

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Dissertations and Doctoral Documents from
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 2023–

Graduate Studies

5-2024

An Unnecessary Barrier: A Critical History of Efforts to Define a Core Repertoire for the Wind Band

Trevor Frost

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/dissunl>



Part of the [Ethnomusicology Commons](#), [Fine Arts Commons](#), and the [Music Performance Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Frost, Trevor, "An Unnecessary Barrier: A Critical History of Efforts to Define a Core Repertoire for the Wind Band" (2024). *Dissertations and Doctoral Documents from University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 2023–*. 94.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/dissunl/94>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Doctoral Documents from University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 2023– by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

AN UNNECESSARY BARRIER: A CRITICAL HISTORY OF EFFORTS TO DEFINE
A CORE REPERTOIRE FOR THE WIND BAND

by

Trevor Frost

A DOCTORAL DOCUMENT

Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Musical Arts

Major: Music
(Wind Band Conducting)

Under the Supervision of Professor Carolyn Barber

Lincoln, Nebraska

May, 2024

AN UNNECESSARY BARRIER: A CRITICAL HISTORY OF EFFORTS TO DEFINE
A CORE REPERTOIRE FOR THE WIND BAND

Trevor Frost, D.M.A.

University of Nebraska, 2024

Advisor: Carolyn Barber

The wind band saw significant development in its literature, instrumentation, and programming practices throughout the twentieth century. Midway through the twentieth century the identification of a “core” repertoire began to make its way into the forefront of the wind band profession’s priorities, resulting in three significant studies by Acton Eric Ostling Jr. (1978), Jay Warren Gilbert (1993), and Clifford N. Towner (2011). Along with these studies many smaller studies and surveys were being published with this same goal of identifying either a “performance core” or an “intellectual core.” However, with new works of serious artistic merit constantly being written and included in these studies, it calls into question the purpose behind the efforts of identifying a “core.”

A defining feature of the wind band is the exponential growth of its literature through efforts by bandmasters such as A.A. Harding, E.F. Goldman, William D. Revelli, Frederick Fennell and others in starting in the twentieth century. These efforts inspired other bandmasters and school band conductors to commission composers who were beginning to experiment with writing for wind instruments whereas before bands would predominately use orchestral transcriptions.

As the number of new compositions being written grew at an exponential rate, programming practices began to shift from transcriptions to original wind band works. Major music distributors and conferences such as J.W. Pepper, Midwest Sheet Music,

and the Midwest Clinic noticed these trends and fueled commissioning efforts and influenced the programming habits through their marketing strategies creating an ouroboros effect.

With the continuous exponential growth of the wind band literature through commissioning efforts and influencers affecting the programming practices of band directors the continuous need to define a “core” repertoire serves as an unnecessary barrier to what could be the next defining era of the wind band. This era would be defined as the pursuit of diversity and inclusion dedicated to experimentation, exploration, novelty, and growth.

Dedication

This document is dedicated to all the educators, conductors, composers, musicians, performers, and to anyone else who is either frightened and/or tired of the status quo of either their educational or professional institutions. It is time to challenge the traditions that hold back these institutions from moving forward and take that first step into the unknown.

“We should always learn from those who came before us,
but we must also forge our own path...”

–Korra

The Legend of Korra

Author's Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank my mom Shelly, my dad Jim, and my sister Shawna for their continued support before, during, and after my time at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Moving away from my home state of New Hampshire was one of the hardest tasks I've ever had to do and without them I would never have been able to do it. From the late-nights calls to the necessary Facetimes to calm me down from various negative emotions, I could never have accomplished this dream without your support and unconditional love. Thank you, I would not be where I am today without them.

I would like to thank the new friends I have made over the past three years both here in Nebraska and throughout the U.S. I would especially like to thank my friends back in New England, the friends I have had since our undergrad days at the University of New Hampshire. Your friendships mean the absolute world to me and I could not have asked for better friends.

I would like to thank my mentor, advisor, and committee chair Dr. Carolyn Barber. You provided a safe space for me to question my surroundings and to challenge both your views and the traditions held by the wind band medium. You helped me improve my conducting techniques and practices, but I am eternally grateful for encouraging me to think differently about the wind band and to look beyond the years long traditions of the wind band and explore what the wind band could be.

I would like to thank Dr. Tyler White, Dr. Stanley Kleppinger, and Dr. Lory Dance for serving on my supervisory committee. Their guidance, influence, and insight, particularly with diversity, equity, and inclusion in my professional life, has been invaluable to me.

I would like to thank the faculty and staff, particularly in the band department, at the Glenn Korff School of Music for including me in your family. I was blindly entering a completely different world to me and you made me feel right at home.

I would like to thank the talented student musicians and performers at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln for making music with me during my recitals and numerous other performances. I threw challenging music at you that required electronics, crystal glasses, and extra-musical aspects among other things and took it in stride. Your friendships mean so much to me and I hope we keep in touch.

Finally, I would like to thank my continued mentor, colleague, and my friend Dr. Andrew Boysen, Jr. When I told him I was interested in pursuing my doctorate he recommended many programs to me. Recognizing my willingness to experiment and knowing the "weird and wacky things" that were happening here, his last suggestion was the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. I would not be here without him.

Table of Contents

Dedication	iv
Author’s Acknowledgements	v
List of Tables.....	viii
Introduction.....	1
Chapter I: Exploration of the Concept of Core	3
Chapter II: Attempts to Define an Intellectual Core Repertoire.....	25
Ensemble Definition	25
Types of Compositions	27
Criteria for Determining Serious Artistic Merit	31
Development of Rating Scale	37
Selection of Evaluators	38
The Results	46
Chapter III: Tracing Band Director Thinking and Behavior	56
1920–1960	56
1960–1990	66
1990–Present Day	71
Chapter IV: Identification of Major Influences and Their Purposes.....	77
J.W. Pepper & Son, Inc.....	77
Shattinger Music Company, later Midwest Sheet Music	83
The Midwest Clinic: An International Band and Orchestra Conference.....	85
Chapter V: Beyond the Core, Defining the Next Era.....	89
References	95
Appendix A: Interview Transcription	110
Appendix B: List of Programs Referenced.....	128
Figure B.1: Sousa Band at Columbia Theater	128
Figure B.2: United States Soldiers’ Home Band at the Soldiers’ Home Band Stand..	129
Figure B.3: Selective Literature for First National Band Contest in 1924.....	130
Figure B.4: New York Military Band at Columbia University.....	131
Figure B.5: A.R. McAllister Model Concert Band Program	132

Figure B.6: William D. Revelli’s List of Suggested Music in November 1942	133
Figure B.7: The Goldman Band’s Program	134
Figure B.8: The League of Composers/70th Birthday of E.F. Goldman Concert	135
Figure B.9: Concert Music for Wind Instruments	136
Figure B.10: First Concert of the Eastman Wind Ensemble.....	137
Figure B.11: University of Michigan Symphony Band.....	138
Figure B.12: Arkansas Tech (Russellville) Symphonic Band.....	139
Figure B.13: Thirty-Fifth Annual New Jersey All-State High School Concert.....	140
Figure B.14: University of Illinois (Champaign) Symphonic Band.....	141
Figure B.15: University of Missouri-Kansas City Conservatory Wind Symphony	142
Figure B.16: United States Marine Band: 2nd Performance	143

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Tracing of Number of Wind Band Performers from 1892-1977	26
Table 2.2—Evaluators who participated across the Ostling, Gilbert, Towner studies	45
Table 2.3—Ostling's determinations of serious artistic merit.....	48
Table 2.4—Result comparison between the Ostling, Gilbert, and Towner studies....	50
Table 2.5—Compositions that met the criteria for serious artistic merit in all three studies.....	50

Introduction

The wind band saw significant development in its literature, instrumentation, and programming practices throughout the twentieth century. The causes for this development were many: professional bands making way for school bands, multiple world conflicts affecting both the music industry and programming practices, efforts being made to attract composers to write original music for the wind band, continued discussions on standardized instrumentation to inform composers the exact instrumentation to write for, and the creation of a flexible wind band that can perform multiple different genres of music. Midway through the twentieth century a different discussion would begin to emerge: the identification of a “core repertoire” for the wind band.

During the review of literature regarding attempts to define a “core repertoire” for the wind band reveals many contradictory terms with slight alterations in each of their definitions. Despite these variants, wind band conductors and researchers using these terms had the same meaning: a selective, exclusive list of wind band compositions chosen from the larger array of literature using criteria that highlight craftsmanship of the composition to indicate its importance in the field. Among the terms applied are listed below:

- | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|
| - Basic Repertoire | - Literature |
| - Canon | - Primary Landmark |
| - Core or Core Repertoire | Repertoire |
| - Essential | - Repertoire |
| - Foundation or Foundational | - Select Repertoire |
| - Hallmark | - Serious |

- Standard Repertoire or Standard Literature
- Works of Artistic Merit
- Works of Serious Artistic Merit
- Works that Stood the Test of Time

To facilitate the exploration of this subject, the present study will sharply define the following terms:

Literature – The entire catalog of wind band compositions that have been written for the medium, whether published or unpublished, including works that will be written in future years.

Repertory – Wind band compositions that have received multiple performances either performed by a specific ensemble or programmed by a specific conductor.

Intellectual Core – Wind band compositions that have been selected from the literature by a group of well-respected wind conductors based on determined criteria or personal beliefs/opinions.

Performance Core – Body of wind band compositions that are most frequently performed. These tend to appear in multiple repertoires.

Chapter I: Exploration of the Concept of Core

As the wind band literature continued to expand at an exponential rate in the mid-twentieth-century, professional groups began creating lists of selected works from the literature in an attempt to inform conductors of the available compositions that are most worthy of study, performance, and of a higher artistic stratum compared to other works. To most scholars, such as Acton Eric Ostling Jr. and Robert H. Olson, it was necessary to establish an evaluative process in determining those selected works. For others, such as Dr. Karl Holvik, it was too early to determine such a list, as the wind band was too young and its literature had not been as fully developed compared to the symphony orchestra's 400-year-old literature.¹ However, Donald R. Hunsberger is the lone outlier of these two groups, writing in 1977 advising that it is up to each wind conductor to discern a personal repertoire from the literature which will be the foundation of their "commitment to serious music."²

Before Hunsberger gave his advice to future wind band conductors, Holvik was asked in 1965 by the president of the College Band Director's National Association (CBDNA), Manley Whitcomb, to conduct a survey of members asking if the wind band has an emerging performance core.³ Out of 111 members asked, seventy-eight members responded with their programs from 1961–6. Holvik extrapolated a performance core

¹ Letter from Dr. Karl M. Holvik, Director of Bands at the University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, July 25, 1966, quoted in Earl H. Bruning Jr., "A Survey and Handbook of Analysis for the Conducting and Interpretation of Seven Selected Works in the Standard Repertoire for Wind Band, (DA diss., Ball State University, Muncie, IN, 1980), 5.

² Donald R. Hunsberger, "Repertoire for Wind Conductors," *The Instrumentalist* 32, no. 2 (September 1977), 45.

³ Karl M. Holvik, "An Emerging Band Repertory, A Survey of the Members of the College Band Directors National Association," *Journal of Band Research* 6, no. 2 (Spring 1970), 19, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

comprising of the compositions that appeared on ten or more programs, resulting in a total of 234 works; of those 136 were original works for band and 98 were transcriptions.⁴ The total number of works gathered was not disclosed.

Two years later, Acton Eric Ostling Jr. would be the first to attempt to define an intellectual core. The list of criteria of serious artistic merit used by Ostling was developed from three sources: Leonard B. Meyer's discussion on artistic values and uncertainty, texts on theory and orchestration, and Ostling's personal correspondence with several well-respected conductors and their own criteria of value and quality.⁵ A further description of each criterion can be found in Chapter III. The initial list for Ostling's study amounted to 1,481 works originating from personal experience, such as works that were conducted and heard through performance or recordings. Along with Ostling's personal experience, additions to the initial list came from other wind conductors based on their personal experience and reviewing the reference list from the Fourth (1973) and Fifth (1974) Annual Wind Ensemble Conferences.⁶ Nomination forms were sent to 312 wind conductors at post-secondary institutions having fifteen or more full-time music faculty listed in the 1974–76 Directory of the College Music Society. The conductors surveyed were asked to nominate ten wind band conductors who they believed most diligently and consistently programmed music of serious artistic merit.⁷ Twenty evaluators were chosen based on the highest number of nominations from the

⁴ Ibid., 19–24.

⁵ Acton Eric Ostling Jr., "An Evaluation of Compositions for Wind Band According to Specific Criteria of Serious Artistic Merit," (PhD. diss., University of Iowa, Iowa City, 1978), 22–3.

⁶ Ibid., 31–3.

⁷ Ibid., 37.

survey. The evaluators were asked to rate the list of compositions based on the criteria for serious artistic merit using a Likert-type summated rating scale. The scale was organized as follows: 0—the composition is not familiar, 1—strongly disagree, 2—disagree, 3—undecided, 4—agree, and 5—strongly agree.⁸ The results of the study yielded a total of 314 compositions that met the criteria for serious artistic merit.

In 1980, Earl H. Bruning sought to create a reference for conducting and interpretation of seven wind band works that he presumed to be within the core since the wind band has “come into its own.”⁹ Bruning recruited ten well-respected wind conductors and were asked to submit ten compositions that were considered to be the most important works for wind band, that were playable and artistically attainable for high school bands in the United States, and that were not currently analyzed in terms of conducting pedagogy and interpretation.¹⁰ All the nominated compositions were then sent back to the evaluators who were asked to select and rank twenty compositions in numerical order of preference, “20” being the least preferred and “1” being the most preferred. The seven works were determined by the lowest average numerical rank points.

Like, Holvik, Robert H. Olson, recognized that the wind band needed a selective list of compositions that could function as a point of departure for conductors’ programming practices.¹¹ In 1982, Olson recruited nineteen well-respected conductors in

⁸ Ibid., 34.

⁹ Elizabeth A. H. Green, *The Modern Conductor*, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), 183, quoted in Bruning, 2.

¹⁰ Bruning, 50.

¹¹ Robert H. Olson, “A Core Repertoire for the Wind Ensemble,” *Journal of Band Research* 18, no. 1 (Fall 1982), 11, ProQuest Dissertations & Global Theses.

the United States to participate in the two-part survey. The evaluators were first asked to nominate works that should be included in the intellectual core, resulting in a list of 68 compositions. The second part of the survey asked the evaluators which works that were historically representative and are of serious artistic merit therefore deserving inclusion in the intellectual core using the following scale: 1–unknown, 2–yes, 3–no, and 4–undecided.¹² Olson, intending to keep the number of compositions to no more than fifty, selected compositions that had the highest number of positive responses.¹³

In 1975, an investigation was made by the College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA) to identify weaknesses in postsecondary schools. Of the ten items that were listed, wind band literature was included.¹⁴ In response to this report, Donald Leslie Peterson sought in 1986 to identify an intellectual core that prospective wind band conductors should experience during their college training. Two populations contributed as part of his study: college band directors at four-year institutions granting music education degrees sampled from the CBDNA membership list, and high school band directors sampled from the Music Educators National Conference (MENC), currently known as the National Association of Music Educators (NAfME). Questionnaires were sent to 184 high school band directors, with 145 responding; and to 108 college directors, with 76 responding. As part of the questionnaire participants were asked to rate, utilizing a Likert Scale, 72 suggested wind band works with the aim of extracting approximately

¹² Ibid., 11–2.

¹³ Ibid., 12.

¹⁴ College Band Directors National Association, “Revealing Survey: Band Directors Dissatisfied with Their Education,” *The Instrumentalist* 30, no. 8 (March 1976), 101.

20 works that all prospective wind band directors should know.¹⁵ Peterson provided space for participants to add other works they felt belonged in this intellectual core but later realized that it would be impossible to include every suggested work. As a way to handle this task Peterson listed works that appeared at least four times, resulting in an additional 28 works.

In 1987, Richard K. Fiese attempted to identify the performance core of college and university wind bands between 1980 and 1985. Fiese mailed a *Frequency of Performance Report Form* to 930 band directors selected from the *Directory of Music Faculties in College and Universities U.S. and Canada, 1984–6*, with 306 respondents.¹⁶ Fiese does not explain the process of how the band directors were selected. The works on the form were compiled from Karl Holvik's 1970 study, J.W. Knight's 1980 study, Robert Olson's 1982 study, and Robert Hornyak's 1982/1985 studies, with additions made by University of Miami music faculty. The resulting master list contained 260 compositions.¹⁷ A second form was sent and the directors and were asked to add works that were not previously included in the *Frequency of Performance Form*. They were asked to provide the number of performances during the 1980–5 period, and whether the work was performed by a wind ensemble, symphonic band, or another ensemble. The results showed that out of a total of 23,635 performances, 1,389 different works written

¹⁵ Donald Leslie Peterson, "The University Band: Its Repertoire and the Prospective Music Educator," (DMA diss., Arizona State University, Tempe, 1986), 118.

¹⁶ Richard K. Fiese, "College and University Wind Band Repertoire 1980–1985," *Journal of Band Research* 23, no. 1 (Fall 1987), 17, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 17.

by 546 composers were performed with 22 composers receiving a minimum of at least 309 reported performances.¹⁸

In 1990, Brian Hughes expressed concerns about whether existing wind band literature gives students a complete background and that band directors have become “misguided” by performances and competitions.¹⁹ As a response, Hughes and Randall Aitchison, former conductor at Forest City (IA) High School, sent a survey to 100 Iowa band conductors containing fifty original compositions asking the directors if they were familiar with the work, had performed the work, and if they owned a score and/or recording, along with open and closed questions.²⁰ Of the 50 works, three works were familiar to all respondents, five were the most performed works, and eight works were included in a significant portion of the survey conductors as their intellectual core.²¹

In the same year, David Otto Woike sought to recommend an undergraduate curriculum based on programming practices by university wind band conductors and an intellectual core defined by those conductors. From the 712 CBDNA members Woike randomly selected 30 band directors across the six regions of the organization.²² No demographic information was given. There were many facets of Woike’s survey, but the final question and the concluding portion is of particular interest within the current study. Woike asked the respondents to list ten wind band works that they viewed as the most significant works to the profession. No other criteria were identified as part of this

¹⁸ Ibid., 37.

¹⁹ Brian Hughes, “Survey of Band Repertoire,” *The Instrumentalist* 45, no. 4 (November 1990), 60.

²⁰ Ibid., 60.

²¹ Ibid., 60, 62, 64.

²² David Otto Woike, “Wind Band Performance Repertoire at the University Level: A Survey of Collegiate Wind Band Curricula and Current Repertoire Selection Process,” (PhD diss., The Ohio State University, Columbus, 1990), 23, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

question. Out of a possible 300 compositions, only 64 different compositions were identified.²³ The concluding portion of the survey asked the respondents to list wind band works that they studied at their respective institutions over the past four academic years in an attempt to define and compare a possible performance core as well as an intellectual core. A total of 1,131 compositions were performed. Of those 410 works were studied or performed more than once during the four-year period, 108 works were performed five or more times during the same time frame, and 57 works were studied or performed at least once during each year.²⁴

In 1993, Jay Warren Gilbert replicated and updated Ostling's study making three modifications: Gilbert's ensemble definition included percussion performers as part of Ostling's ten-player minimum, the elimination of marches and fanfares as Gilbert did not view them as truly meritorious works but rather lighter works that fill in around major works, and the deletion of the appendix containing works that appeared on state music lists.²⁵ The initial master list for Gilbert's study consisted of 1,261 compositions: 285 works that met Ostling's criteria, 501 works that were within ten points of meeting Ostling's criteria, an undetermined amount of works from the World Association of Symphonic Bands and Ensembles (WASBE) report of the 1987 WASBE Literature Committee; 39 works from Robert Halseth's 1987 examination of commissions, performances, and/or discussions at CBDNA events; 95 works added by John P. Paynter,

²³ Ibid., 71.

²⁴ Ibid., 73.

²⁵ Jay Warren Gilbert, "An Evaluation of Compositions for Wind Band According to Specific Criteria of Serious Artistic Merit: A Replication and Update," (DM doc., Northwestern University, Evanston, 1993), 4-5, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

former Director of Bands at Northwestern University, and several other unnamed college band directors; and 72 works that were suggested by the evaluators after the initial survey.²⁶ Nomination forms were sent to 354 wind conductors at post-secondary institutions having fifteen or more full-time music faculty listed in the 1986–8 Directory of the College Music Society. The conductors surveyed were asked to nominate ten wind band conductors who had performed or studied wind music of serious artistic merit and whose judgement would be highly regarded.²⁷ Utilizing the same criteria and rating scale developed by Ostling, the results of Gilbert’s study revealed that 191 compositions met Ostling’s criteria for serious artistic merit.²⁸

Three years later, David Alan Gaines sought out to identify an intellectual core for high school wind bands. Gaines’s initial master list originated from comparing 13 state wind band music lists, and selecting those that appeared on seven or more. This resulted in a list of 209 compositions as a point of departure for Gaines’s study. As a survey body, Gaines selected members of the MENC. Through a randomization process and elimination of certain respondents based on lack of qualifications, e.g. not current or former high school band directors, Gaines mailed questionnaires to 1,531 members of MENC with 437 responding.²⁹ Each respondent was asked to categorize each work by selecting one of the following: y–yes the work belongs in an intellectual core for high school band; n–no the work does not belong in an intellectual core for high school band;

²⁶ Ibid., 12–5.

²⁷ Ibid., 148.

²⁸ Ibid., 150.

²⁹ David Alan Gaines, “A Core Repertoire of Concert Music for High School Band: A Descriptive Study,” (DE diss., Columbia University, New York, 1996), 37–41.

or u—the work is unfamiliar.³⁰ The result was a total of 106 compositions identified in the intellectual core.

In 1998, Brian Keith Hopwood attempted to identify the emergence of a performance core by comparing programs performed at national and regional conventions of CBDNA from 1991–95. Music programs from 118 out of 141 conventions were used (programs from the remaining 23 conventions were missing).³¹ A total of 1,718 different compositions were performed; of those, 1,201 compositions were performed only once within this time span.³² Hopwood provides an analysis of performance frequency of the type of work found in this sample. Original compositions had 1,651 performances, transcriptions had 611 performances, marches had 264 performances, solos with wind band had 219 performances, solos with transcribed wind band accompaniment had 116 performances, and works for wind band and chorus had 27 performances.³³

In the same year, Raymond David Thomas identified a need to develop an intellectual core of grade III and IV compositions that meet the criteria of serious artistic merit first developed by Ostling. Thomas’s reasoning was that the majority of the studies that had addressed this topic primarily focused on compositions that were classified as grade V or VI.³⁴ Thomas’s master list, consisting of only grade III or IV works, was compiled from the National Band Association’s (NBA) *Selective Music Lists for Bands*, Eugene Corporon and David Wallace’s 1984 *Wind Ensemble/Band Repertoire Guide*,

³⁰ Ibid., 43–4.

³¹ Brian Keith Hopwood, “Wind Band Repertoire: Programming Practices at Conventions of the College Band Directors National Association,” (DMA diss., Arizona State University, Tempe, 1998), 85.

³² Ibid., 62.

³³ Ibid., 70.

³⁴ Raymond David Thomas, “An Evaluation for Wind Band, Grades III and IV, according to Specific Criteria of Artistic Merit,” (PhD thesis, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1998), 4.

Frank Battisti's 1995 *The Twentieth Century American Wind Band/Ensemble, History, Development and Literature*, Thomas Dvorak's 1986 *Best Music for Young Band* along with his 1993 *Best Music for High School Band*, Joseph Kreines's 1989 *Music for Concert Band: A Selective Annotated Guide to Band Literature*, and Norman Smith's 1989 book *Band Music Notes*,³⁵ along with several unpublished lists by composers and college and university conductors.³⁶ The completed master list was reviewed by Craig Kirchoff, the Director of Bands at the University of Minnesota, to make further suggestions. The final master list contained 1,396 compositions. Participant invitations were sent to 51 NBA State Chairs, one from each state including the District of Columbia, asking them to participate in the survey and/or to nominate other directors.³⁷ Of the 38 who agreed to participate in the survey, twenty-eight evaluation forms were returned. Using the same criteria for serious artistic merit first developed by Ostling, evaluators were asked to rate the compositions using a similar modified Likert scale similar to the one used by Ostling and Gilbert: 0—the composition is not familiar, 1—the composition has little to no artistic merit, 2—the composition has minimal artistic merit, 3—the composition has moderate artistic merit, 4—the composition has high artistic merit, and 5—the composition has exceptional artistic merit.³⁸ The evaluators were also asked to assign a grade to each known work designating its difficulty level from I–VI, with 0 indicating that the work was unknown to the evaluator.³⁹ The final list contained only

³⁵ Sources can be found in References.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 32–3.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 35.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 33–4

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 34.

works that fell into the difficulty grade level (mean) range of 2.6–4.5 that met the criteria for serious artistic merit, resulting in a total of 309 works.⁴⁰

Another study produced in this same year was done by Craig S. Young who investigated what wind band literature was being performed by high school wind bands from 1994 to 1997 and to evaluate the quality of this performance core. Young telephoned 150 high school band directors who worked for six years or more in a school with a student population of 1000 or more requesting programs from the past three years and asking what the most important consideration for choosing a particular work was.⁴¹ Young followed up with those directors with a written questionnaire with one of the questions asking what criteria they used for selecting works for performance using a rating scale: 5—very important to 1—rarely or never important. The criteria that were listed came from Bauer, Deborah Marko Devore, Maurice Gerow, Gary Samuel Grant, and Woike.⁴² Of the 150 prospective participants, 117 surveys were returned, and 101 respondents had included programs from the last three years.⁴³ In order to determine the quality of the literature found in the programs, Young developed a Repertoire Evaluation Inventory (REI) using several studies, articles, books, and lists, both published and unpublished, along with a panel of experts.⁴⁴ A rating system was developed to assign from one to three points to 530 compositions that were divided into three groups. The first group consisted of sixty-seven works listed in the Ostling and Gilbert studies that

⁴⁰ Ibid., 38–9, 104.

