PERCEPTIONS OF QUALITY AND LEVEL OF FAMILIARITY OF MARCHES

AMONG HIGH SCHOOL BAND DIRECTORS

by

LAURA EASON

A THESIS

Presented to the School of Music and Dance
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Music

June 2019

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Laura Eason

Title: Perceptions of Quality and Level of Familiarity of Marches among High School Band Directors

This thesis has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Music degree in the Music Education Department by:

Dr. Jason M. Silveira   Chairperson
Dr. Eric Wiltshire   Member
Dr. Andrew Strietelmeier   Member

and

Janet Woodruff-Borden   Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

Original approval signatures are on file with the University of Oregon Graduate School.

Degree awarded June 2019

THESIS ABSTRACT

Laura Eason

Master of Music

School of Music and Dance

June 2019

Title: Perceptions of Quality and Level of Familiarity of Marches among High School
      Band Directors

The main purpose of this study was to investigate a possible correlation between high school band directors' familiarity with selected marches and their perceptions of quality of the selected works. Band directors who chose to participate in this study ($N =$ 288) were asked to indicate their familiarity with and perceptions of six selected marches using a Likert-type scale. In conjunction with a quantitative assessment, participants were also asked to report the criteria they consider when selecting marches for their program. Using Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient as an analytic method, the researcher was able to determine that there was a moderate positive correlation between the two variables. Additionally, the researcher was able to determine through Consensual Qualitative Research (CQR) that while familiarity with the work or composer and the quality of the composition were considered in the selection process, the priority for most participants was suitability and educational value.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Laura Eason

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

      University of Oregon, Eugene, OR

      Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX

DEGREES AWARDED:

      Master of Music Education, 2019, University of Oregon

      Bachelor of Music Education with Certification, Texas Tech University

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

Horn Performance

Brass Pedagogy

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Substitute Teacher K–12, Eugene 4J, Eugene, OR, Spring 2017

Managing Teacher, Bricks 4 Kidz, Eugene, OR, 2015–2016

Music Teacher, Levelland ISD, Levelland, TX, 2013–2015

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Jason Silveira for his guidance in the preparation of this research. Dr. Silveira's passion for research has been inspiring to me throughout this process, and I am so very thankful that he has encouraged excellence and has been patient with me and my work on this manuscript. In addition, special thanks are due to the committee members of this project, Dr. Andrew Strietelmeier and Dr. Eric Wiltshire. Finally, I would like to thank my husband, Andrew, for all his support and encouragement throughout this process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Selecting repertoire for concert band carries a significant amount of responsibility for directors. There is a prominent lack of curriculum written for fine arts programs when compared to academic programs (Conway, 2002). Because of the lack of a unified written curriculum for K–12 music education in the United States, the process of selecting music for a band program is challenging for directors who often feel they must choose between selecting high-quality repertoire and repertoire suitable to be played by secondary school bands (Hopkins, 2013). Reynolds (2000) suggests that repertoire selection creates the structure of a well-rounded music education. Since repertoire choice creates the framework for musical curriculum, directors must face the demanding task of choosing from a large body of literature based on the curricular needs of their students.

Since World War II, band programs have grown more popular in the United States (Gary & Mark, 2007; Hansen, 2005), and the amount of literature composed for band has grown exponentially (Towner, 2011). While there have been notable high-quality pieces written for wind band, there are also low-quality pieces that directors must sift through when selecting repertoire (Reynolds, 2000). Ostling (1978) laid valuable groundwork for selecting quality literature of artistic merit according to specified criteria, and since Ostling's work, there have been two notable updates (Gilbert, 1993; Towner, 2011). However, even with a unified method of analyzing the quality of literature for wind band, Gilbert (1993) stated that,

> Wind conductors who concern themselves with finding performance
> literature of the highest quality know that their searches can be futile or
> frustrating. Obtaining reliable information about quality wind works can
> be difficult for a number of reasons, including infrequent performances of

the work, score availability, and the unavailability of first-quality professional level recordings (p. 1).

Throughout the research literature considering the quality of compositions written for wind band, marches are noticeably underrepresented. Both Gilbert (1993) and Towner (2011) chose to omit marches for the following three reasons: (1) the form of marches follow their function, (2) marches are often programed around major works and are often not the focus of concerts, and (3) there are very few, if any, marches composed since the Ostling study that match the artistic merit of marches that were originally evaluated. While marches may be considered as somewhat predictable and peripheral works, there are still musical concepts contained within marches (e.g., countermelodies, *obbligato*, form and structure, etc.) that can be transferred to works considered to be more central in the core repertoire for wind band (Clark, 2009).

Holvik (1970) compiled a master list of concert programs from 1961 to 1966 to determine what pieces were frequently being performed by college bands and investigated whether a core band repertoire had emerged. A considerable quantity of marches was included in the research and represented a large percentage of the concert programs. Kish completed an update in 2005, almost four decades after the original study. In Kish's study, a new master list was created using the same method as the original study and Kish then compared his list with the Holvik list. In the analysis of the two lists, marches remained a consistent part of the repertoire and a staple of band history (Kish, 2005). Even though marches are considered core repertoire, they were notably underrepresented in the Ostling study and excluded from consideration by both of the updates (Gilbert, 1993; Towner, 2011). Even more recently, a 2012 project catalogued major works for wind band composed since 1995. The results of this project indicated

2

that marches were being performed less than other concert pieces (Cicconi, 2012). While there are numerous studies examining wind band literature trends, there is still a remarkable gap in literature exploring the role of marches in the modern wind band curriculum and repertoire.

Many music educators become familiar with repertoire during their time performing with their college ensembles, and that familiarity may impact the decisions they will make when selecting repertoire for their own programs (Young, 1998). Familiarity is defined as "having heard it somewhere" or in other words "predictability, as a result of repeated exposure to the same or similar music" (Price, 1986). In a study examining the relationship between familiarity and preference in music education, familiarity gained through repetition had a positive impact on preference (Droe, 2006). It is possible that directors frequently exposed to marches in their degree program may develop a familiarity with, and possible preference for, specific march titles, composers, or the march genre.

To date, there has been no investigation into the relationship between band directors' familiarity with marches and band directors' perceived quality of marches. Marches are a significant piece of band history (Gary & Mark, 2007; Hansen, 2005), and frequently appear on state festival lists (Approved Festival List, 2018; Band Performance Requirements, 2018; Literature Lists, 2018; Music Lists, 2018). Therefore, this study will address the following research questions: (1) What level of familiarity do high school band directors have with selected quality marches; (2) What are high school band directors' perceptions of quality of selected marches; (3) What relationship (if any) is there between high school band directors' perceptions of quality, and their familiarity

with selected marches; and (4) What criteria do high school band directors use when selecting marches for their students?

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Band and Marches: A Love Story

The tradition of marches is appropriately linked to the history of military music. There are multiple accounts of wind and percussion instruments employed in military roles as early as the Age of Antiquity (Whitwell, 1985). The Greeks used flutes to accompany dances designed to prepare young boys for the military, and even went as far as training military horses to respond to specific melodic signals. In addition to the militant role of these early wind instruments, they were also frequently heard at weddings, funerals, and other civic events (Farmer, 1912; Whitwell, 1985). Additionally, the Romans often employed trumpets to instruct the movements of small armies, as well as to accompany religious sacrifices, funeral rites, banquets, and Roman theatrical events. (Farmer, 1912; Whitwell 1985). After the fall of the Roman Empire and throughout the Middle Ages in Europe, military music was composed to suit whatever instrumentation was available (Goldman, 1946). Consequently, regional cultures in Europe began to develop unique musical sounds.

In the 16th century, it became fashionable for composers to write music for related instruments, such as string quartets. Goldman (1946) suggests that composers writing serious instrumental music during the 16th century preferred to write for homogenous ensembles which mirrored composers' desire for tonal singularity. Serious instrumental music of 17th-century Europe was largely represented by string ensembles in England, trombone choirs in Italy and Germany (Goldman, 1946). Otherwise, serious instrumental music of this time was unstandardized before 1700 with a few notable exceptions such as

5

Giovanni Gabrieli, who composed some mixed scores, and Claudio Monteverdi who often included mixed orchestration as he developed opera (Goldman, 1946; Grout & Palisca, 2010). Moving forward to the 17th and 18th centuries in Europe, wind and percussion instruments were commonly used to signal military drills, relay tactical information, and provide sirens to warn towns of approaching threats (Goldman, 1946; Kappey, 1894; Rhodes, 2007). Eventually, the function of military bands began to focus more on public entertainment over exclusively military functions.

Well-performed popular melodies tended to attract young people to enlist in militaries, excite patriotism, and connect colonists to their mother country (Kappey, 1894). In this way, military music formed a reputation for entertainment that began in Germany and spread across Europe in the 18th century. National rivalries intensified, resulting in the development of larger military bands across Europe. In consequence, marches developed a strong relationship with national identities during this time (Goldman, 1946). This led to nations developing their own styles and sounds to establish a cultural and nationalistic character. Regarding this shift, Goldman (1946) states:

> The marches, for example, are a form of national music, not for export. It is true the marches of Sousa, Alford, Ganne and many other celebrated composers in this genre have international currency, but as least ninety percent of all marches written have patriotic or local connotations. (p. 64).

Nineteenth and twentieth century town and military bands grew in popularity across Europe and the United States partly because they were able to bring popular and previously inaccessible symphonic music to people from all socio-economic backgrounds (Goldman, 1962). Symphonic works written for orchestra would not have been equally accessible for most of the working class before town and military bands began performing orchestral transcriptions. By the 19th century, professional band repertoire

6

included marches, quicksteps, waltzes, polkas, gallops, arrangements of opera arias, and orchestral transcriptions (Grout & Palisca, 2010; Kappey, 1894; Rhodes, 2007). Well-known composers of the 19th and early 20th centuries, such as Wagner, Liszt, and Bruckner, all encouraged arrangements of their orchestral works for band because they knew that their music could reach a much larger audience. Soon, bands were performing orchestral music throughout the 19th century until it became a common practice. By the end of the century, professional bands had acquired a reputation as the "poor man's orchestra" (Goldman, 1962; Grout & Palisca, 2010). Nonetheless, when it comes to literature written specifically for band, Goldman (1946) states that "the basic item of the band's repertory, and the only musical form that belongs to it by tradition, is the march" (p. 12).

Patrick Gilmore founded his professional band in the mid-19th century and organized two major music festivals in the United States which eventually led to the rise of professional bands. The first music festival was The National Jubilee, which was intended to celebrate the end of the American Civil War and featured a 1,000-piece band and a choir of 10,000. Next, Gilmore organized The World Peace Jubilee, honoring the end of the Franco-Prussian War, which featured 20,000 performers, including Strauss (Grout & Palisca, 2010). Gilmore and his band's success in the late 19th century led to an explosion of professional touring bands; composers and bandsmen Patrick Gilmore, John Phillip Sousa, Karl King, and Edwin Franko Goldman became celebrities and toured the country performing at a variety of civic events (Grout & Palisca, 2010; Mark & Gary, 2007; Rhodes, 2007). While Gilmore developed the wind band as a serious musical entity, it was Sousa who developed the form of traditional concert marches (Goldman,

1962). Sousa is also credited with popularizing bands in the United States, largely due to his iconic marches. Sousa was especially gifted with programming; in addition to over 100 marches composed for his bands, he also brought European classics from Bach to more contemporary works like Wagner to his audiences (Grout & Palisca, 2010). Marches written after the American Civil War and before World War I provide the bulk of marches considered to be core band repertoire and have taken on several forms, from basic entertainment to serious art music (Grout & Palisca, 2010; Rhodes, 2007).

Eventually, the popularity of professional band concerts and marches were overshadowed as advancements in technology decreased the need for outdoor band concerts. American jazz music was also in competition with military band music at this time, and jazz eventually overtook the popularity of concert bands. (Mark & Gary, 2007). However, interest in school band programs began to progress after Albert Austin Harding, a personal friend of Sousa, founded the Department of Bands at the University of Illinois. The University of Illinois Band program was the first significant college band which served as a model program for developing high school bands in the United States by the 20th century (Mark & Gary, 2007). By the early 20th century, beginning band programs in schools were starting to appear, which dramatically increased the amount of people who could participate in band because before this time, private lessons were the only way to learn an instrument (Keene, 1982).

The end of World War I coincided with a decrease in military and community band movements, leaving many qualified musicians and directors in search of a new way to earn a living in the 1920s (Hansen, 2005). Public school band programs began to develop more rapidly throughout the United States, offering employment opportunities

for former bandsmen. Naturally, these school bands began performing at public events, a role that would previously have belonged to professional or community bands (Hansen, 2005).

Marches have had a long relationship with the establishment of bands and band programs and they exemplify the identity crisis between utilitarian function, entertainment, and more recently, educational purposes. Bands no longer existed as a substitute orchestra, nor were they meant to perform at civic events exclusively. While utilitarian traditions are maintained in band programs within the United States through marching uniforms and halftime shows, the purpose of band programs has shifted towards attaining new levels of artistic abilities through repertoire selection, concert performances, and education (Goldman, 1962). Until recently, marches had been the only musical genre exclusive to band, comparable to other minor art forms such as the waltzes by Strauss (Goldman, 1962).

