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Abstract

The tenor saxophone has gained prominence as a classical instrument for composers and performers during the last four decades. Interest in the instrument has inspired the creation of innovative works and tenor saxophonists are charged with preparing these works for performance. Performing new repertoire has impacted the way in which the classical tenor saxophonists explore the musical potential of their instrument and their role in a larger sense. The aim of this study is to identify important works in the contemporary classical tenor saxophone repertoire, establish how performers approach these works, and discover their perceptions of the instrument.

Twenty-two professional saxophonists from Australia, Europe, the United Kingdom and the United States of America completed a questionnaire in which they identified significant contemporary classical tenor saxophone works and explained why the works were important to the instrument’s modern repertoire. Twelve saxophonists then participated in an interview in which they explored their perceptions of classical tenor saxophone performance, and gave insights into their experiences studying, performing and teaching the most significant repertoire.

Three key works written between 1986 and 2011 were identified, all of which utilised the tenor saxophone’s extensive musical and technical capabilities. These works were all written in a contemporary style and featured strong influences
from jazz/pop music. Saxophonists regarded the tenor saxophone as a versatile instrument remarkably suited to the classical idiom and unique in the saxophone family. These professionals employed novel technical and musical approaches in their performance of the contemporary tenor saxophone repertoire to create successful and authentic interpretations. They explained their common perceptions of the instrument and shared a collective musical identity as classical tenor saxophonists.
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1 Introduction

The tenor saxophone is a versatile instrument with the potential to perform within any musical setting. It is perhaps most familiar as an iconic jazz instrument, best exemplified by the virtuosic abilities of performers such as Stan Getz, Lester Young and John Coltrane and Michael Brecker. The alto saxophone was more prominent than the tenor saxophone in the early classical repertoire and this popularity is still evident in modern classical saxophone repertoire. However, in recent years, composers’ and performers’ growing interest in the tenor saxophone has resulted in a gradual shift in its perceived musical role from a solo jazz to classical instrument. Classical tenor saxophonists such as James Houlick (USA) and Niels Bijl (NED) have actively promoted the classical tenor saxophone as a viable classical instrument and strongly advocated the creation of new repertoire to realise the full potential of the instrument. This growing interest in the instrument and its performance practice has impacted the way in which the classical tenor saxophonist sees him or herself in the 21st century.

The contemporary tenor saxophone repertoire presents a myriad of challenges to the 21st century saxophonist through the development and inclusion of a diverse range of compositional and musical styles. Features such as jazz improvisation, the presence of electronics and avant-garde, non-traditional styles of composition, are becoming more commonplace and intrinsic to the classical saxophone repertoire. In such compositional styles, performers are charged with adopting different musical roles, either as interpreter or as reproducer of the musical works, which
may conflict with their own personal expectations and preferences. The tenor saxophonist has to navigate their changing role when composers offer a level of freedom for performers’ reading of music, or expect an exact reproduction of their intentions through the written notation.

Innovative playing styles can be attributed to recent developments in tenor saxophone repertoire. These playing styles often require saxophonists to create sounds not usually found within more traditional western art music, through the use of new and innovative methods. This can be challenging for emerging saxophonists, as they need to develop playing styles and practices to increase their technical capacity beyond the traditional performance practices. As pedagogues, saxophonists are responsible for transmitting the changes in style and practice to students, as they extend the legacy of the instrument and its repertoire to the next generation.

To date, investigations of the saxophone have mainly been focused on the other instruments of the saxophone family (soprano, alto and baritone), with few studies directed towards the tenor saxophone. The aim of this thesis is to determine how contemporary professional performers approach the classical tenor saxophone and its burgeoning repertoire, as well as its influence on their collective sense of identity as classical tenor saxophonists. The study will discover how professional saxophonists currently view the tenor saxophone as an instrument, and how they view themselves as classical tenor saxophonists. It will investigate the way in which the classical tenor saxophone sound and style differs from the other
members of the classical saxophone family as well as from the jazz saxophone. Finally, it will establish professionals’ technical and musical approaches to recent repertoire, in reproducing and interpreting significant musical works in the canon.
2 Literature review

2.1 Saxophonists as community

For a musician, a strong sense of musical identity surrounds their instrument choice, performance style, career, and place in the musical community. The idea of musical self will change and evolve through the individual's lifespan, as they undergo changes to their musical preferences and contexts and as they reassess and reallocate their values and priorities.

2.1.1 Formation of musical identity

An individual's musical preferences, values and ideals play a large influence in the formation of a musical identity. For young people, music preferences act as a social identifier, allowing them to indicate and represent their personality characteristics and values to others (MacDonald, Hargraves, & Miell, 2002). When surveying the musical preferences of 606 Greek university students, Gardikiotis and Baltzis (2012) found a direct link between the students' preferences and self-identification and their musical preferences. When reflecting on their individuality the students' musical identities and preferences moved towards more alternative styles of music, such as rock and punk music. However, when tasked with reflecting on their social interactions, the students' musical identities shifted to be more in line with expressive and dramatic styles such as those which relate to personal emotions and gender relationships. By re-evaluating the importance of
particular values within different contexts and situations, the students were able to modify their musical identities.

For professional musicians, the establishment of their identity is impacted by their professional role and careers (Bennett, 2007; Oakland, MacDonald, & Flowers, 2013). Bennett (2007) interviewed professional musicians to find out the various roles they assumed after tertiary education in order to maintain a steady and fulfilling professional career. She found that during their tertiary study, musicians form their initial musical identity around their instrument, due to the time spent within this field, and their intention to pursue a strictly performance based career. However, the performers were forced to assume other professional roles such as teacher, conductor or administrator, in order to sustain and further their careers. By diversifying their musical and professional roles, the performers moved their identities from instrumentalist to the more encompassing identity of musician (Bennett, 2007; Oakland, MacDonald, & Flowers, 2012).

Professional opera singers saw their vocal abilities as an integral part of their self-identity (Oakland et al., 2013; Oakland et al., 2012). They formed their identity around their ability to sing, their professional employment within an opera company and how others perceived them as professional opera singers (Oakland et al., 2013). This professional status and identity separated them from other singers, particularly non-professionals, and indicated their specific musical priorities. In particular, one professional declined to join a choir of amateur singers
as she saw a clear separation in approaches and priorities between the professional and amateur musicians (Oakland et al., 2012).

2.1.2 Development of music identity through group membership

The concept of assimilation or relationship with a group strengthens an individual's self-identity. They are able to situate and distinguish themselves as part of particular identity groups by self-categorisation and through comparing their priorities and values with others, both inside the group and without (Stets & Burke, 2000). Individuals experience higher levels of self-esteem by belonging to an identity group (North & Hargreaves, 1999; Tarrant, North, & Hargreaves, 2002). On the other hand, individuals will suffer from lower self-esteem when they lack a well-defined self-identity, which makes them unable to form associations with identity groups (North & Hargreaves, 1999).