⁴¹ Craig S. Young, “The Quality of Repertoire Chosen by High School Wind Band Conductors and the Resources and Criteria Used to Choose This Literature,” (PhD diss., The Ohio State University, Columbus, 1998), 37–8, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

⁴² Ibid., 40–1. Sources can be found in References.

⁴³ Ibid., 43.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 47.

were deemed to have serious artistic merit by over half of the panel, works in this group received two points. The second group consisted of 191 works listed by Gaines, R. A. Negro, and Woike, works that appeared in two of these three studies received one point. Group three consisted of 272 works listed as important works for high school band developed by Thomas L. Dvorak, Robert Grechesky, and Gary M. Ciepluch, and Miles, along with Battisti, Reynolds, and the University of Colorado Bands, works that appeared in two or more of these studies received one point.⁴⁵ Works that received three or four points were placed in Category 1 of the REI indicating that every conductor should know and perform them on a regular basis. Works that received two points were placed in Category 2 indicating that every conductor should be aware of and perform them periodically. Works that received one point were placed in Category 3 indicating that they are of high quality but below the highest two levels.⁴⁶ Marches, fanfares, and works for soloists accompanied by bands were excluded. After the panel reviewed the works, Young placed them in finalized categories with panel disagreements being averaged and rounded up.⁴⁷ These finalized categories were compared to the programs sent in by the 101 respondents; three points were given to a work in Category 1, two points were given to a work in Category 2, and one point was given to a work in Category 3.⁴⁸ A total of 1,459 performance instances were logged with 793 individual works being performed. Of the 793 works, 545 were performed by one of the seventy-two bands who sent in programs, 119 works were performed by two bands, with 128 works were performed by

⁴⁵ Ibid., 47–8. Sources can be found in References.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 48–9.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 50.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 51.

three or more bands.⁴⁹ Out of the 530 works that were listed in the REI, 244 works were found on at least one program.⁵⁰

The following year in 1999, Timothy Brett Rhea performed a similar study but within the Texas public school setting. A master list was compiled of grade III–V works from the 1995–8 *Prescribed Music List (PML)* of the University Interscholastic League (Texas) and, unlike previous studies, evaluators were not asked to add works to the master list.⁵¹ Rather than relying on the somewhat nebulous designation of “artistic merit,” Rhea devised criteria related to educational use and value: the composition has (1) a well-conceived formal structure, (2) creative melodies and countermelodies, (3) harmonic imagination, (4) rhythmic vitality, (5) contrast among all music elements, (6) representative orchestration representing a beautiful tone and timbre, and (7) an emotional impact.⁵² Richard Floyd, University Interscholastic League Director of Music Activities, and Robert Floyd, Executive Director of the Texas Music Educators Association, assisted Rhea in identifying Texas public school band directors based on past accomplishments and programming practices.⁵³ No demographic information was given. Using the same Likert-rating scale as Ostling, twenty evaluators were asked to rate 327 compositions, 169 grade V works, 97 grade IV works, and 106 grade III works.⁵⁴ The results yielded 181 works that met the criteria for serious artistic merit.⁵⁵

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 57–9.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 70–1.

⁵¹ Timothy Brett Rhea, “An Evaluation of Wind Band Compositions in the Texas Public School Setting According to Specific Criteria of Artistic Merit,” (DMA doc., University of Houston, Houston, 1999), 3.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 5.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 9–10.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 33.

In 2001, Ronald L. Howard attempted to define an intellectual core for the middle school wind band to help directors with their programming. Questionnaires were sent to 163 middle school wind band directors who had at least ten years of middle school experience, consistent success at festivals and contests, and who were currently teaching middle school wind band, with 130 respondents.⁵⁶ No demographic information was given. Howard compiled a master list of ninety-two compositions with the following criteria as part of the questionnaire: (1) a work had to appear on at least twenty-four of the thirty state lists available to Howard, and (2) a composition must appear on at least two out of the four lists available from national organizations or publications.⁵⁷ Marches, show tunes, popular pieces, and novelty numbers were not included in the master list. As part of the questionnaire the respondents were asked to indicate whether each composition should be included in the intellectual core with either a yes or no, allowing space for respondents to add compositions that were excluded from the master list.⁵⁸ The results of the survey revealed that a total of forty-six compositions should be included in the intellectual core.⁵⁹

In 2004, Carol M. Hayward designed a college course dedicated to wind band literature featuring select works to assist the prospective band directors in developing criteria for programming for their ensembles. With the help of her advisor Dr. Russel Mikkelson, Hayward invited 70 collegiate directors and 94 high school directors based on

⁵⁶ Ronald L. Howard, "Repertoire Selection Practices and the Development of a Core Repertoire for the Middle School Concert Band," (PhD. diss., University of Florida, Gainesville, 2001), 61.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 54.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 60.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 103.

their recognized knowledge of wind literature. Thirty-one collegiate directors and 36 high school directors responded.⁶⁰ The respondents were asked to apply a list of criteria including melody, harmony, rhythm, structure, and texture to the compositions indicating whether they were “very important,” “moderately important,” or “not important.”⁶¹ Hayward compiled the basic list of criteria by consulting Ray Cramer’s article “What Materials are You Going to Use to Teach ‘About Music’ ‘Through Music’ while ‘Performing Music?’”⁶², and the criteria of serious artistic merit developed by Ostling.⁶³ Along with sharing their opinions the respondents were also asked to list other criteria they believed to be important that were not found on the original list. The final section of the questionnaire consisted of a list of grades III–VI wind band works in which the respondents were asked to select only five works that they believed would be a good “starting point” for Hayward’s curriculum.⁶⁴ The respondents were also give extra space to include any works that were not listed. The master list was derived from *Rehearsing the Band*, by John Williamson; *Best Music for High School Band*, by Thomas Dvorak; and *Teaching Music through Performance in Band*, edited by Richard Miles; along with consulting the 1990 National Band Association music list.⁶⁵ Hayward’s master list had a total of ninety-five works: twenty-five grade III, twenty-six grade IV, twenty-six grade V,

⁶⁰ Carol M. Hayward, “A Course in Band Literature Based on a Standard Repertoire Developed from the Opinions of Selected Collegiate and Secondary School Band Directors,” (DMA diss., The Ohio State University, Columbus, 2004), 54.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 63.

⁶² Ray Cramer, “What Materials are you Going to Use to Teach ‘About Music,’ ‘Through Music’ While ‘Performing Music?’,” in *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band*, ed. Richard Miles, (Chicago: GIA Publications, 1997), 7–10.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 55.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 55–6.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 55–6.

and eighteen grade VI. Hayward determined that works that were chosen by fifty percent or more from either group would be included in the intellectual core.

As a replication of Holvik's 1976 survey, David L. Kish investigated the programming trends of voluntary program listings published in CBDNA reports between 1998 and 2002 in his 2005 article.⁶⁶ Of the total 11,765 performances of individual compositions, 170 works appeared on fifteen or more programs with 143 works being works original to the band (i.e. not transcriptions).⁶⁷ Fifty-three compositions were found in both Holvik's 1976 survey and Kish's 2005 survey.⁶⁸

In 2009, Sean R. Powell investigated the programming trends of Big Ten university wind ensembles between 2002 and 2006 as an attempt to define a performance core.⁶⁹ Receiving a 100% response rate, Powell contacted the directors of bands at each Big Ten university and requested to view their concert programs from within the time frame, eliminating special concerts such as alumni bands events and commencement performances.⁷⁰ Of the 2,106 performances of individual compositions, 1,856 works were works original to the band medium. Of those 1,856 works, 183 were programmed at more than once, 87 works were programmed more than twice, with four works being programmed ten times.⁷¹

⁶⁶ David L. Kish, "A Band Repertoire has Emerged," *Journal of Band Research* 41, no. 1 (Fall 2005), 2.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁶⁹ Sean R. Powell, "Recent Programming Trends of Big Ten University Wind Ensembles," *Journal of Band Research* 44, no. 2 (Spring 2009), 1–12. The Big Ten universities at this time were the following: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Indiana University, University of Iowa, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, The Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University, Purdue University, and University of Wisconsin-Madison.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 3–7, 11.

In 2010, Eric S. Wiltshire, Timothy A. Paul, Phyllis M. Paul and Erika Rudnicki investigated the programming trends of Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC) university wind ensembles between 2002 and 2009 as an attempt to define a performance core.⁷² Receiving ten out of twelve responses, the group contacted the directors of bands at each ACC university and requested to view their concert programs within the time frame, eliminating special concerts as described above. Additionally, if a group gave several performances of the same work within a short period of time, e.g. tours, then the composition was listed only once.⁷³ Of the 705 performances of individual compositions, 534 works original to the band medium, five works were programmed ten or more times and 34 were programmed five or more times.⁷⁴

Clifford N. Towner performed a second update of Ostling's study in 2011 with the following modifications: (1) the evaluators would be more globally diverse, (2) procedures for distributing and collecting lists, ratings, and nominations were altered in order to use current technology, (3) transcriptions were omitted due to growth in literature, and (4) works composed after January 1, 2008 were omitted to reduce the number of works likely to be unfamiliar to the majority of reviewers.⁷⁵ The initial master list of Towner's study consisted of 1,714 compositions: 362 works that met the criteria of

⁷² Eric S. Wiltshire, Timothy A. Paul, Phyllis M. Paul, and Erika Rudnicki, "Programming Practices of Atlantic Coast Conference Wind Ensembles," *Contributions to Music Education* 37, no. 2 (2010), 45–63. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24127226>. The ACC universities at this time were the following: Boston College, Clemson University, Duke University, Florida State University, Georgia Institute of Technology, University of Maryland, University of Miami, University of North Carolina, North Carolina State University, University of Virginia, Virginia Tech, and Wake Forest University.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 48.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 48–50.

⁷⁵ Clifford N. Towner, "An Evaluation of Compositions for Wind Band According to Specific Criteria of Serious Artistic Merit: A Second Update," (DMA doc., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 2011), 8–9, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

serious artistic merit in either the Ostling or the Gilbert study, 343 works that were within ten percentile points for meeting the criteria in Gilbert's study, 828 works that had been composed since the first replication from various sources, and 501 works from wind band conductors that were known for being knowledgeable in wind band literature.⁷⁶ Using a process similar to both Ostling and Gilbert, nomination emails were sent to the complete membership directories of CBDNA and WASBE through their respective online directories.⁷⁷ Members who were the principal conductor of a professional or post-secondary institution wind band and responded were asked to nominate ten wind band conductors who they believed to be the most diligent seekers and programmed music of serious artistic merit.⁷⁸ Utilizing the same criteria and rating scale developed by Ostling and used by Gilbert, a total of 144 compositions met the criteria for serious artistic merit.⁷⁹

In 2011, Timothy A. Paul replicated an earlier study done by Powell investigating the programming trends of the Pac-10 universities' wind ensembles between the years 2002 and 2009 as an attempt to define a performance core.⁸⁰ Receiving a 100% response rate, Paul contacted the directors of bands at each Pac-10 university and requested to view their concert programs from within the time frame, eliminating special concerts.⁸¹

⁷⁶ Ibid., 25–7.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 30.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 142.

⁸⁰ Timothy A. Paul, "Pac-Ten Wind Ensemble Programming Trends," *Journal of Band Research* 47, no. 1 (Fall 2011), 49–61. The Pac-Ten universities at this time were the following: University of Arizona, Arizona State University, University of California-Berkeley, University of California-Los Angeles, University of Oregon, Oregon State University, University of Southern California, Stanford University, University of Washington, and Washington State University.

⁸¹ Ibid., 51.

Of the total 1,166 performances of individual compositions, 826 works were works original to the band medium. Of those 826 works, 189 were programmed more than once, 82 works were performed three or more times, and only two works were performed more than ten times.⁸²

The following year, Paul replicated his 2011 study but focused on Big 12 university wind ensembles as an attempt to define a performance core.⁸³ Following the same method, time frame, and receiving a 100% response rate, 1,702 performances of individual compositions were found with 1,158 works being works original to the band medium.⁸⁴ Of those 1,158 works, 290 were programmed more than once, 170 works were programmed three or more times, sixteen works were programmed eight or nine times, and seven works were programmed ten or more times.⁸⁵

These 22 studies reveal the strong interest of wind band conductors and scholars to define a core for the wind literature. It is unclear why, and to what end, this need exists except for the persistent need to prove the artistic value of the wind band as a medium. As Holvik asserted in 1966, the wind band does not have the benefit of a long history whereas the orchestral medium's 400 years of history enabled the gradual development of both a performance and an intellectual core repertoire.⁸⁶ Within the band medium, nine studies, Holvik, Fiese, Hopwood, Young, Kish, Powell, Wiltshire, et al. and Paul have

⁸² Ibid., 51, 53.

⁸³ Timothy A. Paul, "Programming Practices of Big Twelve University Wind Ensembles," *Journal of Band Research* 47, no. 1 (Fall 2011), 11–26. The Big Twelve universities at this time were the following: Baylor University, Iowa State University, Kansas State University, Oklahoma State University, Texas A&M University, Texas Tech University, University of Colorado, University of Kansas, University of Missouri, University of Nebraska, University of Oklahoma, and University of Texas.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 13.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 16.

⁸⁶ Holvik, quoted in Bruning, 5.

focused on defining a performance core. Of these, seven utilized a similar approach. Apart from Holvik and Hopwood, who used a four-year period, the other studies utilized a five-year period. Although these seven studies used the same methodology and yielded similar response rates, their results varied widely. Heretofore no study has attempted to track the influences these efforts have had, such as on commissioning practices and conference performance expectations.

The remaining two studies, Fiese and Young, requested programs from organizations and measured the quality of these programs. Both studies developed a master list of compositions taken from previous studies, none of which were taken from the same source. Fiese was the only one in this group that focused on the number of works by a composer and Young was the only one that excluded marches, fanfares, and solos accompanied by wind bands.

The other thirteen studies, Ostling, Bruning, Olson, Peterson, Hughes, Woike, Gilbert, Gaines, Thomas, Rhea, Howard, Hayward, and Towner focused on defining an intellectual core. Among these there were three different methodologies that were used: panel nominations, panel recruitment, and surveys sent out to the full membership of an organization.

Ostling, Gilbert, and Towner had members of the profession whom they had selected nominate well-known conductors who “consistently programmed music of serious artistic merit.”⁸⁷ A total of 47 evaluators, all of whom teach at the post-secondary level, participated in at least one of the three studies, with six participating in two, and

⁸⁷ Ostling, 37.

only two, Frank Battisti and Donald Hunsberger, participating in all three. Out of the forty-seven evaluators, there was only one woman, Mallory Thompson, and no persons of color were nominated. Of all the other studies mentioned no demographics of the participants were given.

Bruning, Olson, Rhea, and Hayward recruited members that were well-known and of high prestige for their studies. Rhea's and a component of Hayward's study invited high school band conductors to participate in their surveys but there was no common evaluator. Bruning's, Olson's, and the other component of Hayward's study invited post-secondary level conductors. Individual evaluators from the Bruning and Olson studies were added to the previous 47 for a total of 61 individual evaluators between the Ostling, Gilbert, Towner, Bruning, Olson, and Hayward studies. Of the 61 participants, 23 evaluators participated in two or more studies.

The six remaining studies, Peterson, Hughes, Woike, Gaines, Thomas, and Howard sent out surveys to organizations in the hopes that larger sample size would yield more responses. Peterson and Woike utilized CBDNA as their starting place for their survey body. Gaines, as well as Peterson, utilized MENC for their starting place and Thomas sent invitations to the NBA State chairs. Hughes utilized their own knowledge and invited Iowa band conductors and middle school band directors respectively.

Of all these studies, four types of criteria were used to measure the inclusion of a work into a performance and/or intellectual core. The two most consistent types of criteria that were used were the frequency of performance (Fiese, Hughes, Hopwood, Kish, Powell, Wiltshire et al., and Paul), and criteria of serious artistic merit first

developed by Ostling and used subsequently by Olson, Gilbert, Thomas, and Towner. Rhea and Hayward used a modified version of Ostling's criteria, Young used criteria from other sources, and Holvik, Bruning, Peterson, Woike, Gaines, and Howard did not utilize any criteria or depended on the respondents' opinions.

Despite all the attempts that approached this topic, we are still no closer to a clear intellectual or performance core. Furthermore, given a body of literature that continues to grow at a rapid rate, it calls into question the efficacy of the attempts to pin down what is by its very nature a moving target. While a performance core can perhaps be measured objectively, any measurement will inevitably become dated as new compositions enter the literature. Measurements of the performance core may be of historical interest, but they serve little practical purpose. An intellectual core is far more elusive. Chapter II will illustrate how thirty years of attempts have resulted in lack of consensus. Subsequent chapters will show that the absence of clearly defined performance and intellectual cores is in fact an essential characteristic of the wind band medium.

Chapter II: Attempts to Define an Intellectual Core Repertoire

This chapter will explore in depth the three major studies that have attempted to define an intellectual core for the band literature: Ostling, Gilbert, and Towner. There will be seven subsections, each associated with an element common to each study: ensemble definition, types of compositions, criteria for determining serious artistic merit, developing the list of compositions, development of rating scale, selection of evaluators, and results. Each subsection will highlight the methodology used and provide a comparison among the studies. The varying results reinforce the assertion that continued attempts to hit the moving target of an ever-expanding literature are futile.

Ensemble Definition

The focus of these studies was to define an intellectual core for the wind band. A first difficulty with such an endeavor, unlike the orchestra, the wind band does not have a standard instrumentation despite efforts made by CBDNA to standardize an instrumentation in the 1940s through the 1960s.⁸⁸ In fact, the wind band has had a long history of inconsistent instrumentation and number of performers as seen in table 2.1 below.

⁸⁸ Richard Lasko, "The CBDNA: A Study of Band Instrumentation," *Contributions to Music Education* no. 1 (Autumn, 1972), 46–55, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24127366>.

Table 2.1: Tracing of Number of Wind Band Performers from 1892-1977

Year	Name of Ensemble	Bandmaster	# of Performers
1892	Sousa Band (1 st Season)	John Philip Sousa	46 ⁸⁹
1905	University of Illinois Band	A.A. Harding	47 ⁹⁰
1918	U.S. Army Regimental Band Authorization		48 ⁹¹
1928	Sousa Band	John Philip Sousa	69 ⁹²
1930	University of Illinois Band	A.A. Harding	143 ⁹³
1950	U.S. Marine Band	William F. Santelmann	67 ⁹⁴
1952	Eastman Wind Ensemble	Frederick Fennell	52 ⁹⁵
1956	State University of Iowa Symphony Band	Frederick C. Ebbs	94 ⁹⁶
1960	The Goldman Band	R.F. Goldman	52 ⁹⁷
1960	University of Michigan Symphony Band	William D. Revelli	117 ⁹⁸
1977	University of Florida Symphonic Band	Frank B. Wickes	71 ⁹⁹

To account for this, Ostling defined the wind band as: (1) ten wind instruments or more, exclusive of percussion requirements, (2) mixed instrumentation, (3) optional use of cello and/or string bass as part of the ensemble or the use of violin and/or viola as a soloist, and (4) the use of a conductor.¹⁰⁰

⁸⁹ Paul E. Bierley, *John Philip Sousa, American Phenomenon*, Columbus: Integrity Press, 1986, 148, https://archive.org/details/johnphilipsousaa0000bier_x6z5/page/148/mode/2up.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Raoul F. Camus, "Band in the United States," *Grove Music Online*, 2013, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.libproxy.unl.edu/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-1002252742>.

⁹² Bierley, 148.

⁹³ Ibid., 69.

⁹⁴ Frank Battisti, *The Winds of Change*, (Galesville, MD: Meredith Music Publications, 2002), 347.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 348

⁹⁷ Ibid., 348–9.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 349.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ostling, 18.

Ostling determined that a minimum of ten wind instruments would be utilized to distinguish bands from chamber ensembles, such as brass/woodwind quintets, yet include works written for smaller wind bands.¹⁰¹ The inclusion of string instruments was used to extend the scope of the music involved, providing new literature for the wind band conductor. Ostling determined that use of solo string instruments, or lower strings to enhance the bass wind instruments, was acceptable as the majority of the instruments in the ensemble were wind instruments and would not compromise the sonority of the wind band.¹⁰² For the Gilbert study, a slight modification of the ensemble definition was made. Rather than having a minimum of ten wind instruments, Gilbert decided to include one to two percussion parts in the ten-player ensemble and would still be considered as a wind ensemble. Towner's study made use of the original definition developed by Ostling with the modification made by Gilbert: (1) a minimum of ten wind instruments and/or percussionists, (2) mixed instrumentation, (3) use of string instruments as described by Ostling above, and (4) the use of a conductor.

Types of Compositions

Ostling included four types of compositions in his study: (1) compositions original to the wind band medium, (2) transcriptions completed by the composer or approved by the composer, (3) transcriptions not completed by the composer from music written between 1750 and 1900, and (4) transcriptions of twentieth century works.¹⁰³ Ostling's reasoning for including some transcriptions was that the orchestra's

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 19.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Ostling., 20.

performance core also contained transcriptions from other types of ensembles. Ostling excluded orchestral transcriptions written between 1750 and 1900 because this music was intended to be performed by a large string section that produced a unique sonority. Ostling contended that this intention would be lost if a smaller ensemble in comparison, such as a wind band, performed a transcription of the work, resulting in an invalid performance.¹⁰⁴

As part of his initial list Ostling had included concert marches and fanfares in the master list. However, Gilbert elected to exclude marches and fanfares for the following reasons: (1) composers of these works generally follow the conventions of form and function, (2) these works are shorter and lighter by nature and are not used as the foundation of a program, and (3) there was no concert march of the same caliber of the concert marches included in the Ostling study that had been written since.¹⁰⁵

Towner followed suit and excluded concert marches and fanfares in his study. In addition to this, Towner also made his study more exclusive by eliminating all transcriptions that were previously defined and used by both Ostling and Gilbert, except those that were done by the composer. Towner argued that transcriptions from other mediums and original wind band works should be evaluated separately as their artistic intentions differ, such as the attempt to emulate the original medium's sonority in transcriptions.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 20.

¹⁰⁵ Gilbert, 2–3.

¹⁰⁶ Towner, 12.

The exclusion of concert marches and fanfares by Gilbert and Towner from the development of an intellectual core suggests a change in wind band conductor behavior which in turn devalues both marches and fanfares. Until the latter half of the twentieth century, these works were viewed as the “band’s greatest original contribution” to its literature.¹⁰⁷ However, eight years prior to making this assertion, R.F. Goldman wrote *The Band’s Music* aimed at tracing the history of the wind band’s literature. In it he included transcriptions while excluding “marches, potpourris, [and] characteristic pieces” as these works, although being the larger part of the band’s literature, were not considered to be “serious” music.¹⁰⁸ This begs the question as to whether or not these types of works should be considered in the discussion of an intellectual and/or performance core despite being the point of origin for the wind band literature. Interestingly, in the Ostling study, although he included concert marches and fanfares he excluded what might be considered functional marches such as John Philip Sousa’s *Stars and Stripes Forever* in spite of its position as the second most performed work in Holvik’s study (1970). This suggests that although marches may have been the greatest original material in the band’s literature according to R.F. Goldman, they were not regarded as “serious music.”¹⁰⁹

Interestingly, as part of the programming rules for the Midwest Clinic, each performing ensemble is required to perform an original march on their program and as

¹⁰⁷ Richard Franko Goldman, *The Concert Band* (New York: Rinehart & Co., 1946), 171, <https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.214407/mode/2up>.

¹⁰⁸ Richard Franko Goldman, *The Band’s Music*, (New York: Pitman Publishing, 1938), 11–2.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 12.

part of their audition recording to keep with the tradition of the concert band.¹¹⁰ The Midwest Clinic gives the following reasoning of why marches are required:

The performance of a march demonstrates to the band selection committee much about the ensemble. It exhibits a clear understanding by the director and individual musicians of the character, phrasing, dynamic contrast, articulation style, pitch control and transparency of musical lines often overlooked or under-rehearsed by many bands. Additionally, the march is an important aspect of our band heritage. The Midwest Clinic is committed to ensuring this form of musical expression is not lost to future generations of directors, ensemble members, and the world. The march requirement is of equal importance to the other selection(s) you include on your recording, so the same care should be given to each.¹¹¹

Although marches are part of the wind band's history as mentioned above, one could argue that any number of genres can exhibit the musical attributes the band selection committee is looking for, e.g. character, phrasing, etc. This requirement also creates an inconsistency between the Midwest Clinic band selection committee and conductors and researchers in the profession. The former advocates for the march, whereas the latter insists that marches do not belong in the intellectual core.

