2018

A Content Analysis of Recommended Composers in Repertoire Lists for Band

Wesley Brewer
Oregon State University, wesley.brewer@oregonstate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.stthomas.edu/rime

Part of the Music Education Commons, and the Music Pedagogy Commons

Abstract

In this study I analyze and describe the contents of recommended band repertoire lists to explore which composers' music is recommended and arranged for band most often. Fourteen repertoire lists provided by state-level music associations and independent publishers were included in the analysis, comprising a total of 32,267 entries. Previous research on band repertoire and programming has tended to focus on composers of advanced literature and has subsequently overlooked the contributions of composers who write music primarily intended for educational purposes. The 25 most recommended composers from each graded difficulty level of literature from 1 to 5+ and overall are reported. The findings provide recognition of composers' contributions to music education and invite further discussions about how the quality, value, and difficulty of repertoire is determined.

Introduction

The selection of repertoire constitutes a fundamental part of the curricular decisions in music ensemble classrooms. While noted conductor H. Robert Reynolds suggested that it "may be an overstatement to say that repertoire *is* the curriculum," he went on to state "we can all agree that a well-planned repertoire creates the framework for an excellent music curriculum" and that repertoire selection "is one of the most difficult aspects of the entire profession" (Reynolds, 2000). Research suggests that this challenge continues to confront band directors. For instance, Brewer and Rickels (2014) analyzed the content of more than 14,000 pieces of social media communications collected from the Facebook Band Directors Group and found that repertoire was by far the most frequently discussed topic. The publication of numerous articles

about repertoire selection and recommendations indicate a deep and ongoing interest in this topic (McCrann, 2016; Wiggins, 2013; for overview see Budiansky & Foley, 2005).

Studies of composers and their contributions to music repertoire have long been a part of music education research. Farnsworth (1962) examined composer "eminence" by measuring the physical space composers occupied in encyclopedia entries and compared these measurements with the opinions of American Musicological Society members; this was but one of multiple studies by Farnsworth on composer eminence (1945, 1963, 1966, 1969). Researchers have used broader techniques of content analysis (Kratus, 1993; Livingston, 1997; Miksza & Johnson, 2012; Palkki, Albert, Hill, & Shaw, 2016) to examine various aspects of music education practices including repertoire selection and music programming. Price (1990) examined orchestral programming trends while Price, Yarbrough, and Kinney (1990) compared orchestral programming trends with university faculty attitudes toward American composers. Powell (2009) examined the programming trends of Big Ten university wind ensembles while Paul (2011) conducted a similar study using Pac-Ten (now Pac-12) wind ensembles.

Several authors have analyzed the content of recommended, suggested, or required music lists, published by state-level and professional music education organizations in the United States (Crochet, 2006; Oliver, 2012; Young, 1998). As Stevenson (2003) noted, the historical origins of these lists likely began with *A Survey of Music Material for Bands*, developed for use in the national band contests of the 1920s. Many state-level organizations that oversee adjudicated ensemble events continue to provide required lists of literature from which participating ensembles must perform a required piece. In other states, repertoire lists are provided only as suggestions or recommendations. Lists of this type have continued to be important resources for directors as well as a source of scholarly interest. Young (1998) found that band directors used

such lists as both primary and secondary sources of repertoire selection, but still favored hearing live performances of repertoire for making decisions. Crochet (2006) found that experienced directors used repertoire lists more often than those with less experience. Oliver (2012) analyzed the contents of 101 lists of recommended repertoire, but purposely excluded state organization lists from his study. He identified a collection of 6,498 unique recommended titles while noting that consensus about how to grade the difficulty of a given composition varied widely between lists. Stevenson (2003) analyzed the contents of 25 recommended music lists from state associations. He extracted compositions appearing on seven or more of the lists, resulting in the identification of 1,270 unique titles that may constitute a core repertoire for band.

A long-running conversation about the varied quality and purposes of repertoire for band continues (Budiansky & Foley, 2005). While bands were a popular form of entertainment and social activity in the early twentieth century, widespread public interest in bands declined over time (Whitehill, 1969). Bands transitioned from being entertainment, community, and/or social organizations, to being primarily affiliated with educational institutions, thereby creating conflicts of purpose and educational value, which extended to repertoire decisions (Mantie, 2012). An important dimension of such discussions has been a healthy debate about the importance of programming and performing original music for band as opposed to arrangements of existing music or transcriptions of orchestral works by well-known composers, which have been historically important sources of band repertoire (Budiansky & Foley, 2005). Discussions about band and its place in music education continue in the field at large (Allsup and Benedict, 2008; Williams, 2011). In the current study I did not aim to further the rich conversation around the purposes of band in the school system, the criteria for defining quality repertoire (Ostling, 1978; Gilbert, 1993), or the means of identifying a core repertoire of band music (Oliver, 2012;

McCrann, 2016; Stevenson, 2003). Rather, I aimed to analyze and describe the contents of widely-used repertoire lists to explore and acknowledge how the work of various composers has contributed to the development of recommended band repertoire at all levels of difficulty.