Since Frederick Fennell established the Eastman Wind Ensemble, band repertoire experienced a shift from band music as entertainment to band music being considered serious literature comparable to orchestral traditions (Hansen, 2005). Fennell advocated for the development of a wind ensemble because he:

> believed there was a genuine need for another wind instrument organization which would combine the appropriate features of the symphony orchestra, military band and concert band with regard to performance, composition and music education (Battisti, 2002, p. 56).

The establishment of the Eastman Wind Ensemble is a major event in American wind band history. Hansen (2005) states:

> Several band historians purport that the founding of the Eastman Wind Ensemble, the repertoire it performed, and the corresponding artistry with

9

which it performed is the most important sequence of events in the advancement of the American wind band in the twentieth century (p. 96).

From an educational standpoint, band programs must convey a sense of musicality and art to students, beyond basic literacy or technical skills (Goldman, 1962). Quality repertoire selection for wind band is paramount for the cultivation of the students' sense of musicality. As band literature has seen significant growth, and no longer relies on orchestral transcriptions or marches, concert marches have been excluded from most recommended lists of literature. Fennell initially developed the wind ensemble to embrace music from all periods of band's history, but the growing trend focused on new music for band may be one of the most significant reasons behind why marches are being programed less frequently today (Kish, 2005).

Quality Band Literature

In 1978, Ostling sought to discover "What available compositions, from a selected list of compositions for wind and percussion instruments…most closely meet identified criteria of serious artistic merit?" (Ostling 1978, p. 13). Ostling established criteria for judging pieces for serious artistic merit and developed a procedure for evaluating the pieces selected for study. For the purposes of Ostling's study compositions considered for artistic merit must include the following guidelines: the composition must have form, shape, variation in orchestration, unpredictability in form, unpredictability in structure, consistency in quality, consistency in style, the composition must be genuine, and must reflect elements of historic importance or educational value (1978, p. 23–20). See Appendix A for a complete description of Ostling's Ten Criteria for Artistic Merit.

From a master list of repertoire selected for the study, 38 of the selected pieces met the maximum possible "points" available according to Ostling's 10 criteria for

serious artistic merit. In one portion of the results section, Ostling noticed that the compositions with the highest ratings from the study were works by major contemporary and noncontemporary composers, despite the major changes in composition for wind band between 1950 and 1970. Due to the realization that the repertoire that achieved the maximum amount of "points" were all composed by major composers, Ostling speculated on the possibility that the evaluator's familiarity with the composers of the considered repertoire may have impacted their decisions when judging the pieces for artistic merit. It is notable that of all the wind band literature selected for analysis, only sixteen marches were considered in Ostling's study.

Ostling suggested that his study be replicated every five years as the literature for band grows, but it was not until 1993 that Gilbert published an update. In addition to the original compositions analyzed in Ostling's study, Gilbert varied his research to include works written since the original study, works considered more meritorious since the original study, and to remove pieces that no longer meet Ostling's 10 criteria.

Gilbert replicated Ostling's procedure as closely as possible and was able to create a new list of compositions. The original 314 compositions from the Ostling study were included on a new master list, along with 692 works that received 70–80% of the maximum amount of points in the original study. Gilbert's study produced similar results to Ostling's study and showed that although the amount of music written for wind band had grown, the percentage of pieces that contain all 10 aspects of artistic merit had decreased. Gilbert excluded marches in his research because he felt that there were no marches composed since the Ostling study that matched the artistic merit of the marches originally evaluated (Gilbert, 1993).

After Gilbert's study was completed in 1993, it took nearly two decades for another update. In 2011, Towner provided a second update to Ostling's work and evaluated music from a comprehensive list of band music. Towner reevaluated the compositions deemed to contain artistic merit from the Ostling and Gilbert studies, and he chose to include the compositions that came within ten points of meeting Ostling's original list of suggested criteria. Other compositions written since the Gilbert study in 1993 were also considered in Towner's study.

The results of Towner's study also showed that as the amount of repertoire for band grew, the amount of compositions deemed worthy of artistic merit since the Ostling study declined (Towner, 2011). Towner suggested that some possible reasons for this was additional (new) repertoire may have created higher standards for the criteria, conductors are becoming more selective, and the panel of expert evaluators in the 2011 study interpreted Ostling's criteria differently than the original panel of evaluators (Towner, 2011). It is noteworthy that both Gilbert and Towner chose to exclude marches for the following reasons: (1) both authors felt that the form of marches follow their function and the focus of their studies should be on works that are not constrained by conventional forms; (2) Marches are considered peripheral works at concerts; and (3) they each felt that no marches written since the Ostling study that match the artistic merit of the marches selected in the original research (Towner, 2011).

Just before Towner released the second update on Ostling's work, Clark (2009) evaluated marches for their historic role, traditional features, interpretations, and the value of marches in music education. Clark also provided resources for selecting marches, and proposed strategies for preserving march traditions (Clark, 2009). The

Florida band directors who were interviewed in Clark's study agreed that there were three important factors for interpreting a march: listening to recordings of a march, reading research conducted on the march, and seeking mentors who have performed the march before or may offer insight into the interpretation of the march (Clark, 2009). The panel of participants also agreed that marches contain pedagogical value and can be used to teach musical concepts that may be easily transferred to other pieces. In fact, where Gilbert and Towner omitted marches due to the limits of their form, the participants of Clark's study agreed that the form of marches make broad concepts less complicated to teach because of the simple form of a march and the efficient way in which marches can be broken down for rehearsal purposes (Clark, 2009). Participants also recognized the historical and cultural importance of marches to the United States and agreed that marches should continue to be included as core repertoire for wind band (Clark, 2009).

Clark's interviews also provided examples of directors in opposition to performing marches. Participants in the survey noted that some directors still consider marches to serve as "warm up" pieces that do not deserve adequate rehearsal time (Clark, 2009). In fact, the participants agreed that the attitude of such directors often leads to treating marches with indifference, and that these directors were selecting marches based on their simplicity and not their quality in order to reduce the rehearsal time spent working on a march (Clark, 2009).

To remedy the dismissive attitude that many directors seem to have regarding marches, the participants suggested that directors should focus on choosing marches of high-quality with complementary concepts that can be transferred to other pieces that band has programed. The participants also suggested that engaging with the history of

marches in American band music would help students learn and become more interested in this type of music. They concluded that marches are worthy of future study because they provide educational value, audience appeal, and historical significance (Clark, 2009).

Since Clark's 2009 study, new research has explored what repertoire is considered most valuable to middle-level band directors. McCrann (2016) surveyed middle-school band directors across the United States to determine what core literature they deemed to be most beneficial to their programs from a pedagogical perspective. Respondents overwhelmingly agreed that the most important genre for young band students to experience was the concert march. Even though band directors considered marches essential for the development of band students, they have been excluded from the majority of band literature studies.

To summarize, several studies have investigated the artistic merit of literature written for wind band. Only one study (Ostling 1978) included marches to be analyzed for qualities of artistic merit, while the subsequent studies (Gilbert 1993, Towner 2011) chose to exclude marches from consideration. Considering marches are valued for their educational, historical, and entertainment value (Clark, 2009), it is unusual that marches have been omitted from the lists of wind band literature considered for artistic merit. Marches have been highly regarded as pedagogical tools, yet there is a lack of research regarding marches as works of serious artistic merit.

Considering that marches are significant contributions to wind band literature (Clark, 2009), why would some band directors continue to perceive marches as lower quality works? One possibility is a lack of classes devoted to music selection in teacher

training programs. Young (1998) sought to determine what literature was being performed by bands in large high schools across the United States in the academic years 1994–1997. Once Young established what repertoire was being performed frequently, he then began to evaluate the criteria participants in his study considered when selecting repertoire. Young was able to determine a relationship between the criteria that the participating directors used to select repertoire and the quality of the literature that was chosen. Considering the previously established criteria for artistic merit, Young discovered that publisher materials were being used more often by conductors selecting lower quality literature and that directors who selected high-quality literature were also actively attending clinics, workshops and conventions (Young, 1998). Directors selecting high-quality literature also valued information on the composer more than directors selecting low-quality literature and regularly attended high-quality concerts (Young, 1998). The results of Young's research indicate that some directors may be selecting works considered to be higher quality based on information about the composer, and not relying solely on publisher materials. The results of Young's study show the importance of classes devoted to literature choice in music education programs so that future educators have the skills necessary to select quality literature, beyond their familiarity with composers. Young also places a responsibility on university directors to continue searching for and selecting high-quality repertoire because they are largely responsible for shaping the development of wind band literature (Young, 1998).

Marketing research and familiarity

There is more research investigating the power of familiarity to influence human behavior in marketing than in the field of music education. For example, consumer

15

preferences for beer, like musical preferences, are highly individualized and can be based on a variety of factors. In the United States alone, there are over 3,000 craft breweries operating as of the writing of this document, compared to the 85 breweries operating in the United States market in 1981 (Carr, Fontanella, & Tribby, 2019). Surprisingly, even though there has been a surge in craft breweries and types of beer available, Americans still trend towards the same large industry lagers (Choi & Stack, 2005). Some food sociologists suggest that this may be due to "behavioral lock-in," which may explain why people gravitate towards the beers they are already in the habit of purchasing, regardless of whether or not another higher quality beer is on the market (Barns, Gartland, & Stack, 2004).

One experiment showed that as a group, beer drinkers were unable to detect any differences between the popular lagers in a blind tasting (Allison & Uhl, 1964). The participants provided tasting notes in the blind tasting which were later compared to a labeled tasting of the same beers. In the labeled test, participants showed a strong preference for "their brand," even when they could not identify their beer in the blind tasting. A comparison of the tasting notes showed that the drinkers consistently rated "their beers" as higher quality, even when the results of the blind tasting showed that they could not differentiate between the beers based solely on taste (Allison & Uhl, 1964). While this experiment is somewhat dated, evidence from more recent research still supports the findings of this study (Calvo Porral & Levy-Mangin, 2015; Choi & Stack, 2005).

Consumer preferences and perceptions of quality are increased when consumers are presented with more familiar beer brands (Allison & Uhl, 1964; Calvo Porral &

Levy-Mangin, 2015; Choi & Stack, 2005). Similarly, market research in the music industry has found that consumer preferences are strongly impacted by familiarity (Ward, Goodman, & Irwin, 2014). While Americans continually buy the same beers in an expanding market, musical choices are also trending towards the same songs, even in an age when almost any type of music is available (Ward, Goodman, & Irwin, 2014).

Music is a large and growing industry, but despite advances in technology and access, traditional radio formats (and radio advertisements) have remained largely unchanged (Ward et al., 2014). Providing consumers with songs that are popular and well-known has proven to be a profitable marketing strategy for radio shows (Ward et al., 2014). Despite the success of radio shows, there are still predictions that radio stations will become obsolete due to overplayed-songs and a demand for new music (Dotinga, 2005). However, recent research shows that what consumers say they want is different from what they choose. These studies show that familiarity is the strongest predictor of consumer music choice, even over other forces such as liking and satiation (Ward, et al. 2014).

Ward, Goodman, and Irwin (2014) investigated the influence of familiarity on consumer musical choice. Their research was broken down into four separate experiments: (1) pilot study; (2) choice study; (3) real choice study; and (4) Optimum Stimulation Level (OSL) experiment. First, the pilot study was conducted in which researchers assessed radio listeners' opinions of the music they heard and found that the listeners agreed that radio stations should play more new music. Listeners also indicated that they found themselves seeking new music on occasion and would grow tired of songs played too often. In the second experiment, investigators set out to determine if

participants would choose music based on familiarity, liking, or satiation. Results indicated that participants chose more familiar music over less familiar music and that familiarity with music was an even stronger predictor than participants' liking of music.

Some concern over the limitations of this study, such as perceived coolness, avoidance of regret, or social endorsement of a song, provided the foundation for the third experiment. Unlike the second experiment, the third experiment had participants actively listen to the songs they chose at the end of the survey. In addition to the survey used in the second experiment, the third experiment also included a listening portion at the end of the survey to determine whether listening to the music would change participants' music choice. Using a list of popular songs similar to the previous study, participants were presented with two songs at a time and asked to rate their familiarity, liking, coolness, and how much they felt they would regret picking the other song in the pair. In support of the second experiment, it was determined that familiarity had a stronger impact on participant choice than liking.

The most likely explanation for the results of this study is that psychologically, people have a lower Optimum Stimulation Level (OSL) for music. OSL is a theory that suggests people prefer a certain level of stimulation throughout their lives, which differs based on the individual. One way to measure OSL is by manipulating participants' cognitive load. In the final experiment, the researchers tested their hypothesis that people have a lower OSL for music by manipulating the participants' stimulation directly using cognitive load. Manipulation of cognitive load in this experiment involved participants being asked to memorize either 20 words (high load), or four words (low load). Participants then chose their preferred genre of music from one of five radio stations to

listen to while they completed the memorization task. Participants were asked to rank their liking, familiarity, and distraction level of the music before being asked to recall the memorized words. Results showed that even under no load (zero words), participants still chose familiar music. This confirms that the OSL for music is low because when manipulated lower by increasing the participants' cognitive load (20 words), the preference for familiarity increased. Throughout all four experiments, the strongest predictor of music preference was familiarity (Ward et al., 2014).