Towner's exclusion of transcriptions, except those done by the composer, suggests another change in band director behavior. Before bandmasters of the early twentieth century began advocating for new original, "serious" literature, bandmasters

¹¹⁰ "Programming Rules," General Programming Rules, The Midwest Clinic, accessed March 28, 2024, <https://www.midwestclinic.org/programming-rules>.

¹¹¹ "Performance FAQs," Performance Application FAQs, The Midwest Clinic, accessed March 28, 2024, https://www.midwestclinic.org/Performance_FAQs

relied on transcriptions from operas, symphonies, and other orchestral literature as their primary source of literature. A few composers of the early twentieth century began to explore writing for wind band even as the band movement began to shift into schools and universities, yet bandmasters continued to use transcriptions.¹¹² The use and creation of transcriptions increased through the twentieth century, despite what would eventually become the exponential growth original wind band literature.¹¹³

Although transcriptions are continually being created and performed, they are no longer the majority of the works performed despite their lingering significance in the literature as seen in the studies by Powell, Wiltshire et al., and Paul, among others leading up to Towner's study.¹¹⁴ Given the continuous growth in the composition of original band works along with growing concern surrounding the artistic ethics of transcription, represented effectively by Whitwell,¹¹⁵ Towner concluded that transcriptions would not be included in his study as all transcriptions differ from the original artistic intent and should be judged on their own merits rather than the merits of the original work.¹¹⁶ Thus transcriptions seem to be facing a decline in relevancy in both the intellectual and performance core.

Criteria for Determining Serious Artistic Merit

¹¹² David Whitwell, "Three Crises in Band Repertoire," *The Instrumentalist* 19, no. 8 (March 1965), 37.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 37, 68.

¹¹⁴ These three studies show the number of transcriptions out of the total number of individual works performed by the participating ensembles. Powell (2009): 250 out of 2,106 (11.9%); Wiltshire, et al. (2010): 171 out of 705 (24.3%); Paul (2011): 339 out of 1,166 (29.1%); Paul (2012): 544 out of 1,702 (32%).

¹¹⁵ Whitwell (1965), 68.

¹¹⁶ Towner, 12.

Given the challenge of quantifying what is ultimately subjective assessment, Ostling developed a list of criteria to create a controlled and uniform environment in which judgement from different individuals can be combined.¹¹⁷ In devising the list of criteria that would be used for his study, he referred to three sources: (1) *Music, the Arts and Ideas* by Leonard B. Meyer (1956), (2) texts on music theory and orchestration,¹¹⁸ and (3) personal correspondence with several unnamed eminent conductors.¹¹⁹ The ten criteria listed below are quoted from Ostling's study,¹²⁰

1. "The composition has form—not 'a form' but form—and reflects a proper balance between repetition and contrast."
2. "The composition reflects shape and design, and creates the impression of conscious choice and judicious arrangement on the part of the composer."
3. "The composition reflects craftsmanship in orchestration, demonstrating a proper balance between transparent and tutti scoring, and also between solo and group colors."
4. "The composition is sufficiently unpredictable to preclude an immediate grasp of its musical meaning."
5. "The route through which the composition travels in initiating its musical tendencies and probable musical goals is not completely direct and obvious."
6. "The composition is consistent in its quality throughout its length and in its various sections."

¹¹⁷ Ostling, 22.

¹¹⁸ The texts used are the following: *Music Fundamentals*, Howard A. Murphy (1962); *Perspectives in Music Theory*, Paul Cooper (1973); *The Art of Orchestration*, Bernard Rogers (1951); and *Guidelines for Style Analysis*, Jan LaRue (1970).

¹¹⁹ Ostling, 23.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 23–30.

7. “The composition is consistent in its style, reflecting a complete grasp of technical details, clearly conceived ideas, and avoids lapses into trivial, futile, or unsuitable passages.”
8. “The composition reflects ingenuity in its development, given the stylistic context in which it exists.”
9. “The composition is genuine in idiom, and is not pretentious.”
10. “The composition reflects a musical validity which transcends factors of historical importance, or factors of pedagogical usefulness.”

For Ostling, the goal of using this set of criteria was to identify an intellectual core that could be accepted by orchestral conductors who would presumably respect the criteria as a reflection of characteristics of the Western canon.¹²¹ The same set of criteria would be used in both the Gilbert and Towner studies thereby maintaining continuity.

Developing the List of Compositions

Ostling’s procedure in developing the master list of compositions was as follows:

1. He compiled a list of works that he had performed and/or heard that he believed met the criteria for serious artistic merit.
2. That list was then sent to Frederick Fennell and five other unnamed wind band conductors who added compositions to the list of which they were aware but not heard or performed.
3. He then added 675 works from H. Robert Reynolds reference list from the Fourth Annual Wind Ensemble Conference held at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in April 1973.
4. The list was then sent to other unnamed conductors while Ostling added still more works from supplementary sources such as dissertations and new publication notices.¹²²

¹²¹ Ibid., 31.

¹²² Ostling, 31–3.

During the evaluation process twelve works were removed because of discrepancies in titles or errors in the selection process, resulting in a master list of 1,469 compositions.

Gilbert's procedure was similar to Ostling's:

1. Gilbert started with the 314 works that met the criteria for serious artistic merit in the Ostling study, removing twenty-nine concert marches and fanfares along with works that were misspelled, had multiple versions, or individual movement titles from a larger work.
2. He added the 692 works that were within ten points of meeting the criteria for serious artistic merit in the Ostling study, removing 191 concert marches, fanfares, and discrepancies identified through correspondence with Ostling. Gilbert then added works from several sources, unavailable to Ostling:
 - a. David Wallace's and Eugene Corporon's 1985 *Wind Ensemble/Band Repertoire*, and an updated list from H. Robert Reynolds's book *Wind Ensemble Literature*.
 - b. An unpublished listing of works programmed by Big Ten University wind bands from 1983–87 done by The Ohio State University Band Department in 1987.
 - c. A listing of works compiled by WASBE in 1987.
 - d. Robert Halseth's examination of CBDNA's listing of works that had been commissioned, performed, and/or discussed at CBDNA events from 1941 through 1985.
3. The list was then sent to John P. Paynter, who had participated in the Ostling study, along with other unnamed conductors, to add other works to the list.¹²³

¹²³ Gilbert, 11–5.

During the evaluation process, further suggestions were made by the evaluators resulting in a master list of 1,261 works, 208 fewer works (-14.2% change) than the master list formed in the Ostling study.

Towner used a similar process to both Ostling and Gilbert with one critical difference: compositions were only included if they were written before December 31, 2007. Both the Ostling and Gilbert studies allowed for newly composed works to be included in their respective master lists, but this had the possible side effect of having a skewed number of works that were unfamiliar to the evaluators.¹²⁴ Towner provided the following reasons for determining the cutoff date: (1) as commissioning continues to grow at an exponential rate, the commissioning group is often provided a one-year time frame for exclusive performance and (2) once a work can be performed by an ensemble, it can take about two years before the work is actually performed, recorded, and/or studied within the wind band community at large.¹²⁵ Evaluators were also encouraged to add compositions during the evaluation period.

Including the above modification, Towner's procedure was the following:

1. Towner began with the 362 works that met the criteria for serious artistic merit in the two prior studies, 191 works from Gilbert and 171 from Ostling that were not included in Gilbert.
2. He then added 343 works that were within ten points of meeting the criteria for serious artistic merit in both previous studies.
3. He then removed 116 transcriptions.
4. Towner then added works from various sources to include in the master list:

¹²⁴ Towner, 23–4.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 24.

- a. *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band* (vol. 1–7, including only grade IV–VI works)
- b. CBDNA National Conference Programs from 1999–2009
- c. *Composers on Composing for Band* (vol. 1–4, including only the top ten compositions)
- d. Award winners from the following composition contests:
 - i. Sousa-ABA-Ostwald Composition Contest (inaugural year 1956)
 - ii. NBA/William D. Revelli Composition Contest (inaugural year 1977)
 - iii. Walter Beeler Memorial Composition Prize (inaugural year 1987)
- e. The list was then sent to five wind band conductors known to Towner to add works. Each conductor’s position at the time of the study is listed below:
 - i. Carolyn Barber: Professor of Music and Director of Bands at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln
 - ii. Felix Hauswirth: Guest Professor at the Instituto Piaget in Lisbon, Portugal; conductor of the Baden–Württemberg Youth Wind Ensemble, Germany and the Zug Wind Orchestra, Switzerland
 - iii. John Lynch: Professor of Music and Director of Bands at the University of Georgia
 - iv. Russel Mikkelson: Professor of Wind Conducting and Director of University Bands at The Ohio State University
 - v. Robert Ponto: Director of Bands at the University of Oregon¹²⁶

After removing 34 works due to discrepancies such as duplicate titles and works that did not meet the criteria of the study, the resulting master list contained 1,680

¹²⁶ Ibid., 25–7.

compositions, an additional 419 works (+33.2% change) from the initial list formed in the Gilbert study.

Although the procedure in compiling the master list was similar in all three studies, and taking into consideration Towner's date modification, the sources used to compile these master lists vary drastically. This was inevitable as new sources were created, older sources were updated, and technological advancements allowed for information to be more accessible. Despite using three additional source materials, Gilbert's study contained 208 fewer works on his initial list when compared to Ostling's initial list.

Development of Rating Scale

The rating scale used by Ostling was a modified Likert summated rating scale. Usually, the Likert scale presents a set of attitude statements and asks respondents to express agreement or disagreement shown using a numerical scale.¹²⁷ Ostling asked evaluators to apply his criteria for serious artistic merit to specific wind band works for the evaluator to either agree or disagree on whether a specific work meets the criteria for serious artistic merit. The other modification was the addition of an "unknown" rating indicating the evaluator was unfamiliar with a given work. The resulting scale was: 0—the work is unfamiliar to the respondent, 1—strongly disagree, 2—disagree, 3—undecided, 4—agree, and 5—strongly agree.¹²⁸ In conjunction with the Likert-scale, Ostling utilized a

¹²⁷ *Encyclopedia of Pain*, s.v. "Likert Scale," accessed March 7, 2024, https://doi-org.libproxy.unl.edu/10.1007/978-3-540-29805-2_2178.

¹²⁸ Ostling, 34.

summated rating scale to average the scores given by each evaluator to yield a final score. Both Gilbert and Towner utilized the same rating scale.

Selection of Evaluators

Through a nomination process, Ostling engaged twenty evaluators for his study. The reasoning for having twenty evaluators was to provide a sizeable number of eminent conductors to validate the subjective nature of the wide-sweeping study while keeping the study manageable to ensure responses from all the evaluators.¹²⁹ Ostling sent out nomination forms to 312 wind band conductors who were listed in the 1974–76 *College Music Society Directory* that taught in a postsecondary institution having fifteen or more full-time music faculty. The form asked the respondents to nominate ten wind band conductors that they believed “most diligently sought and most consistently programmed music of serious artistic merit.”¹³⁰

Of the 312 nomination forms that were sent out, 188 were returned with 222 separate wind band conductors being nominated, 30 conductors receiving more than ten nominations, and 17 conductors receiving more than 20 nominations.¹³¹ Invitations were sent to the 17 conductors and three were selected by Ostling. Interestingly, Ostling received a blank nomination form from an unidentified conductor with a note stating that the 20 evaluators for this study should be chosen by Ostling to “assure a consistent quality in the judgements.”¹³²

¹²⁹ Ostling, 36–7.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 37.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 39.

¹³² *Ibid.*, 40.

The following twenty evaluators participated in the study. Each evaluator's position at the time of the study is listed:

Frank Battisti: Conductor of the Wind Ensemble and Chairman of the Department of Music Education at the New England Conservatory

Harry Began: Director of Bands at the University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign

Frank Bencriscutto: Professor of Music and Director of Bands at the University of Minnesota-Minneapolis

Paul Bryan: Professor of Music and conductor of the Wind Symphony at Duke University

Frederick Ebbs: Professor of Music and Director of Bands at Indiana University-Bloomington

Frederick Fennell: Conductor-in-Residence at the University of Miami

Charles Gallagher: Associate Professor of Music at the University of Maryland-College Park

Robert Gray: Professor of Music, conductor of the Wind Ensemble, instructor of trombone, and Associate Director of the School of Music at the University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign

Donald Hunsberger: Conductor of the Eastman Wind Ensemble, Eastman Wind Orchestra, and Co-Chairman of the Conducting and Ensemble Department of the Eastman School of Music

David McGinnis: Professor of Music, Head of the Performance Division, and conductor of the Concert Band at The Ohio State University

James Matthews: Professor of Music and Director of Bands at the University of Houston

Kenneth Moore: Faculty at the Oberlin College Conservatory

James Neilson: Director of the Educational Department of the G. Leblanc Corporation¹³³

John P. Paynter: Professor of Music Theory and Director of Band Organizations at Northwestern University

William D. Revelli: Director Emeritus of the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor Bands

H. Robert Reynolds: Professor of Conducting and Director of Bands at the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Richard Strange: Professor of Music and Director of Bands at Arizona State University

Robert Vagner: Professor of Music and Director of at the University of Oregon–Eugene

David Whitwell: Conductor of the Wind Orchestra, and Chairman of the Wind and Percussion Area at California State University-Northridge

Keith Wilson: Professor of Music and Associate Dean of the School of Music at Yale University¹³⁴

Following the same methodology, Gilbert sent 354 nomination forms to college band directors listed in the 1986–88 *College Music Society Directory* who taught in a postsecondary institution having fifteen or more fulltime music faculty. Although Gilbert did not specify how many nominations were asked from the 354 directors, it can be assumed that the number was ten nominations to match the Ostling study.

Of the 354 nomination forms that were sent out, 203 were returned with 252 separate wind band conductors being nominated with fifteen conductors receiving twenty

¹³³ The G. Leblanc Corporation was a musical instrument manufacturing company from the 1890s until 2004, when it was sold to Conn-Selmer, a division of Steinway Musical Instruments.

¹³⁴ Ostling, 42–60.

or more nominations.¹³⁵ Excluding two nominees who had retired from college teaching before 1980, 20 evaluators were utilized in Gilbert's study. The twentieth evaluator, due to a tie in nominations, was selected by Gilbert after consulting with his advisor, John P. Paynter.¹³⁶

The following six evaluators who participated in Gilbert's study had also participated in the Ostling study: Frank Battisti, Donald Hunsberger, John Paynter, H. Robert Reynolds, Richard Strange, and David Whitwell. The other fourteen evaluators are listed below with the position they held at the time of the Gilbert study:

Eugene Corporon: Professor of Music and Director of Wind Studies at the
University of Cincinnati

Ray E. Cramer: Director of Bands at Indiana University-Bloomington

James Croft: Professor of Music and Director of Bands at Florida State
University

Stanley DeRusha: Director of Orchestral Activities at Butler University

Howard Dunn: Professor of Music Education at Southern Methodist
University

Richard L. Floyd: State Director of Music Activities for the University
Interscholastic League at the University of Texas-Austin

Jerry F. Junkin: Associate Professor of Conducting at the University of
Texas-Austin

Mark S. Kelly: Director of Bands and Professor of Music Education at
Bowling Green State University

Craig Kirchoff: Professor of Music and Director of University Bands at
The Ohio State University

¹³⁵ Gilbert, 17.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 18.

Allan McMurray: Professor of Conducting, Director of Bands, and

Chairman of the Conducting Faculty at the University of Colorado

Larry Rachleff: Music Director and Conductor of the Rice University

Symphony Orchestra¹³⁷

James Smith: Faculty member at the University of Wisconsin conducting the Wind Ensemble, Symphonic Band, and served on the graduate conducting faculty

Myron Welch: Professor of Music and Director of Bands at the University of Iowa

Frank B. Wickes: Director of Bands at Louisiana State University¹³⁸

For Towner, this process was more efficient given the use of email communication and complete online membership directories of CBDNA and WASBE. However, with all technological advancements and the updating of the procedure, side effects arose that had not been a concern in the previous two studies. The first was the potential for overlap between these two directories resulting in double nominations and an over-weighted opinion. The second issue was that there are no set criteria for membership in these organizations; anyone can join these organizations including music publishers and other representatives of industry, scholars, and interested members of the general public.¹³⁹ To counteract these challenges, Towner cross referenced both directories to identify and eliminate any duplicates and, as part of his initial email, defined the eligibility needed to participate in his survey.¹⁴⁰ The eligibility needed to

¹³⁷ Prior to his appointment at Rice University, Rachleff was Professor of Conducting at the University of Michigan conducting the University Concert Band, Chamber Winds, and Contemporary Ensemble.

¹³⁸ Gilbert, 20–38.

¹³⁹ Towner, 32.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

participate in his study was that the participant needed to be the “principal conductor of a professional or collegiate/university wind-band.”¹⁴¹

From this point, the procedure of selecting the twenty evaluators for Towner’s study was similar to the previous two studies. It is worth noting that the response rate of the initial nomination survey of Towner’s study is significantly lower than the previous two studies; only 113 nominations were received out of a total of 2,537 emails soliciting nominations.¹⁴² Despite this dramatically lower rate of return Towner determined that it was sufficient for two reasons: (1) not everyone who received the nomination email was qualified to respond and (2) the correlation between response rate and survey quality had come under increased scrutiny as discussed by The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR).¹⁴³ It was because of this lower response rate that only eighteen evaluators were utilized in Towner’s study as he did not want to use evaluators who received a smaller percentage of nominations than in the previous two studies.¹⁴⁴

The following four evaluators who participated in Towner’s study had also participated in the Gilbert study: Frank Battisti, Eugene Corporon, Donald Hunsberger, and Jerry Junkin, with only Battisti and Hunsberger participating in all three studies. The other fourteen evaluators are listed below with their position they held at the time of the Towner study:

Richard Clary: Professor of Music, Senior Band Conductor, and Director
of Wind Ensemble Studies at The Florida State University

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Ibid., 40.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 40–1. For more information on this scrutiny the reader is urged to visit <https://aapor.org/response-rates/>.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 45.

- Steven D. Davis: Director of Bands and Wind Ensembles, Associate Professor of Conducting, Conservatory Large Ensembles Chair, and Conductor of the Conservatory Wind Symphony at the University of Missouri-Kansas City
- Gary Green: Professor of Music and Director of Bands at the University of Miami
- Michael Haithcock: Director of Bands and Professor of Music (Conducting) at the University of Michigan
- Felix Hauswirth: Guest Professor at the Instituto Piaget in Lisbon, Portugal; conductor of the Baden-Württemberg Youth Wind Ensemble, Germany and the Zug Wind Orchestra, Switzerland
- Gary W. Hill: Evelyn Smith Professor of Music and Director of Ensemble Studies at Arizona State University
- John Lynch: Professor of Music and Director of Bands at the University of Georgia
- Stephen Pratt: Professor of Music and Director of Bands at Indiana University
- Tim Reynish: Faculty of the International Chamber Music Studio at the Royal Northern College of Music in Manchester, United Kingdom
- Eric Rombach-Kendall: Professor of Music and Director of Bands at the University of New Mexico
- Timothy Salzman: Professor of Music and Director of Concert Bands at the University of Washington
- Kevin Sedatole: Director of Bands, Professor of Music, and Chair of the conducting area at Michigan State University
- Jack Stamp: Professor of Music, Chairperson of the Music Department and Director of Bands at Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Mallory Thompson: Director of Bands, Professor of Music and coordinator of the conducting program at Northwestern University¹⁴⁵

The table below shows the evaluators who participated across the three studies. The demographics of the evaluators were not mentioned in any of the studies:

Table 2.2—Evaluators who participated across the Ostling, Gilbert, Towner studies

	Ostling	Gilbert	Towner
Frank Battisti	×	×	×
Harry Begian	×		
Frank Bencriscutto	×		
Richard Clary			×
Eugene Corporon		×	×
Ray Cramer		×	
James Croft		×	
Steven Davis			×
Stanley DeRusha		×	
Howard Dunn		×	
Frederick Ebbs	×		
Frederick Fennell	×		
Richard Floyd		×	
Charles Gallagher	×		
Robert Gray	×		
Gary Green			×
Michael Haithcock			×
Felix Hauswirth			×
Gary Hill			×
Donald Hunsberger	×	×	×
Jerry Junkin		×	×
Mark Kelly		×	
Craig Kirchhoff		×	
John Lynch			×
James Matthews	×		

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 45–72.

Donald McGinnis	×		
Allan McMurray		×	
Kenneth Moore	×		
James Neilson	×		
John Paynter	×	×	
Steven Pratt			×
Larry Rachleff		×	
William Reveli	×		
Timothy Reynish			×
H. Robert Reynolds	×	×	
Eric Rombach-Kendell			×
Tim Salzman			×
Kevin Sedatole			×
James Smith		×	
Jack Stamp			×
Richard Strange	×	×	
Mallory Thompson			×
Robert Vagner	×		
Myron Welch		×	
David Whitwell	×	×	
Frank Wickes		×	
Keith Wilson	×		

The Results

In order to categorize the compositions as having serious artistic merit a minimum criterion had to be determined from the ratings by the evaluators. Each composition from the master list was given a numerical value based on the number of responses in each column of the rating scale multiplied by the numerical value of each column in which the results of the summation of all columns would equal the total amount of points for each composition.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁶ Ostling, 62.

A threshold was created to determine, based on the number of points a composition received, if a composition was of serious artistic merit. The maximum number of points that a composition could receive was 100, meaning that all twenty evaluators knew the composition and gave it the highest rating. To determine the number of points required for a composition to be of serious artistic merit, Ostling chose arbitrarily the rating “4” multiplied by twenty, the maximum number of evaluators that knew the composition, equaling eighty points. Thus eighty points was the criterion for determining which compositions met the criteria for serious artistic merit.¹⁴⁷ A seemingly random caveat for compositions that were known to all twenty evaluators was that the percentage of total possible points was lowered to seventy-nine percent to allow one “undecided” response.¹⁴⁸ The use of a sliding scale was also used as Ostling felt that a composition needed to receive a higher rating from fewer evaluators to balance the consensus. Ostling’s determinations are shown in the following table:

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 63.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

Table 2.3—Ostling's determinations of serious artistic merit¹⁴⁹

Number of Evaluations	Total Possible Points	Points Required	Percentage of Total Points
20	100	79	79
19	95	76	80
18	90	72	80
17	85	68	80
16	80	64	80
15	75	60	80
14	70	56	80
13	65	52	80
12	60	48	80
11	55	44	80
10	50	40	80
9	45	36	80
8	40	32	80
7	35	28	80
6	30	24	80
5	25	20	80
4	20	17	85
3	15	13	86.6
2	10	9	90
1	5	5	100

Ostling also took into consideration the possibility of evaluators whose personal standards may have skewed the results. To accommodate this, Ostling analyzed the ratings from each evaluator by: (1) finding the mean rating value, (2) determining a median rating value, (3) determining the percentage of ratings given above “3”, (4) determining the percentage of rating value “5”, (5) determining the percentage of rating

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 64.

value “3”, and (6) determining the percentage of rating given below “3”.¹⁵⁰ These so-called “discriminating evaluators” were identified as those whose ratings were among the ten highest in each method of analysis.¹⁵¹ Six “discriminating evaluators were identified and a coefficient of correlation was established between the number of compositions rated by individual evaluators and the number of compositions that received at least a “4” by each evaluator. When including results from all twenty evaluators the correlation was .71 and when the six “discriminating evaluators” were removed the correlation was .93.¹⁵² This added an additional perspective in interpreting the percentage of maximum points received by compositions that were rated by less than half of the evaluators.

Gilbert utilized the same method of analysis that Ostling developed, with the addition of three tables showing: (1) compositions that met the criteria in the Ostling study but did not meet the criteria in the Gilbert study, (2) compositions that did not meet the criteria in the Ostling study but met the criteria in the Gilbert study, and (3) new compositions that were written after the Ostling study and met the criteria in the Gilbert study.¹⁵³ Towner also utilized the same method of analysis that Gilbert used and Ostling developed.

The following table shows the results of each study and the percentage change among them:

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 66.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Ibid., 146.

¹⁵³ Gilbert, 40.

Table 2.4—Result comparison between the Ostling, Gilbert, and Towner studies

	Master List	# of works that met criteria	% of works that met criteria	% change of works meeting criteria from Ostling	% change of works meeting criteria from Gilbert
Ostling	1,469	314	21.4%	—	—
Gilbert	1,261	191	15.1%	-39.7%	—
Towner	1,680	144	8.6%	-51.1%	-24.6%

At first glance, the data suggests that there is a downward trend in the percentage of works that meet the criteria for serious artistic merit. However, given the different pools of evaluators and works in the master lists the interpretation of the data is still problematic.

Although the initial master lists vary widely and the number of works that had met Ostling's criteria are declining across the three studies, there are 76 works that met the criteria for serious artistic merit across the three studies. They are listed below:

Table 2.5—Compositions that met the criteria for serious artistic merit in all three studies¹⁵⁴

Composer	Title	Ostling Score	Gilbert Score	Towner Score
Amram, David	King Lear Variations (1967)	81.4%	82.1%	85.6%
Bassett, Leslie	Designs, Images and Textures (1966)	88.0%	85.0%	86.7%
Bennett, Robert Russell	Suite of Old American Dances (1949)	82.0%	86.0%	83.5%
Benson, Warren	Concertino (for alto saxophone and wind ensemble) (1954)	82.0%	86.2%	88.9%
Benson, Warren	The Leaves are Falling (1963)	85.0%	95.0%	92.2%
Benson, Warren	The Passing Bell (1974)	88.6%	95.0%	92.2%
Benson, Warren	The Solitary Dancer (1969)	81.1%	86.0%	88.9%
Berg, Alban	Chamber Concerto for Violin, Piano and 13 Wind	100.0%	99.0%	100.0%

¹⁵⁴ Towner, 176–85.