In this regard, the studies cited earlier have several limitations. Those authors that have examined programming trends and core repertoire have necessarily focused on the perceived worth of singular compositions rather than on composers' overall contributions. Additionally, many authors have focused on the programming or recommendations of professional or collegiate ensemble directors, resulting in an emphasis on more difficult literature. There is a need for research that highlights two aspects of data that may be of interest to music educators: (a) studies that broadly include and acknowledge composers of less-difficult literature, and (b) studies that recognize recommended composers' overall output and contribution to the field. Four research questions guided the current study:

1. Which composers are most recommended in the selected resources across all grade levels?

2. Which composers are most recommended in the selected resources at each grade level from 1 to 5+?

3. Which recommended composers' music most often appears as an arrangement across all grade levels?

4. How do the results of the analysis inform the current state of band repertoire?

Methodology

I gathered recommended band repertoire lists from music education organizations and publications via the internet. The full list of resources used in the study appears in Appendix A; the resources were current as of May 2015 when they were compiled from U.S. state-level music associations as per recommended, required, or suggested repertoire lists. The criteria for repertoire to be included in these lists varies between organizations, but is assumed to represent the collective approval of organization leaders or members. It should be noted that many state organizations do not use or provide such lists, and others still refer members to lists from other states (Stevenson, 2003).

I used three criteria to determine whether a repertoire list was usable in the current study: (a) the list was publicly available for electronic download, (b) the list included at least five different levels of music graded by difficulty, and (c) the list contained enough error-free information to reasonably identify the correct composer, grade level, and arranger for each piece. As a result, I excluded non-exportable databases and paper-only lists that would not facilitate software-based analysis. I also excluded lists that used other grading criteria such as school size. Additionally, I incorporated two lists not from state organizations because of their prominent use by music educators (Hash, 2005; Stevenson, 2003): (a) the list of repertoire contained in the first eight full volumes and the two volumes of beginning band repertoire from the *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band* book series published by GIA, and (b) the list of suggested repertoire provided by the National Band Association.

There is no consensus on the procedure or criteria for grading band music. As Oliver (2012) noted, it is possible for a single composition to appear in as many as three different grade levels across lists. In the current study, the grade level assigned to each composition in a list was

used in the analysis with no effort made to re-categorize or achieve consistency across lists. All of the lists in the current study except two use a six-level scale from Grade 1 (easiest) to Grade 6 (most difficult). The University Interscholastic League (Texas) and Louisiana lists use a five-level scale, with Grade 5 being the most difficult literature. Additionally, the *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band* book series contains sub-levels in Grade 1 (1-, 1, 1+). For the purpose of analysis in the current study, all levels below Grade 2 were combined into Grade 1. Grades 5 and 6 were combined into Grade 5+. Table 1 outlines the repertoire resources included in the study and the number of compositions in each resource across grade levels ($N = 32,267$).

Table 1

Distribution of Compositions per Grade Level and Resource Included in the Study

Organization	Gr. 1	Gr. 2	Gr. 3	Gr. 4	Gr. 5+	Total
Florida	105	250	282	218	643	1,498
Georgia	81	175	269	290	615	1,430
GIA/Teaching Music.	101	167	159	160	319	906
Iowa	0	46	101	134	128	409
Kentucky	39	237	297	245	383	1,201
Louisiana	258	374	488	462	560	2,142
Maryland	118	222	196	265	467	1,268
National Band Assoc.	75	368	435	376	728	1,982
Nebraska	43	131	190	137	238	739
North Carolina	172	392	377	465	754	2,160
Texas/UIL	152	196	278	230	298	1,154
Utah	0	223	707	566	1,006	2,502
Virginia	644	1,665	2,662	2,306	2,435	9,712
West Virginia	415	1,176	1,265	984	1,324	5,164
Total	2,203	5,622	7,706	6,838	9,898	32,267

For each resource, the data were formatted to fit in an Excel spreadsheet, often imported from a PDF file provided by the organization or publisher. Each spreadsheet was reviewed to correct typographical errors or reconcile different name spellings for the same composer (i.e. Tchaikovsky and Tchaikowsky). Data entry errors in the original sources created initial obstacles to analysis and I made efforts to identify and group compositions by the same person including

the correction of spelling, punctuation, and formatting errors. Particularly problematic were lists where only last names were given and where there were two prominent composers with the same last name (e.g. Mark Williams and Clifton Williams). In these cases each composition was verified against other internet resources and repertoire lists to ensure that the correct composer was credited.

