationship between opinions of quality and the director’s years of experience, background, and professional development activities. The review of literature will focus on four components of this topic: (1) repertoire selection, (2) recommended and core repertoire, (3) issues of quality, and (4) professional development.

**Repertoire Selection**

As music educators continue to become more accountable for standards, assessment, and curriculum development, band directors must be aware that the music they choose for study and performance is equally as important as textbooks for other academic subjects. In other words, the music that is selected must possess traits that can be defined by concepts that should be taught and assessed through objectives in order to meet the curricular expectations and requirements of most school districts. The following review demonstrates that this selection process is not conducted in a consistent manner by high school band directors. Forbes (2001) even suggested that the process of selecting repertoire may be more of an art than a science and it is unique to each director. The following literature identifies two main areas that have been studied when directors choose repertoire: (1) techniques used to select music, and (2) specific factors that are taken into consideration.

Apfelstadt (2000) wrote on the importance of selecting repertoire as it applies to the National Standards for Music Education and curriculum. This article outlined principles for selecting music by addressing quality, teachability, and appropriateness for
effective student learning. Several descriptors are presented for each area to assist directors in choosing music.

The article also addressed the movement of the National Standards for Music Education. The author listed each content standard and discusses its implications for repertoire selection. She maintained that improvising and composing are the two standards that present the most challenge for ensemble directors. However, careful planning and repertoire choice can make these standards relevant to repertoire selection. She concluded by stating,

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. We must challenge our students and ourselves to learn musics that embrace a wide span of time, a range of cultures and traditions, and a variety of styles. (p. 46)

Sheldon (1996) discussed the importance of repertoire as the curriculum for band classes, and the way music educators learn about making informed decisions about repertoire selection. The author stated that research shows there is little evidence of systematic or unbiased instruction for pre-service teachers to develop the skills to select appropriate levels of quality instrumental literature. She highlighted three potential negative influences on the process of choosing music for performance and study by pre-service or novice teachers. First, Sheldon argued that recent performance experience from college ensembles may not allow music education majors to learn and study repertoire from all grade levels. She contended that most university and college ensembles perform music that is too difficult for most middle or high school bands.
Another factor that the author argued may not be most helpful for selecting repertoire is relying on a composer’s reputation. Sheldon stated that not every piece by a well known composer may lead to the musical growth of the students. She contended that directors should review each piece for its intrinsic quality. The final error young directors may make is relying too heavily on the influence of mentors. She stated that mentors have great and long-lasting influence on young music educators. The possibility exists that if the mentor defines a piece of music as inferior, or not worthy of study, young teachers may choose not to perform it with their ensembles even though it may possess inherent musical qualities. She suggested that college professors and mentors should provide information in an unbiased way that informs pre-service and novice teachers about what makes one band work more preferable than another.

The article continued with attributes that music educators should consider when selecting repertoire such as quality and craftsmanship, scoring and instrumentation, elements of expression, length of composition, level of difficulty, programming, and student enjoyment. Sheldon concluded by recognizing that qualitative judgments and personal preference affect repertoire selection and there will always be some subjectivity in the process. However, she contended that if information on repertoire selection is presented in a systematic way without bias as part of an undergraduate experience, pre-service and novice teachers will be better informed to determine if a piece of music is of quality and will meet the curricular needs of the students.

Forbes (2001) investigated the repertoire selection practices of high school choral directors. Two samples of directors were chosen to participate. The first sample consisted of directors who were identified as outstanding by university choral directors
and/or music education faculty, and the second sample was other randomly selected directors. An initial questionnaire was given to gather background information about the community, school, choral program, and director’s educational background. The questionnaire was then followed with a phone interview asking ten open-ended questions regarding their repertoire selection process, beliefs regarding the balance of repertoire, and quality as selection criteria.

The results of this study found no common structure or system that directors use in approaching repertoire selection. Most directors described a process that narrows down the vast amount of available music by using one or two criteria, and then following the same procedure until a program is selected. The results suggest that selecting repertoire may be more of an art, rather than a science, and a checklist of proper procedures for selecting music may be inappropriate. Many directors in the survey felt a standardized approach would be inappropriate. Forbes suggested that directors may need to seek inspiration when selecting repertoire and this may depend on their individual preferences.

According to Forbes, most directors agreed that a variety of criteria are used, however the ranking of this criterion was found to vary depending on the repertoire under consideration. Directors were found to place more emphasis on the development of musicianship when selecting classical music, whereas they placed more emphasis on entertainment value when considering popular music. Since musicianship was a consideration when selecting classical music, it could also be concluded that directors should consider literature with educational value, rather than entertainment value. It is also noteworthy to mention that directors who were not identified as being outstanding
selected more popular music on average than directors who were identified as outstanding. Additionally, directors not identified as outstanding gave less importance to quality as criteria for repertoire selection. Due to the many findings of this study, the author recommended further investigation.

Bauer (1996) investigated the methodologies used and criteria considered by high school band directors in choosing repertoire for study and performance. He also studied the importance that directors give to criteria that reflect curricular and non-curricular concerns.

Bauer surveyed 100 randomly selected high school band directors in Ohio. His study concluded that the top methodologies used by directors were (1) listening to publishers’ promotional recordings, (2) browsing through the music store, and (3) consulting the Ohio Music Education Association (OMEA) contest list. Bauer contended that combining the techniques of reviewing publishers’ promotional recordings, browsing through scores at music stores, and consulting recommended lists of repertoire is more effective and thorough for selecting repertoire than any single method. Another result from this study showed that directors with bachelor’s degrees relied more on recommendations from colleagues than did directors with master’s degrees. Consequently, the study also showed that directors with master’s degrees seemed to solicit advice from music store professionals more often than younger or less experienced directors.

Bauer’s study also examined the criteria band directors most often consider when selecting music. The top four factors were (1) their band’s ability to execute the technical demands of the composition, (2) their band’s ability to execute the musical demands of
the composition, (3) the ensemble performance concepts (balance, blend, intonation, etc.)
that can be taught through the composition, and (4) the musical stylistic concepts
(phrasing, legato/staccato/marcato style, dynamic contrast, etc.) that can be taught
through the composition.

Jones (2005) reviewed dissertations about concert band repertoire with
applications for school and collegiate bands. He also completed a study in Pennsylvania
to identify the repertoire that was performed by high school bands during the 1996-1997
school year, and the processes and selection criteria used by band directors. He also
investigated how band directors learn of new pieces. He then compared these results
with a study by Gaines in 1996.

Jones’ study showed that 10% of the 609 total compositions were programmed
three or more times. Thirty-six percent of the compositions were programmed five or
more times. Sixty-two percent of compositions were also included on Gaines’ Core
Repertoire list. Jones also found that 14 of the 17 pieces listed on Gaines’ Essential
Repertoire list were programmed. Results also showed that directors use publishers’
promotional recordings as the number one method to find new pieces of repertoire
followed by colleague interaction, attending conferences and concerts, and the use of
recommended repertoire lists. The three factors that directors consider most often for
selecting repertoire were artistic value, educational value, and programming balance.

As evidenced in the preceding literature review, there may be no customary
practice associated with the selection of repertoire. However, there is some evidence that
music educators consider educational standards as they develop curriculum. The
standards movement has guided directors to take into account the musical concepts that
can be taught when selecting music. This literature also shows that directors base their repertoire selection on their students’ abilities. However, the specific procedures for selection remain unique to the individual. Additionally, the literature suggests that younger or inexperienced directors may need more guidance in developing procedures for repertoire selection.

**Recommended & Core Repertoire**

One factor of repertoire selection that has been well-researched is the development and use of a core or standard repertoire for band. Olson (1982) described a core repertoire as “repertoire which can function as a programming nucleus, as a base for the study of wind band music historically and pedagogically, and as a qualitative measurement for the artistic evaluation of new music” (p.11). Many states and professional organizations, as well as many wind band experts have compiled lists of recommended pieces of music that meet Olson’s definition of a core repertoire that all students and/or musicians should know and/or perform. Several studies have investigated the origins and consistency of recommended or core repertoire lists and have attempted to investigate the influence of these lists on band directors’ procedures for selecting music to study and perform with their ensembles.

Gaines (1996) conducted a study with the premise that little research had been conducted to validate the literature on recommended repertoire lists. Gaines states that there was no evidence to support that high school band directors’ attitudes are consistent with the people who develop such repertoire lists. Gains also contended that many repertoire lists are not based upon a consensus or practical study, but rather based
upon the judgments of those who compile the lists. This study investigated what compositions would make up a core repertoire for high school band.

A questionnaire was prepared and sent to current and former high school band directors throughout the United States. The questionnaire contained a list of 209 compositions that appeared a minimum of seven times from thirteen different recommended repertoire lists. The participating directors were then asked to respond that yes, the piece should be included in a core repertoire, no, the piece should not be included, or the piece was unfamiliar to the participant.

From data collected from 437 usable questionnaires, Gaines concluded the following: (1) High school band directors seem to agree upon a core repertoire. (2) Certain composers were more represented than others. Fifteen different composers comprised nearly 50% of the 106 compositions listed as the core repertoire. (3) The top 5% of the pieces listed were considered to be the “essential” repertoire for high school band by the author. The top 5% included 17 compositions, of which 12 were originally composed for band. Gaines also noted that responding band directors seemed to favor pieces originally composed for band rather than arrangements or transcriptions.

Olson (1982) addressed the existence of a core repertoire that can serve as a basis for programming, and serve as a qualitative measurement for the artistic evaluation of music. Olson defines the core repertoire as: (1) historically representative, (2) of serious artistic merit, and (3) of a manageable number for the user of the study.