Perception of music

Over the last two decades, there has been a surge in research investigating music cognition. Recent studies have shown that musical, non-linguistic, and language processing are less domain specific than previously thought, and that music processing actively engages the whole brain (Koelsch, Fritz, Schulze, Alsop, & Schlaug, 2005; Parsons, 2001). In fact, upon researching infants' response to music, it was determined that some aspects of melodic contour, rhythmic patterns, and musical form are learned through exposure to culturally-significant music (Demany & Armand, 1984; North, Hargreaves, & Pembrook 2001; Trehub, 1987; Trehub & Hannon, 2006). Research investigating infants' perception of music all indicated that infants exposed to the music of their own culture begin processing the music more rapidly than infants without culturally-relevant musical exposure. Neuroimaging research has also shown that there is very little difference between adult musician, adult non-musician, and children's processing of music (Koelsch et al., 2000; Koelsch et al., 2005; Krumhansl & Jusczyk, 1990). These studies each suggest that humans are uniquely receptive to musical

knowledge and complex auditory signals, indicating that the nature of music may hold

some biological relevance.

Several studies investigating how the quality of music is perceived by participants

have shown that while results are individualistic in nature, there are strong correlations

between liking the music and considering that music to be of high artistic merit. (North &

Hargreaves, 1998; North, Hargreaves, & Pembrook, 2001). Additionally, early research

has shown that repetition is a promising strategy that does increase listeners' enjoyment

of specific musical pieces (Bradley, 1971; Hargreaves, 1984). However, while repetitive

listening increased the enjoyment of specific pieces, researchers were still unsure how to

deepen listeners' overall appreciation of Western art music. One study found that

teaching analytical skills through guided listening increased participants' general

preference for Western art music (Bradley, 1972). More recently, research focused on

non-musician music preferences found that program notes have a positive impact for

audience members unfamiliar with the music being performed (Margulis, 2010; Margulis,

Kisida, & Greene, 2015). The results of research investigating music perception indicate

that aesthetic evaluations are formed by a combination of familiarity with a type of music

and information about the music.

Familiarity and Cognition

Multiple studies show that there is a positive correlation between familiarity and

preference in music (Alkoot, 2009; Fung, 1996; Hamlen & Shuell, 2006; North &

Hargreaves, 1995; Pereira, Teixeira, Figueiredo, Xavier, Castro, & Brattico, 2011;

Richardson-Melech, 2011; Van Den Bosch, Zalimpoor, & Zatorre, 2013; Zissman &

Neimark, 1990). On a neurological level, the emotion and reward regions are

significantly more active than other areas of the brain when listening to familiar music (Pereira et al., 2011). Further, there is a strong and positive relationship between self-reported pleasure and notable measures of emotional arousal in listeners engaged with familiar music (Van Den Bosch et al., 2013). Results of a study investigating the neurological effects of familiar music shows that some level of expectation and predictability are obtained through repeated exposure to music resulting in emotional arousal (Van Den Bosch et al., 2013). The neurological evidence presented by this research suggests that repeated exposure to music may increase subjects' liking of the music. Other non-neurological studies support these findings and confirm a positive correlation between familiarity and liking of music (Alkoot, 2009; Fung, 1996; North & Hargreaves, 1995; Zissman & Neimark, 1990). On the subject of familiarity and music preference, Hoffer (1981) states:

> People generally like what they know and avoid what they don't know. If there be truth in "I know what I like," there is also truth in "I like what I know." This is so partly because people don't hear unfamiliar types of music accurately or fully; they simply miss a lot that music in an unfamiliar style has to offer. People also prefer what they know because they feel more comfortable and competent with it. An unfamiliar type of music may make a person uncomfortable because he can't make sense out of it and that encourages self-doubt, which discourages positive associations with the music (p. 7).

Zissman and Neimark (1990) conducted related research which evaluated the effects of participants liking music and the participants' perceived goodness (liking) of the music across 12 different Western music genres. For the purposes of their research, "goodness" was left up to participants to determine and was defined as "quality as music" (p. 483). The Zissman and Neimark (1990) study showed that excerpts from the twelve

genres that were expected to be familiar to the participants were ranked higher in participant liking and perceived goodness than unfamiliar musical excerpts.

Recognizing the influence of familiarity over music choice has sparked further exploration in music education. A comparison of both musician and non-musician students' preferences for world music provided further evidence of a strong relationship between familiarity and preference (Fung, 1996). In a more recent study, American non-music students were questioned about their familiarity with and preference for Arabic music compared with other world music. Results support previous research demonstrating that people prefer music they are already familiar with (Alkoot, 2009). Other studies focused on American public-school students determined that guided listening and repeated exposure to music through regular lessons had an impact on the students' preference for and liking of Western classical art music and world music (Fung, 1996; Hamlen & Shuell, 2006; Heingartner & Hall, 1974; Richardson-Melech, 2011).

As of the writing of this document, there has been no investigation into the relationship between band directors' familiarity with marches and band directors' perceived quality of marches. Given the lack of research specifically investigating marches as quality repertoire and the level of familiarity band directors have with marches, this study will focus on the following research questions: (1) What level of familiarity do high school band directors have with selected quality marches? (2) What are high school band directors' perceptions of quality of selected marches? (3) What relationship (if any) is there between high school band directors' perceptions of quality, and their familiarity with selected marches? and (4) What criteria do high school band directors use when selecting marches for their students?

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to test the procedures and instrumentation for implementation in the full study. Due to the omittance of marches in previous studies evaluating high-quality literature (Ostling, 1978; Towner, 2011; Young, 1998), the investigator sought out a panel of directors at the university level to assist in the selection of marches considered to be high-quality compositions. The investigator contacted directors from universities in the state of Oregon to begin building a list of high-quality marches. Four directors from the University of Oregon and Oregon State University were asked via email to list five marches they considered to be high-quality compositions, suitable to be performed by high school bands. Of the four contacted directors, only three responded. In order to broaden the sample of suggested marches, the investigator chose to include marches which also appeared in the *Teaching Music Through Performing Marches* book from the *Teaching Music Through Performing in Band* series. Once a list of marches was compiled, the investigator identified the marches most frequently mentioned across all three university directors' responses and suggested marches which also appear in *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band* series. Seven marches were found in common between the university directors' list and marches which appear in the *Teaching Music Through Performance in Band* series (Chevallard & Miles, 2003). Of the seven common marches, the investigator randomly selected five marches to be used in the pilot study.

After establishing a list of high-quality marches, the researcher chose excerpts from each march using criteria similar to those found in previous studies involving the

selection of excerpts from band repertoire (Morrison, Price, Geiger, & Cornacchio, 2009; Price & Chang, 2005; Silvey, 2011; Silvey & Koerner, 2016). Excerpts for both the pilot study and the full study were selected based on the following:

1. There must be instances of style changes within the excerpt for listeners to consider varied articulations, dynamic contrasts, and feature opportunities for expressivity and musicality.

2. The excerpts contain representation of at least two contrasting sections of the march.

3. Each excerpt selection was approximately 60 seconds in length and started and ended at appropriate phrase points.

As an added measure of reliability, the investigator also chose to utilize recordings made by professional military bands from the United States. The five marches selected for the pilot study, in no particular order, were as follows:

1. *Stars and Stripes, Forever* (Sousa)

2. *On the Mall* (Goldman)

3. *The Chimes of Liberty* (Goldman)

4. *Barnum and Bailey's Favorite* (King)

5. *The Washington Post March* (Sousa)

After march excerpts were selected, the researcher designed an online survey containing six sections; the first five sections provided an audio excerpt with the march title and composer listed for each excerpt, and two corresponding items that allowed participants to indicate their level of familiarity with the march and their perception of the quality of the march on a five-point Likert scale. The anchors of the Likert scale ranged

from (1) least familiar or low quality, to (5) very familiar or high-quality. The final item of the questionnaire was open ended and asked participants to list what criteria they used when selecting marches to be performed by their ensembles.

The investigator then contacted all high school band directors on the public membership directory from the Oregon Band Directors Association website. The researcher also shared the survey with Oregon band directors' social media groups and the Oregon School Activities Association. Once the survey had been opened an informed consent statement appeared notifying interested participants that no identifying information would be collected, and that participation was completely voluntary with no penalty for non-participation or partial participation. Thirty-three high school band directors in Oregon participated in the pilot study.

The researcher received approval for the full study from the Institutional Review Board (IRB). IRB approval can be seen in Appendix E. Between the pilot study and the full study, a modification to the questionnaire was made. In the pilot study, the questionnaire included the title and composer of each excerpt. Considering evidence that familiarity has an impact on perception of quality the researcher removed titles and composer names from the survey used in the full study (Alkoot, 2009; Fung, 1996; Hamlen & Shuell, 2006; North & Hargreaves, 1995; Pereira et al., 2011; Richardson-Melech, 2011; Van Den Bosch et al., 2013; Zissman & Neimark, 1990).

Stimulus Construction

In the full study, the investigator expanded the march selection process to include representation of band directors from Pac-12 universities. In the pilot study, the investigator intended to survey high school band directors in the state of Oregon, but for

the full study the investigator expanded the sample of participants to a national level. Because the questionnaire was intended for a national sample, the investigator felt that a larger pool of university directors should be contacted. The investigator contacted directors via email and asked for a list of five marches, suitable to be performed by high school band, that they felt were high-quality composition. Out of the twenty-one university directors contacted, ten directors chose to participate. The investigator did not specify the type of march (e.g., traditional march, concert march, circus march, etc.); answers ranged from orchestral transcriptions to traditional military marches. Of the responses, the investigator found six marches mentioned at least three times. The investigator took the six most frequently suggested marches and began determining excerpts to be used from each march in the survey. Excerpts were selected based on the same criteria from the pilot study. The six selected marchers, in no particular order, were:

1. *L'Inglesina (Little English Girl)* (Delle Cese)

2. *Florentiner March* (Fučík)

3. *Stars and Stripes, Forever* (Sousa)

4. *"March" from Symphonic Metamorphosis* (Hindemith)

5. *Children's March* (Grainger)

6. *Commando March* (Barber)

Participants

The target population surveyed in this study was high school band directors in the United States who were actively teaching at least one band at the high school level. The questionnaire used in this study was sent out via email to high school band directors, using a combination of convenience and snowball sampling methods. The researcher

26

contacted the president of each state's music education association or band director's association. If there was a public membership directory, the investigator contacted all high school band directors through the Qualtrics online survey program. Twenty-five states were represented in the responses and a total of 288 high school band directors participated in the survey. See Table 1 for a list of states represented in this study and the number of high school band directors who participated. Out of 288 participants, 221 completed the entire survey. While band directors from the state of Oregon were represented in the pilot study, new data were collected from participants representing the state of Oregon in the full study.

Table 1

Number of participants representing each state

Alabama–3	Georgia–4	Maine–2	Ohio–4	Tennessee– 2
Arkansas–47	Illinois–3	Michigan–1	Oklahoma–2	Texas–1
California–1	Kansas–9	Minnesota–2	Oregon–25	Washington, DC–2
Colorado–1	Kentucky–28	New Jersey–4	Pennsylvania–2	West Virginia–13
Florida –80	Louisiana–1	New York–1	South Dakota–20	Wisconsin–25

Instrumentation and Procedures

Data were collected via Qualtrics. Participants were assigned to one of three random presentation orders to account for possible order effects. Presentation orders can be seen below in Table 2.

Table 2

March Presentation Orders by Composer's Last Name

Order 1	Sousa	Delle Cese	Hindemith	Grainger	Barber	Fučík
Order 2	Hindemith	Delle Cese	Fučík	Grainger	Sousa	Barber
Order 3	Sousa	Fučík	Delle Cese	Grainger	Hindemith	Barber

The survey contained seven sections; the first six sections provided an audio excerpt from a march, and two corresponding items asking participants to (1) indicate their level of familiarity with the march, and (2) indicate their perception of the quality of the march on a Likert scale. The Likert scale for each question ranged from 1 (not familiar/low quality) to 5 (very familiar/high quality). The excerpts provided in the questionnaire were approximately 60 seconds long, and the completion time for the entire questionnaire was approximately six minutes. The final section of the questionnaire asked participants to provide what criteria they considered when selecting marches for their concert programs in an open-ended response field.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Quantitative Analysis

Four questions guided this research: (1) What level of familiarity do high school directors have with selected quality marches? (2) What are high school directors' perceptions of quality of selected marches? (3) What relationship (if any) is there between high school band directors' perceptions of quality, and their familiarity with selected marches? and (4) What criteria do high school band directors use when selecting marches for their students? To address the first two research questions, descriptive statistics (M and SD) were calculated for both familiarity and perception of quality. The main analytic method employed to address the third research question was Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. The fourth research question was addressed though a method of qualitative analysis.