	Instruments, Op. 8 (1925)			
Berlioz, Hector	Symphonie Funèbre et Triomphale, Op. 15(1840)	91.1%	80.0%	82.2%
Brahms, Johannes	Begräbnisgesang, Op. 13 (chorus and wind ensemble) (1858)	84.4%	88.0%	93.3%
Bruckner, Anton	Mass No. 2 in E Minor (1882)	92.0%	92.0%	96.5%
Copland, Aaron	An Outdoor Overture (1942)	86.0%	80.0%	80.0%
Copland, Aaron	Emblems (1964)	80.0%	95.0%	93.3%
Dahl, Ingolf	Concerto for Alto Saxophone and Wind Orchestra (1949)	92.2%	94.0%	98.9%
Dahl, Ingolf	Sinfonietta for Band(1961)	98.9%	99.0%	97.8%
Dello Joio, Norman	Variants on a Medieval Tune (1963)	87.4%	89.0%	84.7%
Dvorák, Antonin	Serenade in D Minor, Op. 44 (1878)	94.7%	100.0%	100.0%
Gounod, Charles	Petite Symphonie in B-flat, Op. 90 (1888)	91.8%	94.0%	85.6%
Grainger, Percy	Colonial Song (1918)	84.7%	91.0%	90.0%
Grainger, Percy	Hill Song No. 2 (1907/1948)	88.2%	93.7%	88.9%
Grainger, Percy	Irish Tune from County Derry (1918)	85.0%	91.6%	82.2%
Grainger, Percy	Lincolnshire Posy (1937)	99.0%	100.0%	95.6%
Hindemith, Paul	Concerto for Organ and Wind Instruments: Kammermusik No. 7, Op. 46, No. 2 (1927)	90.0%	86.7%	87.1%
Hindemith, Paul	Konzertmusik, Op. 41 (1926)	94.1%	96.8%	90.0%
Hindemith, Paul	Symphony in B-flat (1951)	99.9%	99.0%	98.9%
Holst, Gustav	Hammersmith (Prelude and Scherzo), Op. 52 (1930)	94.7%	99.0%	95.6%
Holst, Gustav	Suite No. 1 in E-flat (1909)	96.0%	97.0%	93.3%
Holst, Gustav	Suite No. 2 in F (1911)	93.0%	91.0%	86.7%
Honegger, Arthur	Le Roi David (original version) (1921)	94.7%	87.8%	85.9%
Husa, Karel	Apotheosis of this Earth (1971)	89.5%	92.0%	90.0%
Husa, Karel	Concerto for Alto Saxophone and ConcertBand (1967)	93.3%	92.0%	89.3%
Husa, Karel	Concerto for Percussion and Wind Ensemble (1970-71)	85.9%	84.0%	81.1%
Husa, Karel	Concerto for Trumpet and	86.2%	86.3%	87.7%

Wind Ensemble (1973)				
Husa, Karel	Music for Prague (1968)	94.0%	100.0%	98.9%
Jacob, Gordon	William Byrd Suite (1924)	87.4%	92.0%	82.2%
Kurka, Robert	The Good Soldier Schweik:	88.9%	88.0%	82.5%
Suite, Op. 22 (1957)				
Mahler, Gustav	"Um Mitternacht" from Aus den Rückert Lieder (1901)	96.4%	92.9%	96.5%
Mendelssohn, Felix	Overture für Harmoniemusik, Op. 24 (1826), edited by John Boyd	87.4%	84.2%	85.6%
Messiaen, Olivier	Colors of the Celestial City (1963)	89.1%	96.5%	96.7%
Messiaen, Olivier	Et Exspecto Resurrectionem Mortuorum (1965)	85.0%	94.7%	94.4%
Messiaen, Olivier	Oiseaux Exotiques (for piano solo and small wind orchestra) (1955)	93.3%	94.7%	94.4%
Milhaud, Darius	Suite Française, Op. 248 (1944)	92.6%	90.0%	85.9%
Mozart, Wolfgang	Divertimento No. 3 in E-flat, K166 (1773)	89.0%	91.1%	84.4%
Mozart, Wolfgang	Divertimento No. 4 in B-flat, K186 (1773)	89.0%	89.4%	85.9%
Mozart, Wolfgang	Serenade No. 10 in B-flat, K370a (old K361) (1781-95)	99.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Persichetti, Vincent	Divertimento for Band, Op. 42 (1950)	88.0%	85.0%	82.2%
Persichetti, Vincent	Masquerade for Band, Op. 102 (1965)	86.3%	91.0%	84.7%
Persichetti, Vincent	Symphony No. 6, Op. 69 (1956)	92.6%	93.0%	88.9%
Poulenc, Francis	Suite Française (for harpsichord and 9 wind instruments) (1935)	90.8%	88.9%	85.6%
Reed, H. Owen	La Fiesta Mexicana (1949)	85.3%	87.0%	85.6%
Reynolds, Verne	Scenes (1971)	92.0%	91.0%	81.1%
Rodrigo, Joaquin	Adagio (1966)	88.6%	80.0%	82.4%
Schmitt, Florent	Dionysiaques, Op. 62 (1914-25)	88.4%	98.0%	92.2%
Schoenberg, Arnold	Theme and Variations, Op. 43a (1943)	96.0%	98.0%	91.8%
Schuller, Gunther	Symphony for Brass and Percussion (1950)	95.8%	94.0%	85.0%
Schuman, William	New England Triptych: Be Glad Then, America; When Jesus Wept; Chester	89.0%	91.0%	88.9%

(1956)				
Strauss, Richard	Serenade Op. 7 (1881)	95.8%	95.0%	88.9%
Strauss, Richard	Sonatine in F "Aus der Werkstatt eines Invaliden", AV 135 (1943)	86.3%	90.6%	88.9%
Strauss, Richard	Suite in B-flat, Op. 4 (1884)	93.3%	91.6%	84.4%
Strauss, Richard	Symphonie for Winds "Fröhliche Werkstatt", AV 143 (1944-45)	86.2%	93.3%	90.0%
Stravinsky, Igor	Concerto for Piano and Wind Instruments (1924)	98.0%	99.0%	100.0%
Stravinsky, Igor	Mass for Chorus and Double Wind Quintet (1948)	94.3%	93.3%	87.1%
Stravinsky, Igor	Symphonies of Wind Instruments (1920)	98.0%	94.7%	100.0%
Stravinsky, Igor	Symphonies of Wind Instruments (revised 1947)	98.0%	99.0%	100.0%
Stravinsky, Igor	Symphony of Psalms (1930, rev. 1948)	99.0%	96.8%	97.8%
Tippett, Michael	Concerto for Orchestra: First Movement (Mosaic) (1962-63)	80.0%	80.0%	81.5%
Van Otterloo, Willem	Symphonietta for Woodwinds (1948)	82.9%	87.1%	80.0%
Varèse, Edgard	Deserts (1954)	89.3%	83.5%	88.8%
Varèse, Edgard	Hyperprism (1923)	86.7%	84.4%	84.4%
Varèse, Edgard	Intégrales (1925)	88.2%	91.6%	91.1%
Vaughan Williams, Ralph	English Folk Song Suite (1923)	88.0%	87.0%	80.0%
Vaughan Williams, Ralph	Toccata Marziale (1924)	90.0%	90.0%	83.3%
Wagner, Richard	Trauersinfonie (1844) revised by Erik Leidzen	88.0%	93.0%	85.0%
Weill, Kurt	Little Threepenny Music (1928)	80.0%	86.3%	90.0%

Towner suggests that the list of works above is a strong example of an intellectual core.¹⁵⁵ However, two problems arise if the assumption is that the works listed above are considered to be an intellectual core because of their consistency across the three studies: (1) this list can only shrink if subsequent studies are undertaken following the Ostling

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 186.

model, and (2) new works cannot be accounted for. In turn these issues call into question the validity of identifying, let alone relying upon, an intellectual core in programming. Additionally, if new works cannot be accounted for, a crisis ensues given the essential role of the performance of newly composed works as an existential characteristic of wind bands since the mid-twentieth century.

The Ostling, Gilbert, and Towner studies focused solely on defining an intellectual core, but the works they identified are not necessarily being performed for various reasons (accessibility of scores and parts, instrumentation, fashion trends in commissioning and programming, etc.). Should the works that are actually being performed have an influence on the intellectual core or vice versa, or should they remain separate? Is one core more valuable than the other or are they both equally important?

Furthermore, the inconsistencies of sources, panelists, evaluators, and methodologies across these highly regarded and frequently cited studies undermine their validity and calls into question the value of identifying core repertoires in the wind band medium. Whitwell identified three eras of crisis in wind band repertoire: 1917–1928, 1938–1944, and 1956.¹⁵⁶ This document asserts a fourth crisis occurring in the wind band literature today, one that sees wind bands as held back by decades of well-meaning yet fatally flawed effort focused on the identification of core repertoires. Chapter III will show how the identification of an intellectual and/or performance core was never a priority through band director thinking and behavior, and Chapter IV will reveal the major influences that continue to orient the profession toward twentieth century models

¹⁵⁶ Whitwell (1965), 36–7.

and practices. Chapter V what may lie beyond the present crisis as a new era for wind bands begins.

Chapter III: Tracing Band Director Thinking and Behavior

This chapter will trace the thinking and behavior of band directors regarding programming and repertoire. It will be divided into three eras: (1) 1920–1960, (2) 1960–1990, and (3) 1990–present. This will show how band directors’ behaviors have evolved over the course of the twentieth century setting up a new era of thinking and behavior in the twenty-first century.

1920–1960

Before the 1920s, professional bands performed at amusement parks and other popular venues for the purpose of entertaining the public and provided working class families a chance to hear so-called “serious” music, music transcribed from European composers, for the first time (refer to Figure B.1).¹⁵⁷ However, starting in the years following World War I and up through the Great Depression, the Golden Age of Professional Bands faced a perfect storm of declination resulting in its ultimate demise. Managers of the amusement parks, fearful of lack of attendance due to the war, delayed the hiring of professional bands, while the bands struggled to perform and find replacements for the musicians who voluntarily left to serve.¹⁵⁸ Concert programming was also affected as bands were urged to cease performing music by German composers such as Schubert, Bach, and Wagner (refer to Figure B.2).

The problems for professional bands started to pile up after the war both socially and culturally. Before automobiles thousands of listeners traveled by train to reach the

¹⁵⁷ Mark Fonder, “A Bird’s Eye View of the Golden Age of Professional Bands: On Beyond Sousa,” *NBA Journal* 53, no. 2 (Winter 2013), 20.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 21

amusement parks, but as Americans gained independence associated with automobiles, they no longer desired to wait for a train and travel for hours at a time.¹⁵⁹

Radio broadcasts started to become popular and while this was an opportunistic moment for bands it proved to be unsuccessful. NBC Family Radio Hour hired Patrick Conway and his band to perform and shared broadcasting time with orchestras, solo voices, and comedians, but since the broadcasts were timed the features tended to run over Conway's time and would cut off during their performances.¹⁶⁰ The absence of the visual aspects associated with the outdoor band concerts, e.g. colorful uniforms, shining instruments, etc., and the rising popularity of jazz promoted through radio broadcasts and phonographs, set concert bands at a disadvantage to other forms of entertainment.¹⁶¹

Musical tastes in America were shifting away from professional bands. This caused places that normally hired bands, particularly smaller indoor venues, to book jazz groups as they were more economically feasible and better suited to accompany dancing.¹⁶² The final nail in the coffin of professional bands was the economic turmoil that was the Great Depression.

Before the end of professional bands however, Frederick Innes, an English trombonist and bandmaster, and Conway started band schools during the off-season to train upcoming musicians to replace professional musicians after they retired. These schools operated when it became too cold to hold outdoor concerts and soon transitioned

¹⁵⁹ Richard K. Hansen, *The American Wind Band: A Cultural History*, (Chicago: GIA Publications, 2005), 63.

¹⁶⁰ Fonder, 23.

¹⁶¹ Hansen, 64.

¹⁶² Fonder, 22.

into public schools as they took over the band scene. Public school ensembles were a cheaper alternative to the professional bands, an appealing aspect before and through the Great Depression.¹⁶³ Communities across the country began requesting these school bands to perform at civic events such as parades and outdoor concerts, the same events that professional bands had done.¹⁶⁴ As a way to maintain band programs in the schools, band contests were established to elevate standards of performance.

The first national band contest was held in Chicago in 1923 sponsored by the National Association of Band Instrument Manufacturers and the next year brought in C.M. Tremaine, director of the National Bureau for the Advancement of Music. As part of the collaboration, the instrument manufacturers funded the contests and the Music Supervisors National Conference appointed a committee to outline contest rules, select contest pieces (refer to Figure B.3), and approve judges.¹⁶⁵ As the band contests grew in popularity the committee tasked with guiding them recognized the limitations of the concert band instrumentation. In an attempt to level the playing field and promote musical quality, the committee established a standard instrumentation based on the tonal range of the orchestra.¹⁶⁶ After years of study and discussion, and despite a committee strongly in support of the instrumentation, their recommendation was met with opposition in 1927. Band directors objected to the use of alto and bass clarinets as those players would never find work, administrators accused the committee of promoting the sale of

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ Hansen, 65.

¹⁶⁵ Joseph E. Maddy, "The Battle of Band Instrumentation," *Music Educators Journal* 44, no. 1 (Sept. – Oct. 1957), 30, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3388785>.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

instruments in return for funding the contests, manufacturers accused the committee of discriminating against the more profitable instruments (e.g. saxophones), and music publishers claimed that a standard instrumentation would render the entirety of their band catalogs useless as the publishers used an already established instrumentation.¹⁶⁷ This opposition however eventually collapsed as new publishers entered the market and aligned their products with the committee's instrumentation.

As the shift from professional bands to school bands was taking place, many conductors of the latter looked to the professional bands as models and borrowed many aspects of their operations, including their literature. By this time during the 1920s and 1930s many well-known and established composers began exploring the wind instrument sounds more purposefully. Composers such as Percy Grainger, Edgard Varèse, Colin McPhee, Vincent Persichetti, and others experimented with wind chamber groups and wind orchestras but some, such as Grainger, scored for American wind bands specifically.¹⁶⁸

However, school band conductors were largely unaware of this literature and stuck to programming transcriptions, the same transcriptions used by the professional bands. One of the few who was keenly aware of what composers were up to was professional band conductor Edwin Franko Goldman.

E.F. Goldman formed the New York Military Band in 1911 to raise the standards of bands and band music.¹⁶⁹ He later changed the name to the Goldman Band in 1922.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 32.

¹⁶⁸ Hansen, 68.

¹⁶⁹ Norman Smith, *March Music Notes*, (Chicago: GIA Publications, Inc., 2002), 236. Quoted in Hansen, 56.

Thanks to funding from the Guggenheim family, noted patrons of the arts, Goldman was able to continue to put on concerts even as other professional bands were going out of business. In its early years, Goldman's band predominantly performed transcriptions (refer to Figure B.4), like other professional and school bands, but he saw the need to generate original band works. Using the resources from the Guggenheim family, E.F. Goldman tirelessly created relationships with composers to write original works and new transcriptions for his band to perform.¹⁷⁰ By the end of his career in the 1950s E.F. Goldman had premiered more than 400 works, both new original works and transcriptions at his concerts.¹⁷¹

Inspired by Goldman's model, other wind band conductors, most notably A.A. Harding and Frederick Fennell, followed suit.¹⁷² Leading up to World War II, more and more composers became interested in writing for wind bands and began pursuing large-scale works: 1932 brought James Gillette's *First Symphony, Pagan*; and in 1937 Grainger accepted his first wind band commission from the American Bandmasters Association, formed by E.F. Goldman in 1929 to help seek out composers to write for the wind band, resulting in *Lincolnshire Posy*.¹⁷³

Despite the increased interest from composers transcriptions still dominated programming practices. Audience members attending the Goldman Band concerts largely requested works from the nineteenth century, whereas new original wind band works tended to be requested by bandmasters or students who had performed them or were

¹⁷⁰ Hansen, 69–70.

¹⁷¹ R.F. Goldman (1938), 9.

¹⁷² Ibid., 70.

¹⁷³ Ibid., 69–70.

curious.¹⁷⁴ According to E.F. Goldman’s son Richard Franko Goldman, while bandmasters can shape the artistic intelligence of the audience, ultimately the audience dictates what the band performs.¹⁷⁵

Another reason the majority of conductors were not taking advantage of the availability of new works had to do with educational trends. Books written in the late 1930s and early 1940s targeting the school band movement tended to focus on program building. *Getting Results with School Bands*, by Gerald Prescott and Lawrence William Chidester, was considered a standard text for conductors and contained programs suggested by many well-known band directors (refer to Figure B.5). Most of the 17 programs consisted primarily of transcriptions.¹⁷⁶ Another example is *The Band’s Music* by R.F. Goldman, quoted earlier in this study and written in the same year as Prescott and Chidester’s book. Although the first portion of the book is dedicated to original band music, the majority of suggested works are transcriptions.¹⁷⁷

When Japan launched a surprise attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941, William D. Revelli, Director of Bands at the University of Michigan and founder of CBDNA, called on the wind band profession to program more “music of a patriotic flavor” without excluding the “great music of our pre-war programs (refer to Figure B.6).”¹⁷⁸ School bands across the United States made patriotic songs the focus of their programs as the number of bands and band musicians increased during the war. Programs of the era also

¹⁷⁴ Goldman, Richard Franko, *The Wind Band: Its Literature and Technique*, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1961), 197–8.

¹⁷⁵ R.F. Goldman (1938), 4.

¹⁷⁶ Whitwell (1965), 37.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ William Revelli, “How Music Can Help Win the War,” *Etude*, (November 1942), 741, 779. Quoted in Hansen, 73.

included other genres, such as dance band, jazz, and chamber music that better connected to the American public looking to show their national pride.¹⁷⁹

Following E.F. Goldman's pursuit of growing the repertoire of original wind band music, Revelli formed the College Band Conductors Conference in 1941, later changing it to the College Band Directors National Association in 1947, with the goal of advancing the college band as a serious medium of artistic expression while playing an important role of the growth of the wind band literature.¹⁸⁰ R.F. Goldman reaffirmed Revelli's goal stating that, "The band is not inferior to the orchestra. It is simply different... there is no reason... a band should not play as artistically as an orchestra."¹⁸¹ Despite the increased pressure to perform the band's traditional vernacular repertoire during the war, the Goldman Band performed its first program entirely of original band works in 1942 (refer to Figure B.7).¹⁸² The League of Composers, an organization dedicated to contemporary music, sponsored the concert hoping to motivate other bands to program original band music. According to R.F. Goldman, this was a turning point in programming practices for bands.¹⁸³

In the years following World War II, band organizations began to follow the call to commission new works. In collaboration with G. Schirmer Publishing Company, CBDNA fostered the creation of new wind band works in a series of publications.¹⁸⁴ R.F.

¹⁷⁹ Hansen, 80.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., 81–2.

¹⁸¹ Richard Franko Goldman, "Bands in War-Time," *Modern Music* 19, no. 3 (March 1942). Quoted in Hansen, 82.

¹⁸² Battisti (2002), 37.

¹⁸³ Richard Franko Goldman, "The Band Proves Its Right to the Concert Hall," *The New York Times*, (December 28, 1947). Quoted in Hansen, 84.

¹⁸⁴ Hansen, 88.

Goldman started a formal commissioning program of original band works in conjunction with the League of Composers¹⁸⁵ and later with the American Bandmasters Association.¹⁸⁶ Along with newly established partnerships between band conductors, publishers, and composers, instrument manufacturers were connected as well through the Midwest Clinic discussed thus far.¹⁸⁷

Following the war more composers started writing large-scale works for band. A concert in 1948 to commemorate the 70th birthday of E.F. Goldman and the 25th Anniversary of the League of Composers marked another significant shift in programming practices (refer to Figure B.8). This all-original band concert included more substantial works with a arch-shaped programming concept, with the more serious works bookended by folk song-based works.¹⁸⁸ Folk song-based works continue to be a mainstay of band programming to this day.

As more talented and mature instrumental musicians returned from serving in military bands during the war, the level of musicianship and artistry improved in schools, colleges and universities, and military bands. These musicians enrolled in music schools assisting in the improvement and development of wind and percussion pedagogy while offering private lessons to students. Composers took advantage of this and wrote more challenging works for wind bands.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁵ Battisti (2002), 39.

¹⁸⁶ Hansen, 91

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 88.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 91.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 93.

This growth and activity eventually led Frederick Fennell, faculty member at the University of Rochester's Eastman School of Music, to reimagine literature and programming for the wind band. In 1951, Fennell organized a concert of miscellaneous chamber wind ensembles that included works by Mozart, Strauss, Ruggles, and Stravinsky, compositions which were then not part of the accepted literature and programming for wind bands (refer to Figure B.9).¹⁹⁰ This led to a brand-new approach to programming for an ensemble. The following year, Fennell implemented his wind ensemble concept of instrumentation (refer to Figure B.10). Each performer would function as an individual (one to a part) and the programming would be divided into three parts: woodwind music, brass music, and full ensemble music (woodwinds, brass, and perhaps percussion) with a commitment to new and/or original works.¹⁹¹ This concept was vastly different from then-current programming practices. For example, Revelli at the University of Michigan balanced his program with half original literature and half transcriptions (refer to Figure B.11), whereas Mark Hindsley at the University of Illinois performed mostly transcriptions, one march, and one original work on each concert.¹⁹² Nevertheless, Fennell and his wind ensemble concept ushered in a new idea of programming while continuing to commission new works that challenged professional players and that interested school bands.

Shortly after the inaugural performance from the Eastman Wind Ensemble Fennell had approached the New York Secondary Schools Music Association, advocating

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 95–6.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 96.

¹⁹² Ibid., 97.

for a broadcasting series in which the wind ensemble would rehearse competition-festival music on the FM Rural Radio Network.¹⁹³ Fennell had also met with Mercury Records producer David Hall to plan the first LP recording of the ensemble that featured works by American composers.

Throughout the 1950s more and more organizations and individuals got involved in commissioning new wind band works: Kappa Kappa Psi and Tau Beta Sigma fraternities, the American Bandmasters Association (ABA) partnering with Ostwald Band Uniform Company, Frank Battisti at Ithaca High School, Robert Austin Boudreau and the American Wind Symphony, and the Contemporary Music Project. This project, initiated by Norman Dello Joio and funded by the Ford Foundation, placed composers under thirty-five years of age in public schools to write music for the students. Warren Benson, the first composer-in-residence for the program, was influential in this program bringing an interdisciplinary approach to composition while raising the quality of literature that school bands were performing.¹⁹⁴

Despite these developments an article was published in the August 1958 issue of *The Instrumentalist* that spawned a monthly column entitled “The Best in Band Music.” Its purpose was to inform the readers of “what some of the outstanding band directors in the country considered the finest selections available for performance by band.”¹⁹⁵ Thirty-one columnists recommended a total of 792 individual works of which 118 had been selected by at least three columnists. Of those, sixty-seven (over 57%) were

¹⁹³ Ibid., 98.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 103.

¹⁹⁵ The Instrumentalist, “The Best in Band Music,” *The Instrumentalist* 12, no. 11 (August 1958), 74, https://archive.org/details/sim_the-instrumentalist_1958-08_12_11/page/76/mode/2up.

transcriptions, indicating that transcriptions were still the dominant kind of music being performed by wind bands leading up to the 1960s.¹⁹⁶ However, times were changing as six of the ten top-rated compositions were original band works.

1960–1990

Although the discussion started in the 1940s, the desire to standardize band instrumentation ramped up in the 1960s, particularly within the ranks of CBDNA. Raymond F. Dvorak, Band Director at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, was concerned that because the instrumentation in scores was varied it would be impossible to perform band music on an international basis.¹⁹⁷ Bernard Fitzgerald, past president of CBDNA and Head of the Department of Music at the University of Kentucky, argued that standardizing an instrumentation would stabilize the tonal instrumental sonority.¹⁹⁸ Revelli supported the idea of a specific international instrumentation for the band and concluded that if this were accomplished, “the band as a serious medium of musical expression will make its finest cultural contribution.”¹⁹⁹

However, there were many conductors, like Fennell, who opposed the standardization of a band instrumentation. At the Eastman School of Music, Fennell sent out hundreds of invitations to composers asking them to write for his wind ensemble concept. Fennell promoted the idea that wind ensembles should be a flexible sound

¹⁹⁶ Battisti (2002), 63.

¹⁹⁷ Raymond F. Dvorak, “International Band Score,” *The Instrumentalist* 7, no. 2 (October 1952), 12, https://archive.org/details/sim_the-instrumentalist_1952-10_7_2/page/12/mode/2up.

¹⁹⁸ Bernard Fitzgerald, “Trends in Contemporary Band Music,” *The Instrumentalist* 15, no. 1 (September 1960), 52, https://archive.org/details/sim_the-instrumentalist_1960-09_15_1/page/52/mode/2up.