Musicians validate their identity, and affirm its importance, by assuming a group identity (MacDonald & Wilson, 2005). They attempt to raise up the standing, or accentuate the positives, of their community, while down playing aspects of other identity groups (MacDonald & Wilson, 2005; Stets & Burke, 2000; Tarrant et al., 2002). Different groups assert the strengths of their musical style in comparison to other groups. Young people positively categorise individuals who like or associate with music styles which are perceived as popular (pop, rock, indie), while negatively stereotyping those who identify with music perceived as non-popular (jazz, classical, metal) (Tarrant et al., 2002). Professional orchestral musicians often accentuate the positive stereotypes (hardworking, dedicated) of their own
instrumental sections while placing negative stereotypes (insensitive, unintelligent) on other instrumental groups (Lipton, 1986). During focus group interviews, free jazz musicians emphasised their ability to play all different styles of music ranging from jazz to pop to classical, while dismissing the performance styles of classical musicians and their lack of improvisational ability (MacDonald & Wilson, 2005). They saw this narrow range of performance styles and the inability to improvise as an indication of classical musicians not being real musicians.

2.1.3 Shared language and understanding of musical communities

For all musicians, group musical identity plays a significant role. The familiarity and similarity helps them to communicate insider information and share common concepts about their instruments or musical styles. Musicians who share an identity, such as brass teachers or string teachers, will employ a common, group specific language when describing the various timbres of their instrument (Cavitt, 1996; Fritz, Blackwell, Cross, Woodhouse, & Moore, 2012). Professional pedagogues share tone colour descriptors in order to communicate effectively with others in the ‘group’. Cavitt (1996) interviewed 32 band directors to investigate about how they describe brass tone colour, and how they convey the concept of good tone quality to their students. The verbal descriptors used by these professionals were then compared to the descriptors found in 21 brass pedagogy books with a list compiled of all the terms used and their frequency. It was found that while not all the terms are used consistently by brass teachers, some appear to be more popular in their use. Cavitt (1996) postulated that teachers might utilise
these terms more readily as students and other musicians may be able to more easily capture their inherent meanings.

While these terms may be common within the vocabulary of other identity groups, however, their intended meanings are affected and determined by the contexts and experiences of each specific musical community (MacDonald, Miell, & Hargraves, 2005). Musicians share tacit knowledge about the language of their instruments or ensembles. This is, gained through their experience in those specific fields, confirming their membership and participation within a particular identity group.

2.1.4 Conflicting musical identities

Individuals undergo an identity crisis when their self-perception does not align with their situation or skills (Oakland et al., 2013; Oakland, MacDonald, & Flowers, 2014; Oakland et al., 2012). Professional opera singers, whose employment was integral to their identity formation, reported undergoing distress and identity loss when made redundant from their opera company (Oakland et al., 2012). In a similar study, another professional opera singer reported being unable to access the musical world due to a physical disability (Oakland et al., 2014). In both studies, the performers experienced inconsistencies between their self-image and their professional, and musical status. These discrepancies caused physiological distress and a sense of loss, which forced them to re-evaluate their self-identities and position within their identity groups. (Oakland et al., 2014; Oakland et al., 2012).
In order to protect themselves from changes or challenges to their identity, individuals will create a separation between their professional and personal selves (Davidson, 2002). Successful performing musicians will often create a public persona to achieve this separation. Davidson (2002) was exposed to many different music performance situations early in her musical development and found that these situations allowed her to form and utilise a public performance identity. This public identity allowed her to adopt a more focused and confident personality during performances, while protecting her personal self from negative criticism. Her colleague, however, was more susceptible to criticism and negative aspects of his performances, as he did not develop a public image or persona early on in his musical training (Davidson, 2002). A professionally employed opera singer was able to negate minimise the negative effects of redundancy by identifying as a musician, rather than his employment (Oakland et al., 2013). While others in his situation had relied on their employment to validate their identity, the musician had created a separation between his professional and personal identity, while also basing his identity formation on more than his employment and singing ability.

2.2 Saxophonist as interpreter

Performing musicians make choices concerning how to play musical aspects, such as dynamics, tempo and expression markings, in order to convey meaning within a performance (Krausz, 1993a; Shaffer, 1995; Silverman, 2007). Music exists not on the written page, but within the sounding and performance of the notation (Bujic, 1993; Lester, 1995). Therefore each interpretation exists only when it is
performed and is shaped by influences that exist within that moment (Silverman, 2007).

Musicians rely on two distinct approaches to develop their interpretations: top down or bottom up. Hallam (1995) interviewed professional freelance orchestral musicians to determine preferred practice styles and found that performers who utilise a top down approach will begin to form their interpretation prior to studying the work. They achieve this by actively analysing each musical aspect of the work and the relationships between them. This approach relies heavily on the ability of the performer to mentally hear the notation and those who lack these skills are unable to utilise this process (Hallam, 1995). Other performers develop their interpretation during their study of the work, relying on unconscious processing of the music to form their interpretation. Chaffin, Lemieux, and Chen (2006) analysed the thought processes and priorities of a musician during a performance and found that as the performer became more familiar with the work their focus shifts from technical to expressive aspects, indicating that study and experience was integral to developing an interpretation.

Musicians, however, are not fixed to one interpretation process; rather they may tailor their approach depending on the situation and context of their performance. Regardless of the approach favoured by the participants, spontaneity played a large factor in the creation of interpretations and performance (Chaffin et al., 2006). Performers must gain the necessary foundation skills and familiarity with
the piece in order to create the musical and mental space in which to spontaneously reinterpret features of the work.

In performing the notation, musicians either contribute to the musical meaning of the work, or act as a reproduction channel, striving to convey only the composer’s musical intentions (Silverman, 2007). When forming their interpretations, performers will apply two different readings to the text or notation. One reading focuses on performing the written notation as precisely as possible in an effort to create a “correct” aural representation. In contrast, by aesthetically reading the written score, performers determine how to interpret the notation in a manner which creates a personal representation (Silverman, 2007).

When performers contribute to the musical meaning of the work by interpreting and developing the composers’ intentions, they adopt a subjective view of the music (Silverman, 2007). They see the written notation and the composer’s intentions as a starting point for a personal interpretation. Silverman (2007) drew similarities between this approach and Rosenblatt’s transactional theory, which describes how the meaning of a written text is created through the act of reading the text, rather than existing within the text itself. This approach moves the responsibility for creating meaning away from the author, or composer, and places a greater degree of responsibility on the reader or performer.

Performers are highly selective about how they emphasise certain aspects of the music, and their choice of character for the work. Shaffer (1995) compared
recorded performances of piano works with structural analyses to demonstrate how structure and expression creates character within an interpretation and performance. His comparisons showed that while the performers’ treatment of expression can be influenced by the structure of a work, there are still a variety of approaches to interpretation between different performers (Shaffer, 1995).