The first research question was meant to determine American high school band directors' familiarity with the six selected quality marches. Using the aggregate data, the results showed that participants were generally familiar with the selected marches. The most familiar march was *Stars and Stripes, Forever* ($M = 4.98$, $SD = 0.13$), followed by *Children's March* ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 1.47$), then *Florentiner March* ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 1.47$), then *"March"* from *Symphonic Metamorphosis* ($M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.71$), *Commando March* ($M = 2.96$, $SD = 1.73$), and lastly *L'Inglesina* ($M = 2.54$, $SD = 1.54$). The SD rating of *Stars and Stripes, Forever* for familiarity is relatively low compared to the SD for familiarity seen in the other selected marches, indicating that participants were very familiar with *Stars and Stripes, Forever* compared with the other marches.

Regarding the second research question, the researcher calculated the means and standard deviations of the quality ratings recorded by the participants for each march. Participants rated the quality of the six selected marches as relatively high quality. The march considered to be of the highest quality was *Stars and Stripes, Forever* ($M = 4.69$, $SD = 0.60$), followed by *Children's March* ($M = 4.58$, $SD = 0.77$), then *Florentiner March* ($M = 4.54$, $SD = 0.63$), *"March"* from *Symphonic Metamorphosis* ($M = 4.34$, $SD = 0.92$), *Commando March* ($M = 4.22$, $SD = 0.90$), and lastly *L'Inglesina* ($M = 4.18$, $SD = 0.83$). Notably, the marches ranked from most familiar to least familiar by participants match the marches ranked from highest quality to lowest quality by participants. The participants' quality ratings of the selected marches show clustered means and standard deviations values as compared to the means and standard deviations seen in the familiarity ratings. The results seem to suggest that participants considered all of the selected marches to be relatively high quality compositions, regardless of their familiarity with the marches.

The survey was designed to present the six selected marches in one of three preselected orders to participants randomly; however, results show that there was an order effect present for quality rating as a variable and for familiarity as a variable. See Table 2 to review the list of orders. Two one-way ANOVAs indicated a significant order effect for both variables. Regarding familiarity, there was a significant order effect for *Stars and Stripes, Forever* $F(2, 232) = 68.99$, $p < .001$, *L'Inglesina* $F(2, 230) = 7.92$, $p < .001$, *"March" from Symphonic Metamorphosis* $F(2, 225) = 19.84$, $p < .001$, *Commando March* $F(2, 216) = 36.90$, $p < .001$, and *Florentiner March* $F(2, 210) = 6.71$, $p = .001$. Only one march, *Children's March*, did not show significant results at the $p < .001$ level.

Bonferroni post hoc tests showed that *Stars and Stripes, Forever* had an order effect between orders 1 and 2, and 2 and 3 for the variable of familiarity. *L'Inglesina* showed an order effect between orders 1 and 3, and 2 and 3. There was also a significant order effect for *"March," from Symphonic Metamorphosis* between order 1 and 3, and 2 and 3. *Commando March* showed an order effect between order 1 and 2, and between order 2 and 3. Finally, *Florentiner March* showed an order effect between orders 1 and 2, and 1 and 3 (see Table 3).

For the variable of familiarity, several Bonferroni post hoc tests were conducted to determine where significant order effects occurred. *Stars and Stripes, Forever* had an order effect between orders 1 and 2, and 2 and 3. *L'Inglesina* showed an order effect between orders 1 and 3, and 2 and 3. There was also a significant order effect for *"March," from Symphonic Metamorphosis* between order 1 and 3, and 2 and 3. *Commando March* showed an order effect between order 1 and 2, and between order 2 and 3. Finally, *Florentiner March* showed an order effect between orders 1 and 2, and 1 and 3.

Regarding quality, a significant order effect was found for *Stars and Stripes, Forever* $F(2, 232) = 962$, $p < .001$, *L'Inglesina* $F(2, 230) = 6.36$, $p < .001$, *Children's March* $F(2, 220) = 3.46$, $p < .001$, *Commando March* $F(2, 215) = 3.09$, $p < .001$, and *Florentiner March* $F(2, 207) = 8.42$, $p < .001$ (see Table 3). Bonferroni post hoc tests were conducted to determine where significant order effects occurred. *Stars and Stripes, Forever* between orders 1 and 2 and 2 and 3. *L'Inglesina* showed an order effect between order 1 and 3, and 2 and 3. Next, *Children's March* had an order effect between order 1 and 3, *Commando March* showed an order effect between order 2 and 3, and finally

31

Florentiner March showed an order effect between orders 1 and 2, and 2 and 3. Although statistically significant, a closer examination of the mean differences between orders shows little practical significance with the largest mean difference being 0.58 (See Table 4). For example, whether or not participants heard *Stars and Stripes, Forever* first or fourth did not drastically affect the familiarity or quality ratings collected from participants.

Table 3

Bonferroni Multiple Comparisons for Familiarity

March Title	(I) Order	(J) Order	Mean Differences (I-J)	Std. Error	p
Stars and Stripes, Forever	1	2	1.67*	.16	< .001
	1	3	0.0	.16	1.00
	2	3	-1.67*	.16	< .001
L'Inglesina	1	2	.17	.25	1.00
	1	3	-.75*	.24	< .001
	2	3	-.92*	.25	< .001
"March" from Symphonic Metamorphosis	1	2	-.27	.25	.85
	1	3	1.19*	.24	< .001
	2	3	1.46*	.25	< .001
Children's March	1	2	-.15	.24	1.00
	1	3	.30	.24	.62
	2	3	.46	.24	.19

Table 3 continued

March Title	(I) Order	(J) Order	Mean Differences (I-J)	Std. Error	p
Commando March	1	2	-1.88*	.23	< .001
	1	3	-.32	.23	.53
	2	3	1.56*	.23	< .001
Florentiner March	1	2	.80*	.28	< .001
	1	3	.96*	.28	< .001
	2	3	.16	.28	1.00

* = Mean difference significant at the $p < .05$ level

Table 4

Bonferroni Multiple Comparisons for Quality

March Title	(I) Order	(J) Order	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	p
Stars and Stripes, Forever	1	2	.51*	.12	< .001
	1	3	.17	.11	.42
	2	3	-.34*	.12	.01
L'Inglesina	1	2	.07	.13	1.00
	1	3	-.35*	.12	<. 001
	2	3	-.42*	.13	<. 001
"March" from Symphonic Metamorphosis	1	2	-.02	.14	1.00
	1	3	.28	.14	.12
	2	3	.30	.14	.10
Children's March	1	2	.04	.13	1.00
	1	3	.32*	.13	<. 001
	2	3	.28	.13	.15
Commando March	1	2	-.20	.14	.47
	1	3	.15	.14	.85
	2	3	.34*	.14	<. 001
Florentiner March	1	2	.58*	.14	<. 001
	1	3	.36*	.14	<. 001

Table 4 continued

March Title	(I) Order	(J) Order	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	p
	2	3	-.22	.14	.38

* = Mean difference significant at the $p < .05$ level

The third research question addressed the relationship between participants'

familiarity with the selected marches and their perception of the quality of each march.

An analysis of the data for both variables in aggregate was performed using a Pearson

Product-Moment correlation coefficient and revealed a moderate and positive

relationship ($r = 0.44$, $r^2 = 0.19$). The same procedure was then repeated for each march

(see Table 5).

Table 5

Marches analyzed with Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient

Title of Piece	r (r^2)	p
Stars and Stripes	.08 (.01)	.22
L'Inglesina	< .01 (.06)	< .001
"*March*" from *Symphonic Metamorphosis*	.51 (.26)	< .001
Children's March	.48 (.23)	< .001
Commando March	.39 (.15)	< .001
Florentiner March	.43 (.18)	< .001

Qualitative Analysis

To address the final research question, open-ended responses from the

questionnaire asking participants to identify criteria they use when selecting marches

were analyzed using consensual qualitative research (CQR) (Hill, 2012). CQR is an

35

inductive method of qualitative analysis which assesses open-ended responses. The

researcher followed the three basic steps for conducting CQR analysis. First the

researcher developed coding domains for each of the responses ($N = 188$) after reading

through every response and identifying commonalities across the responses. The

commonalities were then organized into a series of codes and applied to every participant

response. In total, 36 codes were identified. For a complete list of the small codes see

Appendix C. For reliability purposes, the researcher approached an independent coder

and requested a review of the codes. The independent coder randomly examined 30% of

the open-ended responses and assigned one or more of the pre-existing codes to each

response. After a comparison of the original researcher's codes with the codes assigned

by the independent coder, a reliability quotient of .70 was achieved (agreements ÷

(agreements + disagreements)), indicating moderate reliability.

Next, the researcher condensed the 36 codes into 13 larger subsuming codes. For

a complete list of the subsuming codes, see Appendix C. Once the responses were

condensed into subsuming codes, the researcher contacted the same independent coder

for reliability purposes. The independent coder randomly categorized 30% of the

participant responses to the thirteen larger subsuming codes. A comparison between the

independent coder's categorization with the 13 subsuming codes revealed a reliability

quotient of .70, again indicating moderate reliability.

For a more parsimonious categorization of the free response data, the 13

subsuming codes were reduced further to nine in consultation with the independent coder.

The nine codes ranging from most frequently mentioned to least frequently mentioned

were: Suitability ($N = 154$), Educational Value ($N = 72$), Musical Elements ($N = 61$),

Engagement ($N = 59$), Concert Considerations ($N = 54$), Compositional Quality ($N = 49$), Familiarity with the Composer/Work ($N = 40$), Cultural/Historical Significance ($N = 35$), and Style of March ($N = 31$). Examples for each large code can be seen in Appendix C.

The most frequently mentioned criteria for selecting marches by participants was suitability, which was mentioned 154 times by participants. Several responses mentioned suitability as the only criterion used when selecting repertoire for a band program. Examples of responses indicating suitability as the most important criteria for participants include:

> I look at the instrumentation to see if it fits the instruments that I have. I also look and see if parts are doubled or not. I look at the difficulty of the marches and see if it is something that my group would be able to play or if there is enough of a challenge for them that the [sic] will be able to play it well and not have a big flop. (Participant 198)

Another participant said:

> I have a very small program. 10 players grades 9–12, 5 in 8th grade band, and 13 in 7th grade band. I have to find music that is playable for all of my kids grades 7 thru 12 to be able to perform a concert. That is the only way that I have anything close to the instrumentation needed to perform. (Participant 170)

And this participant said:

> Difficulty, and it also all depends on the current instrumentation. Let's say I don't have enough low brass within my concert band, then I would need to find something not as low brass heavy. (Participant 259)

In addition to suitability, the next most commonly mentioned criterion was educational value, which could be seen across 60 responses, often associated with suitability. Examples include the following responses:

> The ability of my students to play it accurately and musically. What skills can my students learn from playing this march? What history/background can I teach my students beyond the music itself? (Participant 78)

> Instrumentation that we currently have. [sic] other literature we are working on skills that will be gained from studying the piece. (Participant 245)

> Degree of difficulty and whether or not the students performing it will be able to address the musical elements of style, dynamics, phrasing in addition to "getting the right note and rhythm." (Participant 189)

Forty-nine responses included some mention of the quality of the work, and 40 responses included familiarity with either the work or the composer as a criterion for selecting repertoire for their band programs. The qualitative results indicated that while suitability and educational value were of primary consideration for most participants, compositional quality and familiarity with the work or composer were also consciously considered by many participants.

Examples of compositional quality cited as a criterion by participants in this study include:

> …Whether I am in front of a middle school, high school, or community band, the march has to be of quality for the band to enjoy playing it and receive a musical benefit from its preparation… (Participant 108)

I look for opportunities for music making...variety of styles, counter melodies, rhythmic accompaniment… (Participant 127)

Variety in both dynamics, articulation, instrumentation, voicing, and styles. I also try to find marches that have interesting parts for the middle voices as well. (Participant 48)

Examples of responses by participants that indicated familiarity was a criterion in the selection of marches include:

If it is well known, has "significance", and is appropriate for the skill level of my group (Participant 223)

I usually search for a march that conforms to the standard march form for teaching purposes. I like to use familiar marches for our audience on the spring concert… (Participant 194)

I select marches that I am most familiar with…. (Participant 38)

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Summary

The purpose of the present research was to address the following research questions: (1) What level of familiarity do high school band directors have with selected quality marches; (2) What are high school band directors' perceptions of quality of selected marches; (3) What relationship (if any) is there between high school band directors' perceptions of quality, and their familiarity with selected marches; and (4) What criteria do high school band directors use when selecting marches for their students?