An additional obstacle to analysis resulted from resources where compositions based on folk music sources named the composer as "anonymous," "folk song," or "traditional." To facilitate analysis, I renamed entries like these in a single category called "traditional." It is important to note that in some lists the composer or arranger was named as composing a piece that might also be labeled "traditional" in another list. These differences in naming created a discrepancy and may have resulted in composers who often create or arrange materials based on traditional sources being over-represented in lists where this distinction is not made. "Traditional" is listed in the results tables where applicable to show its prevalence in the study. After correcting the aforementioned errors and making these clarifications and adjustments, the data from each list were inputted into SPSS for analysis.

I began by establishing frequency scores and percentage of space scores for each composer within each resource. Frequency scores were calculated using SPSS descriptive statistics, counting the number of times a composer's name appeared in the resource. Percentage of space scores were calculated by dividing the frequency score by the total number of entries in each resource. This approach was informed by Farnsworth (1962) who used the concept of allocated space to measure composer eminence. After finishing these calculations, I combined the frequency and percentage of space data from each repertoire list into a comprehensive spreadsheet that included the final data from all lists across all grade levels from 1 to 5+.

For secondary data analysis, I calculated the mean percentage of space score for each composer by adding the percentage of space scores from each list together and then dividing by 14, the total number of lists analyzed in the study. The mean percentage of space score (*M%)* is used as the primary measurement of "recommendation" in this study because list size varies widely (*range* = 409 to 9712; *M* = 2304.7 1464; *Mdn* = 1464). The percentage of space measurement is preferable to frequency alone because it treats each list with equal importance and recognizes composers who are well-represented across multiple lists rather than heavily represented on one or two high-volume lists (e.g. Virginia). In order to answer research question 2, I repeated the analysis procedure for each group of compositions at the individual difficulty grading levels. In order to answer research question 3, I repeated the analysis procedure for composers whose entries indicated an arranger. I did not make a distinction between a transcription and an arrangement; all such compositions were classified as arrangements.

Results and Discussion

Results for the most recommended composers across all grade levels are shown in Table 2. The mean percentage of space occupied by each composer across the 14 lists is reported as *M%*. Standard deviation (*SD*) and frequency scores (*n*) are also included. Results for the 25 most recommended composers at each individual grade level from 1 through 5+ are shown in Tables 3 through 7 and are found in Appendix B. In instances where two or more composers had the same reported mean within a grade level, I have given the higher ranking to the composer with the higher frequency score. In each table where "traditional" is included, I have also added the composer who was ranked in 26th place in order to provide recognition to the individual who would have been displaced by inclusion of the "traditional" classification in the results. Results

for the 25 recommended composers whose music most often appeared as an arrangement are

shown in Table 8, also found in Appendix B.

Table 2

The 25 Most Recommended Composers Across All Grade Levels
(N = 32,267)

Rank	Composer	M%	SD	n
1	Bach, Johann Sebastian	2.30	.91	657
2	Grainger, Percy Aldridge	1.94	.92	418
3	Curnow, James	1.42	1.47	491
4	Ticheli, Frank	1.42	.77	281
5	Sheldon, Robert	1.28	.58	427
6	Reed, Alfred	1.21	.88	309
7	Erickson, Frank	1.11	.48	366
8	Holst, Gustav	1.07	.45	256
9	McGinty, Anne	1.06	.47	411
10	Handel, George Frideric	1.05	.62	345
11	Grundman, Clare	1.02	.47	243
12	Del Borgo, Elliot	1.00	.40	402
13	Balmages, Brian	.87	.57	282
14	McBeth, W. Francis	.86	.50	212
15	Traditional	.84	.99	221
16	Holsinger, David	.83	.52	230
17	Swearingen, James	.82	.65	347
18	Wagner, Richard	.81	.39	240
19	Smith, Claude T.	.79	.34	254
20	Persichetti, Vincent	.79	.46	156
21	Smith, Robert W.	.77	.63	321
22	Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus	.77	.40	268
23	Vaughan Williams, Ralph	.76	.36	163
24	La Plante, Pierre	.75	.37	173
25	Tchaikovsky, Peter Ilyich	.72	.51	281
26	Barnes, James	.68	.21	205