Olson asked respected university wind ensemble conductors from the United States to nominate compositions they felt were of artistic merit for inclusion in his project. This resulted in a list of 68 pieces of music. The same evaluators were then
asked to determine if each of the compositions should be included in a selective, core repertoire. The evaluators were also asked to explain their criteria used in defining a wind ensemble.

The results of this study concluded that there was a functional core repertoire of wind ensemble literature. Olson concluded that nearly 50 compositions are worthy of being included in a core repertoire.

Stevenson (2004) collected twenty five selective lists from state and professional associations to determine if the pieces of music comprising these lists were regularly recommended for their educational and musical value by multiple sources. The author used grades I – VI in determining the difficulty level of the compositions because the majority of the states used that system. From a total of 9,647 titles on all lists the author created a list of 1,270 pieces found on at least seven state lists.

Stevenson found that all grade levels of music contained significantly more original compositions for band than transcriptions or arrangements. Most of the lists contained music scored for the traditional concert band instrumentation. Few military marches appeared on the state lists, however several concert marches did appear. The most popular pieces for each grade level were published in this article and were listed by difficulty level and in order of the number of recommendations.

Begian (1991) was asked by the American Bandmasters Association to address the concern of the decline of the school band movement. In this study he addressed, “The study and performance of great artistic literature from all periods of Western history, and the evaluation of artistic musical expression” (p. 10). Both of these areas were considered to be lacking with high school band programs. Begian contended that… “The
study and performance of good music is what attracts students to a band program” (p. 10). The author also contended that the primary excuse for the performance of poor quality repertoire is related to the music that publishers market. He continued by stating that good businesses promote music that sells. It is up to the directors to purchase quality music for performance.

Additionally, Belgian coordinated a compilation of outstanding band repertoire. He then asked seven outstanding college and university conductors to evaluate the list. As a result of this project, Begian presented a list of selected repertoire divided into Grades III – V. He used the criteria from Best Music for High School Band by Thomas Dvorak to determine the appropriate grade level. Dvorak (1993) stated:

…this book represents a part of the “Grade I” through “Grade VI” spectrum so commonly used in our profession today, Grade I begin suitable for first year bands (in elementary schools, middle schools, and junior high schools), Grade II being suitable for second year bands (likewise in elementary schools, middle schools, and junior high schools), Grade III being suitable for mature third year bands in middle school and junior high school and beginning first year bands in high school, Grade IV being suitable for most high school bands, Grade V being suitable for the finest high school bands, most college bands and community bands, and Grade VI being suitable for advanced college and professional bands.

(p. 11)

Hughes (1990) contended that there is a great disparity between what band directors choose to perform with their ensembles and what they deem as significant repertoire. He surveyed Iowa high school band directors to determine what constitutes
the core repertoire of band music. They were also asked to describe their familiarity on 50 diverse compositions provided by identifying the following: (1) familiar because they had heard it or performed it, (2) they had performed the piece in an ensemble, (3) not performed the work, but studied the score, (4) owned a copy of the score, (5) owned a recording of the piece.

Hughes’ results ranked the 50 pieces in order of familiarity that he considered to be the core repertoire. However he also noted that only 32% of the respondents stated on the survey that they have a core curriculum.

Kish (2005) replicated a study by Holvick that was published in 1970. The purpose of the Kish study was to determine if a standard band repertoire had indeed emerged during the past forty years. Kish collected five years of concert programming from the College Band Directors National Association Report. The programs from the CBDNA report were submitted voluntarily from throughout the country. Each performance from 1998 – 2002 was entered into a computer to calculate the results. Due to limitations, three editions of this list were computed before arriving at final results.

The results analyzed 11,765 pieces of music. The findings showed 170 pieces that were listed on at least 15 programs. 143 (84%) of these pieces were original compositions for band. Holvick’s original study showed 156 concert works (67%), 43 marches (18%), 20 solo works (9%), and 15 show tunes or novelty pieces (6%). Kish’s study showed 149 concert works (88%) and 21 marches (12%). When compared, 53 of the compositions were listed on both lists. Eight of the top ten most frequently performed compositions in Kish’s study were also included in the Holvick study. A complete list of results from both studies was published in the article.
Many of the aforementioned studies and articles contained the recommended, or core lists of repertoire resulting from their research. A consensus can be made that a large percentage of the numerous recommended or core lists of repertoire contain many of the same pieces. Over the past thirty years many of these pieces have remained on such lists. It is a concern that even though there are numerous recommended lists available containing a core repertoire, research suggests that directors do not always rely on these recommendations when selecting repertoire. Another result from the literature indicates that most directors prefer music that was originally composed for band as opposed to transcriptions and arrangements. Also, concert marches were preferred over military marches. These conclusions suggest that personal preference for certain styles or genres of music may influence the repertoire selections of some directors more than expert recommendations or the suggestion of using a core repertoire.

**Issues of Quality**

The literature overwhelmingly states the need for students to study and perform music of high quality. Although there is not one clear definition, many studies have attempted to define characteristics that affect the quality of music. Some music is considered to possess educational quality, while other music is thought to contain artistic merit. An argument has also been made that the highest quality music can serve both purposes.

Fonder (2000) compared characteristics of music that are considered to be quality for educational purposes and music that is considered to be of artistic quality. Fonder begins by reviewing historical factors that have led to the notion that there is a difference between these two types of quality music. He stated that significant orchestral
composers, when writing for just winds, composed music of lesser quality. The author continued by stating that changes have taken place in regard to composing for band. He cited that the wind band community has seen an increase in the quantity of writing for wind band by eminent composers.

The article continues with a discussion of the emergence of band into the school curriculum. Historically, school administration and the public felt that the band’s purpose was to perform music that entertained and provided musical enlightenment. Fonder cited that marching band for its entertainment value, and band contests for their competitive spirit were the primary reasons that bands existed. The quality of music in the early history of band education was not high due to the utilitarian focus of the band’s activities. Fonder contended that young directors today still have some of these historic pressures placed on them when selecting repertoire. He stated that it takes mature musicians and teachers who have a strong philosophical base to adhere to a curriculum of artistic substance.

Fonder concluded this article with a discussion of ten criteria that directors may consider when judging a composition on serious artistic merit. He provided commentary for each of these factors as they also may relate to educational quality. He states that there is no justification to select a piece of music simply to teach a musical concept, but rather an excellent piece of music will provide the concepts from which to teach.

Fiese (1993) examined the judgments of three unfamiliar wind band scores by public secondary school band directors. The author surveyed 84 members of the Texas Bandmasters Association. The study attempted to determine the level of agreement among the subjects in regard to the quality of the scores and how the scores were ranked.
by each of the subjects. The author also compared how the subjects ranked the criteria used to determine the quality of the pieces.

The study was strictly limited to addressing relative musical quality, rather than absolute musical quality. Fiese concluded that perhaps none of the scores used were of exceptional musical quality. He also found little agreement among the subjects in regard to both their ranking of the quality of the pieces and their ranking of the criteria. Fiese states that this may be due to individual perceptions and values. Though there were not significant findings of statistical importance, the author noted that directors who ranked the scores similarly also seemed to assign the same importance to the criteria used to make the selections.

Sheldon (2000) examined experienced and inexperienced band directors' perceptions of quality and musical content in three different experimental settings. The author noted that there is a small amount of qualitative research on selecting high-quality band repertoire. However research has been done in reviewing music, and the use of practices that determine the music’s variety and contrast in melody, harmony, rhythm; expressive elements; form and structure; programming function; moments of tension and release; appropriate difficulty level; suitability to the instrumentation; and student and audience appeal.

Participants were asked to determine the quality of a piece of mid-level band repertoire while they examined the amount of time they focused on musical elements in the score and their perceptions of difficulty. This was done as one group of participants silently studied the score and also as another group only listened to a recording of the piece. The third component of the study simultaneously combined listening and score
study of three pieces of music with different styles. Participants were asked to comment on difficulty and quality of the pieces.

The results indicated there were very few differences in the way that both experienced and inexperienced teachers responded to the experiments. Teachers’ perceptions of craftsmanship and quality seemed to be influenced most by the mode of study. More listeners were able to make judgments on these criteria than were participants who only studied the score. However, it was determined that the compositional content of the selected examples may not have been unique enough for part three of the study. Therefore, it may have been difficult for the participants to perceive any one particular musical element as being more outstanding than another. The author suggested that continued research needs to be completed on music evaluation techniques.

Del Borgo (1988) addressed factors that directors should consider when selecting repertoire. He states that students will grow aesthetically and develop technical skills through the study and performance of carefully selected music. He maintained even though music is often selected for its technical challenge, audience and performer appeal, style, and educational value, the music may not be of high quality. This article provides a list of several criteria directors can use to determine quality such as craftsmanship, variety, musical interest, and contrast. He concluded by stating that it is a combination of these elements that create quality in a piece of music. He emphasized that it is the musical meaning beyond the notes that is the goal of composers and that careful attention to each of the parts of the composition will help determine the value of the entire piece.
Hayward (2006) investigated some of the prevailing criteria being used to select quality music for ensemble performance. The second goal of this study was to identify pieces from the standard wind band repertoire which college music education majors should be familiar with before completion of their degree. The results of this study could then be used to formulate a syllabus for a wind literature course to be taught at the college level. The author identified two areas of concern regarding the need of this study: (1) music education majors who intend to become band directors need to become familiar with the standard wind band repertoire; and (2) future music educators need to have experiences that allow them to develop skills in evaluating music based on quality.