To create or discover meaning in a musical performance, the performer must employ a combination of technical and musical readings (Silverman, 2007). The performer's reading of the notation, however, is influenced by their personal experiences and context. As these experiences are particular to the individual the resulting interpretation will be exclusive to that performer (Krausz, 1993b; Velimirović, 1986). Bamberger (2005) investigated how context, particularly educational history, affects musical interpretation. He tasked three children with sounding a predefined melody on bells and then had them create instructions for others to follow. Those participants with no musical education approached each aspect of the music as equal, while the others, who were deemed as accomplished violinists, placed importance and emphasis on certain elements of the music, viewing others as less vital to the instruction.

Music notation is often seen as a recognisable language which is read by individuals using a particular interpretation style (Velimirović, 1986; Yates, 1968). In reality, notation systems more closely resemble a code needing to be deciphered by the performer (Velimirović, 1986). This cipher quality is a result of both their continued development and their limited ability to visually represent and convey
ideas and creativity (Velimirović, 1986; Yates, 1968). In music, scores offer invaluable information for the performer on which to base their interpretation. When examining the metaphors used to describe music, Woody (2002) found that musicians were able to ascertain the atmosphere of a work or excerpt by considering its compositional structure. However, Rosenblatt’s theory highlights that written texts can point to deeper unwritten meanings, which is unable to be provided visually (Silverman, 2007). Music notation therefore does not and cannot represent the full intentions of the composer; rather it acts as a starting point for interpretation (Silverman, 2007; Velimirović, 1986).

According to Krausz (1993b) the incomplete nature of notated scores is seen as a fixed feature of classical music and the main reason that multiple interpretations are possible and valid. While performing a musician will add many features which are not notated in the score, meaning that each interpretation is merely one out of a possible multitude of realisations of the written notation (Lester, 1995). These interpretations, in order to be valid, should each hold a level of appropriateness (Krausz, 1993b). This appropriateness however, should be judged against standards, which reflect both the performer’s approach to the work and the varying contexts which influenced their reading of the notation.

Performers who aim to transmit the composer’s exact intentions adopt a strict view of the music (Silverman, 2007). Many 20th century composers saw their intentions as the only true interpretation of the musical score, to the point of forbidding no other musical will but their own in a performance (Yates, 1968). In
particular, the contemporary composer Christian Lauba, who composed many iconic works for the saxophone, saw the saxophonist as a reproducer of his intentions. During performances, the saxophonist is tasked with performing the written notation precisely, presenting the audience with a faithful reproduction of all aspects of the score (Umble, 2000). In these instances, performers see their role as to create a reproduction or “aural photocopy” of the score (Silverman, 2007, p. 102). For these performers, the responsibility of creating musical meaning rests solely with the composer, who communicates their intentions to the performer through the notated score. These musicians essentially position themselves as a subordinate to the composer and act as the medium through which the composer’s original intentions are presented to the audience (Silverman, 2007). In these instances, the performer’s focus is on reproducing the notated information in a way that would best represent the composer’s original intentions. This approach, however, is not interpretation in the strictest sense as the performer is not undertaking any aesthetic choices or conveying their own emotive ideas (Krausz, 1993b).

For these reproducers, the composer’s intentions can be the only valid interpretation of the work (Krausz, 1993b). This stance distinguishes them as “singularists” (Krausz, 1993b, p. 80). Many musicologists also hold this attitude, disregarding performance renditions in their analyses, and view performance and analysis as only tenuously linked (Lester, 1995). While these musicians maintain that there can only be one valid interpretation of a work, they would diverge from the written score if the composer could be convinced to change their
interpretation, by being shown that a deviation is an improvement on the original idea or is the ideal interpretation of the work (Krausz, 1993b).

2.3 Saxophonist as technician

In order to perform contemporary repertoire effectively and successfully the tenor saxophonist must possess a diverse technical skill set and understand how these skills are created and applied during performance (Weiss & Netti, 2009). These skills include the ability to manipulate the various internal bodily structures, which shape regular tone colour, as well as the facility to achieve non-traditional extended techniques. The saxophone is a relatively young instrument, first patented by its inventor Adolphe Sax in 1846 (Harvey, 1995). Sax’s original aim was for the saxophone to possess the ability to project its sound much like brass instruments, the technical speed and dexterity of the woodwinds and the musical voice reminiscent of the strings (Harvey, 1995; Hemke, 1975). The saxophone’s key work allows it to cover a normal range of just over two and a half octaves, and utilises a single reed mounted on a mouthpiece much like the clarinet. When blown the reed vibrates, it creates a sound wave whose pitch is determined by the length of the saxophone’s tube (Heller, 2013). By pressing or releasing the keys, the performer adjusts the length of the instrument, altering impedance of the sound wave, which results in a change in pitch.

In order to learn and absorb new information and skills the individual must move the knowledge sequentially through three distinct learning stages, the sensory register, the working memory and the long-term memory (Biggs & Moore, 1993).
The sensory register retains the new information for a brief period of time while the individual scans it and determines its importance to the task at hand. If the information is found to be relevant and significant it is moved on to the working memory. If it is not deemed to be important then the information is discarded. Conscious thinking occurs within the working memory. However, during this stage of the learning process, the individual is only able to focus on one major train of thought at a time (Biggs & Moore, 1993; Hattie & Yates, 2014). As the working memory cannot hold information for an extended time period the individual must focus on processing this information to transition it to the long-term memory. This movement is achieved through either rote learning or “coding” the information.

Rote learning involves the repeated practise of information to gain the ability to create an exact reproduction (Biggs & Moore, 1993). This approach is beneficial if individuals do not possess any pre-existing knowledge on the topic, as an understanding of the information is not a requirement of retention (Mitchell & Martin, 1997; Nijs, Lesaffre, & Leman, 2013) In music, performers apply this process of deliberate repetitive practice in order to build and gain the necessary foundation skills and the ability to subconsciously recall these skills at will (Nijs et al., 2013). In much the same way, Mitchell and Martin (1997) found similar benefits to rote learning when observing the development of French language students and the education approaches used by their teachers. These students were able to understand and develop their French language skills more quickly and easily by rote learning vocabulary and phrases. The students built up their
vocabulary through rote learning to a standard high enough to allow an understanding of the language's grammar rules.

When coding or encoding, the individual interprets and understands new information by comparing it with pre-existing information stored in their long-term memory (Biggs & Moore, 1993; Hattie & Yates, 2014). Unlike rote learning, coding requires the individual to understand the information in order to form the necessary links. Musicians gain an understanding of new and more challenging repertoire by comparing it to previously learnt musical structures, such as scales and chord patterns (Nijs et al., 2013). In doing so, they create connections between the old and new information, placing this new information within the context of the old and allowing them to absorb the new information more quickly than through rote learning. Language students underwent the same developmental processes when learning grammatical concepts. By comparing them to their pre-existing knowledge, they experienced a greater rate of development than those who were forced to rely solely on rote learning (Mitchell & Martin, 1997).