In response to research question 1, the results in Table 2 represent a curious mixture of

composers known widely for historically significant contributions to Western classical music as

well as composers who are known almost exclusively for their contributions to educational band

literature. The results seem to reflect historical roots of band repertoire development that remain in practice today: (a) adapting music from other genres and ensemble-types to be played by bands, and (b) the development of educational literature that can be played by musicians of various skill levels. It is of particular interest to note that the most recommended composer across all grades, Johann Sebastian Bach, never composed any works for band. While few musicians and educators would argue against the quality of Bach's compositions, it is perhaps surprising to discover that his compositions are recommended more than those of any other composer, including many who devoted their careers to composing specifically for band.

With respect to research question 2, it is clear that there are simply more recommended compositions at higher levels of difficulty, as can be seen in Table 1. Advanced literature has been the primary focus of many studies aimed at defining works of "serious artistic merit" (Ostling, 1978; Gilbert, 1993) and those studies looking at programming trends among university and professional organizations (Powell, 2009; Paul, 2011, Price, 1990). An important function of the current study is to recognize the contributions of composers like Anne McGinty who have consistently produced recommended works, but at lower levels of difficulty. There are 68 unique composers identified in this study, but only two of these composers (Bach, Curnow) appeared in the top 25 results of every grade level. Five composers (Balmages, Del Borgo, Erickson, Swearingen, Ticheli) appeared in four of the five grade level results. Seven composers (Broege, Daehn, Grainger, Handel, Mozart, Ployhar, Sheldon) appeared in three grade level results. Nineteen composers appeared in two grade level results tables, while the remaining 35 composers appeared only once. While the varying systems for grading music may obscure the meaning of these results to some extent, these results do suggest that composers' contributions

are often concentrated on a specific level of difficulty. The composers named above whose contributions appear across multiple grade levels are the exception rather than the rule.

The reported standard deviation for each composer in Tables 3 through 7 indicates level of consensus between the lists regarding a composer within each grade level; a lower standard deviation indicates a higher level of consensus between lists. Consensus trends within each standard deviation results column provide insight into the average level of agreement within each grade. This statistic can be found by taking the square root of the mean variance within each standard deviation column for each grade level. The results of this analysis yield the following results: Grade 1 = 1.75; Grade 2 = 1.31; Grade 3 = 1.19; Grade 4 = 1.10; Grade 5+ = .75. As a lower number indicates a higher level of consensus, these results support the findings of other studies that suggest a wider diversity of opinions about composers and compositions at lower difficulty levels (Stevenson, 2003; Oliver, 2012). Further exploration of the reasons for this lack of consensus about less-difficult literature could be rich territory for future research.

With respect to research question 3, approximately 27% ($n = 8,827$) of the compositions contained in the data set were listed as arrangements. Recommended composers whose works most often appeared as an arrangement appear in Table 8. Despite debates about the relative importance of original music for band versus the adaptation of existing music (Budiansky & Foley, 2005), the results suggest that arranged music continues to hold a prominent place in recommended band repertoire. This finding echoes the results of Stevenson's (2003) work, which indicated that arrangements and transcriptions occupied anywhere from 15 to 50 percent of recommended compositions at each grade level. Of further interest, though outside the direct scope of this study, are aesthetic questions provoked by the results. What about the nature of Bach's compositions has made them such a rich source of material for band? What are the

particular sonic properties that have repeatedly led band arrangers to his works? What qualities differentiate the suitability of Bach's compositions from other well-known Western classical music composers like Mozart and Handel, who are recommended and arranged less frequently, and at lower levels of difficulty? Such questions may be of interest for future researchers.

Conclusion

In providing recommendations for future research and scholarly work, I suggest that just as the movement toward standardized band instrumentation benefitted the development of bands and composers throughout the 20th century (Battisti, 2002), a movement toward the standardization of literature grading may help educators and researchers who have interest in continuing the study of repertoire development over time. Wide variation in methods, classifications, and scales have obscured the usefulness and meaning of these categories and the resources that utilize them. Likewise, agreement about how to credit compositions based on traditional or folk music sources would help educators more clearly identify which compositions are wholly original, which compositions are based on traditional material, and which compositions are arrangements of pre-existing music.