Regarding the first research question, the results of this study indicate that participants were somewhat familiar with the selected marches. In reference to the second research question, results showed that participants largely rated the quality of the selected marches as high quality. Regarding the third research question, a moderate positive correlation between directors' familiarity with the selected marches and their perceptions of the quality of the same marches. Overall, the findings were consistent with prior research. First, previous research has shown that, while perception of quality of music is individualistic, there are strong correlations between liking the music and considering that music to be of high artistic merit (North & Hargreaves 2001). In the present study, participants were somewhat familiar with the selected works, and rated the quality of the compositions as high quality. A positive and moderate relationship was observed between familiarity and quality ratings recorded by participants in this study. Secondly, the relationship between familiarity and perception of quality is consistent with marketing

40

research observing consumer preference for familiar beer above less familiar beer, and sometimes above higher quality beer (Allison & Uhl, 1964; Barns, et al., 2004; Calvo Porral & Levy-Mangin, 2015; Choi & Stack, 2005). Additionally, previous research has also shown that there is a positive correlation between familiarity and preference in music (Alkoot, 2009; Fung, 1996; Hamlen & Shuell, 2006; North & Hargreaves, 2001; Pereira, et al., 2011; Richardson-Melech, 2011; Zissman & Neimark, 1990; Van Den Bosch, et al., 2013).

Regarding the fourth research question in which participants were asked to list criteria that they use when selecting marches for their band program, suitability and educational value were the most frequently cited criteria among participants of the current study. Concerning the quality of the composition, participants in previous research have suggested that directors select high-quality marches that contain complementary concepts that can be transferred to other pieces the band has programmed (Clark, 2009). More recent research explored core wind band literature to determine the most beneficial works from a pedagogical perspective. In the present study, educational value was the second most frequently mentioned criterion for selecting marches, which is also in agreement with previous research (Clark, 2009).

It is interesting to speculate on possible reasons why familiarity with a march or the quality of the march were not considered as frequently as other criteria. According to the qualitative data collected in this study, participants made conscious choices to pick marches suitable for their ensemble that contain educational value. Familiarity and composition quality were recorded across several responses, but overall, they proved to be a lower priority for the directors who participated in this study. Future research might

41

explore whether familiarity and composition quality were considered lower priority by participants because they were not consciously choosing pieces for the band based on those criteria.

Limitations

Although the results of the current study are in line with previous research, it is not without its limitations. First, the researcher contacted Pac-12 university directors and asked that they each suggest five marches, suitable for high school band, that they felt were high quality compositions. Similar to Gilbert (1993), Ostling (1978), and Towner (2011) the researcher sought a panel of experts to assist the selection of marches. The selection process may be a possible limitation for this study because the selected marches were chosen by university directors, while the participants of this survey were high school directors who may have approached the selection of marches differently.

Another possible limitation was that the researcher did not operationally define quality for the Pac-12 University directors, although the initial email did reference the original Ostling study (1978). Furthermore, when the researcher designed the questionnaire, quality was not defined for participants. In accordance with prior research investigating definitions commonly used to describe aesthetic responses to music (Lychner, 1998), the researcher chose to allow participants to have their own self-constructed definition of quality. Additionally, the researcher determined that the focus of the study was on how participants perceived the marches on their own. However, this study may have benefited from a specific definition for quality.

There was also a lack of demographic information collected from participants in this study that may have affected participant responses. Possible demographic influences

that may have affected this study might include location in the US, level of education, experience level. However, previous research has shown that age and gender have very little impact on the physiological processing of music and preferences of musical style in adults and children (Koelsch, Grossmann, Gunter, Hahne, Schroger, & Friederici, 2003; Koelsch, Maess, Grossmann, & Friederici, 2003; LeBlanc, Sims, Siivola, & Obert, 1996). Additionally, years of experience as a music educator has very little impact on perceptions of educational value in quality compositions (Sheldon, 2000), and there is no evidence that the gender of adult listeners would have any effect on perceptions of quality literature.

The march presentation orders also presented a limitation to this study. The researcher selected three random presentation orders out of 720 possible orders. For future studies, it would be beneficial to allow the questionnaire software to randomly present orders to participants, rather than delineating the three orders presented in this study. Another limitation to this study was the social desirability of the self-reported data by participants in this study. It is possible that when participants were asked to rate their familiarity with the marches that some of the participants reported a higher level of familiarity with the pieces due to social pressures. The sampling methods used in this study could also be considered a limitation. The researcher chose to employ convenience and snow-ball methods of sampling because these two methods can sample a large population in a short amount of time. However, a random sampling method may enable future research gain a more representative sample from the target population.

Implications and recommendations for future research

The correlations between familiarity and perceived composition quality observed in this study hint at possible developments in the field of music education. It is interesting to speculate on the impact the results of this study may have on curriculum. Directors may believe they are choosing music based on composition quality, but it could be that they are selecting compositions based on familiarity with either the work or with the composer. While the quality of the work may still be considered high quality, it is possible that directors may be selecting marches based on a bias they are unaware exists. It would be interesting to explore how the quality of an entire body of work by a composer well known for writing marches is perceived by directors. Are all marches written by John Philip Sousa considered high quality, and if so, is it because of Sousa's popularity? How would perceptions of his work change if a previously unknown Sousa march were rediscovered? Additionally, during the march selection process, the type of march (e.g., orchestral transcription, traditional/military march, circus march) was never specified when the researcher initially contacted Pac-12 university directors. It may be interesting to observe changes in director's perceptions of different types of marches.

The applicability of this study could be further examined by selecting different marches, unknown marches, or works by unknown composers. Further, a comparison of how directors perceive the same unknown march given different information about the composer may provide insight into whether directors are engaging with the quality of the work, or if familiarity with the composer has an influence on how quality is perceived. There are also other under-researched genres of wind band literature that would benefit from this type of research, such as fanfares, concertos, or repertoire written for middle

44

school band. It would also be interesting to investigate whether directors feel they must choose between selecting high-quality repertoire or repertoire suitable to be played by their bands. Furthermore, research investigating whether some types of marches (e.g., traditional/military, circus, orchestral transcriptions, concert, etc.) are perceived as higher quality, regardless of their standard format. It would also be interesting to observe how the quality of marches are perceived in comparison to other genres of wind band literature.

The results of this study suggest a number of future directions for research intended to explore the correlation between familiarity and perception of quality in music literature. Due to the positive moderate correlation between perceptions of quality and familiarity with selected marches, directors may increase their knowledge of unfamiliar marches by attending band-focused workshops, college band concerts, and seeking out unfamiliar marches for their programs. In addition to observing directors' perceptions of quality and familiarity with marches for curricular purposes, it would also be beneficial to observe programming trends. Following Holvik's (1970) and Kish's (2005) research, a study investigating what trends, if any, appear in the march genre. If there are programming trends in the march genre, an investigation of the composition quality seen in the most frequently performed marches would be compelling. Correspondingly, if there are programming trends, it would be interesting to see what impact, if any, university programming trends have on high school or middle school band programming trends.

APPENDIX A

OSTLING'S TEN CRITERIA for ARTISTIC MERIT

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.

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.

QUESTIONAIRE

---

1 Thank you for participating in this survey! Please read through the information below and check whether or not you would like to continue.

The Survey:
If you agree to participate in this survey, you will be asked to listen to 6 excerpts from 6 different marches. Each excerpt will be accompanied by two questions asking you to rate your familiarity with the march, and whether you consider the piece to be a high quality or low quality march. The last question is simply asking what sort of criteria you use when selecting marches for your band. Total time to complete the survey will take approximately 6 minutes.

Risks:
This survey is low risk, and is meant to record your opinions regarding the marches selected.

Payment:
You will not be paid for your participation in this survey.

Confidentiality:
Your response to this survey will be completely confidential. The survey will not ask you for   any personal or identifying information and your participation will be anonymous.

Participation:
You participation in this survey is voluntary; you are free to withdraw your participation at any moment without consequence.

Contact Information:
If you have any questions about this study, please contact Laura Eason at leason@uoregon.edu

Please select an option:

○ Yes, I would like to participate in this survey. (1)

○ No, I do not want to participate in this survey (2)

Please make sure your computer speakers are turned on, and at a comfortable volume. For each of the following excerpts, please click the "play" icon, and answer the two questions on each page. Click the "Next" button when you are ready to begin.

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

Page Break

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how familiar are you with this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Familiarity (1)	○	○	○	○	○

On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the quality of this march?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)
Quality (1)	○	○	○	○	○

What criteria do you consider when selecting a march for your concert programs?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C
PARTICIPANT RESPONSES

Participant responses are verbatim.

Participant	Response
6	The ability of the group, the quality of the March and if it fits the theme of the other music. I also want to expose students to various styles of marches, ie the[sic] Metamorphous march would be great if I had bassoons, but the others do work (except Grainger because of no oboes). Thanks
7	I typically avoid the Sousa/King style marches and program ones that are a bit more Symphonic in nature (e.g. Grainger Children's March, Hindemith Symphonic Metamorphosis or Barber Commando March) because I find them to be more compositionally interesting
8	My ensemble. How it fits with the program. My education goals for the term we are performing.
9	What is achievable for the ensemble while still stretching their abilities. What contrasts well with the other works in our set. What has historical significance and can serve as a platform for teaching other musical concepts, etc.
10	When I'm selecting middle school marches, I tend to lean toward 6/8 and 2/4 marches. If I have a really strong band then I introduce cut time marches. With my high school marches I try to find literature that is not too long in length because the numbers in my band make it hard for the musicians to take a breath or let someone else in their section play while they are resting. We sometimes have one player to a part in certain sections so I am always thinking about how taxing the piece is on the player. I also look for marches that are interesting and not too repetitive. My bands have typically liked marches for example: March of the Belgian Parachutists was a favorite.
11	The criteria I use is the highest quality of march. I.e. [sic],. Sousa, Fillmore, Karl King, Zo Elliot, Holst. Then I think about my students and which March would be adequate to get the most out of them to learn about March Style, and which Marches would they be able to play the most musically.
12	Does it fit the personality and instrumentation of my ensemble. Does it fit into my program and is it an appropriate choice.

58

14	The difficulty level first; can my band play it. Then the melody and quality of parts. Is there something for everyone? Is it boring? The historical importance is also a good thing for educating the students.
15	Instrumentation. Grade Level of the music. Interest for the students. Contains techniques that we need to work on.
16	Range. Key. The melody. Sadly, I also base if off whether or not there's a "stinger" at the end.
17	Meter - How comfortable are my students with 6/8?. Key. Range in euphonium and trumpet
18	Grade level, instrumentation, accessibility.
19	Do I have the correct instrumentation to be able to support this march? Will students connect to it easily?
20	How it fits my ensemble. What the purpose/theme of the program may be. Why at all? This is a genre that I highly value. It is a style that can be applied in a variety of other genre's. It is always appealing to learn the historical significance surrounding the piece, and also the purpose for why it was written in the first place.
21	First and foremost, I consider the ability of my ensemble. All of the marches listed above, although they are high quality, have one issue or another for my ensembles. For instance, the trio on Star and Stripes Forever is particular difficult. Other issues would include balanced instrumentation and range (brass). I will put marches, such as those above, in front of my students when my ensembles' abilities/instrumentation align with the demands of the music.
23	Can my students play it? Is it interesting to me and my students?
25	Sousa always (lesser played marches the better). Fillmore always. Bennett marches for middle school kids. Swearingen arrangements of standards for smaller less technical ensembles. Needs to have a beautiful trio melody and a breakstrain [sic] Be able to make stylist differences
26	If my band can perform the march well.
27	Grade level, composer, and style.
28	Playing level of the group. Instrumentation. Do I like the march. Will the audience enjoy the march

29	Playability, crowd appeal, theme
30	I look for marches that are considered to be the "meat and potatoes" of concert band march literature. Not every march should be Sousa as long as it provides the opportunity to teach structure and technique however, being a Sousa fan, I have had students play his works often
31	Is it good music? Does it have good teaching moments to fit my needs? I spent 22 years playing in a top military band in Washington DC before teaching, there aren't too many I haven't played!
32	Difficulty level and the ability of the ensemble? Does the piece fit with the other pieces on the performance? Do I enjoy the piece/find value in it as a piece on it's own merits?
33	Difficulty of parts throughout all instrumentation.. Quality of writing and/or parts, so no one gets too bored. What concepts are to be taught/re-enforced as we learn.
34	Difficulty. Historical Merit. Artistic Merit. "iTunes" test This means if it comes up on my playlist, do I move to the next piece or stop and listen to it. Do I personally enjoy the piece. If I don't, my students certainly won't. Pathfinder of Panama is a perfect example. I have never done it with my students but it is my absolute favorite
35	Range then rhythmic demand.
36	I have a preference for minor marches (minor key on 1st strain). Also like a catchy trio melody. Relatively easy clarinet parts (to fit our program). Diversity of parts for the french horns
37	Play-ability for my groups. I tend to favor the Sousa / Fillmore / King marches and there are some great arrangements of those for grade 3 bands. I have also played the Radetzky, Shostakovich Galop, and Amporita Roca when I had groups that could do so, for something different. I typically don't think to do things like the Holst Suite marches as a stand alone march, but that would work, too.
38	I select marches that I am most familiar with. I like to us older marches that don't get played often by other ensembles. I also tend to use compound meter marches to review and/or introduce compound meter.
39	Range, playability. Difficulty of 2nd and 3rd parts. Solos and features. Educational opportunities (style, technique). Melody, countermelody,

	engagement for low instruments and percussion. Variety of textures is something I also take into consideration
40	I have a small band so instrumentation and covering/ doubling parts is key.
42	Is it really a march? When I want to select a March, I want am always thinking about the traditional Marches from military band. A march like symphonic metamorphosis or Holst Second Suite, does not truly qualify in that way for me. Very different in my opinion
43	Grade of Music. Concert Festival State List
45	Technique, range, and instrumentation strengths of my current group.
46	Technical facility required, familiarity, opportunity for growth within ensemble.
47	Not repetitive. It's uniqueness. It's History.
48	Variety in both dynamics, articulation, instrumentation, voicing, and styles. I also try to find marches that have interesting parts for the middle voices as well.
49	First is the orchestration I have of students and their strengths/weakness. My band is small (36), so not all marches are a possibility just on instrumentation; that is the students that are on specific instruments. I also like to do a Sousa or Sousa style march at least every other year.
50	Difficulty suitable for the band. Does it feature the right sections or individuals. Does it fit teaching/learning goals. Does it mix nicely with other program selections. Is there an element of originality or uniqueness, compared to is it a very generic march
51	The last three excerpts did not play. I look for marches that fit well with a small ensemble and are at the difficultly level that fits my band. I like Gallant Marines as an example.
52	Is it accessible for my ensemble? If it's a "re-arrangement," is it acceptable? Example: My 42 piece band (there are 94 students in our high school) is playing Semper Fidelis, arr. Custer
53	blend and balance of the instrumentation. technical difficulty