Once information has been processed in the working memory, it is stored within the long term memory (Biggs & Moore, 1993). Musicians will commit their performance skills, such as bodily sensations or finger movements, to their long term memory, in order to create an instinctive, or embodied, approach to playing their instrument (Howard, 1982; Nijs et al., 2013; Taylor, 2012). Like singers, who are able to internalise and pinpoint exactly where each sound would create a bodily sensation (Howard, 1982), saxophonists studying extended techniques
committed the physical sensations needed to achieve a particular extended technique to their long term memory for later retrieval and use (Taylor, 2012). These performers would engage their “sensory memory” (Biggs & Moore, 1993, p. 208) in order to connect the desired sounds with the physical processes and sensations. Nijs et al. (2013) found musicians were able to unconsciously recall a large amount of knowledge about their instrument and its processes once it had been committed to their long-term memories. This results in an automatic response by the performer and the feeling that the instrument has been absorbed into the musician’s physical body (Nijs et al., 2013).

2.3.1 Air Support

In saxophone performance the air stream serves a similar role to the vibrations caused by a brass player’s lips, or the plucking of a string instrument (Teal, 1963). To achieve the necessary air support the performer must employ active breathing. This is characterised by deeper and quicker than usual inhalations and an increase in pressure, both internally and during the long exhalation (Londeix, 1997; Teal, 1963). This increased exhalation pressure stabilises the performer’s airstream and maintains its consistency throughout the breath. When inhaling the performer must engage their abdominal muscles in order to lower the diaphragm and achieve a full breath (Londeix, 1997). During exhalation the saxophonist achieves the necessary pressure increase by continuing the engagement and contraction of the abdominal muscles. The performer must constantly monitor the produced sound and tailor the exhalation pressure to achieve the desired tone (Londeix, 1997).
This “conscious” style of breathing shares many similarities with those used by athletes and yogi (Londeix, 1997, p. 7). Often during performances, such as in short rests or staccato passages, the saxophonists must stop the airflow without taking a new breath, either by closing the throat or stopping the diaphragm (Teal, 1963). Teal (1963) suggests practising these methods without the instrument by repeatedly exhaling for four counts, stopping the breath by either closing the throat or stopping the active muscles for four beats and then restating the airflow at the same pressure.

Professionals were aware that certain approaches to breathing could hinder saxophonists’ ability to perform at their optimum level (Londeix, 1997). Teal (1963) described the breath as a “medium of decreasing pressure” (Teal, 1963, p. 35) similar in nature to the air within a tyre or balloon. When deflated, both the tyre and balloon retain a quantity of residual air, which helps to preserve the basic shape of the object. If the performer expels the majority of their lung capacity before the next inhalation, the shape of the lungs may change dramatically and severely hinder the next inhalation. In contrast frequent breaths can create a build-up of stale, deoxygenated air, leading to asphyxia and interference with the performers breath and playing ability (Teal, 1963).

2.3.2 Embouchure

In saxophone performance, the embouchure denotes the various bodily structures which effect tone production, such as the lips around the mouthpiece, the surrounding facial muscles, tongue position and the shape of the mouth cavity
(Londeix, 1997; Teal, 1963). The embouchure’s most basic purpose is to ensure the performers’ airstream moves steadily from body to instrument through an airtight connection. The standard saxophone embouchure involves the performer positioning their teeth on the top of the mouthpiece, while the bottom lip curls over the bottom teeth and makes contact with the reed (Londeix, 1997; Teal, 1963). The bottom lip should be supportive, but relaxed, acting like a firm cushion against the reed, as opposed to pushing upwards towards the mouthpiece. If the performer applies too much upward jaw pressure, the reed will not vibrate freely and the tip opening of the mouthpiece will be constricted (Londeix, 1997). This will restrict the airflow into the instrument and reduce the performer’s embouchure flexibility, resulting in a nasal and undesirable tone colour. Saxophonists’ jaw shape and structure can affect how the embouchure is formed, such as unintentionally placing too much, or not enough, lip on the reed. This may cause individuals to be more comfortable and have a greater range of flexibility on different sizes of saxophone (soprano, alto, tenor, baritone) depending on how their jaw is shaped (Teal, 1963).

In order to control and alter the saxophone’s diverse tone colours, it is imperative the performer attains a level of flexibility in the surrounding muscles or “embouchure wheel” (Teal, 1963, p. 41), as well as the ability to tailor the shape of the tongue and oral cavity (Londeix, 1997). To gain the flexibility and control of the embouchure saxophonists need to develop the muscles of the mouth through a variety of exercises. Assuming a whistling position develops control of the corners
of the mouth, while pushing the lips together, and then lowering the jaw, helps to develop and engage the lower lip and chin muscles (Londeix, 1997).

When playing, saxophonists must employ and continually adjust both the embouchure and air pressure to create a level of consistency between tones, and a steady and unified timbre (Rascher, 1941). This ability to adjust these aspects is imperative to the saxophonist as the instrument possesses a great number of naturally occurring and differing timbres, particularly when the lower and higher registers are compared. To develop a clear tone, the performer should position the oral cavity as if to pronounce the syllable “ü,” while flattening the tongue to the bottom of the mouth (Londeix, 1997).

2.3.3 Tone production

Tone production in wind instruments involves the creation of a sound via the regular vibration of the air column through the instrument (Teal, 1963). Musicians are most concerned with creating sounds which feature a specific tone quality or colour, particularly those which are deeply resonant and pleasing to both performer and audience (Londeix, 1997; Teal, 1963). While the physical instrument plays an important role in tone production, achieving the desired and consistent tone colour on the saxophone relies heavily on the performer’s embouchure and air support (Londeix, 1997; Rascher, 1941; Teal, 1963; Weiss & Netti, 2009).

Pedagogues advised performers to avoid utilising a single tone colour. Instead they should develop a range of different timbres in order to create nuanced
performances (Londeix, 1997). In performance of contemporary repertoire, this flexibility is often a necessity as the saxophonist may be required to manipulate or manoeuvre their embouchure past the traditional position in order to achieve newer extended techniques (Weiss & Netti, 2009).

The construction of the saxophone’s mouthpiece allows for a great deal of diversity in available tone colours (Harvey, 1995). Different styles of mouthpieces possess distinctive measurements, particularly in relation to the space between the reed and the tip of the mouthpiece (otherwise known as the facing) and the size and shape of the inner tone chamber. Generally speaking, jazz mouthpieces offer a much more flexible tone colour, while classical mouthpieces create a much more centred, but often less flexible timbre (Vanderheyden, 2010). There are, however, many instances of jazz saxophonists, such as Branford Marsalis and Chris Valada, regularly performing on mouthpieces generally considered as classical. Wyman (1972) compared the tone colour quality of alto saxophone mouthpieces and found that the saxophonist’s bodily structures and processes, such as embouchure and air support, have a significant effect on the produced sound. This demonstrates that while the mouthpiece does influence tone colour much of the influence comes from the performer themselves. As the mouthpiece serves to complete the instrument’s conical shape, it is important that its volume corresponds with that missing from the cone’s ending (Heller, 2013). If the mouthpiece does not fulfil this missing volume, or the construction of the mouthpiece is faulty, the vibrations caused by the reed and airstream may not act as desired, producing an unusable noise.
2.3.4 Harmonics, Overtones and Voicing

On the saxophone it is possible to achieve a large range of overtones (Weiss & Netti, 2009). The conical shaped body of the instrument allows it to produce the same resonating behaviour of an open-ended cylindrical instrument, such as the flute, of the same size (Heller, 2013). The overtones or harmonics are built upon a fundamental, usually one of the lower pitches (Bb, B, C, C#). They are predictable in their progression and are separated by diminishing intervals as they ascend to the thirteenth partial (Weiss & Netti, 2009).