Hayward contended that most music majors experience performing quality music in their college ensembles in Grade V and VI categories leaving little performing experience with familiarity of quality music in the Grade III or IV categories. Further, she listed other factors that may contribute to why directors do not select quality music. These include: (1) The fact that concert band as an ensemble is historically much younger than orchestra and choir. (2) Publishers promote new music with free recordings and catalogs that may not contain only quality music. (3) There is an abundance of music that has instant gratification for the performers and audience such as pop music. (4) Some music has been composed or identified as “educational” music and therefore is given a certain connotation of being lesser quality. (5) There is a lack of discrimination of quality by younger directors. (6) There is a lack of college courses in repertoire selection.

The study was completed by surveying selected college and high school band directors. Hayward found that criteria can be developed for determining quality in music and a list was developed by the author. Most of the criteria were related to the five basic
elements of music – melody, harmony, rhythm, form (structure), and timbre/texture.

Other criteria were based upon aesthetic considerations of style and emotion. A list of ten total criteria was ranked in the survey. All directors determined that all ten categories were important factors in identifying quality. The results showed that 100% of the collegiate band directors agreed that music demonstrating craftsmanship in orchestration and scoring was a determining factor in quality. That was also listed as the most important criteria by high school band directors.

Directors were also asked to rank pieces from a standard list of repertoire. The result showed that there was agreement upon what pieces constitute the best repertoire in Grades III and IV. Over 50% or more of both the high school and college band directors had very similar rankings for the top pieces.

A final list of 24 pieces of Grade III and IV literature was taken to be significant repertoire that could be studied by college music majors to provide criteria for determining quality. Additionally, the list of ten criteria for determining quality in music was found to be significant.

The issue of quality has only begun to be investigated as it pertains to repertoire selection. There is evidence that shows several criteria exist to assist directors in making judgments of quality when selecting repertoire. Research also suggests that there is more quality band music available now than ever before. It is the responsibility of individual directors to choose to investigate criteria to make informed decisions when selecting music for study and performance.
Professional Development

Research indicates that even though there are numerous factors that influence repertoire selection, and there are numerous recommended lists of quality repertoire, there is not a consistent process that directors use when making the critical decision of selecting music for study and performance. Undergraduate programs may not offer courses in band repertoire or may not include information on how to systematically analyze a score to determine the intrinsic worth of a piece of music. Therefore, it is the responsibility of each music educator to become aware of the factors that influence repertoire selection and the characteristics of quality repertoire. Professional development, beyond the undergraduate experience may be necessary to assist band directors in making informed decisions about the selection of quality repertoire. Though little research exists about professional development specifically for music educators, the following articles highlight some of the trends and suggestions for professional development activities.

Shuler (1995) stated that an important factor that may influence the future of arts education is improved instruction. He stated, “Reforms in teacher preparation, teacher screening and licensing, and in-service professional development will play a critical role in preparing the arts education profession to produce high student achievement in the broad scope of learning outlined by the standards” (p. 2). He suggested that local school districts align their professional development activities with the national standards.

Shuler continued by outlining three key principles for improving teaching based upon a study of the philosophy and the content of the national standards. (1) Teachers do not teach what they cannot do themselves. (2) Music education needs to involve a larger
percentage of the K-12 student population, especially at the secondary level if it is to survive and thrive. (3) Music teachers must continue to learn. The author discussed that one of the outcomes of the national standards is to produce a more enlightened general public. To achieve this, the author stated that music teachers need a stronger background in designing and assessing philosophically sound curricula based on the national standards. Shuler concluded that in order to ensure a future for arts education, teacher education, in-service growth, and assessment must play a critical role in the process of improving arts instruction.

Smith and Haack (2000) discussed the need for music educators to constantly be refreshed with new ideas and materials. The authors stated that many states now have requirements for continued education and it is the responsibility of each music educator to seek new experiences that will enhance their teaching assignments. The article discussed several factors that affect the need for professional development such as technology, integration and whole school learning models, state and national standards, and the simple fact that change is constant. Smith and Haack stated, “Choosing to continue broadening and deepening skills and understandings can benefit teachers personally, intellectually, musically, and pedagogically” (p. 29). The article concluded with several methods music educators can use to develop a professional development plan. The authors stated,

A professional development plan should take two factors into account: (1) institutionally-oriented development to add breadth and depth to the music educator’s knowledge, skills, and attitudes as may be required in the general and specific school setting; and (2) individually-oriented professional development to
provide specific opportunities for personal growth and professional advancement. (p. 30).

Conway, Hibbard, Albert, and Hourigan (2005) addressed several factors that affect professional development in the arts. They contended that arts educators need content-based professional development rather than activities that are designed for traditional academic subjects. The areas for professional development most often chosen by music educators are technology, assessment, music literature, standards, creativity, and grant writing. Results from a questionnaire compiled by the authors indicated that time management, advocacy for music, choosing literature, and keeping up with educational trends were all concerns that face experienced teachers. They argued that these, along with other suggestions by arts educators, should be the basis for professional development activities.

The article examined some of the affects of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation (also known as the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act) on professional development such as funding. It is possible for school districts to receive funding for professional development providing they meet several regulations set forth by the NCLB law. The authors also strongly suggest that there is a need for research regarding professional development activities for the arts. The NCLB law stipulates that all instruction should be based on scientific research. Research so far shows that arts teachers need administrative support to participate in professional development opportunities such as workshops, clinics, and conferences. Research also indicates that arts teachers not only need professional development activities sponsored by their schools
or institutions, but also they also need individually-chosen activities that may be more specific to arts-centered issues.

Reynolds (2000) addressed issues that band directors must face when selecting music for performance. Reynolds stated “that most directors agree that a well-planned repertoire creates the framework for an excellent music curriculum that fosters the musical growth of our students” (p. 31). He continued by discussing important factors such as keeping lists of repertoire that directors have performed, want to perform, or have been recommended for performance. He discussed factors that directors should consider when selecting such as the technical difficulty of pieces and the importance of having a purpose for the ensemble. Finally the article recommended several things that band directors can do to find out more about quality repertoire. He suggested networking with colleagues, studying scores, attending workshops and conferences, reading books, journals, reviews, and the Sunday edition of the *New York Times*. He also suggested that directors investigate repertoire not only that affects their day-to-day teaching, but also repertoire that indirectly affects their teaching. Learning more about the entire music profession and making art part of everyday life will help to make an informed director.
Summary

This review of literature suggests that there is a need to select quality music that can meet the curricular demands of school districts and at the same time provide meaningful and artistic experiences for students. There are numerous recommended lists that directors can use to help identify core pieces of music that stand out as important or essential for students’ musical growth, and music-specific professional development may be needed to educate directors about this topic. Also, criteria exist that directors can use to establish their personal definition of quality and assist them in choosing repertoire.
CHAPTER III – METHODOLOGY

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate high school band directors’ definitions of quality music, the definitions’ impact on repertoire selection, as well as the relationship between opinions of quality and the director’s years of experience, background, and professional development activities. The questions investigated in this study were:

Research Questions

1. How do high school band directors define quality as it pertains to high school band repertoire?

2. What is the relationship between high school band directors’ definitions of quality and their selection process for high school band repertoire?

3. What is the relationship between band directors’ backgrounds and their definition of quality repertoire?
   3c. Does the type of school where they teach affect this relationship?
   3d. Does the function of age and years of experience affect this relationship?

4. What is the relationship between types of professional development activities and band directors’ definitions of quality repertoire?
   4a. Does coursework affect this relationship?
   4b. Does attendance at workshops and conferences affect this relationship?
   4c. Does performance and/or private study affect this relationship?
4d. Does membership in other professional music organizations affect this relationship?

**Design**

This study investigated high school band directors’ definitions of quality repertoire and their processes of repertoire selection through descriptive research techniques. In order to answer the research questions and to gain a broad perspective on this topic, the researcher developed an on-line questionnaire designed for high school band directors in Pennsylvania who are members of the Pennsylvania Music Educators Association (PMEA). The questionnaire was pilot tested to determine clarity before being administered. No changes were made as a result of the pilot survey.

**Data Collection Tool**

An on-line questionnaire format was selected because of its convenience and accessibility. Many music educators regularly use email and the internet as their main sources of communication. By avoiding the high cost of traditional postage and the belief a higher response rate would result due to the extensive use of on-line communication, the on-line survey was most desirable. The Survey Monkey website (www.surveymonkey.com) was used to create and administer the questionnaire. Survey Monkey is an on-line service that allows researchers to create surveys and collect data quickly and efficiently. The Survey Monkey questionnaire allowed participants to access the website, anonymously type in the questionnaire number, and complete the survey.

The questionnaire featured two types of questions that were developed based on the review of literature. First, close-ended questions addressed the topics of demographics, professional development activities, and educational background.
Additionally, five open-ended questions were presented to gain information regarding the directors’ definitions of quality and how those definitions may or may not influence their repertoire selection processes. Directors were also asked to indicate repertoire that they had performed with their high school band during the past two years. They were asked to indicate why those pieces were chosen for performance. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix A. Similar studies such those by Hayward (2000) and Forbes (2001), were consulted because of their use of quality as a criterion when selecting repertoire. Also, the development of the questionnaire was aided by consulting studies such as those conducted by Bauer (1996) and Jones (2005) which examined the importance of certain criteria used to determine factors that influence directors’ repertoire selection processes. Table 1 indicates the relationship of the survey questions to the research questions.