¹⁹⁹ William D. Revelli, “Report on International Instrumentation,” in *The College and University Band: An Anthology of Papers from the Conferences of the College Band Directors National Association, 1941–1975*, ed. David Whitwell and Acton Ostling Jr. (Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference, 1977), 87, https://archive.org/details/collegeuniversit0000unse_o5w4/page/86/mode/2up.

resource that would adapt to any woodwind-, brass-, and percussion-based instrumentation a composer might require.²⁰⁰ Keith Wilson, Director of Bands at Yale University, concluded similarly that the composer should determine how to use the instruments without being restricted by “confusing, pre-cautionary advice” given by conductors and publishers.²⁰¹ Composer Donald O. Johnston added that “too many mixtures of color can result in a certain dullness” and would “tend to have a certain color similarity” between composers if an instrumentation were to be standardized.²⁰² Walter Beeler called out conductors for their lack of “confidence in transparent music” and reliance on arrangements that were heavily-cross-cued.²⁰³

Despite opposition, CBDNA President James Neilson called for a special conference in 1960 to reach a consensus on standardizing the band instrumentation. This resulted in a so-called “ideal balanced band” of seventy-two instruments intended to serve as a model for future reference.²⁰⁴ The results were not intended to be policy recommendations but rather to identify a pattern of instrumentation to stimulate further discussion. Since the appointed task was completed, CBDNA dissolved the committee in 1962.²⁰⁵

²⁰⁰ Frederick Fennell, *Time and the Winds*, (Huntersville, NC: NorthLand Music Publications, 2009), 57.

²⁰¹ Keith Wilson, “Instrumentation is the Composer’s Prerogative,” *The Instrumentalist* 18, no. 3 (October 1963), 84.

²⁰² Donald O. Johnston, “Composing for the Wind Band,” *The Instrumentalist* 20, no. 10 (May 1966), 57.

²⁰³ Walter Beeler, “More Band Color,” *The Instrumentalist* 19, no. 1 (August 1964), 58.

²⁰⁴ Lasko, 52.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.* Members of the committee who developed the “ideal” band instrumentation were: William D. Revelli, University of Michigan; Mark H. Hindsley, University of Illinois; L. Bruce Jones, Louisiana State University; Hugh McMillen, University of Colorado; William Schaefer, University of Southern California; and Robert Vagner, University of Oregon.

Although large-scale works for band were starting to appear in the 1950s, most if not all of these works were still in manuscript form while those that were available in published form were of low print quality due to the expense of engraving large scores. William Schaefer, Director of Bands at the University of Southern California, called for band directors to program more of these unpublished works despite the high rental costs and to encourage publishers to invest in the publication of more of these large-scale, challenging works.²⁰⁶ Composers continued to be commissioned producing more and more large-scale and challenging works which were being performed all over the country. However, in the mid-1960s and into the 1970s, a new music movement made its way into the wind band; a movement that was both unfamiliar and uncomfortable among some of the band conductors through its music.

Musical post-modernism gave the wind band a new type of literature that contrasted the predictability of much of the wind band repertoire. With more composers from the academic and art music ranks writing for band, conductors were faced with new instrumental techniques and non-traditional notation styles.²⁰⁷

Up until this point, transcriptions had been the dominant music genre for winds, but a survey of CBDNA members by Karl Holvik of Northern Iowa College indicated a shift in programming. Holvik requested programs from 1961–1966 and identified 234 different works, 136 being original works and 98 being transcriptions.²⁰⁸ In addition, programs from the 1967 CBDNA conference consisted mostly of original band works

²⁰⁶ William Schaefer, "The Emerging Band Repertoire," in Whitwell and Ostling Jr. (1977), 64–5.

²⁰⁷ Battisti (2002), 85.

²⁰⁸ Holvik (1970), 19–24.

(refer to Figure B.12).²⁰⁹ As fewer transcriptions were being written and performed, more bands began programming all original works (many of greater length), a change from years earlier when bands would perform ten to twelve short works.²¹⁰

There were still bands that followed the potpourri programming style of the old professional band emulating a sort of variety show alternating significant original works, transcriptions, and medleys of popular tunes.²¹¹ By 1970, however, many conductors were beginning to move their university wind bands toward serious music and away from lighter entertainment.²¹² H. Robert Reynolds, then Director of Bands at the University of Wisconsin, helped facilitate and reaffirm this shift from simply being a provider of “situational” music to performing music of “aesthetic worth.”²¹³ To help reinforce this shift, the New England Conservatory hosted the first National Wind Ensemble Conference in 1970 to bring conductors, composers, and publishers together to discuss new literature.

Fennell’s wind ensemble concept eventually infiltrated high school All-State ensemble structures in the early 1970s (refer to Figure B.13) as the one-on-a-part practice offered a new challenge for students who were accustomed to performing in their large public-school bands. Both public-school and post-secondary bands began adding wind

²⁰⁹ Battisti (2002), 86.

²¹⁰ Ibid., 92.

²¹¹ Frank Battisti, “My View of the Wind Repertoire (1960–74),” *The Instrumentalist* 44, no. 4 (November 1989), 19.

²¹² Battisti (2002), 93.

²¹³ H. Robert Reynolds, “Letter from Readers: Re: CBDNA (Bowles) Position,” *The Instrumentalist* 25, no. 3 (October 1970), 8.

ensembles to their programs offering a broader range of literature while including more premiere performances on their programs.²¹⁴

Through the mid-1970s and into the 1980s Pulitzer Prize-winning composers began writing works for winds, including Joseph Schwantner, Michael Colgrass, Ellen Taaffe Zwilich, and others. This created a division in what had been a shared literature between high school bands and post-secondary bands as the works became more challenging, moving beyond the technical capabilities, instrumental resources, and artistic maturity found in high schools.²¹⁵ The influence that post-secondary bands had on high school bands diminished markedly. It was during these years that studies began to appear attempting to define both an intellectual core and a performance core within the band literature. There was a growing sense that the predominance of new wind band works on programs, gave the impression that the wind band did not have either an intellectual or a performance core.²¹⁶ The lack of core was perceived within the wind band community as a sign that the band literature was less artistically viable, and therefore less worthy of respect when compared to the orchestral literature.

Although bands and their literature were closely associated with American society in the first half of the twentieth century, that was no longer the case after the upheavals of the 1960s and 1970s. Entering the 1990s transcriptions were still a large part of the band's literature, although the number of new transcriptions was slowly dwindling. However, with all the new original band literature being written and performed,

²¹⁴ Battisti (1989), 19–20.

²¹⁵ Battisti (2002), 99–100.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 118–9.

transcriptions were under increased scrutiny regarding artistic integrity with respect to the source material.²¹⁷

1990–Present Day

At the start of the 1990s, there seemed to be a new movement in American music occurring, identified by composer Kyle Gann. Gann asserted that “academic composition” had taken over the artistic innovations from the 1960s and onward, destroying spontaneity, expression, and ignoring audience response.²¹⁸ Gann called for music to be more connected to American society and the American vernacular. Composers of the late twentieth century began to weave those aspects into their works through poems, popular music, or reference to events in American history (refer to Figure B.14).²¹⁹

Composer Francis McBeth speculated that a dramatic increase of young composers writing wind band music occurred due to better university pedagogy, an increase in population, and the acceptance of band as a viable artistic medium by post-secondary institutions.²²⁰ As more and more wind band composers emerged and more wind band compositions were being written, some conductors became frustrated with the quality of literature that was being produced. Conductors such as Timothy Reynish and David Whitwell defined good music as music which evokes feeling or an emotional response.²²¹ Others, like composer and music critic Russell Platt, an outsider to the band

²¹⁷ Ibid., 118.

²¹⁸ Hansen, 122.

²¹⁹ Ibid., 124–7.

²²⁰ W. Francis McBeth, “The Evolving Band Repertoire,” *The Instrumentalist* 50, no. 1 (August 1995), 22.

²²¹ Hansen, 132.

world, suggested that bands remain true to their roots, specifically collegiate athletics and ceremonial tasks of the U.S. military, while exploring new types of artistic territory.²²²

Tensions between directors and publishers seemed to rise throughout the 1990s. In 1990, *The Instrumentalist* asked publishers to give their thoughts on what conductors were performing, and asked conductors to comment on the music the publishers were publishing. Some publishers were willing to risk publishing more challenging, out of the ordinary works but found conductors seemed unwilling to take the same risks. Some conductors complained that the music being published lacked intrinsic artistic value because publishers seemed to focus on music for educational use.²²³ To resolve this issue, Eric Stokes and conductor Craig Kirchhoff, both at the University of Minnesota, developed a commissioning series to have major composers such as Michael Colgrass, Libby Larsen, and Chen Yi write music for elementary and middle school ensembles. In 1997, the American Composers Forum, with funding from the Rockefeller Foundation, The Pew Charitable Trusts, The John and James Knight Foundation, and the George Frederick Jewett Foundation formed *BandQuest*, the largest educational commissioning project to date.²²⁴

However, not everyone viewed this music, along with most of the music being published, as having intrinsic artistic value. In 2005, American writer, historian, and biographer Stephen Budiansky published an article in the *The Washington Post* that

²²² Russell Platt, "The Quest for Good Music and the Role of the Symphonic Band," *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles* 6, (1999), 58–9. Quoted in Hansen, 133.

²²³ *The Instrumentalist*, "Friendly Advice from Directors and Industry," *The Instrumentalist* 20, no. 12 (July 1999), 21.

²²⁴ Hansen, 137.

caused a great deal of controversy in the wind band profession. His article, “The Kids Play Great. But That Music...” ripped into the inferior quality of music that was being written, published, and programmed by school ensembles.²²⁵ Budiansky asserted that music education should be about “having the chance to experience firsthand the truly great music of all genres—the great music that, after all, is the whole point of learning to play or sing.”²²⁶ This prompted a second article in the 2005 *WASBE Journal*, two talks, one at the 2009 WASBE conference in Ohio and one at the 2010 CBDNA Eastern Division conference in Pennsylvania, along with over 150 responses from school band directors, student musicians and parents, professional musicians and composers, and university music educators with 88% of them validating Budiansky’s critique.²²⁷ The quality, or lack thereof, of the music that was being used to teach music in schools became the focal point of attention throughout the wind band profession.

As the world entered the new millennium and through to the present day, the number of commissions, commissioning bodies, and premieres in the wind band community has continued to rise at a rapid rate. Numerous organizations host composition competitions to help launch less established composers into the musical marketplace. The number of commissioning consortiums has increased as well, allowing public schools and post-secondary institutions with smaller budgets to commission and premiere new works. New conferences and symposiums, such as New England

²²⁵ Stephen Budiansky, “The Kids Play Great. But That Music...” *The Washington Post*, (January 30, 2005), 1, <https://budiansky.com/WashPost.pdf>.

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, 2.

²²⁷ Frank Battisti, *The New Winds of Change: The Evolution of the Contemporary American Wind Band/Ensemble and Its Music*, (Chicago: Meredith Music Publications, 2018), 254.

Conservatory's "Wind Music Across the Century," bring conductors and composers together to reflect on past accomplishments and discuss future possibilities, and U.S. conductors were becoming more aware of international composers thanks to WASBE. Finally, the performance of transcriptions continues to decline as shown in studies by Kish, Powell, Whiltshire et. al., Rudnicki, and Paul.

As new literature was being developed, so was technology. By the end of the twentieth century recordings of wind bands/ensembles were becoming more common since Fennell's LPs with Mercury Records. The Cincinnati College–Conservatory and the University of North Texas wind bands, led by Eugene Corporon, recorded 23 CDs for the Klavier Wind Recording Project. In 2006, Naxos of America, Inc., the world's leading classical music group, launched *Wind Band Classics*, a series of CD recordings of "the best in symphonic band music, performed by international wind ensembles."²²⁸ In the same year, Nikk Pilato began formulating ideas for a "wiki" database specifically for wind band works. The Wind Band Repertory Project, launched in 2008, is a comprehensive online database of wind literature which is continually expanded and enriched by its users.²²⁹ With WRP being expanded by its users, conductors who premiered a commissioned work can post the information and recording immediately after the performance, allowing for widespread news of new works and performances. The CDs from Naxos, the Klavier Wind Recording Project, and the WRP allowed band

²²⁸ "Wind Band Classics," Edition/Series, Naxos, accessed March 14, 2024, https://www.naxos.com/EditionSeries/Detail/?title=Wind_Band_Classics.

²²⁹ Battisti (2018), 275.

directors around the world to access new and old recordings and composition listings from the comfort of their home, office, or rehearsal room.

Composers in the twenty-first century have been experimenting with wind bands in combination with solo instruments, electronics, and extra-musical elements providing new, innovative sounds. Performances at conferences and symposiums are featuring works written in the twenty-first century. At the 2009 CBDNA National Conference at the University of Texas-Austin fifty-six works were performed of which forty-one (73%) had been written in the first decade of the twenty-first century (refer to Figure B.15).²³⁰

Along with experimenting with different combinations of instruments, ensembles, and the use of electronics, the wind band saw an uptick in composers incorporating a variety of different styles and genres such as jazz, commercial, popular music, and global influences. Composers would also focus increasingly on social, political, and global issues such as global warming, wars, racism and prejudice, and later the COVID-19 pandemic.

With the pandemic ravaging the world, restrictions and social distancing requirements created new problems for the wind band profession in terms of instrumentation, literature, and performance practice. Instrumentation and literature. To help ease the burden, composers formed groups to arrange their own works into flex band arrangements, enabling whatever instruments a conductor has at their disposal to perform works by those composers. The Creative Repertoire Initiative (CRI) was one of these groups. Formed in the spring of 2020, composers Frank Ticheli, Robert Ambrose, Omar

²³⁰ Ibid., 301.

Thomas, Brian Balmages, Pete Meechan, Alex Shapiro, Eric Whitacre, Steven Bryant, Michael Daugherty, Julie Giroux, and Jennifer Jolley teamed up to arrange some of their previously written works for a variety of ensembles and ability levels regardless of instrumentation. Sensing a lucrative trend, publishers jumped on this opportunity to market and sell these flex arrangements to bands. However, some conductors argued that these arrangements diminished the musical integrity of the works and further perpetuated the pattern of low-quality band music identified by Budiansky.

A century ago, the wind band relied on transcriptions and marches as the core of its literature and ensembles were oriented toward entertainment. In the intervening years programming practices, conductor behaviors, and perceptions of wind band function have changed. As the wind band continues into the second decade of the twenty-first century and soon into the third, questions arise. What will our programming practices look like ten years from now? Will conductors' attitudes and behaviors continue to change, and if so, what will affect those changes? Will there still be a desire to define an intellectual and/or performance core despite the many failed attempts to do so? And how will the exponential growth of the literature influence the wind band's concept of itself as a medium of artistic expression?

Chapter IV: Identification of Major Influences and Their Purposes

This chapter explores three prominent organizations that have influenced the attitudes and programming practices within the wind band profession. These organizations, through their business models and practices, affect every band director in the United States from beginning levels through the professional ranks. These organizations play an outsized role in determining, both deliberately and collaterally, the music that ensembles perform and therefore the music that publishers publish and composers compose.

The following organizations will be explored through research and personal correspondence:

- J.W. Pepper & Son, Inc., founded in Philadelphia in 1876
- Shattinger Music Company, established in St. Louis in 1876 and absorbed by Midwest Sheet Music in 2013
- The Midwest International Band and Orchestra Clinic established in Chicago in 1946

J.W. Pepper & Son, Inc.

Starting out of his parents' print shop in Philadelphia, James Welsh Pepper founded J.W. Pepper in 1876, a music publishing company with the goal of giving musicians "everything they needed to be their best."²³¹ Along with printing sheet music, Pepper also printed the *Musical Times and Band Journal*, an early version of the Pepper

²³¹ "1876," Pepper Timeline, J.W. Pepper, accessed March 11, 2024, <https://www.jwpepper.com/since1876#1>.

catalog, which helped musicians improve their technique and connected musicians with one another to facilitate performance and collaboration.²³²

In addition to producing journals and printing music, Pepper began manufacturing instruments and accessories, in collaboration with Henry Distin, an English brass instrument manufacturer and member of the famed Distin family quintet.²³³ With the additional assistance from bell maker Alexander LeForrestier, Pepper was responsible for many instrumental innovations earning several high honors throughout the 1880s and 1890s, including the highest medal and diploma for craftsmanship at the 1883 Chicago World's Fair.²³⁴ Interestingly, the idea of the sousaphone was conceived by John Philip Sousa in conversation with Pepper, who expressed a desire for bass instrument with an upward facing bell.²³⁵ A year later, the United States Navy commissioned J.W. Pepper to produce complete sets of band instruments for seventeen ships.²³⁶

As the company continued to grow, opening additional locations in New York City and then later in Chicago, the types of publications also grew to include music for band and orchestra along with collections for brass, woodwind, string, and percussion instruments.²³⁷ Alongside this outburst of sheet music, Pepper also released music education books such as *How to Teach Bands* and *How to Teach Orchestras*, providing

²³² Brendan Lyons, "A History of Service: Bringing Musicians Together," *J.W. Pepper*, September 15, 2016, <https://blogs.jwpepper.com/a-history-of-service-bringing-musicians-together/>.

²³³ David Whitwell, *A Concise History of the Wind Band*, ed. Craig Dabelstein, 2nd ed, (Austin: Whitwell Publications, 2010), 310.

²³⁴ Brendon Lyons, "A History of Service: Pepper Instruments," *J.W. Pepper & Son, Inc.*, July 12, 2016, <https://blogs.jwpepper.com/a-history-of-service-pepper-instruments/>.

²³⁵ *Ibid.*

²³⁶ "1894," Pepper Timeline.

²³⁷ *Ibid.*

instruction in ensemble pedagogy.²³⁸ As the company grew a change in business practice also occurred, shifting to focus its efforts on retail sales rather than publishing and instrument manufacture.²³⁹

However, the newly named J.W. Pepper & Son was forced to declare bankruptcy in 1941 due to the economic downturn of the Great Depression. The following year, Harold Burtch, a former J.W. Pepper customer, recruited a group of investors to purchase the company in the hopes they could save it.²⁴⁰ As an attempt to revive the company, Burtch secured a contract with the U.S. Navy, similar to what James Welsh Pepper did in the 1880s. With World War II at its peak, demand for military band music skyrocketed and brought J.W. Pepper & Son back from the brink of collapse to a second era of growth.²⁴¹

With new marketing strategies and the acceptance of outside management, business boomed. In 1955, Pepper hosted its first music reading session at the University of Delaware involving over 500 musicians and music teachers.²⁴² Through the 1950s and 1960s, the business savvy of Ron Rowe, took the company from a regional focus to a national presence, opening stores in Atlanta, Georgia; Troy, Michigan; and Tampa, Florida.²⁴³

²³⁸ Brendon Lyons, "A History of Service: Music Education," *J.W. Pepper & Son, Inc.*, August 18, 2016, <https://blogs.jwpepper.com/a-history-of-service-music-education/>.

²³⁹ "1924," Pepper Timeline.

²⁴⁰ Brendan Lyons, "A History of Service: Pepper Buildings," *J.W. Pepper & Son, Inc.*, November 9, 2016, <https://blogs.jwpepper.com/a-history-of-service-pepper-buildings/>.

²⁴¹ "1943," Pepper Timeline.

²⁴² *Ibid.*, "1955."

²⁴³ *Ibid.*, "1966," "1968."

As new technologies emerged in the 1980s, J.W. Pepper continued to expand. The company launched the Choral Experience boxed sets in 1983. These boxed sets contained the “best new choral releases” for purchase allowing directors to review the works from the comfort of their home or office while taking the time they needed to choose the appropriate music for their ensemble.²⁴⁴ Due to the success and wide appeal of the Choral Experience Pepper expanded this idea to wind bands and orchestras with the Recorded Library, a collection of new works selected by Pepper’s editorial staff consisting of former teachers and former employees of other publishing houses.²⁴⁵

Subsequent innovations included: the Pepper National Music Network in 1989, an internet forum used to foster collaboration across the country; the introduction of full online ordering in 1995, and the establishment of ePrint in 2000, allowing customers to purchase and print music on the same day.²⁴⁶ In 2012, a marketing platform called My Score was introduced for independent composers who could not get their music, published by more traditional publishers.²⁴⁷ Although J.W. Pepper is a distributor, My Score is a self-publishing division that allows independent composers to upload their music to be made available in J.W. Pepper’s catalog while retaining all copyrights and ownership of the works.²⁴⁸

²⁴⁴ Brendan Lyons, “A History of Service: Editors’ Choice,” *J.W. Pepper & Son, Inc.*, June 2, 2016, <https://blogs.jwpepper.com/a-history-of-service-editors-choice/>.

²⁴⁵ Ibid.

²⁴⁶ “1989,” “1995,” “2000,” Pepper Timeline.

²⁴⁷ Ibid., “2012.”

²⁴⁸ “What are the benefits of using My Score?,” FAQs, My Score Support, J.W. Pepper, last modified March 16, 2021, <https://myscoresupport.jwpepper.com/support/solutions/articles/61000291237-what-are-the-benefits-of-using-my-score->.

Given their long history and national scope, J.W. Pepper's effects on band director's attitudes and programming practices was of keen interest in preparation of this thesis. Of particular interest for the current study were the qualifications of the editors, the process through which they choose music to include in the various catalogs and selective lists, and their target market. Fernandes compared J.W. Pepper to a pet store. Customers enter the pet store looking to adopt animals and to purchase accessories such as leashes, however, the customers can only adopt animals that are already in the store and the store cannot sell certain accessories if the manufacturers do not make them available.²⁴⁹ In the music distribution business, editors are only able to sell works that are already published. This eliminates unpublished or self-published works from the sales and marketing process.

To maintain a supply of music to sell, distributors search actively for compositions by sponsoring commissions, hosting reading sessions, and attending many music educators' association events, along with communicating with band directors through emails, phone calls, networking at professional conferences and social media.²⁵⁰ From this research they determine which trends to advertise. One of the most recent trends that they discovered was flex band arrangements, or compositions in which the composer provides flexible options rather than a fixed instrumentation. Building from this concept they spoke with composers and publishers to see if works could be made into

²⁴⁹ Kathy Fernandes, interview by author, Microsoft Teams, February 2, 2024.

²⁵⁰ Ibid.

flex arrangements as more and more band directors were looking for them due largely to circumstances brought on by the pandemic.²⁵¹

In terms of cultural trends, they follow a similar process. Fernandes used the Barbie movie as a recent example along with celebrations such as Pepper's upcoming 150th birthday and the 250th anniversary of the founding of the United States.²⁵² From these prompts they determine what the needs for programming are likely to be J.W. Pepper might do to prepare to support them.²⁵³ Another trend that J.W. Pepper has noticed is the desire for more authenticity with regard to culture or geography. As band directors become more mindful of culture appropriation or misrepresentation, J.W. Pepper is attempting to keep pace.²⁵⁴ However, like every business, J.W. Pepper is not immune to setbacks from risks taken based on trends that may not develop momentum.

Within this overarching strategy, each editor has a particular responsibility to create promotions for a specific subset of ensembles, e.g. marching band, orchestra, church choral, etc. Certain categories involve multiple difficulty levels, e.g. concert band from the beginning through the advanced or professional level. The challenge then is for the editor to switch perspectives while evaluating.²⁵⁵ Consistency within the ratings and descriptions of the products that they are selling is primary goal.²⁵⁶ After each editor has done their research, they come together as a team to talk about the works, comparing them, reorganizing them if they felt a work should belong in a different category and/or

²⁵¹ Ibid.

²⁵² Ibid.

²⁵³ Ibid.

²⁵⁴ Ibid.

²⁵⁵ Ibid.

²⁵⁶ Ibid.

difficulty level, and sharing their opinions of what to include in the catalogs and selective lists. Another goal is to maintain a spectrum of music that allows both well-funded and advanced ensembles and less well-endowed ensembles or those with inconsistent instrumentation to find what they need.²⁵⁷

Within each of the categories are varieties of genres and styles. An example given by Fernandes: if an ensemble is looking for a trombone feature J.W. Pepper makes sure they have a supply while also specifically looking for new trombone features to add to their already established genre.²⁵⁸

In regard to self-publishing, J.W. Pepper is supportive of independent composers that self-publish, as seen by their My Score marketing tactic. However, this initiative is fiscally impractical; therefore, J.W. Pepper encourages composers to get published as publishers perform critical functions such as editing and formatting score and parts.²⁵⁹

While influencing band directors' attitudes and programming practices around the United States and extending into the global market, J.W. Pepper also seems to be influenced by trends that are being caused by those same band directors, effectively creating an *ouroboros* effect. Band directors established the trends, J.W. Pepper identifies and markets those trends, and then band directors shift the trends, and the process repeats itself.

Shattinger Music Company, later Midwest Sheet Music

²⁵⁷ Ibid.

²⁵⁸ Ibid.

²⁵⁹ Ibid.

Established in St. Louis, Missouri, Adam Shattinger founded Shattinger Music in 1876 specializing in sheet music. The store remained in the Shattinger family until 1948 when the business was sold to William Shaw, rebranding the store to Shattinger Music company while expanding the choral and school business and established the instrumental department. The business was then sold to Jim Cochran and Linda Bagsby in 2000.²⁶⁰

Two years prior, Mark and Cindy Schellenberg purchased M-R Music, a small sheet music store in Olivette, Missouri that sold piano and vocal music to teachers in the area. As M-R Music grew over the next seven years, they relocated to Maryland Heights and in 2005 added choral and orchestral music.²⁶¹

After the Shattinger Music Company went out of business in 2013, Jeff Girard, Jim Kerfoot, and Dick Boyd, former employees of Shattinger, went to M-R Music bringing their expertise in wind band sales.²⁶² Two years later, M-R Music rebranded to Midwest Sheet Music and expanded their market presence to the national level. Shattinger Music, and more recently Midwest Sheet Music, are frequently the only exhibitors selling score, sheet music, and reference materials at CBDNA divisional and national conferences and they are a major presence at the Midwest Clinic.