Band continues to be one of the primary vehicles for music education in the United States as evidenced by a survey distributed to 1,000 secondary school principals, the results of which indicated that 93% of schools were offering a course in band, more than any other type of music offering including chorus, orchestra, and guitar (Abril & Gault, 2008). While the merits and educational purposes of large instrumental ensembles in schools continue to be an important topic of discussion (Allsup & Benedict, 2008; Williams, 2011), band nonetheless remains a staple of school music education in the United States. Data suggest that repertoire, in particular, remains a primary concern and frequent topic of discussion among practicing band directors

(Brewer & Rickels, 2014). As long as band remains part of the school curriculum, it is incumbent upon researchers to continue examining best practices surrounding the teaching of band, including studies of recommended repertoire and educational resources provided for band directors.

Appendix A

Florida Bandmasters Association. (2014.). *2014 – 2015 concert music list*. Retrieved May, 2015 from http://fba.flmusiced.org/for-directors/music-lists/

Georgia Music Educators Association. (n.d.). *LGPE band music list.* Retrieved May, 2015 from http://www.gmea.org/band/

GIA Publications. (2011). *Teaching music through performance in band: A comprehensive listing of all volumes by grade, 2011*. Retrieved May, 2015 from http://www.teachingmusic.org/pdfs/TMTPComprehensiveList.pdf

Iowa High School Music Association. (n.d.). *Required literature list - band.* Retrieved May, 2015 from http://ihsma.org/large-group-festival/

Kentucky Music Educators Association. (n.d.). *Kentucky selective music list for bands*. Retrieved May, 2015 from https://www.kmea.org/FESTIVAL/BandList/BandListBasis.htm

Louisiana Music Educators Association. (n.d.). *Complete prescribed list grades 1 – 5*. Retrieved May, 2015 from https://www.lmeamusic.org/assessments/vocal-district-large-ensemble-assessment/band-performance-requirements/

Maryland Music Educators Association. (n.d.). *Band list*. Retrieved May, 2015 from http://www.mmea-maryland.org/new-page-1/

National Band Association. (n.d.). *Selective music list*. Retrieved May, 2015 from http://njsma.com/bandfest/NBA_Music_List.pdf

Nebraska State Bandmasters Association. (n.d.). *Recommended music list*. Retrieved May, 2015 from http://nsbma.org/resources/suggested-literature.html

North Carolina Bandmasters Association. (n.d.). *Concert band MPA list*. Retrieved May, 2015 from http://www.ncbandmasters.org/concertbandmpa.html

University Interscholastic League. (n.d.). *Prescribed music list*. Retrieved May, 2015 from http://wwwdev.uiltexas.org/pml/

Utah Music Educators Association. (n.d). *Required literature list*. Retrieved May, 2015 from
http://umea.us/stband.php

Virginia Band and Orchestra Directors Association. (n.d.). *Large ensemble music list*. Retrieved
May, 2015 from http://www.vboda.org/

West Virginia Secondary Schools Activities Commission. (2015). *Graded music list*. Retrieved
May, 2015 from http://www.wvssac.org/activities-commission-band/graded-music-list

Appendix B

Table 3

The 25 Most Recommended Composers from Grade 1 Repertoire
(n = 2,203)

Rank	Composer	*M*%	*SD*	*n*
1	McGinty, Anne	4.94	2.57	93
2	Kinyon, John	3.19	2.47	81
3	O'Reilly, John	3.18	2.16	56
4	Edmondson, John	3.08	1.59	57
5	Smith, Robert W.	2.67	1.57	64
6	Story, Michael	2.62	2.20	69
7	Owens, William	2.09	1.51	37
8	Traditional	2.06	2.95	46
9	Daehn, Larry	1.94	2.31	23
10	Margolis, Bob	1.78	1.82	24
11	Sweeney, Michael	1.76	1.39	23
12	Balmages, Brian	1.55	1.03	39
13	Curnow, James	1.55	1.42	32
14	Erickson, Frank	1.54	1.68	38
15	Clark, Larry	1.53	1.46	40
16	O'Loughlin, Sean	1.42	1.98	28
17	Del Borgo, Elliott	1.41	1.22	26
18	Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus	1.26	1.17	21
19	Swearingen, James	1.22	1.43	32
20	Handel, George Frideric	1.22	1.39	26
21	Feldstein, Sandy	1.22	2.04	26
22	Williams, Mark	1.21	.84	27
23	Grice, Rob	1.20	1.35	35
24	Broege, Timothy	1.13	1.42	14
25	Ployhar, James	1.12	1.41	28
26	Bach, Johann Sebastian	1.02	1.16	22