Tables were also developed by the researcher to compare the information gathered through the questionnaire to pertinent information found in the literature review. A table that listed characteristics of quality and a table that listed factors that influence repertoire selection were developed for analytical purposes (See Table 2 and Table 3).
Table 1. *Survey Questions Related to Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>High school band director and member of PMEA</td>
<td>Screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your School #1</strong></td>
<td>My school district is best described as</td>
<td>Question 3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your School #2</strong></td>
<td>Average size of a graduating class</td>
<td>Question 3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background #1</strong></td>
<td>My age range</td>
<td>Questions 3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background #2</strong></td>
<td>Total number of years I’ve been teaching</td>
<td>Questions 3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background #3</strong></td>
<td>Total number of years I’ve been a high school band director</td>
<td>Questions 3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development #1</strong></td>
<td>Coursework beyond Undergraduate Degree</td>
<td>Question 4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development #2</strong></td>
<td>Attendance at workshops</td>
<td>Question 4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development #3</strong></td>
<td>Attendance at conferences</td>
<td>Question 4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development #4</strong></td>
<td>Activities while attending conferences</td>
<td>Question 4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development #5</strong></td>
<td>Other professional journals received</td>
<td>Question 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development #6</strong></td>
<td>Other professional organizations</td>
<td>Question 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development #7</strong></td>
<td>Perform regularly</td>
<td>Question 4c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development #8</strong></td>
<td>Take private lessons</td>
<td>Question 4c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development #9</strong></td>
<td>Type of private lessons</td>
<td>Question 4c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development #10</strong></td>
<td>Other professional development</td>
<td>Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality &amp; Rep. Selection #1</strong></td>
<td>Personal definition of quality repertoire</td>
<td>Questions 1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality &amp; Rep. Selection #2</strong></td>
<td>Does quality affect your repertoire selection</td>
<td>Question 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality &amp; Rep. Selection #3</strong></td>
<td>Other factors that influence repertoire selection</td>
<td>Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality &amp; Rep. Selection #4</strong></td>
<td>Sources for selecting repertoire</td>
<td>Questions 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality &amp; Rep. Selection #5</strong></td>
<td>List repertoire from two concert programs and why it was selected</td>
<td>Question 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants

The participants for this study were high school band directors (Grades 9 – 12) in the state of Pennsylvania who were members of the Pennsylvania Music Educators Association (PMEA). PMEA members were partially chosen as a convenience, and because they would serve as a fairly comprehensive sample population. In addition, PMEA members were selected because the concept of quality may influence repertoire choices for PMEA-sponsored festival performances, and may affect the PMEA recommended repertoire list for band. Therefore, it was hypothesized that more PMEA members might respond to the questionnaire because the topic of quality repertoire may affect their activities in PMEA.

Procedures

The process to recruit potential subjects was conducted in several steps. First, email addresses were identified through the use of the each PMEA District’s website and also through assistance from the PMEA Executive Office and district officers. A letter was then developed to invite subjects to participate in the questionnaire (see Appendix B). The researcher sent the invitation via email to all high school band directors who were members of PMEA from January 7 through January 11, 2008. The email invitations for PMEA Districts 2 and 8 were sent by District Officers due to regulatory policies within those PMEA Districts. A total of 672 email invitations were sent with six messages returned because of incorrect email addresses. Four emails were returned because the receivers were no longer serving as high school band directors. Three of those people indicated that they forwarded the invitation on to the correct person. After potential subjects received the information for the study, they were able to access the
questionnaire through the internet by connecting to the Survey Monkey website using the provided link. Prior to completing the survey the subjects were asked to provide consent for participation (see Appendix C). Following their consent, two hundred and twelve subjects completed the survey that yielded a positive return rate of approximately 32%. Subjects completed the questionnaire from January 7, 2008 until January 31, 2008. Due to a large number of responses, a second invitation was not sent.

Data Analysis

Subject responses from completed questionnaires provided descriptive data that indicated their opinions of quality repertoire and their repertoire selection processes. The close-ended questions were analyzed through central tendency to indicate the subjects’ demographic information, background, and professional development activities. The open-ended questions were coded and then analyzed through central tendency to indicate the subjects’ opinions of quality repertoire and their repertoire selection processes.

The data regarding quality repertoire was compared to a list of quality characteristics synthesized by the researcher from pertinent literature. A list of the quality characteristics and the sources from which the quality characteristics were extracted is contained in Table 2. A comparison of the subjects’ definitions of quality was completed to determine if the subjects’ definitions were common or if the subjects possessed new ideas or concepts regarding quality.
Table 2. *Characteristics of Quality Band Repertoire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well-conceived formal structure</td>
<td>Cramer, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Craftsmanship</td>
<td>Delborgo, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dvorak, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fonder, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hayward, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of variety and repetition</td>
<td>Delborgo, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fonder, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hayward, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of melodic material</td>
<td>Cramer, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melodic and Countermelodic interest</td>
<td>Delborgo, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative melodies and counterlines</td>
<td>Hayward, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse timbres</td>
<td>Delborgo, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of interesting background material</td>
<td>Delborgo, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of textures</td>
<td>Battisti, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delborgo, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast of dynamics</td>
<td>Delborgo, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast of rhythmic material – vitality/momentum</td>
<td>Cramer, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Interest</td>
<td>Delborgo, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of Meters</td>
<td>Dvorak, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hayward, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast of instrumentation</td>
<td>Cramer, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delborgo, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dvorak, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fonder, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast in mode and key</td>
<td>Delborgo, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dvorak, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>Delborgo, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingenuity, Originality</td>
<td>Fonder, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hayward, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McBeth, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persellin, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting harmonic material</td>
<td>Cramer 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Imagination</td>
<td>Delborgo, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hayward, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic shape</td>
<td>Delborgo, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherent ideas – logical</td>
<td>Delborgo, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent style, ideas, quality</td>
<td>Fonder, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hayward, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural transitions</td>
<td>Delborgo, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficiently unpredictable</td>
<td>Fonder, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hayward, 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Continued on the next page.
Table 2. Characteristics of Quality Band Repertoire Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elicits an emotional response, emotional impact</td>
<td>Cramer, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hayward, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates Style and/or expression</td>
<td>Hayward, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durability – can stand up to intense rehearsal</td>
<td>Persellin, 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data regarding factors that influence directors’ selection processes was compared to a list of known factors synthesized by the researcher from relevant literature. A list of these factors and the sources from which the factors that influence repertoire selection were extracted is contained in Table 3. A comparison of the subjects’ factors that influence their repertoire selection processes was completed to determine if the subjects’ processes were common or if the subjects possessed new ideas or concepts regarding the factors that influence their repertoire selection.

The data from the open-ended questions and the close-ended questions were coded to reflect constructs which may influence the relationship between the subjects’ opinions of quality, the factors that influence their repertoire selection, and the subjects’ demographic information, backgrounds, and professional development activities. The data was then used to answer the research questions.
### Table 3. *Factors that Influence Repertoire Selection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty level</td>
<td>Apfelstadt, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forbes, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band’s ability to execute the technical demands</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band’s ability to execute the musical demands</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forbes, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble performance concepts that can be taught</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical stylistic concepts that can be taught</td>
<td>Apfelstadt, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forbes, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific musical style of particular composer can be taught</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical concepts that can be taught</td>
<td>Apfelstadt, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of composition</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing based on specific musical elements</td>
<td>Apfelstadt, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forbes, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic response available to students</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming needs for specific performances</td>
<td>Apfelstadt, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forbes, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with other works by composer or arranger</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fits into the overall curriculum of literature for the year</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical or theoretical concepts that can be taught</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forbes, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ musical preferences</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forbes, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience appeal</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forbes, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical era of composition</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of a particular genre</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of a particular world culture</td>
<td>Apfelstadt, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of the piece</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director’s musical preferences</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director previously performed the piece</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director previously conducted the piece</td>
<td>Bauer, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Apfelstadt, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forbes, 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV – RESULTS

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate high school band directors’ definitions of quality music, the definitions’ impact on repertoire selection, as well as the relationships between opinions of quality and the director’s years of experience, background, and professional development activities. The questions investigated in this study were:

Research Questions

1. How do high school band directors define quality as it pertains to high school band repertoire?

2. What is the relationship between high school band directors’ definitions of quality and their selection process for high school band repertoire?

3. What is the relationship between band directors’ backgrounds and their definition of quality repertoire?
   3e. Does the type of school where they teach affect this relationship?
   3f. Does the function of age and years of experience affect this relationship?

4. What is the relationship between types of professional development activities and band directors’ definitions of quality repertoire?
   4a. Does coursework affect this relationship?
   4b. Does attendance at workshops and conferences affect this relationship?
   4c. Does performance and/or private study affect this relationship?
4d. Does membership in other professional music organizations affect this relationship?

Research Procedures

In order to complete the research study, email addresses for potential participants were identified through the use of each PMEA District’s website and also through assistance from the PMEA Executive Office and district officers. The researcher sent an invitation via email to all high school band directors who were members of PMEA to complete an online survey.

Participants

A total of 672 email invitations were sent to high school band directors in Pennsylvania. After potential subjects received the information for the study, they were able to access the questionnaire through the internet by logging on to the Survey Monkey website. Two hundred and twelve subjects completed the survey which yielded a positive return rate of approximately 32%. Unfortunately, 78 responses were eliminated because respondents did not answer Question 17 regarding the participant’s personal definition of quality as it pertains to high school band repertoire. Question 17 was essential to answering the research questions. Therefore 134 surveys, which yielded a usable return rate of 20%, were used to analyze the data and answer the research questions.