As with J.W. Pepper, the question of how Midwest Sheet Music affects band director's attitudes and programming practices is central to this thesis. The outsized

²⁶⁰ Tim Bryant, "Shattinger Music Remains in Business," *St. Louis Today*, May 28, 2013, https://www.stltoday.com/news/local/column/shattinger-music-remains-in-business/article_73c76421-187b-5fa0-9ee6-83db2aee08cb.html.

²⁶¹ "Our Store," Midwest Sheet Music, Midwest Sheet Music Team, accessed March 12, 2024, <https://www.midwestsheetmusic.com/page/our-store/>.

²⁶² *Ibid.*

influence of Shattinger Music and later Midwest Sheet Music with the college and university wind band community specifically, and the crucial role of college and university band directors in the decades-long quest to define core repertoires for the wind band, make this piece of the puzzle critical in understanding professional attitudes and programming practices at all levels. A clear sense of how Midwest's New, Top Picks, and Standard Literature are populated could shed light on the initiation of and response to trends effecting the development of the American wind band. The author will continue to reach out to the staff at Midwest Sheet Music to gain insight.

The Midwest Clinic: An International Band and Orchestra Conference

The Midwest Clinic is the world's largest instrumental music education conference, annually drawing approximately 17,000 attendees to Chicago from all fifty states and as many as forty countries. Before the Midwest Clinic's inaugural session in 1946, smaller clinics were organized by individuals, such as A.A. Harding, director of bands at the University of Illinois from 1907–1948, and organizations, such as the National School Band and Orchestra Association and VanderCook School of Music. As music businesses expanded after World War II, there was a need to make directors aware of the new music that was being written and becoming available. Colonel Harold Bachman, a close friend of Harding and the music education director for the Educational Music Bureau in Chicago at the time, recognized the value and importance of band clinics, in particular the clinics hosted by the National School Band and Orchestra Association in the 1930s and 1940s. As a result, he urged H.E. Nutt of VanderCook

School of Music, Howard Lyons of Lyons Band Instrument Company, and Neil A. Kjos of the Kjos Music Company to begin a new clinic in Chicago following World War II.²⁶³

With the wind band field changing rapidly with new original music being written and attempts to standardize instrumentation the need for quality literature for beginning and intermediate bands became apparent. According to Bachman, the clinic would showcase a diverse selection of music that included easier grade levels with help from Nutt and composer Paul Yoder in its promotion. This was in contrast to the University of Illinois clinics which featured more challenging music.²⁶⁴ The first clinic was extremely successful as it featured reading sessions, performances, guest conductors and artists, exhibits, meetings, and a luncheon.²⁶⁵

As the years passed the Midwest Clinic became extremely popular and drew national attention, as well as directors from Canada. More bands were invited to perform, and sessions and open forums were added. By 1951 the name was changed to the Midwest National Band Clinic and it offered seventeen instrumental clinics, seven concerts and reading sessions, (including a performance from a string orchestra from Champaign, Illinois), and a variety of events for the nearly 3,000 attendees.²⁶⁶ By 1962, the first day of the Midwest Clinic was designated as “Orchestra Day,” sponsored by the National School Orchestra Association and by 1968 the name changed again to the Midwest National Band and Orchestra Clinic.²⁶⁷ In December of 1982, it was decided to

²⁶³ Victor Zajec, *The First 50 Years*, (Dallas: Taylor Publishing, 1996), 17.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 19–22.

²⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 27.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 28–9.

invite bands from other countries with the Norwegian National Youth Band becoming the first foreign group to perform in 1986. That same year the name was changed yet again to the Midwest International Band and Orchestra Clinic.²⁶⁸ The name would change again in 1996 to its current form, The Midwest Clinic: An International Band and Orchestra Conference.

As the Midwest Clinic continued to grow in number of participants so did the number of concerts, sessions, and activities to address the changing needs of the registrants. In 1988, College Night debuted and college credit for attending the clinic was offered for the first time. The idea for College Night came from Jo Faulmann, faculty member of the University of Miami. Prior to the inaugurating of College Night, Faulmann had noticed that many colleges and universities were trying to recruit students throughout the exhibit halls and was concerned that these students might not have the time or proper credentials to access all the exhibits.²⁶⁹ After presenting the idea to the Midwest Board, she set into action her plan of having a concentrated grouping of colleges and universities for a single evening for the sole purpose of recruitment.²⁷⁰ Originally geared towards high school students, College Night flourished into an event where current band and orchestra directors were also looking to continue their education.

Today, the purpose of the Midwest Clinic is: (1) raising instrumental music education standards by advancing pedagogical methodologies, (2) developing innovative teaching techniques, (3) assisting those interested in music education in their professional

²⁶⁸ Ibid., 29.

²⁶⁹ Ibid., 30.

²⁷⁰ Ibid.

work, (4) presenting the newest available repertoire for bands and orchestra, and (5) holding clinics to better music education.²⁷¹ In preparation for the 2024 clinic in December, there are already forty-two publisher exhibit booths registered under the category of “Music Publisher” as of March 12.²⁷² For the 2023 clinic there were a total of twenty performances of wind bands, one of which was a new music reading session where publishers could submit works and have those works performed.²⁷³

The Midwest Clinic is then an *ouroboros* effect in it and of itself but on a much larger scale. Performing ensembles are required per The Midwest Programming Rules that all music must be published by no more than two publishers and be available to the directors, most if not all being represented by the publishers in the exhibit booths and sponsoring the reading sessions.²⁷⁴ Many publishers sponsor exhibits to showcase their products where band directors can peruse scores and listen to recordings of new publications as well as more established works. Retail distributors, such as J.W. Pepper and Midwest Sheet Music, set up their own booths and perform field research on upcoming shifts in trends among the ensemble band directors. The distributors then market those trends to music educators on a national and international scale. This process is then continuously repeated indefinitely.

²⁷¹ “Learn About Our Conference,” Conference, The Midwest Clinic, accessed March 12, 2024, <https://www.midwestclinic.org/conference>.

²⁷² “Exhibitor Hub,” Exhibitors, The Midwest Clinic, accessed March 12, 2024, <https://mwc78.smallworldlabs.com/exhibitors>.

²⁷³ *The 77th Midwest Clinic*, iPhone iOS 14.1 or later ed., v. 2.2.0 (The Midwest Clinic, 2023).

²⁷⁴ “Programming Rules,” The Midwest Clinic.

Chapter V: Beyond the Core, Defining the Next Era

This final chapter invites readers to look beyond the need to define both an intellectual and/or performance core into the next era of the wind band. Although subjective, the comparison of programs at various levels are valuable in identifying trends, but doing so does not inhibit or influence significant programming practices as was seen in Chapter III. The continuous and thus far fruitless attempt to define an intellectual core is an outdated practice that contradicts the beliefs and practices that distinguish wind band medium from any other. To maintain its unique position, the wind band profession should reallocate its energy to fostering diversity, equity, and inclusion in all facets of band activity and to further evolving its programming practices through commissioning that encourages experimentation in composing, programming, and teaching.

As mentioned in Chapter II, one of the issues in defining an intellectual core is that new works have little to no chance of entering the core. The wind band community is constantly fostering the creation of highly artistic music through commissions, consortiums, awards, and premieres. The 2023 Midwest Clinic featured eighteen wind band performances with a total of 214 individual works (refer to Figure B.16). Of those works thirty-seven (17.3%) were transcriptions, 177 (82.7%) were original band compositions, and a total of ninety-nine (46.3%) works were written in the 2020s alone with 56.6% of those works written in 2023. These percentages are misleading because of the Midwest Clinic programming rules “50% of each concert band program must be music published and printed between the preceding year through August 1st of the current

year.”²⁷⁵ The chances of these ninety-nine works entering the intellectual core are slim to none because they were selected to adhere to the rules, not because the works themselves are exemplary. If diversity, equity, and inclusion are prioritized by the wind band community in the twenty-first century then the continued attempts to define an intellectual core run contrary to this principle. The statistical weight of older, more widely performed and studied compositions reflecting the values and homogeneity of earlier eras in the profession is simply too great.

Many band organizations such as the National Band Association (NBA), Music for All (MFA), and CBDNA initiated programs to address gender and ethnicity issues during the early part of the twenty-first century, and these continue today.²⁷⁶ These programs foster mentorships in minority populated schools, provide grants for participation in conducting symposiums, commissions, awards, and conferences. Shifts in programming practices have also promoted an uptick in performances of compositions written by underrepresented composers. The Midwest Clinic provides the following guideline for performance at the clinic,

Diversity in programming and performance is a key objective for the Midwest Clinic. We require your Band or Orchestra program to include at least one composition by a composer from a historically marginalized group such as, but not limited to women, Indigenous/Native, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Asian American, and/or Pacific Islander. Your assigned liaison will provide guidance with your selection process.²⁷⁷

²⁷⁵ “General Programming Rules,” The Midwest Clinic.

²⁷⁶ Battisti (2018), 382.

²⁷⁷ “General Programming Rules,” The Midwest Clinic.

Although well intended, this statement raises two questions: (1) are we programming works by underrepresented composers because their representation is valuable in some way, and (2) what are we representing? Are we only considering external qualities such as gender, ethnicity, or sexual orientation or might it be more worthwhile to diversify our programs through different musics and/or compositional identities? Or should we combine both perspectives? Each offers new insight leading to the possibility of changing our way of thinking about programming practices.

Many underrepresented composers and conductors feel frustrated to be included in programs or on repertoire lists as just a name, as Tyler Ehrlich, Director of Bands at Decatur (GA) High School recounts,

...[in] recent conversation with a friend [it] came up that a composer, who also happens to be a person of color, was going to be added to a diversity repertoire list. This action frustrated her because she felt that she was really just being reduced to a name on a list—there was no intentionality or true appreciation of her music while creating this source.²⁷⁸

The wind band community must remember that while seeking new music written by underrepresented composers, we must not program their works simply to check a box. Tokenization, no matter how well-intentioned, is not the way forward.

American composer Alex Shapiro shares a similar concern but towards programs of all underrepresented composers.

²⁷⁸ Robert Taylor, “Out in Front: Queer Identity and Visibility in the Wind Band—Tyler Ehrlich,” in *The Horizon Leans Forward: Stories of Courage, Strength, and Triumph of Underrepresented Communities in the Wind Band*, ed. Erik Kar Jun Leung (Chicago: GIA Publications 2021), 131.

... I've always been uncomfortable with such a curation. If a marginalized group declares its equality to everyone else in the field yet opts to self-segregate in spite of offering opportunity, the optics of the event risk sending a contrary message that only highlights differences. That message is sometimes weakened by a catch-all approach to programming that frankly, in its exuberance to be inclusive, does not always adhere to the highest compositional standards and consequently risks harming the very concept it seeks to promote.²⁷⁹

Conductors who aim to offer richly diverse programs must put in the time and effort to expose themselves to the vast sea of composers from all backgrounds. The investment of time required to discover, assess, study, and prepare compositions by unfamiliar composers is immense and the prospect is daunting. As a result, many seek shortcuts.²⁸⁰

Identifying a balance between representing a composer's external qualities and providing exposure through teaching and performance for new musics and compositional identities is similarly daunting. Australian composer Jodie Blackshaw suggests "compositional/creative approach as an additional component of diversity that could increase the inclusion of underrepresented composers while transforming wind band music designed for educational purposes."²⁸¹ Blackshaw defines "compositional/creative approach" as the process when writing a work resulting in their fundamental and unique artistic, creative identity.²⁸² Although Blackshaw is writing specifically about educational music, this ideology can also be applied to music for any purpose.

²⁷⁹ Alex Shapiro, "Reaching Out and Bringing Women In," in Leung, 171.

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 167.

²⁸¹ Jodie Blackshaw, "The Repertoire (R)evolution," in Leung, 186–7.

²⁸² *Ibid.*, 187.

Blackshaw identifies two primary motivations of educational institutions for diversifying programs: (1) to better represent the population of performers and audiences and (2) to offer performers and audiences differing elements or qualities.²⁸³ Although she validates these motivations she adds a third suggesting that the selection of repertoire also be based on the various composers' compositional approaches. These might include unusual voicings, rhythmic elements affecting texture, expression of social issues, different performance settings, and more.²⁸⁴ When adding Blackshaw's third perspective the call for diversity extends past external aspects of identity into each composer's being as a creative artist.

Many, if not all, of the national band associations, conferences, educational institutions from elementary through post-secondary schools and professional bands recognize the need to increase diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives in programs and performances. However, the wind band community's fixation on defining an intellectual and/or performance core inhibits these efforts by continually returning focus to a body of literature that is the antithesis of diverse. The wind band community faces not just an opportunity but an obligation to continue to expand its literature—just as generations before have, but with a new task: to commission (1) a broad spectrum of composers not just to check a box but for the artistry of their music, and (2) works springing from a broad spectrum of compositional/creative approaches as defined by Blackshaw.

The purpose of this study is to show that the modern wind band is defined in part by a longstanding commitment to the robust growth of its literature that started in the

²⁸³ Ibid., 191.

²⁸⁴ Ibid.

early twentieth century and has continued at an exponential rate through the mid and late-twentieth century and into the new millennium. Current professional practice ensures that the wind band literature will continue to expand, and the ever-increasing presence of composers of diverse backgrounds, identities, and artistic practices will result in a growing body of high quality, highly diverse compositions. Pursuit of diversity and inclusion, rather than repeated attempts to classify and exclude, is the next logical step for a medium dedicated to experimentation, exploration, novelty, and growth.

Whitwell identified three literature crises in the twentieth century, but we are facing a fourth. Just as the attempts to standardize instrumentation failed, so too will attempts to standardize literature through the definition of an intellectual core. Fennell took a risk and his experiments had a profound positive effect on the trajectory of the wind band into the late-twentieth century. The time has come for the entire community to follow his lead not with the band's instrumentation, but with its literature. It is time to set aside our obsession with a core literature and embrace what could prove to be our medium's unique strength: diversity.

References

- Battisti, Frank L. "My View of the Wind Repertoire Part I: 1900–59." *The Instrumentalist* 44, no. 4 (November 1989): 12–17, 105.
- . "My View of the Wind Repertoire (1960–74)." *The Instrumentalist* 44, no. 4 (November 1989): 16–20, 88.
- . "My View of the Wind Repertoire (1975–89)." *The Instrumentalist* 44, no. 5 (December 1989): 19–22, 36.
- . *The New Winds of Change: The Evolution of the Contemporary American Wind Band/Ensemble and Its Music*. Chicago: Meredith Music Publications, 2018.
- . *The Twentieth Century American Wind Band/Ensemble: History, Development and Literature*. Fort Lauderdale: Meredith Music Publications, 1995.
- . *The Winds of Change*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music Publications, 2002.
- . *Winds of Change II: The New Millennium*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music Publications, 2012.
- Begian, Harry. "Standards of Excellence for Band Repertoire." *The Instrumentalist* 45, no. 1 (January 1991): 10–3, 55.
- Blocher, Larry, Ray Cramer, Eugene Corporon, Tim Lautzenheiser, Edward S. Lisk, and Richard Miles. *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band*. Edited by Richard Miles. Chicago: GIA Publications, 1997.
- , and Jack Stamp. *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band*. Vol. 2. Edited by Richard Miles. Chicago: GIA Publications, 1998.
- Blocher, Larry, Eugene Migliaro Corporon, Ray Cramer, Tim Lautzenheiser, Edward S. Lisk, and Richard Miles. *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band*. Vol. 3. Edited by Richard Miles. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2000.
- . *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band*. Vol. 4. Edited by Richard Miles. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2002.

- . *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band*. Vol. 5. Edited by Richard Miles. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2004.
- . *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band*. Vol. 6. Edited by Richard Miles. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2007.
- . *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band*. Vol. 7. Edited by Richard Miles. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2009.
- . *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band*. Vol. 8. Edited by Richard Miles. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2011.
- . *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band*. Vol. 9. Edited by Richard Miles. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2013.
- . *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band*. Vol. 10. Edited by Richard Miles. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2015.
- . *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band*. Vol. 11. Edited by Richard Miles. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2018.
- , and Andrew Trachsel. *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band*. Vol. 12. Edited by Andrew Trachsel. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2021.
- Bauer, William I. "The Selection of Concert Band Music by High School Band Directors." *Update: applications of research in music education* 15, no. 1 (Fall/Winter 1996): 4–9.
- Beeler, Walter. "More Band Color." *The Instrumentalist* 19, no. 1 (August 1964): 58–60.
- Bierley, Paul E. *John Philip Sousa, American Phenomenon*. Columbus: Integrity Press, 1986.
- Blackshaw, Jodie. "The Repertoire (R)evolution." In Leung, 186–226. Leung, Erik Kar Jun, ed. *The Horizon Leans Forward: Stories of Courage, Strength, and Triumph of Underrepresented Communities in the Wind Band*. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2021.

- Bodiford, Kenneth G. "Evolution of Contemporary College Wind Band Repertoire and Programming in the United States: 1800-2010." DMA diss., University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, 2012. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Bryant, Tim. "Shattinger Music Remains in Business." *St. Louis Today* (May 28, 2013). https://www.stltoday.com/news/local/column/shattinger-music-remains-in-business/article_73c76421-187b-5fa0-9ee6-83db2aee08cb.html.
- Brewer, Wesley. "A Content Analysis of Recommended Composers in Repertoire Lists for Band." *Research and issues in music education* 14, no. 1 (2018). <https://ir.stthomas.edu/rime/vol14/iss1/3>.
- Bruning Jr., Earl H. "A Survey and Handbook of Analysis for the Conducting and Interpretation of Seven Selected Works in the Standard Repertoire for Wind Band." DA diss., Ball State University, Muncie, IN, 1980.
- Bryan, Paul. "The State of the Repertoire: Some Observations and Suggestions." *Journal of Band Research* 9, no. 1 (Fall 1972): 3–8. ProQuest Dissertations & Global Theses.
- Bryant, Tim. "Shattinger Music Remains in Business." *St. Louis Today*. (May 28, 2013). https://www.stltoday.com/news/local/column/shattinger-music-remains-in-business/article_73c76421-187b-5fa0-9ee6-83db2aee08cb.html.
- Budiansky, Stephen. "The Kids Play Great. But That Music..." *The Washington Post* (January 30, 2005): 1–3. <https://budiansky.com/WashPost.pdf>.
- Camus, Raoul F. "Band in the United States." *Grove Music Online*, 2013. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.libproxy.unl.edu/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/0-mo-9781561592630-e-1002252742>.
- Cardany, Brian M. "Attitudes Toward Repertoire and the Band Experience Among Participants in the Elite University Wind Band Programs." DMA diss., Arizona State University, Tempe, 2006.

- Cipolla, Frank J. and Donald Hunsberger, eds. *The Wind Ensemble and its Repertoire: Essays on the Fortieth Anniversary of the Eastman Wind Ensemble*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1994.
- College Band Directors National Association. "Revealing Survey: Band Directors Dissatisfied with Their Education." *The Instrumentalist* 30, no. 8 (March 1976): 101–3.
- Devore, Deborah Marko. "Choral Music Repertoire Selection in the Ohio Music Education Association Large Group High School Concerts." PhD. diss., Kent State University, Kent, OH, 1989. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
- Dello Joio, Norman. "The Quality of Music." *Music Educators Journal* 48, no. 5 (April/May, 1962): 33–5. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3389578>.
- Dvorak, Raymond F. "International Band Score." *The Instrumentalist* 7, no. 2 (October 1952): 12–3, 45.
- Dvorak, Thomas L., Robert Grechesky, and Gary M. Ciepluch. *Best Music for High School Band: A Selective Repertoire Guide for High School Bands & Wind Ensembles*. Edited by Bob Margolis. Brooklyn: Manhattan Beach Music, 1993.
- . *Best Music for Young Band: A Selective Guide to the Young Band/Young Wind Ensemble Repertoire*. Brooklyn: Manhattan Beach Music, 1986.
- Fennell, Frederick. "Basic Band Repertory." *The Instrumentalist* 29, no. 7 (February 1975): 28–9.
- . "The Wind Ensemble." *American Music Teacher* 2, no. 4 (March/April 1953): 12–3, 16–7. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43531458>.
- . *Time and the Winds*. Huntersville, NC: NorthLand Music Publishers, 2009.
- Fernandes, Kathy. Interview by author via Microsoft Teams. February 2, 2024.
- Fiese, Richard K. "College and University Wind Band Repertoire 1980-1985." *Journal of Band Research* 23, no. 1 (Fall 1987): 17–42. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

- Fitzgerald, Bernard. "Trends in Contemporary Band Music." *The Instrumentalist* 15, no. 1 (September 1950): 52–3.
- Fonder, Mark. "A Bird's Eye View of the Golden Age of Professional Bands: On Beyond Sousa." *NBA Journal* 53, no. 2 (Winter 2013): 18–23.
- Furey, Edward. "Percentile Calculator." CalculatorSoup. Last modified September 19, 2023. <https://www.calculatorsoup.com/calculators/statistics/percentile-calculator.php>.
- Gabriel, Arnold D. "New Concert Band Repertoire." *The Instrumentalist* 39, no. 5 (December 1984): 13.
- Gaines, David Alan. "A Core Repertoire of Concert Music for High School Band." *Journal of Band Research* 34, no. 1 (Fall 1998): 1–24. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- . "A Core Repertoire of Concert Music for High School Band: A Descriptive Study." DE diss., Columbia University, New York, 1996.
- Garofalo, Robert J. Review of *An Evaluation of Compositions for Wind Band According to Specific Criteria of Serious Artistic Merit* by Acton Eric Ostling. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* no. 64 (Fall 1980): 55–8. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40317625>.
- Gerow, Maurice. "A Study of the Relation Between the Criteria Used for Choral Concert Program Building at the College Level and an Analysis of the Elements of the Music Structure Found in Choral Music." Doc diss., Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1961. Dissertation Abstracts, 22, 3689.
- Gilbert, Jay Warren. "An Evaluation of Compositions for Wind Band According to Specific Criteria of Serious Artistic Merit: A Replication and Update." DM doc., Northwestern University, Evanston, 1993. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Goldman, Edwin Franko. *Band Betterment: Suggestions and Advice to Bands, Bandmasters, and Band-players*. New York: Carl Fischer, 1934.

- Goldman, Richard Franko. "Bands in War-Time." *Modern Music* 19, no. 3 (March 1942).
Quoted in Richard K. Hansen. *The American Wind Band: A Cultural History*.
Chicago: GIA Publications, 2005.
- . *The Band's Music*. New York: Pitman Publishing, 1938.
- . "The Band Proves Its Right to the Concert Hall." *The New York Times*
(December 28, 1947). Quoted in Richard K. Hansen. *The American Wind Band: A
Cultural History*. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2005.
- . *The Concert Band*. New York: Rinehart & Co., 1946.
- . *The Wind Band: Its Literature and Technique*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.,
1961.
- Grant, Gary Samuel. "An Evaluation by Missouri High School Band Directors of Criteria
Used to Select Concert Band Music." PhD. diss., University of Missouri,
Columbia, 1993. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
- Grashel, John W. Review of *The University Band: Its Repertoire and the Prospective
Music Educator* by Donald Leslie Peterson. *Bulletin of the Council for Research
in Music Education* no. 100 (Spring 1989): 95–7.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/40318278>.
- Green, Elizabeth A. H. *The Modern Conductor*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-
Hall, Inc., 1969. Quoted in Earl H. Bruning Jr., "A Survey and Handbook of
Analysis for the Conducting and Interpretation of Seven Selected Works in the
Standard Repertoire for Wind Band, (DA diss., Ball State University, Muncie, IN,
1980).
- Groulx, Timothy J. "Creating the Canon of Wind Band Literature: A History of the
National Contest Literature Lists, 1924–1943." *Journal of Research in Music
Education* (2023): 1–24.
- Halseth, Robert Edmore Powell. "The Impact of the College Band Directors National
Association on Wind Band Repertoire." DA diss., University of Northern
Colorado, Greeley, 1987.

- Hanna, Dan H. "Revolving Repertoire for College Band?." *The Instrumentalist* 18, no. 4 (November 1963): 56.
- Hansen, Richard K. *The American Wind Band: A Cultural History*. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2005.
- Hayward, Carol M. "A Course in Band Literature Based on a Standard Repertoire Developed from the Opinions of Selected Collegiate and Secondary School Band Directors." DMA diss., The Ohio State University, Columbus, 2004. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Holvik, Karl M. "An Emerging Band Repertory, A Survey of the Members of the College Band Directors National Association." *Journal of Band Research* 6, no. 2 (Spring 1970): 19–24. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- . And David Whitwell. "The Emergence of a New Band Literature." *Music Educators Journal* 62, no. 5 (January 1976): 64–6.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3394982>.
- Holz, Emil A. "The Schools Band Contest of America (1923)." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 10, no. 1 (Spring 1962): 3–12.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3343906>.
- Hopwood, Brian Keith. "Wind Band Repertoire: Programming Practices at Conventions of the College Band Directors National Association." DMA diss., Arizona State University, Tempe, 1998.
- Howard, Ronald L. "Repertoire Selection Practices and the Development of a Core Repertoire for the Middle School Concert Band." PhD diss., University of Florida, Gainesville, 2001. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Hughes, Brian. "Survey of Band Repertoire." *The Instrumentalist* 45, no. 4 (November 1990): 60–5.
- Hunsberger, Donald R. "Repertoire for Wind Conductors." *The Instrumentalist* 32, no. 2 (September 1977): 44–6.