54	Criteria not necessarily in order of importance: Do I like the way it sounds? Does it offer opportunities for teaching traditional "march style?" I like low brass countermelodies, but right now my baritones are weak (so no exposed baritones this year). I like low clarinets in the trio, with opportunities to make nifty musical phrases. Great "go to" march composers, even if I don't know the march: King, Sousa, Chambers, Fillmore, Alford, etc. I may program a "traditional" march alongside a non-traditional march (ie Hindemith alongside King). British vs. Sousa vs. Circus (I like to change it up) newly composed marches are fine, but there are so many great old marches that I haven't discovered yet... and my kids need to be exposed to the standards as well!
56	Are we able to play it (range, technical consideration, instrumentation)? Is it in the original key? If not, is it in a musically satisfying alternative? Example: Semper Fidelis as penned by Sousa is in the concert key of C. Bb is far more accessible, and as long as the trills stay intact, is a better choice for a grade level 3 - 3.5 level band (which is my advanced band). Is it a classic, hidden gem, new work, etc.? Depending on programming, I may wish to select accordingly for balance. Obviously, is it a good march? Some are better written than others. What am I trying to teach/reinforce? I try to program at least one 6/8 piece every concert. A 6/8 march (My favorite is "Black Horse Troop") might really fit the bill. What if I'm looking for a paso doble [sic], a ceremonial march, or an English/ European style march? Is it for an occasion, ie. Veterans Day, Memorial Day, Fourth of July, graduation, etc.?
57	melodic theme. dynamic contrasts
58	because being in a small school and my band is a 7-12 grade band a march needs to have main melody that the students can grasp quite quickly. I usually pick a march that is a grade 2 - 2+. I tend to stay away from a march in 6/8 due to the fact the younger players have a difficult time with that.
60	Instrumentation of my ensemble. Exposed sections. Key signature. Rhythm difficulty
61	Difficulty. Time Period. Style. Instrumentation . Scoring. Historical Significance
62	Mainly instrumentation - what do I have in my band and which players are strong

63	Age of group, technical challenges and new teaching material, instrumentation, composers, is it a "standard"
64	How difficult the woodwind parts are. Try to stay away from trills.
65	I direct a city band and we do theme concerts, so the march should have something to do with the theme. Our one rehearsal proceeds the concert so technical difficulty influences my choice of marches
66	Technical difficulties matching ability levels. Melody in instruments other than the "typical" melody instruments.
67	Playability, fits with rest of program
68	Instrumentation, Skill Level, Appeals to students
70	Difficulty level; opportunities for learning new concepts; reinforce already learned musical concepts; range; number of percussion parts
72	Uniqueness OR historical relevance. Difficulty. Does it fit my curriculum
73	How difficult the independent/polyphonic lines are. If I have strength across parts AND sections, then I could make a variety of choices. If certain sections are not as strong or deep then I will trade articulation difficulty for ease in key or articulations. No matter what, I ALWAYS have a march on the program. ALWAYS.
74	Range, style, difficulty level
75	Level of difficulty, instrumentation, and educational value
76	If you can whistle the theme as you go out the door, for audience appeal. Will it provide a quality learning and growth experience for the ensemble.
77	It takes a lot of consideration before selecting a march. I am sure to check the difficulty of the march to make sure it is attainable for the group. I also look at how musical the march is and the quality of the march. It is not easy pulling kids in to a march nowadays; you really have to find one that will grab their attention. Something they will enjoy playing. I could play Sousa marches all day, but for them it is a different story. I believe it is hugely important to try and have a march on every spring concert program. The students - whether they like it or not - need to be exposed to the great march literature whether it be a military march or circus march. It is all substantially important to the band literature

78	The ability of my students to play it accurately and musically. What skills can my students learn from playing this march? What history/background can I teach my students beyond the music itself?
79	The exposure to various composers. Range for Clarinets and Trumpets.
81	Melodic & harmonic content/interest. technical demands. Form. history of the piece
82	Playability is the first step in my process followed by what skills am I trying to teach them this semester and how well does this match with what I am trying to reinforce. Lastly I try to find something I can listen to repeatedly for several months and music that students can connect with.
83	Accessibility. For developing bands, the woodwind ranges are the primary thing that prevent me from picking harder marches- especially clarinet. Otherwise, I just make sure it has diverse quality sections, and that it has musical interest and merit
84	Interesting ways the composer deviates from the standard march form. Counter melodies that add to the melody. Creative melody or scoring of the melody. Harmonic movement or chromatic alterations that push the standard march form.
85	Is it of quality and playable by my students.
98	Educational value, Historical influence to the literature, Playable, Does it fit the ensemble the current ensemble. Does it inspire the students
100	Instrumentation, Difficulty Level (related to my group at the time), Do I and will my students/parents enjoy playing/listening to the march.
101	Level of ensemble ability. Strengths and weaknesses of ensemble. Amount of contrast in the piece. If the piece fits the rest of the program. Whether the ensemble has played a similar style march recently.
102	Instrumentation, students' technical and musical abilities
103	Strengths and weaknesses of my ensemble. What type of performance we will performance this march or marches. How I can use it as a teaching tool. Significance of the composer

105	Can my students handle it, does it challenge and motivate them, and does it provide them a positive experience in playing and working towards a common goal of making great music.
106	Well written melodies and interesting countermelodies. Of course it must be at the appropriate level of difficulty for my ensemble as well.
108	The march has to fit the ability level of the band. Whether I am in front of a middle school, high school, or community band, the march has to be of quality for the band to enjoy playing it and receive a musical benefit from its preparation. I look at composers first and then titles and then scores. The march sets the tone on a festival stage and it also sets up the audience for the ability level of the band. The march helps the director teach or reinforce style and it needs to build the confidence of the group and also give the lead players something to get their teeth into to inspire and require practice.
109	What educational components are being addressed? Instrumentation as well as instrument strengths (Klaxon needs horns...no horns = no Klaxon). If possible program thematic continuity. Of the pieces being programmed, how many are familiar/standards and how many are not.
111	Level of difficulty for ALL instruments. Historical significance. Cultural background and how it will affect tempo/style. Overall length. Variety of melodic material/Predictability
113	Depth, craft, originality, difficulty, instrumentation, & artistry
114	Style, demand, Percussion Writing, Audience Entertainment
115	If it fits my ensembles instrumentation and ability
116	One that actually uses a march like style is important. I am not a fan of marches that sound like overtures. I think marches are an extremely important part of the wind band history. I usually gravitate toward the more traditional marches Sousa, King, Filmore, etc. I would consider all the marches in these listening examples to be great literature for High School groups to play
117	Ability level. Is it a good piece? musicality (can we achieve what the piece is asking)
118	Relevant Composer, Educational Value (Teaching Form, History, etc.) and "Playability" - does it challenge my student appropriately

119	Does it fit with the skill level of the concert band in question? Is it a quality piece of music worthy of inclusion in the curriculum? I have lately sought to include a greater breadth of music and cultural experiences in my concert selections...we and I have spent so much time with American marches - it's fun and interesting to explore marches from other parts of the world. I recently spent 2 years living and working in Australia, where I conducted a brass band with an extensive history, and found some old WWI and pre-WWI marches that were quite interesting...so I'm working on adjusting them to American school band instrumentation
120	Playability. Is it a challenge for my group? Will it be an enjoyable addition to the program?
121	Educational benefit for my performers. Counter melody. Tempo of march, how it fits into my program.
122	Middle School: ranges, rhythmic complexity, form (I usually stick to standard march form to teach the concepts and let high school branch out in more non-traditional march forms) appropriate key signatures, overall "interest" level of the march and thickness of the writing. Depending on my group I'll stick to more block scoring if my group is weaker, or a more independent line if my group is stronger.
123	Your "selections" were rather interesting. #'s 2,3 & 5 were certainly more "light overtures" in their style rather than true marches. Regarding "criteria" I always tried to program a more "traditional" styled march in to our concert rep...Anything by Sousa, Karl King, Henry Fillmore. Since the basic history of a march is more "militaristic" I feel that tradition plays an important role in my selection process. There are "Concert Marches" like the Holst that you selected and then there are more traditional marches like Stars & Stripes Forever. They both hold their own in the band literature world but I thought that your survey would be more along the lines of traditional marches. Best of luck...
125	Accessibility, teaching material, quality, and what allows my ensemble to sound good on
126	Demand on musicians - Changes from year to year depending on musicianship/instrumentation
127	I look for opportunities for music making...variety of styles, counter melodies, rhythmic accompaniment. Because I teach middle school, I look for accessibility in ranges, rhythms, and technical demands.

129	Engaging and technical/musical parts for the majority of players
130	I love the standard march and feel it is important to program. I consider my trumpet section since the Sousa marches tend to be on the face throughout and can wear them down. I also consider my strengths to see what section can be featured. I have 3 concert bands and all 3 play a standard march
131	The ability level of the students, and the instrumentation
132	Ensemble strengths & weaknesses. Will it drive me insane to listen to it a lot. How tough it will be for chops of the performers when considering other pieces on the program. If there are concepts in the piece that are appropriate to teach given the abilities of the students (ex. programming a 6/8 march when the students are ready to learn 6/8).
133	Playability by the students and its educational value.
134	Melodic interest, harmonic development, playing ranges
135.	Playability. Quality. Fun.
136	Quality of the music. Can the students learn about what makes it a march and can this knowledge be used to facilitate the playing and appreciation of the march style. Is this march a good vehicle to showcase the talents and instrumentation of the group. Is this a "march" or an overture in march tempo. Can the average non-musician march to it.
138	Melodic interest, harmonic interest, rhythmic interest, structure
140	Grade level and quality of music
141	Appropriateness for my ensemble. Harmonically interesting. Opportunities for artistic dynamic and tempo decisions beyond the printed music.
142	Accessibility, familiarity, dedication to style, speed, length, key, meter, dynamic contrast
147	The most important factor is the strengths and weaknesses of the ensemble. Second I consider how the march will fit in with the rest of the program and how I can continue to expose my students to great music.