Participants indicated their age by selecting one of three categories. Figure 1 indicates their responses.
One participant indicated two age ranges and therefore this response was excluded. In general, the participants’ ages and years of experience were closely aligned. As participants had more years of experience there was a greater difference between the average number of years they had taught music compared to the average number of years they taught high school band. Figure 2 shows this comparison.

*Figure 2. Comparison of Average Years of Teaching Music to Average Years Teaching High School Band*
Participants indicated the demographics of the school district where they taught in terms of rural, suburban, and urban. Figure 3 indicates the responses to this question.

Figure 3. Demographic Information

Participants also indicated the average number of students in a graduating class in their school district. One participant indicated two responses for this question and therefore that response was excluded. Figure 4 shows the participants’ responses to the average size of the graduating class.

Figure 4. Average Size of Graduating Class
Research Question 1 - How do high school band directors define quality as it pertains to high school band repertoire?

The participants indicated a variety of responses regarding their definition of quality as it pertains to high school band repertoire. The researcher compared the participants’ responses to Question 17 (What is your personal definition of quality as it pertains to high school band repertoire?) to Table 2: Characteristics of Quality Band Repertoire from Chapter 3. Each response was coded according to the number of characteristics present in the subject’s definition compared to the characteristics as defined by experts in the field found in Table 2. Since there were a total of 17 characteristics found in Table 2 and it was unlikely that any response would contain more than a few characteristics, the researcher coded responses in increments of three. For example, Code A meant that there were no characteristics from Table 2 found in a particular response and Code B meant that there were one to three characteristics present in a response. Table 4 shows how the responses were coded and Figure 5 shows the results of the participants’ coded responses.

Table 4 – Coding System for Definitions of Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Characteristics of Quality Band Repertoire Present in Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>10-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fifty-four of the participants indicated at least one characteristic that was consistent with the expert definitions found in Table 2. One participant listed eight characteristics of quality which were all consistent with the experts’. The most common characteristics of quality found in the participants’ definitions included well conceived structure, contrast of instrumentation, variety of key/mode, and rhythmic interest. Although over half of the subjects did not list any characteristics of quality compared the characteristics defined by experts, Figure 6 indicates common responses that were not contained in Table 2.

Figure 5. Characteristics of Quality Compared to Expert Definitions Found in Table 2.

Figure 6. Common Definitions of Quality Not Found in Table 2.
Other common responses that were not consistent with expert definitions included music that is part of the standard repertoire, music that has stood the test of time, music that is appropriate for the subject’s ensemble, music that has audience appeal, and music that is written by a well-known composer.

**Research Question 2 - What is the relationship between high school band directors’ definitions of quality and their selection process for high school band repertoire?**

The participants indicated a variety of responses regarding their selection process for high school band repertoire. The data regarding factors that influence directors’ selection processes was compared to a list of known factors found in Chapter 3, Table 3. This comparison was completed to determine if the subjects’ processes reflected those found in the literature review or if the subjects possessed unique or different ideas regarding the factors that influence their repertoire selection.

The coding system from Table 4 was used to designate participants’ definitions of quality repertoire. An additional code (Code E) was used for participants whose definitions of quality did not contain any of the characteristics found in Table 2, but whose responses indicated that the “teachability” of the repertoire or educational value was the primary focus for their definitions of quality. The decision to use Code E was because 56 participants listed educational value as a primary factor in selecting repertoire. Table 5 summarizes the responses that were found to be consistent with Table 3, and Table 6 summarizes participants’ responses that were not defined by the experts in the literature review.
Table 5. Factors Related to Repertoire Selection Found in Table 3 Compared to Definitions of Quality Defined in Figure 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band’s ability to execute the technical demands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band’s ability to execute the musical demands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble performance concepts that can be taught</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical stylistic concepts that can be taught</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific musical style of particular composer can be taught</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical concepts that can be taught</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of composition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing based on specific musical elements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic response available to students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming needs for specific performances</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with other works by composer or arranger</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fits into the overall curriculum of literature for the year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical or theoretical concepts that can be taught</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ musical preferences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience appeal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical era of composition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Continued on next page.
Table 5. *Factors Related to Repertoire Selection Found in Table 3 Compared to Definitions of Quality Defined in Figure 5 Continued.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative of a particular genre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of a particular world culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of the piece</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director’s musical preferences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director previously performed the piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director previously conducted the piece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. *Additional Factors Related to Repertoire Selection Compared to Definitions of Quality Defined in Graph 5.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music is challenging</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational/Teachability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Curricular opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews/Recommendations from colleagues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Repertoire Lists</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths of the band</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of the concert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular music from television or movies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time to prepare music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music is fun</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music has stood the test of time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data contained in Tables 5 and 6 overwhelmingly indicates that aside from quality, the participants primarily select repertoire based on its perceived educational value and concepts that can be taught from the music. However, few responses show that the repertoire fit curricular needs. Other factors of note include positive responses to student and audience appeal, the degree of challenge the music presents, and the difficulty of the music. The data indicates that little consideration was given to the directors’ preferences and previous experience with selected pieces, and to historical or cultural aspects that could be taught.

Participants were asked to provide examples of repertoire that was performed on concert programs within the last two years from when the survey was taken. This question was asked to attempt to verify a positive relationship between their definitions of quality and the factors that influence their selection processes. Due to the wide variety of responses it could not be determined whether or not the data collected was consistent with the verification of the participants’ repertoire selection processes.

1. **Research Question 3. What is the relationship between band directors’ backgrounds and their definition of quality repertoire?**

   3a. Does the type of school where they teach affect this relationship?

   3b. Does the function of age and years of experience affect this relationship?

Participants were asked to indicate demographic information about their school district, age, and years of teaching experience. The coding system from Table 4 was used to designate participants’ definitions of quality repertoire and Code E from Table 5 was
also used was used for participants whose definitions of quality did not contain any of the characteristics found in Table 2, but whose responses indicated that educational value was a primary focus for their definitions of quality. Table 7 summarizes the responses of participants’ school demographics compared to their definitions of quality repertoire and Table 8 summarizes the size of the graduating class compared to the participants’ definitions of quality repertoire. Table 9 summarizes the responses of participants’ age ranges compared to their definitions of quality repertoire and Table 10 summarizes the participants years of experience compared to the participants’ definitions of quality repertoire.

Table 7. Definitions of Quality Compared to School Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Definitions of Quality Compared to Size of Graduating Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-250</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 and up</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Tables 7 and 8 indicate that the majority of participants whose definitions of quality repertoire contained no characteristics consistent with the experts (Codes A and E) were mostly from rural schools with less than 250 students in a graduating class. It is important to note that over half of the total participants indicated these responses. Participants whose definitions were consistent with the expert
definitions (Code B) were mostly from suburban schools and had a variety of graduating class sizes. However, participants whose definitions were more consistent with the expert definitions (Codes C and D) were from mostly from rural schools. In all categories participants indicated the fewest responses for urban schools and schools with graduating class sizes of more than 400 students.

Table 9. Definitions of Quality Compared to Participants’ Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 – 35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 and older</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Definitions of Quality Compared to Participants’ Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Service 1-5 Years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Service 6-14 Years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran 15+ Years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Tables 9 and 10 indicate that the majority of participants in all categories, except Codes C and D, were mostly 36 years old or older and were also considered to be veteran teachers who had taught 15 or more years. Participants whose definitions were most consistent with the expert definitions (Codes C and D) had taught between six and fourteen years, but their age ranges varied.

4. What is the relationship between types of professional development activities and band directors’ definitions of quality repertoire?

4a. Does coursework affect this relationship?
4b. Does attendance at workshops and conferences affect this relationship?

4c. Does performance and/or private study affect this relationship?

4d. Does membership in other professional music organizations affect this relationship?

Participants were asked to indicate information about their professional development activities including coursework beyond their undergraduate music education degree, attendance and participation at workshops and conferences, continuing to perform and/or study privately, and maintaining membership in other professional music organizations. The coding system from Table 4 was used to designate participants’ definitions of quality repertoire and Code E from Table 5 was also used was used for participants whose definitions of quality did not contain any of the characteristics found in Table 2, but whose responses indicated that educational value was a primary focus for their definitions of quality.

Figure 7 summarizes the participants’ post baccalaureate and graduate studies. The data indicates that for each of the areas of post baccalaureate study there was little proportional difference between the categories of participants. The most pursued graduate study by all participants was a Master’s degree in music education with 28 participants indicating they were in the process and 38 participants stating they had completed the degree. Forty-eight participants indicated that they had completed or were in the process of completing other post baccalaureate coursework in music, and 26 participants had either completed a degree in performance or were in progress. Few participants indicated that they had completed a doctoral program or participated in
military service in music. One participant had completed a Master’s Degree in Music Therapy and one participant had completed a Master’s Degree in Music Composition. Neither of these participants’ definitions of quality was consistent with the expert definitions. The majority of participants who indicated that they were completing coursework outside of music were pursuing educational leadership or principal certification programs.

Figure 7. Participants’ Post Baccalaureate Study
Table 11 summarizes the participants’ participation at workshops and conferences. For the purposes of this study a workshop or clinic was defined as a professional development opportunity on a single topic (ex. instrument repair or horn pedagogy) lasting at least one hour, but not more than one day, and a conference was defined as a professional development opportunity sponsored by a professional music organization or association lasting more than one day that is intended to improve specific skills as a music teacher.