- Johnston, Donald O. "Composing for the Wind Band." *The Instrumentalist* 20, no. 10 (May 1966): 56–8.
- Jones, Patrick M. "A Review of Dissertations about Concert Band Repertoire with Applications for School and Collegiate Bands." *Journal of Band Research* 40, no. 2 (Spring 2005): 60–83.
- J.W. Pepper. "Since 1876." *Pepper Timeline*. Accessed March 11, 2024. <https://www.jwpepper.com/since1876#1>.
- . "What are the benefits of using My Score?." FAQs. *My Score Support*. Last modified March 16, 2021. <https://myscoresupport.jwpepper.com/support/solutions/articles/61000291237-what-are-the-benefits-of-using-my-score->.
- Kish, David L. "A Band Repertoire has Emerged." *Journal of Band Research* 41, no. 1 (Fall 2005): 1–12.
- Kreines, Joseph. *Music for Concert Band: A Selective Annotated Guide to Band Literature*. Tampa: Florida Music Service, 1989.
- Lasko, Richard. "The CBDNA: A Study of Band Instrumentation." *Contributions to Music Education* no. 1 (Autumn, 1972): 46–55. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24127366>.
- Leitzel, Galen E. "The History and Development of the American Public School Concert Band, (1920–1941) and its Influence on Concert Band Repertoire." DMA diss., Shenandoah Conservatory of Shenandoah University, Winchester, VA, 2006.
- Lyons, Brendan. "A History of Service: Bringing Musicians Together." *J.W. Pepper & Son, Inc.*, September 15, 2016. <https://blogs.jwpepper.com/a-history-of-service-bringing-musicians-together/>.
- . "A History of Service: Editors' Choice." *J.W. Pepper & Son, Inc.*, June 2, 2016. <https://blogs.jwpepper.com/a-history-of-service-editors-choice/>.
- . "A History of Service: Music Education." *J.W. Pepper & Son, Inc.*, August 18, 2016. <https://blogs.jwpepper.com/a-history-of-service-music-education/>.

- . “A History of Service: Pepper Buildings.” *J.W. Pepper & Son, Inc.*, November 9, 2016. <https://blogs.jwpepper.com/a-history-of-service-pepper-buildings/>.
- . “A History of Service: The Pepper Catalog.” *J.W. Pepper & Son, Inc.*, March 24, 2016. <https://blogs.jwpepper.com/a-history-of-service-the-pepper-catalog/>.
- . “A History of Service: Pepper Instruments.” *J.W. Pepper & Son, Inc.*, July 12, 2016. <https://blogs.jwpepper.com/a-history-of-service-pepper-instruments/>.
- . “A History of Service: The Pepper Website.” *J.W. Pepper & Son, Inc.*, April 27, 2016. <https://blogs.jwpepper.com/a-history-of-service-the-pepper-website/>.
- Maddy, Joseph E. “The Battle of Band Instrumentation.” *Music Educators Journal* 44, no. 1 (Sept. – Oct. 1957), 32, 35, 37. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3388785>.
- Manfredo, Joseph. “Albert Austin Harding and His Influence on the Development of the Instrumentation of the American Collegiate Wind Band.” *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, no. 125 (Summer, 1995): 60–74. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40318726>.
- Mark, Michael L. *A Concise History of American Music Education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2008.
- Martin, Michael D. “Band Schools of the United States: A Historical Overview.” *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* 21, no. 1 (October 1999): 41–61. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40215205>.
- McAllister, A. R. “National School Band Contests.” *Music Supervisors’ Journal* 19, no. 4 (March 1933): 25. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3383890>.
- McBeth, W. Francis. “The Evolving Band Repertoire.” *The Instrumentalist* 50, no. 1 (August 1995): 20–5.
- Midwest Sheet Music. “Our Store.” *Midwest Sheet Music Team*. Accessed March 12, 2024. <https://www.midwestsheetmusic.com/page/our-store/>.

- Moore, James E. "National School Band Contests between 1926 and 1931." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 20, no. 2 (Summer 1972): 233–45.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3344089>.
- National Band Association. "Selective Music Lists." Accessed May 2, 2024.
<https://nationalbandassociation.org/selective-music-lists/>.
- Naxos. "Wind Band Classics." Edition/Series. Accessed March 14, 2024.
https://www.naxos.com/EditionSeries/Detail/?title=Wind_Band_Classics.
- Negro, R.A. "Selected Recommended Repertoire Lists for Concert Band: A Content Analysis." Unpublished master's thesis, Bowling Green State University, 1994.
- Norcross, Brian, Frank Battisti, Warren Benson, and Frederick Fennell. "Spotlight on American Band Education." *Music Educators Journal* 78 no. 5 (January 1992): 53–8. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3398238>.
- Odegard, Edfield Arthur. "The Current Status of the Symphony Band the Medium and its Music." PhD diss., University of Iowa, Iowa City, 1955.
- Olson, Robert H. "A Core Repertoire for the Wind Ensemble." *Journal of Band Research* 18, no. 1 (Fall 1982): 11–35. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Ostling, Jr., Acton Eric. "An Evaluation of Compositions for Wind Band According to Specific Criteria of Serious Artistic Merit." PhD. diss., University of Iowa, Iowa City, 1978.
- . "College Band Repertoire." *The Instrumentalist* 33, no. 12 (July 1979): 20–2.
- Paul, Timothy A. "Pac-Ten Wind Ensemble Programming Trends." *Journal of Band Research* 47, no. 1 (Fall 2011): 49–61.
- . "Programming Practices of Big Twelve University Wind Ensembles." *Journal of Band Research* 47, no. 2 (2012): 11–26.
- Peterson, Donald Leslie. "The University Band: Its Repertoire and the Prospective Music Educator." DMA diss., Arizona State University, Tempe, 1986.

- Platt, Russell. "The Quest for Good Music and the Role of the Symphonic Band." *Journal of the World Association for Symphonic Bands and Ensembles* 6, (1999): 58–9. Quoted in Richard K. Hansen. *The American Wind Band: A Cultural History*. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2005.
- Powell, Sean R. "Recent Programming Trends of Big Ten University Wind Ensembles." *Journal of Band Research* 44, no. 2 (Spring 2009): 1–12.
- Prescott, Gerald R. and Lawrence W. Chidester. *Getting Results with School Bands*. Minneapolis: Paul A. Schmitt Music Co., 1938.
- Revelli, William D. "How Music Can Help Win the War." *Etude* (November 1942): 741, 779. Quoted in Richard K. Hansen. *The American Wind Band: A Cultural History*. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2005.
- . "Report on International Instrumentation." *The College and University Band: An Anthology of Papers from the conferences of the College Band Directors National Association, 1941–1975*. Edited by David Whitwell and Acton Ostling Jr. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference, 1977.
- . "The School Band Movement." *Music Educators Journal* 23, no. 5 (March 1937): 32–3, 35. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3384579>.
- Reynolds, H. Robert. "Band Conducting as a Profession." *The Instrumentalist* 27 (May 1973): 66–70.
- . *Core Repertoire*. Unpublished.
- . "Letter from Readers: Re: CBDNA (Bowles) Position." *The Instrumentalist* 25, no. 3 (October 1970): 8–11.
- . "Repertoire is the Curriculum." *Music Educators Journal* 87, no. 1 (July 2000): 31–3. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3399675>.
- Rhea, Timothy Brett. "An Evaluation of Wind Band Compositions in the Texas Public School Setting According to Specific Criteria of Artistic Merit." DMA doc., University of Houston, Houston, 1999.

- Samson, Jim. "Canon (iii)." *Grove Music Online*. 2001. Accessed February 10, 2024. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.libproxy.unl.edu/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000040598>.
- Schaefer, William. "Is There an Emerging Band Repertoire?." *The Instrumentalist* 21, no. 9 (1967): 50–2.
- . "The Emerging Band Repertoire." *The College and University Band: An Anthology of Papers from the conferences of the College Band Directors National Association, 1941–1975*. Edited by David Whitwell and Acton Ostling Jr. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference, 1977.
- Schmalz, Peter. "Improving Band Literature." *The Instrumentalist* 45, no. 3 (October 1990): 56–8.
- Shapiro, Alex. "Reaching Out and Bringing Women." In Leung, 157–83.
- Sheldon, Deborah A. "Preservice and In-Service Teachers' Perceptions of Band Music Content and Quality Using Self-Report and Behavioral Measures." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 48, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 10–25. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3345453>.
- . "The Difficult Art of Writing Creative Music for Young Bands." *The Instrumentalist* 57, no. 12 (July 2003): 25–9.
- Smith, Norman. *March Music Notes*. Chicago: GIA Publications, Inc., 2002. Quoted in Richard K. Hansen. *The American Wind Band: A Cultural History*. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2005.
- Taylor, Robert. "Out in Front: Queer Identity and Visibility in the Wind Band—Tyler Ehrlich." In Leung, 117–56.
- The Instrumentalist. "The Best in Band Music." *The Instrumentalist* 12, no. 11 (August 1958): 74–76.
- The Supervisors Service. "State and National High School and Grammar School Band Contests." *The Supervisors Service* 3, no. 4 (1924): 4, 40–2. Quoted in Timothy J.

Groulx. "Creating the Canon of Wind Band Literature: A History of the National Contest Literature Lists, 1924–1943." *Journal of Research in Music Education* (2023): 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00224294231201073>.

———. "Friendly Advice from Directors and Industry." *The Instrumentalist* 20, no. 12 (July 1999): 20–2, 24, 27–8, 87–8.

The Midwest Clinic. "Exhibitor Hub." Exhibitors. Accessed March 12, 2024. <https://mwc78.smallworldlabs.com/exhibitors>.

———. "General Programming Rules." Conference. Accessed March 15, 2024. <https://www.midwestclinic.org/programming-rules>.

———. "Learn About Our Conference." Conference. Accessed March 12, 2024. <https://www.midwestclinic.org/conference>.

———. "Performance FAQs." Performance Application FAQs. Accessed March 28, 2024. https://www.midwestclinic.org/Performance_FAQs.

———. "Reading Sessions". iPhone iOS 14.1 or later ed., v. 2.2.0. The Midwest Clinic, 2023.

Thomas, Raymond David. "An Evaluation of Compositions for Wind Band, Grades III and IV, according to Specific Criteria of Artistic Merit." PhD thesis, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1998.

Towner, Clifford N. "An Evaluation of Compositions for Wind Band According to Specific Criteria of Serious Artistic Merit: A Second Update." DMA doc., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 2011. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Tremaine, C. M. "School Bands and Band Contests." *The Journal of Education* 109, no. 13 (April 1929): 368–9. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42837548>.

Umar, Frederick. "An Evaluation of the Ostling Research Design for Establishing a Repertoire of Serious Artistic Merit." DE diss., La Sierra University, Riverside, CA, 2017. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

University of Colorado Bands. *Standard Repertoire*. Unpublished.

- Wallace, David and Eugene Corporon. *Wind Ensemble/Band Repertoire*. Greeley: The University of Northern Colorado, 1984.
- Wallace, Jacob. "On Repertoire." *In The Future of the Wind Band*, edited by William M. Perrine, 113–28. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2021.
- Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, unabridged, and Seven Language Dictionary*. Springfield, MA: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1976.
- Whitwell, David. *A Concise History of the Wind Band*. Edited by Craig Dabelstein. 2nd ed. Austin: Whitwell Publishing, 2010.
- . "The Band Director as Scholar." *The Instrumentalist* 27, no. 4 (November 1972): 67–70.
- . "Three Crises in Band Repertoire." *The Instrumentalist* 19, no. 8 (March 1965): 36–7, 68–9.
- Wiggins, Timothy D. "Analytical Research of Wind Band Core Repertoire." PhD diss., Florida State University, Tallahassee, 2013. FSU Digital Library.
- Wilson, Keith. "Instrumentation is the Composer's Prerogative." *The Instrumentalist* 18, no. 3 (October 1963): 275–6.
- Wiltshire, Eric S., Timothy A. Paul, Phyllis M. Paul, and Erika Rudnicki. "Programming Practices of Atlantic Coast Conference Wind Ensembles." *Contributions to Music Education* 37, no. 2 (2010): 45–63. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24127226>.
- Wind Repertory Project. "CBDNA 1967 National Conference." Concerts. Last Modified August 11, 2019. https://www.windrep.org/Concerts:CBDNA_1967_National_Conference.
- . "CBDNA 2009 National Conference." Concerts. Last Modified July 15, 2022. https://www.windrep.org/Concerts:CBDNA_2009_National_Conference.
- . "2023 Midwest Clinic Concerts." Concerts. Last Modified January 5, 2024. https://www.windrep.org/Concerts:2023_Midwest_Clinic_Concerts.

Woike, David Otto. "Wind Band Performance Repertoire at the University Level: A Survey of Collegiate Wind Band Curricula and Current Repertoire Selection Processes." PhD diss., The Ohio State University, Columbus, 1990. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Young, Craig S. "The Quality of Repertoire Chosen by High School Wind Band Conductors and the Resources and Criteria Used to Choose This Literature." PhD diss., The Ohio State University, Columbus, 1998. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Zajec, Victor. *The First 50 Years*. Dallas: Taylor Publishing, 1996.

Appendix A: Interview Transcription

Interviewer: Trevor Frost, Doctoral Candidate at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Interviewee: Kathy Fernandes, Chief Sales and Marketing Officer of J.W. Pepper & Son, Inc.

Interview Setting: Interview was performed on Microsoft Teams on Friday, February 2, 2024, at 8 a.m.

(Start of Interview)

Trevor Frost (TF): Let me pull this up for you. I can read this to you if you'd like.

Kathy Fernandes (KF): Sure.

TF: I'm doing a research exploratory document. As my primary sources, I'm using the Ostling study regarding core repertoire, Jay Gilbert's update to the core repertoire, and then Clifford Towner's second update in 2011 as kind of like the three main sources of research here. So as part of my proposal, and this is quoted in my proposal, "These four studies," I'm including the Robert Olson core repertoire for the wind ensemble in 1982. So, "These four studies spanning 33 years were dedicated to defining a core repertoire, but each one contains new works that show greater merit is being discovered. New works for wind bands are constantly being written, which is a defining feature of the wind band, at least since the work of Albert Austin Harding, Edwin Franko Goldman, Revelli, Fennell, and others in the 20th century. If the modern wind band is defined in part by commitment to robust growth of its repertoire, then the persistent efforts to define a fixed core seems to be futile. I intend to start a dialogue within the wind band community to demonstrate that the continuous work to define a core distracts from more pressing issues

such as commissioning new works, calling for more inclusivity in educational institutions, and the evolution of programming practices.”

KF: Okay, that’s helpful because that can help me not focus in areas where it may not be as fruitful to your research.

TF: Okay.

KF: I have just kind of an opening perspective to help understand the answers to questions. Because J.W. Pepper is a retailer, we have a different vantage point around core repertoire. As I was driving to work this morning saying, how am I going to explain what we do? And we’re specialty retail, right? Our specialty is music. I often think of us like a pet store. People love their pets; people love their music. But a pet store can’t sell what they’re not able to sell, right? So, we go out and scour the globe, from our desks, but also out at all kinds of events. And you mentioned some of the commission projects, we sponsor some such as the Revelli. We hold reading sessions all around the country, a lot of them choral, where it’s a grassroots effort to find, you know, there might be a local composer who gets on a local reading session. That’s fabulous because we’re going to be able to take that music and bring it into potentially a much broader audience. So we are also heavily supportive of self-publishing, although, as a business, and for reasons very practical, we always recommend people get published if you can, because publishers perform critical functions. Not the least of which is that everybody could use an editor.

TF: Right.

KF: Anybody who’s ever hit send out an email says, “Oh, I wish I looked at that.”

TF: (*laughs*)

KF: Not all of us can have the same level of expertise in everything on every instrument in every ensemble type. So that we find that it is such an underappreciated aspect of what a publisher does. Hopefully a good publisher will edit and say, “Hey, you chose this, are you sure you want to do that? Because that takes us piece from being here to here.” Just imagine the value of having a dialogue with somebody who’s looking at your work for your own benefit. That is what we see in self-publishing when two composers get together, they start talking. And they’ll be like, “I was really interested in why you did this.” An editor would have had that conversation with them just as part of their every day. So that being said, if I go back to that pet store thought, we’re limited in what we can do if somebody doesn’t want their products on our shelf. But what we are going to do as a company is to try to represent the spectrum of repertoire. But commissions, they are out of our hands initially, until they get published or the composer makes them available. And the other thing that will happen is if we can’t come to any business terms. Some people just don’t want anybody else to handle their music. And that’s okay, that is their right. But sometimes we hear, “why don’t you have this.” But it’s like, “we’ve been trying for 10 years.” (*laughs*)

TF: (*laughs*) Right.

KF: We can’t sell it. So that’s why I use the pet store analogy. It’s like, “I can’t sell a leash if the leash manufacturer doesn’t let us sell it out of the store.” And because we are also retail. I love your thesis. Because we are not about a fixed core repertoire. We’re about this dance with directors who are making decisions. And we are both—it’s like

who leads who follows, right? We're saying, "oh, we're seeing a tendency towards this."

My gosh, most recent flex band.

You know, the whole world needed to be flexible.

TF: Right.

KF: So, flex band picked up. We saw [people] were looking for more resources. We talked with publishers and composers saying, "if you can make it flex, we're seeing that people really are looking for that." So that's a relatively recent example. And the other bit I wanted to just kind of lay out there is that Pepper serves many markets. We add over 60,000 pieces of music a year to our database, we have 1.2 million products. We love the Holst suites, right? But then we also are trying to find that new composer as well, and establish a way to work with them. But the majority of our business is going to be for the younger grade levels, just because of the sheer numbers of the schools and performing organizations. If we talk about rubrics and selection and all of that, there are some divides at how we look at something as it is audience dependent. How we look at a piece of sacred music for church use is going to be different than how we look at a piece for collegiate or adult community choir use. And that's what we do, we try to say, "here's what this piece is, here are all these audiences, where can we and how can we help people find this piece? How can we help this piece find its audience?" So that's what we think our job is, is to try to connect that. But there's all kinds of products and there's all kinds of people. So that's why I'm usually tired on a Friday morning. *(laughs)*

TF: *(laughs)* That makes sense.

KF: Well, but it's actually super cool, right? As a musician, I get it. It can either be the perfect piece or perfectly wrong.

TF: Right.

KF: So that's kind of the background of our role. But other than that, I can help with whatever questions you have.

TF: You had mentioned that kind of like a who follows who kind of thing in regards to programming trends. How do I phrase this? Do you take a look at programs from like the Midwest Clinic or like CBDNA, stuff like that? Or do you just send out a survey to folks like, "what are you programming," kind of thing?

KF: For the Midwest, pieces performed at Midwest, we put out a way for customers to see what those are. So, I say customers, because again, we have a website, so people come in, hopefully they're going to shop with us. And we advertise it, we'll send out an email to, to music directors after, after the conference, see what was performed at Midwest. And that's actually quite a bit of work because there's a lot of works performed by different organizations. We don't often get the list until just before the event. And then we go and do research. Okay, here are all the pieces. So, we share that. So that should reflect most of what's done at Midwest. It will not reflect the commissions because if they're not available for sale yet, we have no way of advertising them. And, and again, I mentioned in our initial hellos that there may be publishers or composers who are not making the works available for sale, so that's the limitation. We can put everything out there we are allowed to show.

TF: Yeah.

KF: If we don't have a way to say this is what it is, we'll struggle. We don't have any way to present it because it doesn't, it can't exist in our systems. So, we do that for Midwest.

CBDNA, for many years we tried to put the programs, tag pieces that were on different programs and by whom. It was a tremendous amount of work because there's nothing identifying that music. We just found it was too burdensome to do. So, to your point, are we scouring those? No, we are, we are primarily looking at sources such as the state and festivals that are happening across the country.

TF: Okay.

KF: We are also in attendance at many of the MEA events and the band and choir events across the country. So, we're also looking at, —are there composers, are there trends that seem to be really resonating? And should we lean into those topics, if you will, or those particular composers? If there's somebody that's like, “wow, they did a session and it was really well attended, a lot of enthusiasm,” that might be something that we try to do an ad around and say, “hey, if you considered the music of,” you know, here's something special about this particular, either individual or type of music. So as far as going to the core repertoire lists, —we don't typically do that. I was a former band product reviewer here at Pepper. I would use them more as is there something we're missing? Is there something basic we're missing here? Because we probably have most of those works available to us because of that research work that we're always doing.

TF: —Great. That's very helpful. I appreciate it. —In our beginning correspondent, you had answered a question that I had, ... I'm just going to quote you here. “They

recommend pieces with qualities that can inspire and appropriately challenge students while supporting directors and teaching technique, musicality, and cultural, historical significance.” I was wondering if you could expand on the musicality and the cultural, historical significance for me, like for J.W. Pepper, what is the criteria of those terms?

KF: So probably a similar track. We’re listening. So, we’re at events, we’re talking with teachers, our team of reviewers are directors and teachers in their various areas. So, if there are trends, and when we say cultural, you know, I’ll say Barbie movie, right?

(laughs) That was cultural this year.

TF: Right.

KF: Okay. There’s Barbie music. We’ll certainly sell it and probably put an ad together because a lot of people are interested. Then there are some that look like they’re going to be good, and they don’t really resonate musically. There might be something of interest in the general population that doesn’t really translate into being programmed per se. I don’t want to give an example because like, here’s one we thought was going to be great.

(laughs)

TF: Yeah. I don’t need to know that. (laughs)

KF: (laughs) ... So, when we say cultural, there could be a number of things. So, one of the things that’s coming up is Pepper’s 150th anniversary of its founding. It’s also going to be the 250th of the United States. So, that’s something, right? So, we’ll be looking for what are the celebrations going to be? What are the musical needs for programming during that time? What does that look like? How can we be prepared to support it? And that that’s still a couple of years away... There’s certainly a desire to have varied

programming, and I mean that stylistically, and different composer voices. And, although I think that's always existed, it has a much brighter spotlight on it now. I don't think directors were ever going to do a concert of all, you know, marches and it's going to be great. Nobody wants that. ... Stylistically people have looked for variety. I think sometimes it's about authenticity, which is terrific. That's a terrific shift, not a big shift because I think musicians have always appreciated authentic research, authentic style. You know, do I write a piece of a certain culture or geography? Have I done my research about it? Am I making up a tune that kind of sounds like, which stylistically might be okay, but it might culturally and authenticity wise, not be so okay without doing the research. And, and I think that people are being more careful, I think, to bring [their research] to the fore if they are composing something that's not part of their experience. Those are some trends and what we try to do in our role is to talk to publishers and writers about some of the things that we see, ... we're hearing from directors through phone calls, through emails, through our engagements at events, through social media. ... We try to have those conversations and do a lot of listening so that we can adjust. I've got a lot of bad examples, but I'll give them to you. (laughs) In, I'm not going to get the year right. There was a time when Big Bad Voodoo Daddy, Brian Setzer Orchestra, right? When those, those bands became very popular, suddenly jazz ensemble in a school was a hot thing... Prior to that, it was always cool, but it wasn't like every kid wanted to be in that band.

TF: Right.

KF: So, that was a trend that it was directly tied to this kind of music cultural thing, which was now that the swing bands are hot, right, and so all of that, comes to bear. We're trying to see that and say, "okay, this is something we can really help talk about." But are there any specific questions you have in that regard? It's such a broad topic.

TF: Yeah. I know it's always different for everyone and the criteria. —I don't know if this is going to be another broad question, but I'll try to narrow it down a little bit. This is another quote from you, "the Pepper editors evaluate the music's musical and pedagogical value." I was just wondering is there like a team of editors who targets music, like church music, choral music, band music? Is there a team of editors who work together? Are there single people who work these out?

KF: So the answer is yes to both. We have editors that were hired because they have and are active in the area that they review. We have people that have individual responsibilities to, create the promotions we have. So, we have people that are responsible for orchestra or marching band, that type of thing. We have school choral, church choral, collegiate community so there's lots of layers and lots of different types of musical use. And if you think of it as kind of the broad-based musical ensemble genre, that that's about right. Band, choir, orchestra, and there's different types. You might have one individual who's looking at both beginning level concert band and they might then say, "this is for the advanced high schools, collegiate bands." The very important work that they do is to first identify its audience, at that layer, "I'm going to look at this differently because this is for advanced players and this one's for beginning players." So, we have attributes that we put on it. Its genre, is it a march? What is it? It's difficulty

level. And what we try to do at Pepper is be consistent within ourselves. We'll look at what a publisher or a composer puts on the music, but we look at that and go, "no, they're, they're grade five is really our six."

TF: Right.

KF: Like kids will get hurt playing this. (*laughs*)

TF: (*laughs*) Yeah.

KF: ... So we'll do that, which people don't always love, but if they're shopping on our website, we need to be consistent. And you can always see what it says on the cover and in the score. We'll give you the tools to look at it. But in general, we try to help for you to be able to filter and get where you need to be. When we talked a little bit earlier about musicality and appropriateness for the level, and it's pedagogical, I'm going to throw all this together. I'll give real examples. When I was reviewing music, I was always so happy to see a grade two [written] in six-eight time, (*laughs*) or compound meter of any kind, because how am I going to teach that if there isn't music?