Table 4

The 25 Most Recommended Composers from Grade 2 Repertoire
(n = 5,622)

Rank	Composer	M%	SD	n
1	McGinty, Anne	3.17	1.48	192
2	Handel, George Frideric	2.58	1.48	132
3	Traditional	2.40	2.82	106
4	Sheldon, Robert	2.26	1.40	108
5	Erickson, Frank	2.14	1.18	94
6	Curnow, James	1.97	1.86	107
7	Del Borgo, Elliot	1.87	.75	111
8	Kinyon, John	1.81	1.12	119
9	Ployhar, James	1.54	1.63	69
10	Swearingen, James	1.53	1.28	100
11	Edmondson, John	1.49	.97	99
12	Broege, Timothy	1.49	1.66	48
13	Sweeney, Michael	1.43	1.44	89
14	Gordon, Philip	1.39	1.38	64
15	Williams, Mark	1.31	.70	71
16	Smith, Robert W.	1.21	.96	71
17	Bartok, Bela	1.20	1.20	44
18	O'Reilly, John	1.17	1.37	88
19	Bach, Johann Sebastian	1.15	.69	73
20	Balmages, Brian	1.14	1.16	58
21	Ticheli, Frank	1.12	.82	34
22	Story, Michael	1.00	.76	61
23	Shaffer, David	.99	1.25	85
24	Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus	.95	.56	64
25	Daehn, Larry	.95	.71	30
26	Grundman, Clare	.94	1.21	22

Table 5

*The 25 Most Recommended Composers from Grade 3 Repertoire
(n = 7,706)*

Rank	Composer	*M*%	*SD*	*n*
1	Bach, Johann Sebastian	3.96	3.14	220
2	Grundman, Clare	2.51	1.79	122
3	Sheldon, Robert	2.15	1.43	137
4	La Plante, Pierre	2.01	1.10	93
5	Erickson, Frank	1.97	1.07	128
6	Curnow, James	1.58	1.69	131
7	Grainger, Percy Aldridge	1.53	1.22	75
8	Swearingen, James	1.50	1.27	125
9	Ticheli, Frank	1.44	1.14	59
10	Handel, George Frideric	1.25	1.27	93
11	Stuart, Hugh M.	1.25	.76	65
12	Carter, Charles	1.21	.96	56
13	Vaughan Williams, Ralph	1.04	.76	46
14	Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus	1.03	.90	80
15	Broege, Timothy	1.03	.65	58
16	Balmages, Brian	1.02	1.03	70
17	Traditional	1.00	1.34	41
18	Daehn, Larry	.94	.48	48
19	Spears, Jared	.89	.89	74
20	McBeth, W. Francis	.86	.94	40
21	Del Borgo, Elliot	.83	.63	96
22	Strommen, Carl	.80	.70	57
23	Davis, Albert O.	.80	.65	53
24	Hazo, Samuel	.76	.54	40
25	Ployhar, James	.74	.63	76
26	Boysen, Andrew, Jr.	.71	.70	31

Table 6

The 25 Most Recommended Composers from Grade 4
Repertoire
(n = 6,838)

Rank	Composer	*M%*	*SD*	*n*
1	Grainger, Percy Aldridge	3.23	1.65	143
2	Bach, Johann Sebastian	3.19	1.81	191
3	Reed, Alfred	2.17	1.86	105
4	Ticheli, Frank	2.08	1.16	85
5	McBeth, W. Francis	1.69	.91	73
6	Curnow, James	1.51	1.56	107
7	Persichetti, Vincent	1.32	1.07	51
8	Sheldon, Robert	1.30	1.23	118
9	Grundman, Clare	1.28	1.36	80
10	Holst, Gustav	1.27	1.04	54
11	Van der Roost, Jan	1.23	1.10	54
12	Smith, Claude T.	1.20	.62	85
13	Williams, Clifton	1.20	.87	52
14	Balmages, Brian	1.04	.78	68
15	Vaughan Williams, Ralph	.95	.51	42
16	Del Borgo, Elliot	.85	.65	81
17	Erickson, Frank	.85	.85	74
18	Stamp, Jack	.85	.70	43
19	Holsinger, David	.83	.93	44
20	Hazo, Samuel	.79	.64	44
21	Swearingen, James	.78	1.34	83
22	Nelson, Ron	.78	.94	25
23	Whitacre, Eric	.72	.63	27
24	Chance, John Barnes	.72	.80	24
25	Arnold, Malcolm	.67	.72	24