Table 11. Definitions of Quality Compared to Participants’ Participation in Workshops and Conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Attendance</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local/County - Rarely or Never</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/County - Once every 2-3 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/County - Once a year</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/County - More than once a year</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/Region - Rarely or Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/Region - Once every 2-3 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/Region - Once a year</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/Region - More than once a year</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State - Rarely or Never</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State - Once every 2-3 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State - Once a year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State - More than once a year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/International - Rarely or Never</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/International - Once every 2-3 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/International - Once a year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/International - More than once a year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bands of America Summer Symposium</th>
<th>PA Governor's Institute for Arts Educators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in Table 11 indicate there was little difference in attendance between workshops and conferences among the participants. The majority of participants whose definitions of quality repertoire contained no characteristics consistent with the experts (Codes A and E) mostly attended district and region workshops and conferences. Although these participants attended fewer local or national professional development events, several also indicated they attended statewide events on a regular basis. Participants whose definitions were consistent with the expert definitions (Codes B, C, and D) proportionally attended more statewide events as well as national and local events than the other participants. The data indicate that the type of professional development
events with the best attendance by participants was district and region workshops. This may be associated with the workshops and clinics that take place during PMEA Festivals, however that correlation cannot be determined by this study.

Figure 8 summarizes the participants’ activities while attending conferences by averaging the percentages of the activities amongst all participants. All of the categories of participants, with exception of Code C, indicated a similar proportional percentage of time spent at each activity. The Code C participants had a higher average percentage spent on visiting exhibits rather than attending concerts, as was indicated by the other categories of participants. The data indicates that on average 45% of the participants’ time is spent attending sessions. A majority of participants who responded that they spent time doing other activities overwhelming indicated they spent time networking with colleagues.

Figure 8. Participants’ Average Time Spent During Conference Attendance

Figure 9 summarizes the participants’ performance habits compared to their definitions of quality. For the purposes of this study, performing regularly was defined as
currently belonging to an established performance ensemble(s), or individually performing at least two times per month. With the exception of Code E participants, more participants in each category indicated they continue to perform regularly. Code C participants had the highest proportion of participants who continued to perform compared to those who do not perform regularly.

Figure 9. *Definitions of Quality Compared to Participants’ Performance Habits*

Figures 10 and 11 summarize participants’ responses regarding their continued private study and what type of private study they do. The majority of participants whose definitions of quality repertoire contained no characteristics consistent with the experts (Codes A and E) did not continue to study privately while the majority of participants whose definitions were consistent with expert definitions (Codes B, C, and D) continued to study privately. The majority of participants indicated that they continued study on their primary instrument followed by conducting and then secondary instruments. Twelve participants (9%) indicated that they continued to study their primary instrument, a secondary instrument, and conducting. Eight of these participants were in Code B.
Aside from the categories of private study that were provided, one participant indicated private study on bagpipes and one indicated private study on voice.

Figure 10. *Definitions of Quality Compared to Participants’ Private Study Habits*

![Bar chart showing definitions of quality compared to private study habits.]

*Figure 11. Definitions of Quality Compared to Participants’ Types of Private Study*

![Bar chart showing definitions of quality compared to types of private study.]

Figure 12 summarizes the participants’ membership in professional music organizations and associations compared to their definitions of quality. Participants in
Code A were the only group to indicate that the majority did not belong to other professional music organizations. Table 12 summarizes the professional music associations and organizations compared to the participants’ definitions of quality. Aside from PMEA and MENC (currently NAfME), the association with the highest number of positive responses was the International Jazz Educators Association, followed by the American Federation of Musicians and local music organizations.

Figure 12. *Definitions of Quality Compared to Participants’ Membership in Professional Music Organizations and Associations*
Table 12. *Definitions of Quality Compared to Participants’ Membership in Professional Music Organizations and Associations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Federation of Musicians</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Guild of Organists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Foundation for the Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Music Teachers Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American String Teachers Association</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Concert Band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Band Directors National Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Brass Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Association of Jazz Educators</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Clarinet Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Horn Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Trombone Association</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Trumpet Guild</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kappa Kappa Psi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea Academy Chorale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Band Association</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American Saxophone Alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA Interscholastic Marching Band Association</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA Music Teachers Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percussive Arts Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Beta Mu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Mu Alpha Sinfonia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI:ME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament of Bands, National Judges Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Organizations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were given the opportunity to indicate other types of professional development in which they participated that was not part of the survey. Most of the responses were inaccurate because they were contained in the survey questions and the participants had responded with duplicate information. However, the following sources of professional development were not contained as part of survey and were provided by participants: participation in the PA Governor’s Institute for Arts Educators, work in
curriculum development, TI:ME courses for music technology integration, conducting symposiums, composition, serving as guest conductor, reading books about music education, attendance at university and professional concerts, and contact with university professors.


Based on the data outlined in Chapter 4, there seems to be some trends that emerge regarding participants’ definitions of quality related to factors of demographics, backgrounds, and professional development activities. The next chapter will synthesize and connect the results, as well as offer suggestions for future research and possible applications to music education.
CHAPTER V – DISCUSSION

Introduction

Music educators select repertoire for their high school ensembles on a regular basis. A challenge faced by directors is weighing factors that determine those decisions as well as deciding what benefits the ensemble will gain from the study and performance of certain repertoire choices over others. If quality is considered to be an important factor in the selection process, the challenge of repertoire selection is compounded because of personal preferences and value judgments made by the director. Additionally, as outlined in Chapter 1, selecting music of quality seems to be increasingly important as educational reform requires a standards-based sequential curriculum that is able to be assessed. The purpose of this study was to investigate high school band directors’ definitions of quality music, their definitions’ impact on repertoire selection, as well as the relationship between opinions of quality and the director’s years of experience, background, and professional development activities.

Pennsylvania high school band directors who are members of PMEA were asked to respond to an on-line questionnaire to gather information about their background, level of experience, professional development activities, and their opinions about quality repertoire. The information was coded and compared to tables that were developed by the researcher containing pertinent information found in the literature review about characteristics of quality and factors that influence repertoire selection. The following research questions guided the study:
1. How do high school band directors define quality as it pertains to high school band repertoire?

2. What is the relationship between high school band directors’ definitions of quality and their selection process for high school band repertoire?

3. What is the relationship between band directors’ backgrounds and their definition of quality repertoire?
   3a. Does the type of school where they teach affect this relationship?
   3b. Does the function of age and years of experience affect this relationship?

4. What is the relationship between types of professional development activities and band directors’ definitions of quality repertoire?
   4a. Does coursework affect this relationship?
   4b. Does attendance at workshops and conferences affect this relationship?
   4c. Does performance and/or private study affect this relationship?
   4d. Does membership in other professional music organizations affect this relationship?

Fifty-four participants, 40% of the total population, indicated that quality was a factor that was related to their repertoire selection process. However, the data suggest that participants’ backgrounds, years of service, school demographics, and professional development activities may not be related to the participants’ definitions of quality repertoire. Quality was listed second to perceived educational value as the factor that had the most influence on choosing music for study and performance.
Profiles

The analysis of the data resulted in categorization of the participants’ responses according to their definitions of quality (shown in Table 4) and the cumulative number of responses for each category in Figure 5. The remaining data description in Chapter 4 related to the participants’ backgrounds, school demographics, and professional development activities were reported by category according to the coding system. The information that follows synthesizes the results for participants according to their code.

Forty-one participants were classified as Code A - those who did not list any expert-defined characteristics of quality in their definitions. Ten (24%) of these participants stated that music that is challenging primarily influences their repertoire selection. Eight (20%) participants indicated that music that appeals to students’ preferences and music by a familiar composer or arranger were factors in their decision-making. Fifty-six percent of these participants were from rural areas and 80% taught in schools with a graduating class size of 250 students or less. Further, the majority of participants (54%) categorized as Code A were veteran teachers who had taught 15 or more years and 59% were 36 years old or older. Thirteen participants (32% of Code A participants) had completed a Master’s degree in music education, and 18 (44%) indicated they had completed or were in the process of other post-baccalaureate study in music. The professional development activities of these participants consisted primarily of participating in district and/or region workshops and conferences and attending statewide conferences every two or three years. Most Code A participants (63%) reported they perform regularly, and almost half of the participants (49%) continued to study privately with most of them continuing to take lessons on their primary instrument.
Eighteen (44%) Code A participants belonged to other professional music organizations and the American Federation of Musicians was the most popular among these participants.

The 43 participants who were classified as Code B listed 1-3 expert-defined characteristics of quality in their personal definitions. All of these participants (100%) stated that quality was a factor related to their repertoire selection decisions. Nineteen percent Code B participants listed audience and student appeal, as well as difficulty level (13%), challenge and instrumentation (26%) as other determining factors. These participants were predominantly from suburban areas (47%) and indicated a relatively even distribution between small and mid-size graduating class sizes. Only five (12%) Code B participants indicated they taught in a school with a class size of 400 or larger. Forty-seven percent stated they were veteran teachers who had taught 15 or more years and 51% were 36 years old or older. Nineteen participants (43%) were in process or had completed a Master’s degree in music education and six (14%) had completed a Master’s degree is music performance. The professional development activities of these participants consisted primarily of participating in district and/or region workshops and conferences and attending statewide conferences on a yearly basis. Most participants (60%) continued to perform regularly, and most of the participants (66%) continued to study privately with most of them continuing to take lessons on their primary instrument. Twenty-three (53%) Code B participants belonged to other professional music organizations and the International Association of Jazz Educators and the National Bandmasters Association were cited the most among these participants.
Ten participants, who were classified as Code C, listed 4-6 expert-defined characteristics of quality in their personal definitions. All of these participants (100%) stated that quality was a factor related to their repertoire selection decisions. Forty percent Code C participants listed the ability to teach technical concepts, and 80% listed both student and audience appeal as prominent influences on their repertoire choices. Fifty percent of these participants were from rural areas and 40% had an average class size between 100-250 students. Four (40%) Code C participants stated they were veteran teachers who had taught 15 or more years, and six (60%) teachers had taught between six and fourteen years. Six (60%) indicated they were 36 years old or older. Four participants (40%) were in process or had completed a Master’s degree in music education and three (30%) indicated they had completed other post-baccalaureate coursework in music. The professional development activities of these participants consisted primarily of participating in district and/or region workshops and conferences and attending statewide conferences on a yearly basis. Eight (80%) Code C participants continued to perform regularly and six (60%) of the participants continued to study privately with most of them continuing to take lessons on their primary instrument. Five (50%) Code C participants belonged to other professional music organizations and the International Association of Jazz Educators was the most common.