To achieve and utilise harmonics the performer must have control over their embouchure, particularly the ability to manipulate their resonating spaces. Much like the process of whistling, this control comes from the performer’s experience with voicing, which is the awareness and ability to control the muscles and areas of the oral cavity and the vocal tract (Sinta, 1992; Weiss & Netti, 2009). By manipulating these internal resonating structures, performers are able to achieve a large range of pitches when blowing only the mouth piece (Sinta, 1992). When investigating the role of the vocal tract, it was shown that experienced players will manipulate these areas to achieve both greater changes in their sound and to access the higher harmonics of the saxophone (Chen, Smith, & Wolfe, 2011). To create these changes the performer will move the position of the tongue’s curve, or hump, to create and manipulate two distinct spaces, the oral cavity and the pharyngeal (rear) cavity, similar to pronouncing different vowel sounds (Sinta, 1992).
In order to gain the necessary familiarity with voicing, Sinta (1992) supplied a range of exercises for the emerging saxophonist. These exercises not only focus on the performer’s ability to produce the overtones, but also develop their ability to mentally imagine the tone before they produce it. This ability is tested when the performer is instructed to play overtone scales or overtone versions of well-known tunes (e.g. Reveille), while only fingering the fundamentals. Rascher (1941) supplied similar exercises and saw this ability to audiate and completely control the overtone series as a necessary fundamental in the production of the altissimo range.

2.3.5 Articulation

Articulation is the process in which performers start notes, or groups of notes, and separate them from other sets (Londeix, 1989). In saxophone performance, basic articulation is achieved through the interruption of the reed’s vibration, usually through stopping the reed with the tongue, or at times altering the airflow (Weiss & Netti, 2009). Performers and pedagogues utilise different phonetic equivalents (tu, ta, ku. etc.) to convey how the tongue should move and touch the reed, in order to produce the desired attack. Each of these syllables results in a different attack, or beginning of the note, and will therefore contribute to a different sound and musical style (Londeix, 1997; Weiss & Netti, 2009). This variety is integral to performance as many composers rely on different articulation styles to create musical phrasing.
In order to develop their articulation speed and accuracy, particularly for staccato, there are a number of exercises the performer can undertake (Londeix, 1997). By pronouncing a series of syllables (e.g. ta te ti to tu) in various rhythms and in combination with a gradually increasing tempo, the performer can develop their tongue dexterity. To develop the strength and endurance of their tongue, Londeix (1997) suggested the performer undertake a series of exercises in which the tongue is pushed against the teeth and the soft palate of the mouth and extended past the lips.

The use of different syllables in articulation practices, as opposed to one singular syllable, has been shown to increase woodwind performers’ accuracy rates (Sullivan, 2006). Over seven days two groups of high school woodwind players (sixty-six participants in total) were taught one of two different articulation styles, monosyllabic (“Tah-ah tah tah”) or multi-syllabic (“Tah-uh tut tut”) (Sullivan, 2006, p. 63). When tested, the students who were taught multi-syllabic articulation patterns had a higher articulation accuracy rate, in both learnt music and sight-reading, over those who were taught using only monosyllabic patterns.

2.3.6 Extended saxophone techniques

Over the last few decades saxophone performance style and technique has progressed immensely (Weiss & Netti, 2009). The modern classical saxophone repertoire now incorporates extended techniques, such as multiphonics, altissimo and slap tongue, pushing the instrument past its traditional tonal palette and helping to redefine its voice (Weiss & Netti, 2009). This change has come about not
only from the development of new compositional styles and structures, but also through exploration of the instrument's sonic abilities.

As extended techniques are still relatively new and non-traditional there are many methods for students to gain mastery over them (Taylor, 2012). When Taylor (2012) surveyed professional saxophonists' approaches to extended technique pedagogy, he found that although there were conflicting opinions on how to teach these techniques, professional pedagogues all stressed the importance of the student possessing a willing attitude and an openness to experiment. Professionals would often only begin their students' study of extended techniques when they featured in the current repertoire (Taylor, 2012). Most students would not start their study of extended techniques until late high school or during university due to the lack of lower difficulty repertoire featuring these techniques. The available pedagogical material which focuses on the production of extended techniques provides the saxophonists with a clear overview of the processes needed, as well as relevant fingering charts and exercises (Londeix, 1989; Rascher, 1941; Sinta, 1992; Weiss & Netti, 2009). While specific fingerings are important in achieving extended techniques, particularly multiphonics and altissimo, it is vital that the performer be able to voice the correct position and perform the appropriate embouchure adjustments (Weiss & Netti, 2009).

### 2.3.7 Multiphonics

Multiphonics involve the saxophonist sounding two or more pitches simultaneously (Weiss & Netti, 2009). Composers originally used multiphonics as
“opaque blocks of sound” (Weiss & Netti, 2009, p. 57) to create textual effects. In recent years, composers have begun utilising them for both melodic and rhythmic purposes. The nature of multiphonics on the saxophone can be particularly confronting to students encountering the techniques for the first time. Weiss and Netti (2009) explored the nature of multiphonics through analytical listening and identified the five main qualities of vibrating behaviour. These qualities include the layer of natural overtones, strong and fast fluctuations between pitches, wide and stable alternations, combinations of two or more partials over the fundamental tone, and narrow intervals between different pitches. The sonic behaviour of the multiphonic is a result of the partial tones which occur throughout the multiphonic and cause the various fluctuations heard within the technique. It is these oscillations that create and contribute to the aggressive tone colour that certain multiphonics possess when performed at louder dynamic (Londeix, 1989). In order to overcome this aggressive nature, the performer may wish to only utilise multiphonics which can be effectively sounded at all dynamic levels.

Due to the non-traditional fingerings needed to produce multiphonics, performers rely on pedagogical and reference texts to discern the appropriate fingerings (Kientzy, 1982; Londeix, 1989; Weiss & Netti, 2009). These texts not only indicate the possible fingering, but also show how the multiphonic and its individual notes behave. Some of the pitches within a multiphonic can be sounded more easily than others, and the saxophonist can utilise these tones to their advantage by using them to lead into the multiphonic or as a focus for the initial attack (Weiss & Netti, 2009). By doing so, they are able to counteract any attack or articulation issues the
technique may present. Certain pitches within the multiphonic also act to stabilise the technique, and when the performer focuses on these pitches, the entire multiphonic is steadied and is able to be sustained for a longer duration. Performers are able to selectively isolate various pitches within the multiphonic through manipulation of their vocal tract resonances, much like the practice of isolating the harmonic series to improve voicing ability (Chen et al., 2011). Taylor (2012) found that tutors would often instruct their students to practise isolating each pitch of the multiphonic. The effect of this exercise is twofold, with the student developing their embouchure flexibility and control, while also discovering the optimum embouchure position to achieve the multiphonic.