TF: Yeah.

KF: We have to do right by the kids. So, that's an example of the pedagogical value. It might be independence of parts, but maybe not for a very young grade level. It might be okay to not have complete instrumentation at an elementary or middle school group. What are the doublings? So that's a lot of the pedagogical, how can have a good musical experience and a learning experience through that music when you get to the upper levels. It's a very different animal, right?

TF: Right.

KF: Do you expect to have a horn section? (*laughs*)

TF: Right.

KF: So right off the bat, they're not doubling in the tenor sax because they don't have to. So that becomes, and those pieces of music typically have more time to develop and claim their space. You know, like we mentioned the Barbie movie earlier and the Barbie movie music, maybe it'll be enduring as a Holst Suite. It may also not be. (*laughs*)

TF: Right.

KF: You know, it's, it's going to have its moment, and you know, great, but the works at the upper level, they tend to take almost years. There's a commission, they're premiered. And then it's people hear it and love it. And it takes a little bit longer for them to kind of hit their stride in their place. And when we say their place, for us, is it going to hit big its first year or will it take a couple people performing it ...then sometimes it's the people that perform that work that go back to their choirs or then had their own choir and said, you know, "it was just great piece that we performed. Let's do that with my group." So, we tend to see some grow over time and hit their stride. And it can be like two or three years before you really see what a more advanced piece of music is going to do. I might also at that point, get onto a festival or a state contest list and then it becomes appealing to people in that geography. So, musicality, it's really the musical elements, but at the end of the day, this is an auditory experience. The music should have a purpose. It might be beautiful, or purposefully jarring. The hardest piece to evaluate is something that just kind of exists and doesn't say a lot. (*laughs*)

TF: Oh yeah. (*laughs*)

KF: We all usually listen independently and then come together and talk about the reviews. It's just easier to be in your zone. But, there are, I find that the most conversations happen about the ones that are kind of on the bubble where you feel you would go to a performance and it wouldn't be the one you'd remember after." So those are the conversations we'll have, about the ones we're not real sure about. So, it's both individuals who have responsibilities for things and then the whole team, coming back together and saying, "okay, here's what I found, any differing opinions?" that kind of thing. And, so it is also a team approach. ...I think the other thing we are also looking at, which might be different than—others. I'm trying to think like when somebody's doing a core repertoire list, they have, again, they're trying to say "these are these are the pieces we hold up." We're also looking for, a spectrum of music—that allows both well-funded advanced performing ensembles to find what they need, but also smaller music programs that might have a strange set of instrumentation. There's a spectrum of need.

TF: Yeah.

KF: And then within each of those is there a variety of style of genre? We're also looking to fill needs. You might have a terrific, trombone player in your ensemble and you want to do a trombone solo with band as a feature. Well, we want to make sure we have those categories covered. And, so we'll look for specific things like that and say, "oh, good, here's a new one. It's not just the five that have been out there for, you know, five years. There's a new, piece that really fits that particular need." So, there's needs-based programming.

TF: Okay.

KF: *(laughs)*

TF: That makes sense.

KF: Does it make sense?

TF: Yeah.

KF: And honestly, I'll say it this way, the well-funded, advanced ensembles, they probably are doing the commissioned works. They can have somebody come in and say, "this is what we're we want so-and-so to write a piece." So yeah, we're trying to fill in gaps too that are just in the repertoire itself.

TF: So, in regards to the core repertoire, especially from the point of view of JW Pepper, it's not that JW Pepper is being exclusive regarding the core repertoire. It's more of a, "we have this set with specific needs," and you're trying to find new works that also fit those needs.

KF: Yes, and works that we can access. So again, I mentioned the commission works because we might not, it's great that they exist, and a lot of commission works become published after a year or two, which is great. But we don't have access to them as a commission. So, it's almost like we can't open that door. We can know about it if we happen to catch a performance or whatever, but we can't do anything with those as a company. We can't do anything with them until they become available in the retail space. So that limits us. We also can't easily say, "here's what people are performing that was in their library," right? So, the piece that they purcha'ed maybe from us or 20 years ago, maybe it was a commission work. We don't know what th'y're pulling out of the drawer in their library. We might know sometimes because they're buying extra parts. *(laughs)*

Why do you need trombone parts? Because probably you're performing it. But we also don't do, analytics around that. It's not, if somebody, needs to replace parts, we're happy to provide them the opportunity to do that. But we're not like, you just have to say, "oh, this is the piece that everybody's buying trombone parts for." I'm picking on trombone players. (*laughs*)

TF: (*laughs*)

KF: We have a couple of blind spots, but that's because we're retail.

TF: Right

KF: And that's okay. I mean, it's inherent. What's in the drawer and what's commissioned is not available to our eyes.

TF: Yeah.

KF: It is fun. I'll say it this way. I actually have a meeting after our discussion with some of our church music reviewers. When we talk about, "okay, let's get together about what are we hearing? What are we seeing? What are the trends?" And I enjoy those conversations so much because that is when we talk about that dance of what are people looking for? Is it something we are we even positioned to respond to? Do we have any ability to serve that need? —I find those the most enjoyable because I think that's what your thesis point is. Is it a fixed firm? Or is it something that evolves and can be enhanced with current need and desire? I find that that's fun, just being in a creative space. It's fun to think, "what can we do with that?" Sometimes we scratch our heads. We can't do anything. We don't have the products to do anything about it. But we also do content. We'll do video and interviews and try to highlight things—and kind of

be a good citizen that way. Right now we're working on a blog for United Sound with Julie Duty. They're doing an awful lot with all abilities coming into ensembles. There's no product for us to sell there. It'd be great if teachers were aware of it, so we let them know it's out there and they can have support if they want to bring a similar program into their school. So anyway, that's a little off topic, but it's listening for trends, what's available.

TF: Right, I'm not sure if you had mentioned this or not, but your primary customer base, I think you had mentioned that it's more geared towards like younger groups.

KF: Yeah, Pepper's always been very in tune with what's happening in the K-12 school market, middle schools, high schools. So over time it's become a big part of what we do, but it really is institutions such as churches, colleges, community groups. Those are the dominant areas that we serve.

TF: Okay—I think, that is it from me. Unless you want to add something.

KF: As we were talking, I wrote down the word musicality and I keep looking at it. And we talked about publishing, we talked about, there's one element that I think is worth a mention because it may be useful, and it is consistency. And when we talked about having an editor being useful with that, one of the things I'm thinking of and it would be a composition where most of the piece sits at a grade three, and then for like eight bars, it's a five. (*laughs*)

TF: Oh, okay

KF: And so, it could be a phenomenal piece of music and that's great, but it's immediately going to take the number of who can perform it substantially down. So as a

company that's talking about this piece of music, we will make sure we say, "and have your horn section ready for a challenge."

TF: *(laughs)*

KF: Check out that B section. So, we, have to make sure that we're talking about that consistency in the piece itself. So sometimes musicality is like, if it's a feature piece, if it is for your trombone soloist, you're fine with them sitting at a five, everybody else being a three or four, that'd be fine. But is the piece itself consistent to what it is? And that's why I think in that editor comment, that's where that came from is somebody would have said, is this intentional? And normally what we hear from composers is, "no, I'm not a horn player. I didn't realize," or "I thought that wasn't a hard thing on a flute." And it's like terrible on a flute. So again, it's takes a village with an ensemble, right? So those are the things that, often people don't think about that goes into the review. But that's a big thing. It doesn't have to be one flavor, but it has to be consistent enough that an ensemble can take it and really work that piece beginning to end.

TF: Yeah, I can definitely relate to that as a composer myself. *(laughs)*

KF: *(laughs)*

TF: It's like, well that didn't work. That's okay. I'll move on. *(laughs)*

KF: Your favorite ideas are in the part. It's like, "all right, do I redo this one as a five or do I?" Yeah, the pain is real. *(laughs)*

TF: Yeah, it is.

KF: But I think that's stuff we have to let people know when that that's the case.

TF: Right.

KF: If your trumpets can handle this, that, it's okay. And our conversation with a composer or with a publisher might be, "is there an optional part? Did you bake options into it so that it just is playable by more ensembles or singable?" —So, that's pretty much what, but again, Trevor, as you're going through stuff, if you have other questions, we can either hop on a call. I don't if we're [Pepper] the core of the fixed core, right? We're reflecting what's in that fixed core. Certainly, if we're making sure we're supporting festivals and state lists, there could be some fixed core type conversation in that. And we're going to be involved in aspects of the collegiate wind band, but not the commission, not what they might have in their library that as we wouldn't have a visibility to.

TF: Again thank you so much for taking the time out of your, I'm sure, busy schedule to talk with me. I really appreciate it.

KF: No problem at all. I wish you well with your dissertation. And I, honestly, it's fun to just take a step back and talk and think about what we do. You know, we're so involved score by score for next season's release that it's every now and it's just nice to step back and go "here's what we're doing and why we're doing it" ... It's okay to know what you don't do well either. We're not situated for certain things. So, that's cool. I wish you luck.

TF: Well, thank you very much. And if I have any other questions, I'll shoot you an email if that's okay.

KF: Absolutely.

TF: Great. Well, it was nice meeting you and thank you for taking the time.

KF: I hope our paths cross somewhere at one of these conferences.

TF: Yes definitely.

KF: Take care now.

TF: Alright, bye.

(End of Interview)

Appendix B: List of Programs Referenced

Figure B.1: Sousa Band at Columbia Theater²⁸⁵

John Philip Sousa, conductor

February 3, 1905

“Di Ballo”	Sullivan
“Stars and Stripes Forever”	Sousa
“Love’s Enchantment” (Arthur Pryor, trombone)	Pryor
“The Coquette”	Sousa
“The Summer Girl”	Sousa
“The Dancing Girl”	Sousa
Aria from “Traviata” (Maud Reese-Davies, soprano)	Verdi
“Secone Polonaise”	Liszt
“Bouree and Gigue” (“Much Ado About Nothing”)	German
“The Honeysuckle and the Bee”	Fit/Penn
“Lovely Night”	Ziehrer
“The Invincible Eagle”	Sousa
“Gypsy Airs” (Dorothy Hoyle, violin)	Sarasata

²⁸⁵ “Sousa and His Band: Greeted by Packed House at Columbia Theater,” *Washington Post*, (1877–1922), February 3, 1902, ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The Washington Post.

Figure B.2: United States Soldiers' Home Band at the Soldiers' Home Band Stand²⁸⁶

John S.M. Zimmermann, director

July 9, 1917

“My Country, ‘Tis of Thee”

March, “Pride of America”	Goldman
Overture, “William Tell”	Rossini
Suite, “Looking Upward”	Sousa
Selection, “The Serenade”	Herbert
Comic solo for trombone, “Slidus Trombonus”	Lake
(Vincent Sguelo, trombone)	
Idyl, “Poor Butterfly”	Hubbell
Hawaiian Waltz, “Moana”	Oleson
Finale, “If I Had a Son For Each Star in Old Glory, Uncle Sam, I’d Give Them All For You”	Burke

“The Star-Spangled Banner”

²⁸⁶ “Band Concerts Today,” *Washington Post*, (1877–1922), July 9 1917, ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The Washington Post

Figure B.3: Selective Literature for First National Band Contest in 1924²⁸⁷

High School Bands		Grammar School Bands	
<i>Overture—Egmont</i>	Beethoven	Selections from <i>Bohemian Girl</i>	Hayes
<i>Overture—Sakuntala</i>	Goldmark	Selections from <i>Aida</i>	Hayes
<i>Overture—Magic Flute</i>	Mozart	Selections from <i>Faust</i>	Hayes
<i>Overture—Euryanthe</i>	Weber	Selections from <i>Trovatore</i>	Hayes
<i>Overture—Turandot</i>	Lachner	Selections from <i>Martha</i>	Hayes
<i>Overture—Military</i>	Mendelssohn	Selections from <i>Tannhauser</i>	Hayes
<i>Overture—Merry Wives of Windsor</i>	Nicolai	Selections from <i>Carmen</i>	Hayes
<i>American Fantasie</i>	Herbert	<i>Bridal Song from Rural Wedding</i>	Goldmark
<i>Hungarian Fantasia</i>	Tobani	<i>Andante from Surprise Symphony</i>	Hayden
<i>Andante from Fifth Symphony</i>	Beethoven	<i>Chanson Sans Paroles</i>	Tschaikowsky
<i>Suite – A Day in Venice</i>	Nevin	<i>Album Leaf</i>	Wagner
<i>Polonaise—Militaire</i>	Chopin	<i>Minuet from Military Symphony</i>	Haydn
<i>Four Indian Love Lyrics</i>	Woodford-Finden	<i>Moment Musical</i>	Schubert
<i>Preludium</i>	Jarnefelt	<i>A Night in June</i>	King
<i>Waltz—Sleeping Beauty</i>	Tschaikowsky	<i>Angelus</i>	Massenet
<i>Prelude in G. Minor</i>	Rachmaninoff	<i>Marche Militaire</i>	Schubert
<i>Ballet—Divertissement, Henry the 8th</i>	Saint-Saens	<i>Scarf Dance</i>	Chaminade
<i>Evolution of Dixie</i>	Lake	<i>Serenade Rococo</i>	Meyer-Helmund
<i>Scenes Pittoresques</i>	Massenet	<i>Aubade Printainiere</i>	Lacombe
		<i>Nocturne from Midsummer Night's Dream</i>	Mendelssohn

²⁸⁷ “State and National High School and Grammar School Band Contests,” *The Supervisors Service* 3, no. 4 (1924): 4, 40–2. Quoted in Timothy J. Groulx, “Creating the Canon of Wind Band Literature: A History of the National Contest Literature Lists, 1924–1943,” *Journal of Research in Music Education* (2023): 10, <https://doi.org/10.1177/00224294231201073>.

Figure B.4: New York Military Band at Columbia University²⁸⁸

E.F. Goldman, conductor

June 10, 1918

Triumphal March from “Cleopatra”	Mancinelli
Overture from “Phedre”	Massenet
Prelude from “Deluge”	Saint-Saëns
Gavotte	Rameau
Fantasie from “Lohengrin”	Wagner
Excerpts from “Aida”	Verdi
“Girls of Baden” Waltz	Komzak
“American Fantasie”	Herbert
“Inflamatus” from “Stabat Mater”	Rossini

(Ernest S. Williams, cornet)

²⁸⁸ “Columbia Begins Its Free Concerts: New York Military Band Plays Airs from Operas in University Gymnasium Because of Rain,” *New York Times*, (1857–1922), June 11, 1918, ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times.

Figure B.5: A.R. McAllister Model Concert Band Program²⁸⁹

Example program in *Getting Results with School Bands*

Grand March, “Democracy”	Lake
Overture, “Queen of Hearts”	Gagnier
“The Sleigh Ride”	Tschaikowsky
“The King of France” from “The Three Quotations”	Sousa
Tone Poem, “Universal Judgement	DeNardis
Intermission	
March, “Our Glorious Emblem”	DeLusa
Overture, “Ariane”	Boyer
Selection from “The New Moon”	Romberg
“Mood Mauve”	Howland
“Memories of Stephen Foster”	Arr. Calliet

²⁸⁹ Gerald R. Prescott and Lawrence W. Chidester, *Getting Results with School Bands*, (Minneapolis: Paul A. Schmitt Music Co., 1938), 236. Apart from March, “Our Glorious Emblem,” all works were taken from the 1936 National School Band Contest List.

Figure B.6: William D. Revelli's List of Suggested Music in November 1942²⁹⁰

SELECTIONS FOR BAND	COMPOSER
Recollections of the War America Over There Voice of Freedom America	Beyer Goldman Grofé Rubenstein-Cailliet Williams
SELECTIONS FOR BAND AND CHORUS	
Arms for the Love of America God Bless America America, My Own I Am an American The Marines Hymn A Real American	Berlin Berlin Cain Neal Phillips Williams-Bower
SONGS	
All Out for America U.S. Field Artillery March Anchors Aweigh	Adams-Lake Sousa Zimmerman
BAND MARCHES	
The Army National Emblem Wings Over America The Stars and Stripes Forever Semper Fidelis Washington Post	Alford Bagley Frey Sousa Sousa Sousa
SELECTIONS FOR OUTDOOR BAND CONCERTS AND PAGEANT	
American Flag Parade Uncle Sam in Review	Pronk-Wegner-Prescott Pronk-Wegner-Prescott

²⁹⁰ Revelli (1942), 779. Quoted in Hansen, 73.

Figure B.7: The Goldman Band's Program²⁹¹

July 21, 1942

PART I.

ORIGINAL BAND MUSIC

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Christmas March | Edwin Franko Goldman |
| 2. Spring Overture | Leo Sowerby |
| 3. Canto Yoruba | Pedro Sanjuan |
| 4. Rhapsody, Jericho | Morton Gould |
| 5. A Legend | Paul Creston |

PART II.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| 6. Newsreel | William Schuman |
| I. Horse-Race | |
| II. Fashion Show | |
| III. Tribal Dance | |
| IV. Monkeys at the Zoo | |
| V. Parade | |
| 7. First Suite in E-flat for Band | Gustav Holst |
| I. Chaconne | |
| II. Intermezzo | |
| III. March | |
| 8. Festive Occasion | Henry Cowell |
| 9. a) A Curtain Raiser and Country
Dance | Richard Franko Goldman |
| b) "Lost Lady Found" | Percy Aldridge Grainger |
| 10. English Folksong Suite | Ralph Vaughan Williams |
| I. March—Seventeen Come Sunday | |
| II. Intermezzo—My Bonny Boy | |
| III. March—Folks Songs from
Somerset | |

²⁹¹ Hansen, 83.

Figure B.8: The League of Composers/70th Birthday of E.F. Goldman Concert²⁹²

January 3, 1948

Toccata Marziale	Ralph Vaughan Williams
Suite Française	Darius Milhaud
Theme and Variations for Band, Op. 43a	Arnold Schoenberg
The Power of Rome and the Christian Heart	Percy Grainger
Commissioned for this occasion by the League of Composers, first performance, Mr. Grainger Conducting	
Shoonthree	Henry Cowell
Canto Yoruba	Pedro Sanjuan
Three Pieces Written for Le Quartorze Juillet of <i>Romain Rolland</i>	
a. Le Marche sur la Bastille	Arthur Honegger
b. Prelude	Albert Roussel
c. Le Palais Royal	Georges Auric
FIRST PERFORMANCE IN AMERICA	
Symphony No. 19 for Band	Nicholas Miaskovsky
Mr. Hendl Conducting	

²⁹² Ibid., 91.

Figure B.9: Concert Music for Wind Instruments²⁹³

Frederick Fennell, conductor

February 5th, 1951

Ricercare for Wind Instruments (1559)	Willaert
Canzon XVI <i>Bergamasca</i> for Five Instruments	Scheidt
Motet: <i>Tui Sunt Coeli</i> for Eight-Voice Double Brass Choir	Di Lasso
<i>Sonata pian e Forte</i>	Gabrieli
<i>Canzon Noni Toni a 12</i> from <i>Sacrae Symphonie</i>	Gabrieli
Suite No. 2 for Brass Instruments (<i>Turnmusik</i> -1685)	Pezel
Three Equali for Four Tronbomes (1812)	Beethoven
Intermission	
Serenade No. 10 in B-flat major for Winds (1781)	Mozart
Intermission	
Serenade in E-flat Major, Op. 7 for 13 Wind Instruments	Strauss
“Angels” from <i>Men and Angels</i> (1921) for Brass Choirs	Ruggles
Symphonies for Wind Instruments (1920/1947)	Stravinsky

In Memory of Claude Debussy

²⁹³ Ibid., 95.

Figure B.10: First Concert of the Eastman Wind Ensemble²⁹⁴

Frederick Fennell, Conductor
1952

Serenade No. 10 in B-flat, K. 370a
(1781)

Mozart

Nonet for Brass (1951)

Riegger

Symphony in B-flat (1951)

Hindemith

²⁹⁴ Battisti (2002), 58.

Figure B.11: University of Michigan Symphony Band²⁹⁵

William D. Revelli, Conductor

February 26, 1952

Homage March (1864) WagnerSymphonic Poem—*The Universal Judgement* (1878/1934) DeNardis/arr Carafella“Meditation” from the Opera *Thais* (1894/1934) Massanet/arr. Harding

Featuring the Flute Choir

Concert March—*A Step Ahead* (1938) AlfordAria from *Bachianas Brasilieras No. 2* Villa Lobos“Carnival” from *La Fiesta Mexicana* (1949) Reed

Intermission

Tocatta and Fugue in D Minor (1705/1942) Bach/trans. Leidzén*Introduction and Samba* (1951) Whitney
Sigurd Rascher, saxophone soloistOverture to the Opera *Colas Breugnon* (1937/1944/1967) Kabalevsky/trans. Beeler*Trumpet and Drum* Land
Barbara McGoey, drum soloist
Paul Willerth, trumpet soloist“Rag” from *Suite of Old American Dances* (1949/1952) Bennett*Michigan Rhapsody* Arr. Werle

²⁹⁵ Hansen, 97.

Figure B.12: Arkansas Tech (Russellville) Symphonic Band²⁹⁶

Gene Witherspoon, Vaclav Nelhybel, conductors

February 11, 1967 – CBDNA National Conference, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Variations on a Korean Folk Song (1967)	John Barnes Chance
Masquerade for Band (1965)	Vincent Persichetti
Symphonic Movement (1966)	Vaclav Nelhybel
English Dances, Book One (1950/1965)	Malcolm Arnold/trans. Johnston
Four Scottish Dances (1957)	Malcolm Arnold/trans. P. Paynter
Dichotomy (undated)	Donald White
Three American Portraits (1966)	Joshua Missal
The Ramparts (1967)	Cliftone Williams

²⁹⁶ “CBDNA 1967 National Conference,” Concerts, Wind Repertory Project, last modified August 11, 2019, https://www.windrep.org/Concerts:CBDNA_1967_National_Conference.

Figure B.13: Thirty-Fifth Annual New Jersey All-State High School Concert²⁹⁷

Stanley D. Hettinger, conductor

February 17, 1974

The Star-Spangled Banner	Key
Conducted by Walter F. Moore, Coordinator	
Concert Fanfare (1946)	Herbert Bielawa
Sinfonietta (1961/1969)	Ingolf Dahl
Theme and Variations, opus 43a (1943)	Arnold Schoenberg
Handel in the Strand (1912/1962)	Percy Grainger/arr. R.F. Goldman

²⁹⁷ Paul A. Oster, "1970–1979," History of the All-State Bands, New Jersey Music Educators Association, accessed March 21, 2024, <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/636a8183960a58397c1b0fa5/t/64150cca7f23f741e0ba8d30/1679101132953/ASB-Programs-1970-1979.pdf>.

Figure B.14: University of Illinois (Champaign) Symphonic Band²⁹⁸

James F. Keene, conductor

February 20, 1991 – CBDNA National Conference, Kansas City, Missouri

Heroes, Lost and Fallen (1989/1991)	David Gillingham
Concerto Fantastique for Saxophone and Wind Orchestra (1983)	Yasuhide Ito
Joseph Lulloff, alto saxophone	
Sheep Shearing Song from Somerset, England (1904/1923/1942)	Eugene Goosens/set. Grainger
Shepherd's Hey (1918/1948)	Percy Grainger
Arctic Dreams (1991)	Michael Colgrass
Symphonic Metamorphosis on Themes of Carl Maria von Weber (1943/1972)	Hindemith/trans. Keith Wilson

²⁹⁸ "CBDNA 1991 National Conference," Concerts, Wind Repertory Project, last modified August 6, 2019
https://www.windrep.org/Concerts:CBDNA_1991_National_Conference.

Figure B.15: University of Missouri-Kansas City Conservatory Wind Symphony²⁹⁹

Steven D. Davis, conductor

March 29, 2009 – CBDNA National Conference, Austin, Texas

UMKC Fanfare (2009)	Chen Yi
Kammerkonzert (1925)	Alban Berg
The Future of Fire (2001/2009)	Zhou Long
Words of Love (2007)	James Mobberley
Finally... (2009)	Paul Rudy and Bobby Watson

²⁹⁹ “CBDNA 2009 National Conference,” Concerts, Wind Repertory Project, last modified July 15, 2022, https://www.windrep.org/Concerts:CBDNA_2009_National_Conference.

Figure B.16: United States Marine Band: 2nd Performance³⁰⁰

Col. Jason K. Fettig and Lt. Col. Ryan J. Nowlin, conductors
December 20, 2023 – The Midwest Clinic

The Directorate (1894)	John Philip Sousa
American Prelude (2023)	Johan de Meij
<i>Premiere Performance</i>	
Lincolnshire Posy (1937/1987/2010)	Percy Grainger/ed. Frederick Fennell
Go BIG or Go HOME (2019/2023)	Jessica Meyer
Carinal Overture (1891/2023)	Antonín Dvořák/trans. Donald Patterson
Aspire (2022)	Jennifer Higdon
Let Freedom Ring (2014)	Ryan Nowlin
The Stars and Stripes Forever (1896/2016)	John Philip Sousa
Apotheosis (1968)	Sammy Nestico

³⁰⁰ “2023 Midwest Clinic Concerts,” Concerts, Wind Repertory Project, last modified January 5, 2024, https://www.windrep.org/Concerts:2023_Midwest_Clinic_Concerts.