Only one participant was classified as a Code D participant and listed 7-9 expert-defined characteristics of quality in his or her personal definition. This participant stated that quality was a factor related to the repertoire selection process and also indicated student and audience appeal as prominent influences on repertoire choices. This participant was from a rural demographic area and had an average class size of less than
100 students. The Code D participant was a mid-service teacher who had taught between six and fourteen years and was between 22 and 28 years old. This participant completed a Master’s degree in music education and indicated participation in district and/or region workshops and conferences and attending statewide conferences on a yearly basis were included amongst his or her professional development activities. This participant did not continue to perform regularly, but continued to study privately on his or her primary instrument as well as on secondary instruments and conducting. The Code D participant belonged to other local professional music organizations.

Forty-seven participants who were classified as Code E did not list any expert-defined characteristics of quality in their definitions, but all (100%) defined quality as music that had inherent educational value. Eleven (23%) of these participants stated that the difficulty of the music was related to their repertoire selection process and 17% indicated the ability to teach stylistic concepts was important. Fifteen percent also indicated that choosing music for specific musical elements influenced their decisions. Thirty (64%) Code E participants were from rural areas and 77% taught in schools with a graduating class size of 250 students or less. Additionally, 17 (36%) Code E participants were veteran teachers, 17 (36%) were mid-service teachers, and 19 (40%) percent indicated an age range of 36 years old and older. Twenty-one participants (45%) were in progress or had completed a Master’s degree in music education and 16 (34%) indicated they had completed or were in the process of other post-baccalaureate study in music. The professional development activities of these participants consisted primarily of participating in district and/or region workshops and conferences and attending statewide conferences on a yearly basis. Twenty-seven (57%) Code E participants did not to
perform regularly, and less than half (47%) of the participants continued to study privately with most of them continuing to take lessons on their primary instrument. Twenty-eight (60%) of Code E participants belonged to other professional music organizations and Phi Mu Alpha, a professional music fraternity, was prevalent among these participants.

In all categories, 71 participants (53%) indicated they taught in rural schools while proportionately more Code B participants worked in large, suburban schools. Also, 71% of the participants indicated they taught in medium to small schools with graduating class sizes of less than 250 students. While most of the participants (47%) were veteran teachers having taught for fifteen or more years, most Code C participants indicated they were mid-service teachers having taught for six to fourteen years.

Concerning professional development activities, a Master’s degree in music education was the most common graduate degree indicated with 21% in progress and 28% completed. Code A participants proportionately had the most participants (32%) complete this degree. Fifty-six percent of all participants indicated they continue to both perform regularly and continue to study privately, and a majority continues to study their major instrument and 25% study conducting. Most participants listed attendance at district and regional workshops (76%) and statewide conferences (79%) as primary sources of professional development, and 74 participants (55%) belong to other professional music organizations.
Definitions of Quality and Repertoire Selection

The results indicate that although there was no single factor that seemed to be related to the participants’ definitions of quality, trends emerged from the data regarding the participants’ definitions and the factors related to repertoire selection. Over half of the participants’ definitions (60%) were not consistent with those of the experts as listed in Table 2. Forty-three percent of the participants defined quality as music that is challenging, and 35% of the participants defined quality as educational. Neither of these characteristics was present on any of the experts’ definitions of characteristics of quality. Other factors that were strongly related to repertoire choices were student enjoyment and audience appeal. Although these were both factors that were listed by the experts related to repertoire choices, neither was cited as having a relationship with the quality of the repertoire or educational value.

The data indicates that there is not a consensus between how band directors and experts define quality although several resources exist to assist directors in making judgments of quality when selecting repertoire. This is supported by Fonder (2005) and Hayward (1999). Also, research conducted by Begian (1991), Gaines (1996) and Olson (1992) suggested that there is an abundance of quality band music currently available and the resources of recommended repertoire lists are readily available. Based on the results of this study, it is suggested that individual directors investigate such resources to make informed decisions when selecting music for study and performance with their ensembles.

Although music that is challenging was among the most prevalent definitions of quality offered by participants, the literature review did not indicate any relationship
between music that is perceived as challenging and the quality of that repertoire. Many pieces of music exist that do not possess any characteristics of quality as defined by the experts, but may be technically or musically challenging for students. The perception that the level of challenge a piece of music affords the students or director defines it as quality is unsupported by the literature in this study. However, the results indicate a perception may exist that the level of challenge may be related to opinions of quality.

The results in this study support Fonder’s (2000) study regarding the perceived educational value that may influence directors’ decisions about repertoire selection. Fonder’s study suggested that young directors may have external pressures placed on them when selecting repertoire and he argues this could result in teachers not choosing quality music. This assertion may be supported by the fact that 21 participants (70%) of those identified as early service teachers did not indicate any expert-defined characteristics of quality in their personal definitions. Fonder stated that there is no justification to select a piece of music simply to teach a musical concept, but rather an excellent piece of music will provide the concepts by which to teach. He contends that it takes mature musicians and teachers who have a strong philosophical base to adhere to a curriculum of artistic substance.

The results of this study suggest that although the most common expert-defined characteristics of quality found in the participants’ definitions were well conceived structure, contrast of instrumentation, variety of key/mode, and rhythmic interest, more participants defined quality as music that has perceived educational value. The data in the present study did not support whether a relationship may exist between the expert-defined characteristics of quality and perceived educational value, but there is potential
that directors could make a connection between these two factors when selecting
repertoire.

The data also suggests that another factor that may influence directors’ definitions
of quality and repertoire selection procedures is the context for which the music is being
selected. Programming needs for a specific concert and the difficulty level of the
repertoire were also listed as prevalent influences on repertoire decisions. Both of these
factors are quite variable and are dependent on the ability level of the specific ensemble
and the programming needs for a specific concert. Therefore, the context for which the
repertoire is selected may be related to a director’s choice to consider quality when
choosing repertoire.

Applications

Given the prevalence of expert opinion regarding the importance of quality in
repertoire selection, there was little evidence from the participants that quality, as defined
by experts, is a prevalent factor related to their repertoire selection. This study did not
ask participants to indicate if their professional development activities included specific
training on repertoire. However since the data did not seem to reflect a relationship
between the participants’ definitions of quality and professional development activities,
perhaps specific sessions regarding repertoire selection and characteristics of quality
should be offered at district and region workshops and state conferences (which were
listed as common types of professional development). This suggestion is supported by
Hayward’s (2006) recommendation that more professional development and perhaps
better teacher training could assist directors in choosing quality repertoire. Additionally,
to increase awareness and use of quality as a consideration in repertoire selection, undergraduate and graduate music education programs should offer preparation regarding defining characteristics of quality as well as specific repertoire selection procedures as part of conducting and wind literature courses. This idea is supported by Bauer & Berg’s 2001 study that suggested undergraduate experiences do not always allow for connections to be made between the inherent musical aspects of a piece and the realities faced by practicing teachers of time constraints, budgets, scheduling, etc. Also, Sheldon (1996) states that research shows there is little evidence of systematic or unbiased instruction for pre-service teachers to develop the skills to select appropriate levels of quality instrumental literature.

Since the majority of the participants in this study teach in rural schools, other possibilities for delivering professional development regarding quality repertoire and repertoire selection procedures could be beneficial. Online courses, workshops, and/or webinars may allow directors who are isolated, or who do not have the time to attend classes at a distant college or university to gain further understanding on this topic. Also, developing a social network site devoted to quality repertoire discussions and repertoire selection may allow directors of all levels to access valuable resources and information. An in-depth, multi-day symposium or academy devoted to issues of repertoire selection and wind literature, that could include conducting an ensemble with selected quality repertoire, may serve as another opportunity for directors to increase their knowledge. It would be most beneficial if experts on quality repertoire were able to participate in these activities, and perhaps PMEA could serve as a resource with the development and implementation of these ideas.
Suggestions for Future Research

The topic of quality has only begun to be investigated as it pertains to repertoire selection and continued research is suggested. Given the importance of quality music as outlined in Chapters 1 and 2, it is alarming to the researcher that only 40% of the participants in this study indicated that quality was a factor related to repertoire selection. Further study must be conducted to find out why.