2.3.8 Altissimo

Pioneered by Sigurd Rascher, altissimo allows the saxophonist to extend the range of the instrument upwards (Rascher, 1941). The construction of the saxophone’s key work allows the performer to move chromatically to notated F#3. By utilising altissimo, the performer can extend their range higher by approximately a sixth in soprano and an octave in alto, tenor and baritone. Employment of the altissimo range has become widely used in the modern saxophone repertoire (Rascher, 1941; Rousseau, 2002; Sinta, 1992). In order to produce this higher range, the performer relies partially on a variety of non-traditional fingerings, as well as their ability to manipulate the harmonic partials of the saxophone. As the altissimo range relies heavily on this manipulation and realisation of the harmonic partials of the instrument, there is a great degree of importance placed on the performer’s tongue position and the creation of resonating space (Weiss & Netti, 2009). The
emphasis on the importance of familiarity with overtones and voicing demonstrates the vital contribution of the performer's manipulation of their vocal mechanisms in gaining greater control and consistency in their altissimo technique.

Saxophonists achieve the optimum position and space for altissimo playing through voicing notes, much like when achieving harmonics (Rascher, 1941; Rousseau, 2002; Sinta, 1992). In order to achieve the desired pitch, the performer must actively tune the resonance of their vocal tract higher to compensate for the instrument's lower resonance (Chen et al., 2011). If a performer is unable to effectively tune their vocal tract tuning, they will be unable to effectively produce the altissimo range. For Rascher (1941), the performer must have the ability to control all aspects of their regular playing in order to achieve the embouchure flexibility needed for altissimo. He also stressed the need for the saxophonist to be able to audiate the next note in a series in order to physically prepare their bodily structures. Through audiation and overblowing, the performer is able to develop consistency in their altissimo register. This is particularly true for the process of overblowing a sixth, where the saxophonist uses the fingering for an upper register note, such as palm key D or Eb, but produce the pitch a major sixth higher by manipulating their embouchure and oral cavity (Rousseau, 2002).

2.3.9 Slap Tongue

Slap tongue involves the performer creating a strong pop or percussive attack to the note, similar to the phonetic sound of “t” (Weiss & Netti, 2009). While there are
different styles of slap tongue they all employ the same technique to initiate the tone. To create the attack, the performer presses their tongue against the reed to create a vacuum, pulling the tongue away at the same moment as releasing a rush of suppressed air into the saxophone.

There are three main types of slap tonguing (Weiss & Netti, 2009). The first and most popular form is considered the standard, and involves the performer maintaining a regular embouchure to create a distinct marcato pitch after the “slap” sound (Taylor, 2012; Weiss & Netti, 2009). This tone can be achieved at a large range of dynamics (p – fff). The “secco” slap is similar to the standard version, but in this instance, the saxophonist does not blow into the instrument after the initial attack, resulting in only the attack being audible (Weiss & Netti, 2009). The dynamic range for the secco slap is much smaller and quieter than the standard slap (pp – mf). The third common type of slap tongue is the open slap, which involves the saxophonist fully opening their mouth after the attack, resulting in a short and percussive sound (Taylor, 2012; Weiss & Netti, 2009). The tone produced in the open slap does not correspond to the fingering; rather, it is slightly higher in pitch due to the shortening of the resonating space when the performer removes their embouchure (Weiss & Netti, 2009).

In his investigation, Taylor (2012) found that the slap tongue was considered one of the hardest extended techniques for students to achieve. The saxophonist must find the correct position or “snapping point” (Weiss & Netti, 2009, p. 145) for the tongue to create the vacuum in order to achieve the slap attack (Weiss & Netti,
Pedagogues favour having students initially work only with the reed in order to gain an understanding and familiarity with how to create this vacuum. In this way students can gain experience in creating the typical popping sound of the technique away from the instrument (Taylor, 2012).

2.4 Tenor saxophone in contemporary classical repertoire

The saxophone is an extremely versatile instrument capable of many extremes, particularly in range, dynamics and expression (Londeix, 1989). This nature allows it to effectively meet the most challenging technical and musical directions made by composers. Modern developments in compositional styles have diversified the tenor saxophone’s repertoire and transformed saxophone performers’ perceptions of music (Weiss & Netti, 2009). In response to these developments the performer has been forced to re-evaluate and evolve their playing styles (Weiss & Netti, 2009).

2.4.1 How composers are using the tenor saxophone

Twentieth century composition saw a period of unrivalled tone and sound experimentation and exploration (Cope, 1971). While compositional structures and forms were still a concern for composers, they began to concentrate on the different sounds available (Weiss & Netti, 2009), which . As the way in which composers listened to and considered sound changed, they pushed the tonal possibilities of acoustic instruments past their traditional performance practices towards new and emergent areas (Cope, 1971). The goal was to move these sounds past being noise and utilise them in serious and meaningful composition.
In order to discover these new sound possibilities composers collaborated heavily with performers (Cope, 1971; Weiss & Netti, 2009). Collaboration between composers and performers has long been an integral part of instrumental composition. During this period, however, performers were particularly important in the development of new playing styles and the discovery of new techniques (Cope, 1971). As contemporary composers began to shift away from traditional tonality and explore more diverse timbres and effects, a specialised understanding of instruments’ capabilities became a necessity. Additionally, collaboration acts as a method for musicians of different skill sets, (such as composition and performance) to bring together different musical ideas, or musical experiences, and discover a common middle ground and understanding (Murphy, 2011; Weiss & Netti, 2009).

The act of collaboration can often lead composers to realise their musical visions and discover previously unthought-of and novel possibilities. Hooper (2012) observed the collaboration between oboist Christopher Redgate and two different composers, Dorothy Ker and Fabrice Fitch. Each composer demonstrated a very distinct approach to this collaboration. Ker used a poetic idea to discover the possibilities of the oboe, while and Fitch used a pitch matrix, made up of the pitches he wished to focus on, to drive the collaboration. The reciprocal nature of collaboration this relationship benefitted both composer and performer as it shed light on previously “obscured” possibilities of the oboe, including timbre changes and effects.
Woodwind instruments benefited greatly from this period of exploitation and collaboration, gaining a variety of new performance techniques (Cope, 1971). These techniques include as multiphonics, blisbigliando (timbre trills), percussive effects and the extension of pitch ranges. In the classical tenor saxophone repertoire, both multiphonics and altissimo (ascending range extension) have become especially commonplace.