148	Tradition, performer's strengths, audience appeal
149	Key signature, Length, Woodwind technique required, trumpet range needed, audience appeal
150	Quality of style and composition. Technical and musical level based on my ensembles capabilities. Introduce, refine and perform certain styles and or nuances historical persepective. [sic] appropriateness of march style to occasion
151	Instrumentation of my ensemble and where my strong players are located. Key signature. Level of difficulty
153	Range and playability by my group
154	Aesthetic of the piece and how it works into the architecture of the overall program. Tonal centers and how they relate to other tonal centers in the program Intellectual and musical demands on the student performers. Technical demands of the performers (is it developmentally appropriate). Pedagogical demands (do our students need to have exposure to compound time, cut time, certain composers, etc.) Will the students enjoy performing it? Will the audience enjoy consuming it?
155	Musical demands. Stylistic demands. Length. Purpose for performance ie. concert, evaluation etc. Familiarity
156	Melodic material. (Usually found without a problem in standard/famous marches). Possibility for phrasing and dynamic contrast. Ability level of my performers. (Key signature!). Diversity of marches: circus, British, American, etc.
157	The quality of literature is different than the quality of march. In other words, good literature that is also a march may not aide in teaching the characteristics of the march style, even if it is still good musical literature. Other than the usual assessment of strengths and weaknesses of the ensemble, I will also consider the transparency of lines, or ability for students to hear and share musical moments passed around, match style, articulation, etc. A good march shares the characteristic marcato [sic] style of other marches and clearly indicates the style in its articulation, careful use of slurs, and note lengths. Student and director are able to identify and work towards the composer's intent. Contrastingly, a march also leaves room for flexibility, allowing for changes of dynamics and other elements in repeats, etc

158	i like quirky marches that are off the beaten path typically
160	The skill level of my students, their strengths and weaknesses, the areas that we need to improve
161	Instrumentation and what the strengths are of my ensemble. I also look at what other successful programs have played successfully. Side note, not sure if I answered all those previous questions correctly. I answered them on their quality of performance (which was very high), not if I liked them or not.
162	quality literature. good melodies. adherence to march style
163	learning objectives - historical value to wind band literature - key - tonality - horn parts.
164	When selecting concert repertoire, I take into account strengths and weaknesses of the ensemble first. Specifically with marches, I try to find quality repertoire that includes the standard form of a march and lends itself well to teaching concepts related to march style and form. This does not necessarily mean I focus on King and Sousa marches, but if possible, I like to stay in this realm because of the historic quality of these two March Kings
165	Does the music work for the level of musicians in my group? Can the students learn something new when performing the music? Does the march follow the standard format? How long will it take my students to learn the march well enough to perform it in concert? Does the march have an interesting history? Or is it special in some way that would interest the audience?
166	Follows historical March expectations to teach history of March bands-also that it fits the level of my students.
167	Key Signatures/Key Changes. Tempo. Instrumentation. Overall level of difficulty
168	Instrumentation (first because of small band size), ease of learning/difficulty, style of march/tempo/meter
169	Instrumentation - I teach at a very small school with limited resources and limited instrumentation. I must consider the difficulty of the parts and what is needed to perform the march at a level that I would consider to be a quality performance

170	I have a very small program. 10 players grades 9-12, 5 in 8th grade band, and 13 in 7th grade band. I have to find music that is playable for all of my kids grades 7 thru 12 to be able to perform a concert. That is the only way that I have anything close to the instrumentation needed to perform
171	I have limited instrumentation, so my first criteria is, can I cover the parts. Second is will they learn something from it, third will they be able to play it, last will we enjoy it
174	instrumentation and strong/weak sections in the band. What meter my students need to work on, I'll try to program a 6/8, a cut time, and a simple meter each year. Obviously the difficulty is a huge factor as well
175	Featuring strong sections of the band; selecting different styles from year to year; selecting some marches with traditional form in order to teach students about intro, first strain, second strain, trio, etc.; playability of march for my band (Grade 2-4)
176	Ability level of the ensemble. Endurance considerations for the brasses. Programming. Is it a great to begin or end a program? Do the members of the ensemble enjoy playing it
177	Playablility, [sic] historical significance, pedagogical impact (keys, rhythms, etc.)
178	I'm in a 3a school, so original Sousa type marches are technically too difficult. I look at accessibility carefully balanced with quality, especially in grade 1 & 2
179	Most traditional "old school" marches bore me and all sound the same (a controversial statement I know) so I pick marches that I enjoy listening to myself. I try to find more modern or unconventional marches for my group. However, sometimes I find more standard marches that have great teaching concepts and catchy melodies that the students love
180	Instrumentation, playability by students
181	I try to program different styles of marches. Clarinet tesatura [sic]. Lots of dynamic contrast and preferably a style shift. Not too long
183	Key, how much technical work for woodwinds, length
184	Ability of players, ranges, rhythmic difficulty, articulation considerations, length of piece, tonal center, key changes

185	Instrumentation. Strengths and weakness of the group and how it fits with each march
186	Obviously, can my band play it is first. Then I look at the melodies. I like a march that has a really good singable [sic] melodic line. It does not need to be a traditional march in structure. Intro, 1st strain, 2nd strain, trio. Commando March and Symphonic Metamorphosis are neither traditional in style, yet are great marches, both of which I have played as a performer
187	I consider my instrumentation and its strengths. I also want my students to enjoy playing it, so it needs to be interesting
188	I consider whether the difficulty level is appropriate for the ability of our group, if the instrumentation is appropriate for our ensemble, and whether the music will offer our students a substantial amount of musical growth. Other slightly lesser factors include pleasing melody, if it can be easily remembered by concert attendees, and whether it somewhat adheres to the traditional standards of marches. We will most likely not perform a march that can't immediately be identified as a march within the first ten seconds or so
189	degree of difficulty and whether or not the students performing it will be able to address the musical elements of style, dynamics, phrasing in addition to "getting the right note and rhythm".
190	Does it fit the standard and expected march form. Does it fit the level of musicianship and instrumentation of the current ensemble. Will students grow musically and learn from the experience.
193	Will my students be successful on this march? That's determined by the overall difficulty of the piece, but also aspects like instrumentation. Is each section capable of playing their part for this march? Does it have strong elements typically associated with a march that will make it a good teaching piece of "march style"? Will my students like the piece? I teach the 2nd band at my high school and whether or not I think the students will enjoy the piece plays a huge role in my repertoire choices. Is there some other element that makes this march unique? Does it stray from the traditional march, but in a musically important way?
194	I usually search for a march that conforms to the standard march form for teaching purposes. I like to use familiar marches for our audience on the spring concert. I take into account the difficulty based on my particular group

195	When I had really good bands, I chose what I consider to be the best marches. Sousa is one of my favorite march composers. The other examples in your survey are all on my list.
196	Style & interest level
198	I look at the instrumentation to see if it fits the instruments that I have. I also look and see if parts are doubled or not. I look at the difficulty of the marches and see if it is something that my group would be able to play or if there is enough of a challenge for them that the will be able to play it well and not have a big flop
199	Difficulty of rhythms. Instrumentation required
200	What can the style of the march teach us? Does it feature sections that are strong in my band?
202	As a public school music teacher, I consider the musical elements that align with educational goals. In particular: the meter, the composer, so my students are exposed to renowned composers, he technical challenges
203	My ensemble is small and young, so I mostly consider instrumentation and range that will set my band up for success. As my program grows and matures, I'd like to pick marches that display a variety of skills and colors and that feature my strong sections
204	I usually look for a piece that has lots of repetition throughout the work. Also, a piece that is familiar to the audience
205	Difficulty - particularly the range for the brass and the technical aspects for the woodwinds. With a large percussion section I also look for mallet parts and/or other equipment aside from snare, bass, crash cymbals. The style of march - American or British are very different, though both teach important skills. Composer. The keys that they address
207	Playability and range. I am in a very small school with limited resources. We are 8th-12th grade in our Senior High school Band. I have students from every walk of life, and we have scheduling problems most semesters. I want to make sure that my students will be challenged, but also will be able to accomplish what I have put before them in the amount of time we have
208	The most difficult they can aspire to!

209	Playability by my ensemble. Growth for the ensemble. Audience appeal. Obscurity. How it fits or contrasts with the rest of the program. My own appreciation for the march
210	What would please the audience? What is the ability level of the performing group?
211	Availability, does it suit the ensemble I am programming for, ranges, etc. , historical importance, form
213	At the point my group is at, I am focused more on level of difficulty. The program I work with is a growing program, so I aim for pieces that they can be successful at, as well as ones that teach them the style
214	I look at quality literature and the ability of my performing group.
215	I try to avoid them. I've never been a huge march fan. There is so much great music out there and I have a hard time having 9 horn players (that can play) merely play off beats for 200 measures. Yes I know not all marches are that way
216	When choosing literature that we study, I look at how the particular selection has helped shaped the modern concert band. All of these marches were composed by people who were pioneers in the world of band literature.
217	Level of my ensemble. Unique character qualities of the march. Composer (underrepresented or under performed). How it fits with the other pieces for that program.
218	I towards not only the instrumentation that I have available in my group and their own capability. I also look toward what is currently being played right now in other groups I try to not play the same thing as everyone else
219	Unique elements since most marches are about the same tempo. I also don't like to program any marches by Sousa or Fillmore
221	Whether my group can play the parts adequately and learn them in the amount of time prior to a concert. The tunefulness of the melodies in the march (i.e., do band members exit the rehearsal whistling the melody?). The originality of the march itself; does the horn and percussion parts do more than keep the beat; are the countermelodies simply longer duration notes within the chords or are they a unique melody unto themselves? (And other possibilities)

222	Varies. Does the melody get passed around the ensemble? Is it an appropriate level for my ensemble? Is it a Sousa? Is it written by a foreign composer?
223	If it is well known, has "significance", and is appropriate for the skill level of my group
233	Range, style, articulations, and repetitive rhythms and melodies.
236	Structure, innovation
241	Ranges. Standard march form (Military, Regimental, Circus, Concert). Melodic structure - is the melody interesting and enjoyable enough that my students (and I) will have fun with the piece. Counter Melodies that are interesting enough to keep those sections of the band engaged. Is there a non musical concept that I can teach via the music - IE Aces of the Air by King allows me to discuss circus acts with the kids or March of the Belgian Parachutists by Leeman would allow me to discuss Belgium and World War II. Audience enjoyment
243	Composer. Style. Craftsmanship. Fit. Range. Technical Demands. Programming needs.
245	instrumentation that we currently have. other literature we are working on skills that will be gained from studying the piece
247	Difficulty of rhythms, ranges of parts, memorable melodies, contrasting trio section, balance between the amount of times each section has the melody
248	As a band: What skills do we have. What is our instrumentation. What skills do we need to build upon. What songs do we need to add to our performance to round out the selections
249	If the piece is a good orchestration, if it is challenging yet not unreachable. Range of the instruments. Is it recognizable by the audience
254	Technicality of parts (make sure they are appropriate for my students abilities. I try to find a march that has a different sound than others.
258	Range, instrumentation, character, and variety
259	Difficulty, and it also all depends on the current instrumentation. Let's say I don't have enough low brass within my concert band, then I would need to find something not as low brass heavy.

261	Educational content. Musical content and quality. Appropriateness for the ensemble
262	Basic March Form, Consistent March Style
277	Musicality, accessibility for players.
281	Does it match my band's strengths? Does it have strong melody & countermelody? Is the right ability level for my group?
282	Instrumentation and abilities of my student musicians. Standard march repertoire for wind band. Thematic elements. Does it follows standard march form which should be taught to student musicians. How does the march compliment and contrast with other selections
283	Key signature, range, tempo, difficulty of woodwind parts, audience appeal

APPENDIX D

QUALITATIVE CODES AND CODED EXAMPLES

Small Codes

Suitability	Educational Value	Programming Needs	Student Engagement
Composer	Historical Significance	Showcase Ensemble	Entertainment Value
Melodic Contrast	Harmony	Memorable Melody	Familiarity
Craftmanship	Melody	Variety	Core Repertoire
Character	Contrast	Cultural Significance	Director Preference
Style	Title	Director Engagement	Country of Origin
Musicality	Originality	Repetition	Predictability
Not Repetitive	Avoids Marches	Innovative	

Subsuming Codes

Musical Elements	Engagement	Composition Quality	Familiarity with the Work	Cultural Tradition
Director's Preference	Suitability	Educational Purpose	Composer	Historical Significance
Challenge Students	Type of March			

Final Subsuming Codes

Suitability (154)	Educational Value (72)	Musical Elements (61)
Engagement (59)	Concert Considerations (54)	Composition Quality (49)
Familiarity with the Work/Composer (40)	Cultural/Historical Significance (35)	Style of March (31)

Examples of Participant Response with Corresponding Code

Suitability (154)	1) Whether my group can play the parts adequately and learn them in the amount of time prior to a concert. (Participant 221).
	2) Difficulty - particularly the range for the brass and the technical aspects for the woodwinds. With a large percussion section I also look for mallet parts and/or other equipment aside from snare, bass, crash cymbals. (Participant 205).
Educational Value (72)	1) Is there a non musical concept that I can teach via the music - IE Aces of the Air by King allows me to discuss circus acts with the kids or March of the Belgian Parachutists by Leeman would allow me to discuss Belgium and World War II. Audience enjoyment. (Participant 241).
	2) As a public school music teacher, I consider the musical elements that align with educational goals. In particular: - the meter - the composer, so my students are exposed to renowned composers - the technical challenges (Participant 202).