The data in this study supports Fiese’s (1993) suggestion that although it seems directors can agree upon music that is considered to be quality as evidenced in recommended repertoire lists, there is little agreement on the basis of these judgments. The results of this study did not reflect a relationship between the participants’ definitions of quality and their backgrounds, years of service, school demographics, and professional development activities. Further studies on a larger scale may reveal different results that may be generalized to a wider population. Perhaps replicating this study with participants from a different state’s music education association would offer further insight into the repertoire selection process related to opinions of quality repertoire. Also, a qualitative research approach may provide a rich source of information regarding how opinions of quality are related to choosing music. It is suggested that another study be conducted with four or five participants from differing demographic situations and in different stages of their careers to allow for additional understanding.

The researcher feels it is important to explore, with more specificity, why there is a perceived disconnect between what is thought to be quality repertoire and why directors do not choose this music. This study provided a broad investigation into this relationship, however was not able to determine a relationship between definitions of quality and
music that has perceived educational value or was perceived to be challenging. Also, this study was not able to determine specific aspects of the participants’ backgrounds in regard to the experiences and opportunities provided in their undergraduate and/or graduate programs regarding repertoire selection. More defined research with only one or two variables, such as investigating what type of training is provided regarding repertoire selection to undergraduate and graduate music education majors, as well as the backgrounds of who is providing such training, may assist in providing more insight into the opinions of quality by practicing teachers. The researcher feels more research should also be conducted to determine specifically how directors spend their time while attending PMEA festivals, workshops, and conferences and what opportunities exist at these events to increase the participants’ knowledge of quality repertoire. Additionally, further specific study regarding different types of graduate study (Master’s degrees in music education, performance, and conducting) may provide insight into directors’ opinions of quality repertoire.

Additional research should also be conducted regarding repertoire that directors select for performance and the repertoire contained on recommended lists. Although this study was not able to determine a relationship due to a wide variety of responses, more specific questioning may provide insight into directors’ opinions of quality repertoire and the actual music they select to perform with their ensembles. The researcher recommends exploring specific repertoire that is selected by directors who use quality as a primary factor in selecting repertoire and comparing those results with the repertoire selected by directors who do not indicate quality as a primary factor.
It was particularly concerning to the researcher that student preferences and audience appeal were tied for the fourth most indicated factors that influence repertoire selection. The data showed that stylistic and technical attributes of the music, as well as ensemble performance skills were perceived to be far less important. It is the researcher’s opinion that directors are supposed to be highly-trained musicians and educators, and it is their responsibility to select quality repertoire to achieve curricular expectations and enhance their students’ musical skills and understanding. The students’ and audiences’ opinions of repertoire should not supersede the importance of providing a quality music education.

The researcher believes that selecting quality repertoire is important for the benefit of students as well as the vitality of band programs. Given the amount of resources available to guide repertoire selection, it is alarming that these do not seem to be consistently used by high school band directors in Pennsylvania. It is hoped that this research will encourage more interest in the issue of quality repertoire for band among band directors and researchers alike.
REFERENCE


Fonder, M. (2000). Educational quality vs. artistic quality in band literature: Must it be either/or?. Unpublished manuscript.


APPENDIX A

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PENNSYLVANIA HIGH SCHOOL BAND DIRECTORS’ BACKGROUNDS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF QUALITY REPERTOIRE

Questionnaire

Tell me about the school district where you currently teach:

1. My school district is best described as:
   Rural  Suburban  Urban

2. The average size of graduating class:
   1-100  101-250  251-400  400+

Tell me about yourself:

3. My age range is:
   22-28  29-35  36+

4. The total number of years I have been teaching music is (including this year): ______

5. The total number of years I have been a high school band director is (including this year):
   ______

Tell me about your professional development experiences:

6. Describe your coursework beyond your Undergraduate Degree (circle all that apply):
   Masters of Music Education:   None  In-Progress  Completed
   Masters in Music Performance:  None  In-Progress  Completed
   Other Masters Degree:    None   In-Progress  Completed

   Indicate Degree Program _________________________

   Military Service- in Music:  None  In-Progress  Completed

   Doctoral Program:   None  In-Progress  Completed

   Indicate Degree Program (ex. D.M.A. in conducting) ________________

   Other Post-Baccalaureate Coursework in Music or Education:   Yes   No

   If yes, describe courses _____________________________________________
7. How often do you attend music workshops/clinics? (For the purposes of this study a workshop/clinic is defined as a professional development opportunity on a single topic (ex. instrument repair or horn pedagogy) lasting at least 1 hour, but not more than one day, that is intended to improve your skills as a music teacher.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Rarely or Never</th>
<th>Once every 2-3 years</th>
<th>Once a year</th>
<th>More than once a year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local/County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How often do you attend music conferences? (For the purposes of this study a conference is defined as a professional development opportunity sponsored by a professional music organization lasting more than one day, that is intended to improve your skills as a music teacher.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Rarely or Never</th>
<th>Once every 2-3 years</th>
<th>Once a year</th>
<th>More than once a year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local/County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Rank the percentage of time that you spend doing the following activities while attending a conference (total should equal 100%):

_______ Attending Sessions
_______ Visiting Exhibits
_______ Attending Concerts
_______ Observing Rehearsal
_______ Presenting Sessions/Concerts
_______ Other (please indicate activity) ___________________________

10. As a PMEA member you currently receive PMEA News, Music Educators Journal, and Teaching Music. Please list any other professional music journals or publications that you receive.
_______________________________________________________________________

11. Aside from PMEA, what other professional music organizations do you belong to?
_______________________________________________________________________

12. Do you perform regularly? (For the purposes of this study, regularly will be defined as currently belonging to an established performance ensemble(s), or individually performing at least two times per month.)

Yes No

13. Do you, or have you taken private lessons after you have completed your undergraduate degree? (If no, please proceed to question 15)

Yes No

14. If yes, please indicate what type of lessons you have taken (mark all that apply)?

Additional study on major instrument
Additional study on a secondary instrument
Conducting
Other ________________________________

15. Please indicate any other sources of professional development in music that you have participated in.
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
Tell me about your opinions of quality music and band repertoire selection:

16. What is your personal definition of quality as it pertains to high school band repertoire?
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

17. Does quality affect your decision when selecting repertoire? If yes, how? If no, why not?
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

18. What other factors (other than quality) influence your repertoire selection process?
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
19. What sources do you use when selecting band repertoire? (check all the apply)

____ Promotional Materials/Recordings from Music Publishers
____ Recommended Repertoire Lists
____ Consulting Books (ex. Teaching Music Through Performance in Band)
____ Colleague Recommendations
____ Reference Recordings/CD’s
____ Attending Concerts/Concert Programs
____ Searching On-line

Other ________________________________

20. List the repertoire from two of your concert programs that was performed within the last two years (title and composer/arranger). Please indicate why each of these pieces was selected for study and performance.

_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________
Dear High School Band Director,

My name is Scott Sheehan and I am asking for your assistance in completing a brief survey about your experiences in selecting repertoire for your high school band. I am conducting this survey for research as part of the requirements for my Master’s Degree in Music Education at the Pennsylvania State University. The title of my project is THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PENNSYLVANIA HIGH SCHOOL BAND DIRECTORS’ BACKGROUNDS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF QUALITY REPERTOIRE, and the purpose is to investigate high school band directors’ backgrounds and how that may impact their definitions of quality music. I have found that although some authors offer suggestions concerning quality repertoire in various articles and journals, little systematic research has been conducted recently to see what the folks who are teaching everyday feel about this topic. If you are interested in assisting me, please click on the link below and you will be given more information on how to complete the survey. Your decision to participate in this research is voluntary and you may stop at any time. Also, you do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. I greatly appreciate your time and effort in assisting me. It is my hope that the information gained through this study will help to enhance music education in our state. Please complete the survey no later than January 31, 2008. Also, if you are not the high school band director in your district, please forward this to the appropriate person. Thank you.

Click this link to enter the survey:

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=MlBGfmCuaA0j0nHm7E9rVQ_3d_3d

Sincerely,
Scott
APPENDIX C

Consent Information and Screening Information

Implied Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PENNSYLVANIA HIGH SCHOOL BAND DIRECTORS’ BACKGROUNDS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF QUALITY REPERTOIRE

Principal Investigator:
Scott R. Sheehan, Graduate Student
240 N. Gail Street
Hollidaysburg, PA 16648
(814) 695-1309
scott_sheehan@tigerwires.com

Advisor:
Dr. Linda Thornton
260 Music Building I
University Park, PA 16802
(814)863-5723
lct12@psu.edu

1. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research is to investigate high school band directors’ definitions of quality music, its impact on repertoire selection, as well as the relationship between opinions of quality and the director’s years of experience, background, and professional development activities.

2. Procedures to be followed: You will be asked to answer 20 questions on an on-line survey regarding your background, professional development activities, and your opinions of quality as it relates to repertoire selection.

3. Duration/Time: It will take about 20 minutes to complete the survey.

4. Statement of Confidentiality: Your participation in this research is confidential. The survey does not ask for any information that would identify you. In the event of any publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared because your name is in no way linked to your responses. Your confidentiality will be kept to the degree permitted by the technology used. No guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third parties.
5. Right to Ask Questions: Please contact Scott Sheehan at (814)695-1309 or scott_sheehan@tigerwires.com with questions or concerns about this study.

6. Voluntary Participation: Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study.

Completion and return of the survey implies that you have read the information in this form and consent to take part in the research. Please print this form to keep for your records or future reference.

**Screening Procedure:**

For the purposes of this study, responses to the following survey are only to be completed by High School Band Directors who are members of PMEA. The following question will be asked prior to seeking potential participants’ consent:

Are you currently a high school band director and a member of PMEA?

If the response is yes, then potential candidates will proceed to the consent page followed by the questionnaire. If the answer is no, the questionnaire will not continue.