### 2.4.2 Jazz influences in contemporary classical music

The popularity of jazz during the 20th century had a substantial influence on classical composers and their compositional styles (Norman, 2002; Salamone, 2005). Within Europe during this time, there was a shift towards non-western artistic elements, and a fascination with Africa and by extent African American culture (Salamone, 2005). Composers were exposed to both live jazz bands and recordings, and were heavily influenced by the novel rhythmic figures, idiomatic tone colours and raw excitement. These Many composers attempted to merge their classical style of composition with jazz by imbuing it with the compositional features, expressive qualities and spirit of jazz (Salamone, 2005). In *Creation du Monde*, Milhaud combined traditional orchestral instruments with iconic rhythmic and stylistic features of jazz music to fuse the two music genres (Norman, 2002). Added to these features were the lyrical blues melody and the composer’s use of the alto saxophone, all of which created a jazz-like quality. These early jazz influenced works however, lacked one of the most distinctive features of jazz-improvisation (Norman, 2002).
Within contemporary music, improvisation is often associated with and seen as the sole province of the jazz genre (Dean, 1989; Gould & Keaton, 2000; Moore, 1992; Norgaard, 2011). When improvising, performers follow a strict set of guidelines and procedures (Dean, 1989). Studies show that artist-level performers are more concerned with the overall structure and contour of their improvisations, as opposed to the individual notes and motives (Johnson-Laird, 2002; Norgaard, 2011). Johnson-Laird (2002) tested the validity of theories concerning how creativity can be computable through algorithmic processes and found that the performers’ in-depth knowledge of the rules or guidelines that govern improvisation allows them to effectively shape their performances and improvise spontaneously.

By adopting these rules and processes into their working memory, performers were able to act on them automatically, gaining the necessary freedom to explore the melodic contour and structure of the improvisation (Johnson-Laird, 2002). Norgaard (2011) interviewed jazz musicians about the thought processes they undertook while improvising. The interviews involved performers listening back to a previously recorded improvisation and commenting on their mental activities at that point in the recording process. These performers reported focusing more on the extended melodic lines, and having these lines correspond to the harmony, as opposed to focusing on particular notes. While certain pitches may be chosen by the performer, Norgaard (2011) suggests that these choices are made consciously by the performer only in an effort to reach their melodic goal.
Historically, improvisation was an important part of classical/art music, particularly in earlier music styles, such as Middle Ages and Renaissance music, early operas and concerto cadenzas (Dean, 1989; Gould & Keaton, 2000; Moore, 1992; Norman, 2002). Improvisation became less common within art music as compositional styles developed. The change from the classical era to the romantic led to works featuring much more intricate and less flexible harmonic structures, which limited the available space, and freedom, in which performers could improvise (Gould & Keaton, 2000; Moore, 1992). During this period improvisation may have begun to decline within the classical idiom due to the emerging attitude of composers as the sole authority on their works and a desire for their works to go unmarred by performers’ unsuccessful or inappropriate improvisations (Gould & Keaton, 2000).

When comparing the performance attitudes and styles of classical and non-classical musicians, Creech (2008) found that modern classical musicians place a greater emphasis on notation-based skills, where as non-classical performers (i.e. jazz musicians) are more concerned with skills such as memorisation and improvisation. Improvisation presents an issue for classical performers, as it requires them to have an extensive knowledge of the harmonic and melodic “rules/norm” of the style they are performing in and to be comfortable spontaneously employing these rules during a performance (Gould & Keaton, 2000). Contemporary art music performers will regularly engage in multiple music genres (classical, romantic, baroque) as part of an ongoing career. This diversity in
styles means that they are unable to devote the necessary time needed to develop the required knowledge and skills to improvise successfully. There is also the added issue that, while performers in earlier eras, such as the times of Bach and Mozart, improvised as part of their performance practice; they did so in the contemporary style. These performers had access to examples of the conventions and rules, whereas modern performers are outside this area of exposure in which to base their improvisations (Gould & Keaton, 2000).

The presence of jazz improvisation is one of the defining characteristics separating jazz influenced works from “third stream” composition (Blake, 1981). The term “third stream” was first used by composer Gunther Schuller to describe and designate music that brings together the styles of western art music (first stream) and world musics (second stream), particularly jazz to create an entirely new artistic style (Blake, 1981; Joyner, 2000; Norman, 2002). In particular, third stream music was an attempt to combine the spontaneous energy of jazz with the compositional structures and forms of western art music (Blake, 1981). Blake (1981), when describing and analysing the third stream education approach at New England Conservatory, argued that this approach to improvisation and musical styles is a valid form of musical artistry within contemporary art music. He saw third stream music as raising improvisation to a similar level of importance, regard and popularity to what it occupied during the Baroque period. Improvisation is a key component to third stream works, distinguishing them from jazz influenced classical compositions (Blake, 1981).
The blending of two very distinct musical styles within the third stream led to many critics, both professional and the general public to view this music as a “mutt” of styles (Joyner, 2000, p. 73). This opinion of third stream stems from the fact that musicians would judge the works by the criteria of their own genres. Jazz musicians would employ the assessment criteria used for jazz music, while classical musicians viewed the compositions in terms of a classical performance. Each of these approaches dismisses the elements of the other style and do not acknowledge that third stream works are written in a completely independent style and should be viewed in both classical and jazz terms (Joyner, 2000). The greatest resistance to the style came not from western art musicians, but jazz performers, who viewed the attempts to fuse jazz with compositional elements of western art music as insinuating that validity of their art form could only be gained through comparison and association with the art music styles. However, for both performers and composers in this style, the hope was that third stream works would be evaluated on their own qualities and not as an amalgamation of the two different styles (Joyner, 2000).

2.4.3 Works for live performers and tape

Over the last several decades there has been an increase in compositions featuring acoustic instruments alongside electronic fixed media (Errante, 1985). This style of composition was developed from the early Musique Concrete, which used pre-recorded, often manipulated, non-musical sounds, and early electronic music, which was based on purely electronic sound sources such as tone oscillators (Antokoletz, 2014). The earliest example of these works is Maderna’s Musica su
Due Dimensioni (1958) for flute, cymbals and tape, which seemed to indicate the unification of the opposing styles and approaches to concrete music and electronic music (Antokoletz, 2014). In contemporary works of this style the fixed media aspect of a work is still referred to as a “tape,” though they may be in a different format (CD, MP3). While these tape parts may be seen to force the performer into one particular interpretation, it is possible for the performer to gain a deeper understanding of the work by carefully studying the contents of the tape, as if it were a part of the ensemble rather than an immobile backing track (Ding, 2006).

To successfully perform fixed media works musicians need to develop a high level of familiarly with the audio of the tape part rather than its written representation in the score as there is not yet an accepted and set method of notating tape parts (Ding, 2006; Kokoras, 2011). Ding (2006) in his study of works for piano and tape, Ding (2006) found that often the representation of the tape part in the score did not align with the audio and this necessitated the performers’ complete awareness of the track. Kokoras (2011) when surveying students’ approaches and experiences with these types of works, Kokoras (2011) found that performers felt much more confident when provided with in-depth and complete information. To provide the necessary information, and aid with understanding the tape part, he suggested that composers include a spectrograph representation of the electronic section, along with timings to aid practice sessions, in order to provide a solid point of reference for the performer.
As the tape part is identical for every performance it is imperative the musician understand the style of rhythmic synchronisation used by the composer (Ding, 2006). Ding (2006) classified the typical rhythmic synchronisation into four distinct types.