Table 7

The 25 Most Recommended Composers from Grade 5+ Repertoire (n = 9,898)

Rank	Composer	*M%*	*SD*	*n*
1	Grainger, Percy Aldridge	2.51	1.32	184
2	Wagner, Richard	1.78	.89	171
3	Reed, Alfred	1.57	.68	165
4	Bach, Johann Sebastian	1.55	.40	151
5	Holst, Gustav	1.54	.90	126
6	Persichetti, Vincent	1.46	.90	99
7	Tchaikovsky, Peter Ilyich	1.42	.91	155
8	Ticheli, Frank	1.41	.86	100
9	Nelson, Ron	1.30	.46	100
10	Copland, Aaron	1.20	.56	84
11	Grantham, Donald	1.20	1.00	80
12	Arnold, Malcolm	1.14	.67	79
13	Sparke, Philip	1.12	.75	102
14	Gould, Morton	1.10	.41	94
15	Bernstein, Leonard	1.10	.70	75
16	Camphouse, Mark	1.06	.37	86
17	Holsinger, David	1.03	.82	122
18	Husa, Karel	1.02	.69	66
19	Gillingham, David R.	.98	.63	89
20	Curnow, James	.95	1.25	114
21	Berlioz, Hector	.95	.50	83
22	Barnes, James	.92	.52	106
23	Smith, Claude T.	.90	.69	104
24	Rossini, Gioacchino	.88	.46	88
25	Dello Joio, Norman	.85	.33	66

Table 8

The 25 Most Recommended Composers whose Repertoire is Listed as an Arrangement Across All Grade Levels and Resources (n = 8,827)

Rank	Composer	*M* (%)	*SD*	*n*
1	Bach, Johann Sebastian	7.92	2.42	653
2	Grainger, Percy Aldridge	4.94	2.52	309
3	Handel, George Frideric	3.44	1.46	343
4	Traditional	3.17	3.88	221
5	Holst, Gustav	2.73	1.35	192
6	Wagner, Richard	2.67	.82	233
7	Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus	2.65	.94	265
8	Tchaikovsky, Peter Ilyich	2.58	1.30	280
9	Arnold, Malcolm	2.13	1.64	116
10	Bernstein, Leonard	1.75	1.28	101
11	Shostakovich, Dmitri	1.68	.77	121
12	Brahms, Johannes	1.56	.55	157
13	Beethoven, Ludwig Van	1.58	1.22	190
14	Vaughan Williams, Ralph	1.48	.68	97
15	Dvorak, Antonin	1.33	.59	133
16	Rossini, Gioacchino	1.36	.58	134
17	Rimsky-Korsakov, Nicolai	1.31	.58	133
18	Verdi, Giuseppe	1.26	.68	116
19	Bartok, Bela	1.22	.55	96
20	Strauss, Richard	1.29	.50	110
21	Copland, Aaron	1.23	.68	73
22	Grieg, Edvard	1.17	.33	96
23	Mussorgsky, Modest	1.13	.68	129
24	Berlioz, Hector	1.06	.61	93
25	Elgar, Edward	1.06	.66	81
26	Saint-Saens, Camille	1.01	.51	87

References

Abril, C. R., & Gault, B. M. (2008). The state of music in secondary schools: The principal's perspective. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *56*(1), 68 – 81.

Allsup, R. E., & Benedict, C. (2008). The problems of band, an inquiry into the future of instrumental music education. *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 16*, 156 – 173.

Battisti, F. L. (2002). *The winds of change: The evolution of the contemporary American wind band/ensemble and its conductor*. Hal Leonard Corporation.

Brewer, W. D. & Rickels, D. A. (2014). A content analysis of social media interactions in the Facebook Band Directors Group. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 201,* 7 – 22.

Budiansky, S., & Foley, T. W. (2005). The quality of repertoire in school music programs: Literature review, analysis, and discussion. *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles*, *12*(5), 17 – 39.

Crochet, L. S. (2006). Repertoire selection practices of band directors as a function of teaching experience, training, instructional level, and degree of success (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3215250).

Farnsworth, P. R. (1945). Musical eminence and year of birth. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, *4*(2), 107 – 109.

Farnsworth, P. R. (1962). Elite attitudes in music as measured by the Cattell space method. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *10*(1) 65 – 68.