Musical Elements (61)	1) Middle School: ranges, rhythmic complexity, form (I usually stick to standard march form to teach the concepts and let high school branch out in more non-traditional march forms) (Participant 122).
	2) selecting some marches with traditional form in order to teach students about intro, first strain, second strain, trio, etc. (Participant 175).
	3) Interesting ways the composer deviates from the standard march form. Counter melodies that add to the melody. Creative melody or scoring of the melody. Harmonic movement or chromatic alterations that push the standard march form. (Participant 84).
Engagement (59)	1) Counter Melodies that are interesting enough to keep those sections of the band engaged. (Participant 241).
	2) Lastly I try to find something I can listen to repeatedly for several months and music that students can connect with. (Participant 82).
	3) Most traditional "old school" marches bore me and all sound the same (a controversial statement I know) so I pick marches that I enjoy

Engagement (cont.)	listening to myself. I try to find more modern or unconventional marches for my group. (Participant 179).
Concert Considerations (54)	1) How does the march compliment and contrast with other selections? (Participant 282). 2) How tough it will be for chops of the performers when considering other pieces on the program (Participant 132). 3) Is this march a good vehicle to showcase the talents and instrumentation of the group (Participant 136). 4) The march sets the tone on a festival stage and it also sets up the audience for the ability level of the band. (Participant 108).
Compositional Quality (49)	1) Will it drive me insane to listen to it a lot (Participant 132). 2) Is it a quality piece of music worthy of inclusion in the curriculum? (Participant 119). 3) The originality of the march itself; does the horn and percussion parts do more than keep the beat; are the countermelodies simply longer duration notes within the chords or are they a

Compositional Quality (cont.)	unique melody unto themselves? (And other possibilities). (Participant 221).
Familiarity with the Composer/Work (40)	1) …the composer, so my students are exposed to renowned composers… (Participant 202). 2) …Standard march repertoire for wind band…(Participant 282). 3) Great "go to" march composers, even if I don't know the march: King, Sousa, Chambers, Fillmore, Alford, etc (Participant 54).
Cultural/Historical Significance (35)	1) Follows historical March expectations to teach history of March bands… (Participant 166). 2) I have lately sought to include a greater breadth of music and cultural experiences in my concert selections...we and I have spent so much time with American marches - it's fun and interesting to explore marches from other parts of the world. I recently spent 2 years living and working in Australia, where I conducted a brass band with an extensive history, and found some old WWI and pre-WWI marches that were quite interesting...so I'm working on adjusting them to American school band instrumentation. (Participant 119).

Style of March (31)	1) The style of march - American or British are very different, though both teach important skills (Participant 205).
	2) Does it have strong elements typically associated with a march that will make it a good teaching piece of "march style"? (Participant 193).

APPENDIX E

IRB APPROVAL FORM

DATE: November 20, 2018

IRB Protocol Number: 11132018.013

TO: Laura Eason, Principal Investigator

RE: Protocol entitled, "Perceptions of Quality and Level of Familiarity of Marches among High School Band Directors"

Notice of Review and Exempt Determination

The above protocol has been reviewed and determined to qualify for exemption as per the Common Rule regulations found at Title 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2). The research is approved to be conducted as described in the attached materials.

Any change to this research will need to be assessed to ensure the study continues to qualify for exemption, therefore an amendment will need to be submitted for verification prior to initiating proposed changes.

Approval period: November 20, 2018 - September 30, 2019

If you anticipate the research will continue beyond the approval period, you must submit a Progress Report at least 45-days in advance of the study expiration. **Without continued approval, the protocol will expire on September 30, 2019 and human subject research activities must cease.** A closure report must be submitted once human subject

research activities are complete. Failure to maintain current approval or properly close the protocol constitutes non-compliance.

You are responsible for the conduct of this research and adhering to the Investigator Agreement as reiterated below. You must maintain oversight of all research personnel to ensure compliance with the approved protocol.

The University of Oregon and Research Compliance Services appreciate your commitment to the ethical and responsible conduct of research with human subjects.

Sincerely,

Christina Spicer, J.D., C.I.P.

REFERENCES CITED

Alkoot, H. A. (2009). *Undergraduates' familiarity with and preference for Arabic music in comparison with other world music*. (Doctoral dissertation). Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.

Allison, R. I., & Uhl, K. P. (1964). Influence of beer brand identification on taste perception. *Journal of Marketing Research, 1*(3), 36–39.

Approved Festival Lists. (2018). Retrieved from https://www.scsboa.org/approved-festival-list/

Band Performance Requirements. (2018). Retrieved from http://www.uiltexas.org/music/concert-sight-reading/band-performance-requirements

Barnes, W., Gartland, M., & Stack, M. (2004). Old habits die hard: Path dependency and behavioral lock-in. *Journal of Economic Issues, 38*(2), 371–377.

Battisti, F. L. (2002). *The winds of change: The evolution of the contemporary American wind band/ensemble and its conductor*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music.

Blood, A. J., Zatorre, R. J., Bermudez, P., & Evans, A. C. (1999). Emotional responses to pleasant and unpleasant music correlate with activity in paralimbic brain regions. *Nature neuroscience, 2*(4), 382–387.

Bradley, I. L. (1971). Repetition as a factor in the development of musical preferences. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *19*(3), 295–298.

Calvo Porral, C., & Levy-Mangin, J. P. (2015). Global brands or local heroes?: evidence from the Spanish beer market. *British Food Journal*, *117*(2), 565–587.

Carr, J. K., Fontanella, S. A., & Tribby, C. P. (2018). Identifying American beer geographies: A multiscale core-cluster analysis of US breweries. *The Professional Geographer*, *71*(2), 1–12.

Chevallard, C. & Miles, R. (2003). *Teaching music through performing marches.* Chicago, IL: GIA Publications.

Choi, D. Y., & Stack, M. H. (2005). The all-American beer: a case of inferior standard (taste) prevailing? *Business Horizons*, *48*(1), 79–86.

Cicconi, C. M. (2012). *Band music, a handbook, a comprehensive catalog of band music written since 1995.* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from http://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1728&context=oa_dissertations

Clark, R. (2009). *Perspectives on the American concert march in music education* (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from http://purl.flvc.org/fsu/fd/FSU_migr_etd-3593

Conway, C. (2002). Curriculum writing in music. *Music Educators Journal*, *88*(6), 54–59.

Demany, L., & Armand, F. (1984). The perceptual reality of tone chroma in early infancy. *The journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *76*(1), 57–66.

Dotinga, R. (2005). Radio industry hits shuffle. *Wired Magazine*. Retrieved from www.uhini.com

Droe, K. (2006). Music preference and music education: A review of literature. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, *24*(2), 23–32.

Farmer, H. (1912). *The rise & development of military music*. London: W. Reeves.

Fung, C. V. (1996). Musicians' and nonmusicians' preferences for world musics: Relation to musical characteristics and familiarity. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *44*(1), 60–83.

Gilbert, J. W. (1993). *An evaluation of compositions for wind band according to specific criteria of serious artistic merit: A replication and update* (Doctoral dissertation). Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.

Goldman, E. F. (1923). *On the Mall*. New York, NY: Carl Fischer LLC.

Goldman, R. (1946). *The concert band* (Field of music; v. 1). New York, Toronto: Rinehart & Co.

Goldman, R. (1962). *The wind band, its literature and technique*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Grout, D., & Palisca, Claude V. (2010). *A history of western music* (8th ed.). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Hamlen, K., & Shuell, T. (2006). The effects of familiarity and audiovisual stimuli on preference for classical music. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education,* (168), 21–34. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40319458

Hansen, R. (2005). *The American wind band: a cultural history*. Chicago, Ill.: GIA Publications.

Hargreaves, D. J. (1984). The effects of repetition on liking for music. *Journal of research in Music Education*, *32*(1), 35–47.

Heingartner, A., & Hall, J. V. (1974). Affective consequences in adults and children of repeated exposure to auditory stimuli. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *29*(6), 719–723.

Hill, C. (2012). *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (1st ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hoffer, C. (1981). *The understanding of music* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Pub.

Holvik, K. M. (1970). An emerging band repertory, a survey of the members of the College Band Directors National Association. *Journal of Band Research*, *6*(2), 19–24.

Hopkins, M. (2013). Programming in the zone: Repertoire selection for the large ensemble. *Music Educators Journal*, *99*(4), 69–74.

Kappey, J. (1894). *Military music: A history of wind-instrumental bands*. London; New York: Boosey.

Keene, J. (1982). A history of music education in the United States. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.

Kish, D. L. (2005). A band repertoire has emerged. *Journal of Band Research*, *41*(1), 1–12.

Koelsch, S., Fritz, T., Schulze, K., Alsop, D., & Schlaug, G. (2005). Adults and children processing music: An fMRI study. *Neuroimage*, *25*(4), 1068–1076.

Koelsch, S., Grossmann, T., Gunter, T. C., Hahne, A., Schröger, E., & Friederici, A. D. (2003). Children processing music: Electric brain responses reveal musical competence and gender differences. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *15*(5), 683–693.

Koelsch, S., Gunter, T., Friederici, A. D., & Schröger, E. (2000). Brain indices of music processing: "nonmusicians" are musical. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *12*(3), 520–541.

Koelsch, S., Maess, B., Grossmann, T., & Friederici, A. D. (2003). Electric brain responses reveal gender differences in music processing. *NeuroReport*, *14*(5), 709–713.

Krumhansl, C. L., & Jusczyk, P. W. (1990). Infants' perception of phrase structure in music. *Psychological science*, *1*(1), 70–73.

LeBlanc, A., Sims, W. L., Siivola, C., & Obert, M. (1996). Music style preferences of different age listeners. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *44*(1), 49–59.

Literature Lists. (2018). Retrieved from https://oregonbda.weebly.com/literature-lists.html

Lychner, J. A. (1998). An empirical study concerning terminology relating to aesthetic response to music. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *46*(2), 303–319.

Margulis, E. H. (2010). When program notes don't help: Music descriptions and enjoyment. *Psychology of Music*, *38*(3), 285–302.

Margulis, E. H., Kisida, B., & Greene, J. P. (2015). A knowing ear: The effect of explicit information on children's experience of a musical performance. *Psychology of Music*, *43*(4), 596–605.

Mark, M.., Gary, C. L. (2007). *A history of American music education* (3rd ed.). Lanham, MD.: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

McCrann, J. P. (2016). *The most valued repertoire of distinguished middle-level band conductors* (Doctoral dissertation). Rutgers University, Newark, NJ.

Morrison, S. J., Price, H. E., Geiger, C. G., & Cornacchio, R. A. (2009). The effect of conductor expressivity on ensemble performance evaluation. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *57*(1), 37–49.

Music Lists. (2018). Retrieved from https://fba.flmusiced.org/for-directors/music-lists/

North, A. C., & Hargreaves, D. J. (1995). Subjective complexity, familiarity, and liking for popular music. *Psychomusicology: A Journal of Research in Music Cognition*, *14*(1), 77–93.

North, A. C., & Hargreaves, D. J. (1998). Affective and evaluative responses to pop music. *Current Psychology*, *17*(1), 102–110.

North, A., Hargreaves, D., & Pembrook, Randall G. (2001). Complexity, prototypicality, familiarity, and the perception of musical quality. *Psychomusicology: A Journal of Research in Music Cognition*, 17(1), 77–80.

Ostling, A. E. J. (1978). *An evaluation of compositions for wind band according to specific criteria of serious artistic merit* (Master's thesis). University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA.

Parsons, L. M. (2001). Exploring the functional neuroanatomy of music performance, perception, and comprehension. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *930*(1), 211–231.

Pereira, C. S., Teixeira, J., Figueiredo, P., Xavier, J., Castro, S. L., & Brattico, E. (2011). Music and emotions in the brain: Familiarity matters. *PloS one*, *6*(11), e27241.

Price, H. E. (1986). A proposed glossary for use in affective response literature in music. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *34*(3), 151–159.

Price, H. E., & Chang, E. C. (2005). Conductor and ensemble performance expressivity and state festival ratings. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *53*(1), 66–77.

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

Rhodes, S. L. (2007). *A history of the wind band*. Retrieved from https://ww2.lipscomb.edu/windbandhistory/

Richardson-Melech, J. S. (2011). *An analysis of the listening preferences of elementary school children for Western classical art music in the orchestra setting* (Doctoral dissertation). Rutgers University, Newark, NJ.

Sheldon, D. A. (2000). Preservice and in-service teachers' perceptions of band music content and quality using self-report and behavioral measures. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *48*(1), 10–25.

Silvey, B. A. (2011). The effects of orchestration on musicians' and nonmusicians' perception of musical tension. *Research and Issues in Music Education*, *9*(1), n1.

Silvey, B. A., & Koerner, B. D. (2016). Effects of conductor expressivity on secondary school band members' performance and attitudes toward conducting. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *64*(1), 29–44.

Towner, C. N. (2011). *An evaluation of compositions for wind band according to specific criteria of serious artistic merit: A second update* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3465178).

Trehub, S. E. (1987). Infants' perception of musical patterns. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *41*(6), 635–641.

Trehub, S. E., & Hannon, E. E. (2006). Infant music perception: domain-general or domain-specific mechanisms? *Cognition*, *100*(1), 73–99.

Van Den Bosch, I., Salimpoor, V., & Zatorre, R. J. (2013). Familiarity mediates the relationship between emotional arousal and pleasure during music listening. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, *7*, 534–543.

Ward, M. K., Goodman, J. K., & Irwin, J. R. (2014). The same old song: The power of familiarity in music choice. *Marketing Letters*, *25*(1), 1–11.

Whitwell, D. (1985). *A concise history of the wind band*. Northridge, CA: Winds.

Young, C. S. (1998). *The quality of repertoire chosen by high school wind band conductors and the resources and criteria used to choose this literature*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 9911293).

Zissman, A., & Neimark, E. (1990). The influence of familiarity on evaluations of liking and goodness of several types of music. *The Psychological Record*, *40*(4), 481–490.