Farnsworth, P. R. (1963). Attitudes toward composers as reflected in three general encyclopedias of the early 1960's. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *11*(2), 142 – 143.

Farnsworth, P. R. (1966). Musicological attitudes on eminence. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 41 – 44.

Farnsworth, P. R. (1969). Encyclopedia favoritism toward native composers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *17*(4), 405 – 407.

Gilbert, J. W. (1993). An evaluation of compositions for wind band according to specific criteria of serious artistic merit: A replication and update (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9334685)

Hash, P. M. (2005). Middle school band contest repertoire in northern Illinois: analysis and recommendations. *Research and Issues in Music Education, 3*(1).

Kratus, J. (1993). Eminence in music education research as measured in the Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 118*, 21 – 32.

Livingston, C. (1997). Women in music education in the United States: Names mentioned in history books. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *45*(1), 130 – 144.

Mantie, R. (2012). Bands and/as music education antinomies and the struggle for legitimacy. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, *20*(1), 63 – 81.

McCrann, J. P. (2016). *The most valued repertoire of distinguished middle-level band conductors* (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University-Mason Gross School of the Arts).

Miksza, P., & Johnson, E. (2012). Theoretical frameworks applied in music education research: A content analysis of the Journal of Research in Music Education, 1979 to 2009. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, *193*, 7 – 30.

Oliver, T. W. (2012). A comparison and analysis of published lists of recommended wind band literature. *Journal of Band Research*, *47*(2), 43 – 63.

Ostling, A. E., Jr. (1978). An evaluation of composition for wind band according to specific criteria of serious artistic merit (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 7822438).

Palkki, J., Albert, D. J., Hill, S. C., & Shaw, R. D. (2016). 20 years of the MENC Biennial Conference: A content analysis. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *64*(1), 14 – 28.

Paul, T. A. (2011). Pac-ten wind ensemble programming trends. *Journal of Band Research*, *47*(1), 49 – 55.

Powell, S. R. (2009). Recent programming trends of Big Ten university wind ensembles. *Journal of Band Research*, *44*(2), 1 – 12.

Price, H. E. (1990). Orchestral programming 1982-1987: An indication of musical taste. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, *106,* 23 – 35.

Price, H. E., Yarbrough, C., & Kinney, M. (1990). Eminence of American composers: University faculty attitudes and symphony orchestra programming. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, *106*, 37 – 47.

Reynolds, H. R. (2000). Repertoire is the curriculum: Repertoire selection has a major impact on what students will and will not learn, and it should help their musical understanding and appreciation. *Music Educators Journal*, *87*(1), 31 – 33.

Stevenson, J. R. (2003). *A survey and meta-analysis of selective wind band/ensemble music lists for the purpose of determining core repertoire at all difficulty levels*. Unpublished

Masters Thesis, Peabody Conservatory of Music, Baltimore, MA.

Whitehill, C. D. (1969). Sociological conditions which contributed to the growth of the school band movement in the United States. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *17*(2), 179 – 192.

Wiggins, T. D. (2013). *Analytical research of wind band core repertoire* (Doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University).

Williams, D. A. (2011). The elephant in the room. *Music Educators Journal*, *98*(1), 51 – 57.

Young, C. S. (1998). *The quality of repertoire chosen by high school wind band conductors and the resources and criteria used to choose this literature.* (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University).

About the Author

Wesley Brewer serves on the Oregon State University (OSU) faculty as Associate Professor and Coordinator of Music Education. Prior to his appointment at OSU, Brewer served as Associate Professor and Director of Music Education at the Chicago College of Performing Arts of Roosevelt University from 2009 to 2016. He completed his doctoral studies in music education at Arizona State University. Dr. Brewer is the author of multiple scholarly publications including articles in the *Journal of Research in Music Education, Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, Research Studies in Music Education*, *The Journal of Music Teacher Education, Music Educators Journal,* and a book chapter in *Issues of Identity in Music Education: Narratives and Practices*. He has presented findings from his research at state, national, and international conferences throughout the United States and in Finland and Norway including meetings of the Society for Music Teacher Education (SMTE), the American Educational Research Association, and the National Association for Music Education. Brewer was conference co-chair for *Narrative Soundings: The Fifth International Conference on Narrative Inquiry in Music Education (NIME5)* and also serves as the facilitator for the Society for Music Teacher Education's Teacher Recruitment Area of Strategic Planning and Action. In 2010, Dr. Brewer was named recipient of the national Outstanding Dissertation Award presented by the Council for Research in Music Education.