- In the first, tape and performer are linked in distinct musical sections, but are not rhythmically related; both start and finish sections simultaneously, and the performer employs rubato within each section.
- The second type demonstrates more synchronisation between tape and performer, despite the presence of continued rubato from the performer, resulting in closer rhythmic unity.
- The third type exhibits some free time, but with stricter synchronisation, typical of works in which performers must play unison sections with the tape after a period of relatively free tempo.
- The fourth interaction type involves steady strict rhythmic interaction, where the music has a steady rhythmic drive and the tape part can act as a metronome to the performer.

While Ding (2006) stressed the need for a deep understanding of the work to achieve the necessary rhythmic synchronisation, performers may also, particularly for the most rhythmically precise works, utilise a click track through headphones to maintain the strict pulse (Kokoras, 2011).

Performing with electronics often presents logistical challenges to performers, particularly if they are not experienced with the use and control of the technology.
and sound engineering equipment (Kokoras, 2011). Pestova (2009) investigated approaches to performances with live electronics, and suggested that a basic knowledge of the technology being used is immensely beneficial to the performer. Not only does this knowledge give the performer a more complete understanding of the work, allowing them which allows for a deeper and more authentic musical interpretation, but it can also reduce possible stress derived from both setting up and performance situations. In order to achieve this knowledge, the performer should actively participate in the equipment set up and collaborate with a sound professional during rehearsals and performances (Pestova, 2009). The collaboration with a technical assistant is a common approach to this style of music, however, the assistant may assume an active role in the performance. This active role includes beginning the tape and cuing the performer for specific entries (Ding, 2006). These cue gestures could be integrated into the musical movement of the work, much like the interaction between members of a chamber group.

Kokoras (2011) saw this lack of familiarity with electronics as evidence of a lack of attention to this medium in the performers’ education. He stressed that it remains in the hands of the institutions to include courses in performance with electronics or to change their curriculums to reflect this growing need for understanding and familiarity with electronic equipment. To aid in the understanding of these works, there should be an increase in available score information for the performers (Ding, 2006; Kokoras, 2011). This information may include cues and rhythmic examples of the electronic part, hardware signal diagrams for the most effective set up of the electronics, and instructions for amplification if needed. The presence
of this additional information would effectively make the composers’ intentions more clear and eliminate much of the extra interpretative work undertaken by the performer.

2.5 The current investigation

This investigation on the nature of the classical tenor saxophonist and his/her instrument is divided into two separate sections. The first part of this study focuses on the performer’s technical and musical approaches to the instrument and its contemporary repertoire. This section will also examine their responses to three significant works from the tenor saxophone’s contemporary repertoire. These works will be significant and representative within the classical tenor saxophone repertoire from 1985 onwards. Through this examination, a more detailed understanding of the attitudes of professional saxophonists towards the classical tenor saxophone, its repertoire, and music in general, will be established.

The second section of this study will extend the themes found in the first to determine the nature of the classical tenor saxophone and the identity of the classical tenor saxophonist. In particular, it will elucidate on the defining characteristics of the classical tenor saxophone and how these features differ from other saxophones. This second section will also determine what forms the classical tenor saxophonist identity, particularly in relation to the diverse and multifaceted perception of the instrument and its possible performance styles.
3 Method

3.1 Ethics approval

The University of Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee approved the study (See Appendix A).

3.2 Recruitment

Twenty-two saxophonists participated in this study. They were identified by their well-respected reputations as both performers and educators of the saxophone and representative of different performance styles within classical tenor saxophone performance (Table 1). Initial contact was made through one of three ways. They were contacted through publically available contact details from professional websites and invited to distribute the study information to other professionals who may be interested in participating. Participants were also recruited through an advertisement on the Tenor Saxophone Index (http://www.tenorsaxindex.info/) and in its newsletter (May, 2013) (Appendix B).

Participants were sent information about the project and invited to take part in a questionnaire and demonstration interview concerning current tenor saxophone performance practices and repertoire (Appendix C and D).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Style School</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Solo</th>
<th>Chamber</th>
<th>Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apsowoude, Bas</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Conservatorium van Amsterdam</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijl, Niels</td>
<td>FR, NED</td>
<td>Enschede Conservatorium</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bornkamp, Arno</td>
<td>FR, NED</td>
<td>Sweenlick Conservatorium</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrnes, Jay</td>
<td>FR, NED, UK</td>
<td>ESMAE Portugal, Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmichael, Steve</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Duquesne University, Carthage College, United States Armed Forces School of Music</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henshaw, Nathan</td>
<td>FR, NED, UK (CO)</td>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, J. Michael</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>University of Illinois, Bowling Green State University</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horch, Kyle</td>
<td>FR, UK, USA</td>
<td>Northwestern University, Guildhall School of Music and Drama</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde, Josh</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Victoria College of the Arts, Bordeaux Conservatorium</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay, Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, Matt</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Royal Northern College of Music</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellema, Ties</td>
<td>FR, NED</td>
<td>Conservatorium van Amsterdam, Bordeaux Conservatorium</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy, Joe</td>
<td>FR, USA</td>
<td>Bordeaux Conservatorium, Bowling Green State University, Northwestern University</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightingale, James</td>
<td>FR, NED</td>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope, David</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts, Eastman School of Music; University of Miami</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royer, Erin</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Royal Northern College of Music</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Andy</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Royal Northern College of Music</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slyvern, Craig</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Andrew</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Sydney Conservatorium of Music</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Materials

3.3.1 Questionnaire

The questionnaire included a series of eight questions concerning the participants’ educational history, style of saxophone performance, common performance settings and equipment usage. The questionnaire also asked the participants to provide a list of significant or potentially significant works in the tenor saxophone repertoire written during the last 25 years and their motivations for their choices (See Appendix E).

3.3.2 Demonstration interview

The demonstration interview participants were from a range of locations, including Australia, the United Kingdom, The Netherlands, and the United States of America, in an effort to present a large variety of musical approaches and performance practices. The semi-structured demonstration interviews focused on the participants’ experience with performance and education of the tenor saxophone, particularly how they approach the current repertoire and how they convey these practices to others (Appendix F). The participants were also invited to demonstrate how they interpret and perform them and also how they would teach a student how to achieve these outcomes.
3.4 Procedure

3.4.1 Questionnaire

All questionnaires were distributed via email. The participants completed the questionnaires by writing directly into the file, which was then returned via email to the researcher. Reply was seen as consent to take part in the questionnaire and confirmation or decline of participation in an interview. Participants were given the option to be named or remain anonymous within the presentation of the results, as well as being invited to participate in a more detailed interview about their approaches to learning and performing this new repertoire.

3.4.2 Demonstration interview

All interviews were conducted in person and held at various locations, including the participants’ homes and places of work, usually in their country of residence. Interviews were expected to take around an hour, but there was no fixed time limit for the interviews. The demonstration interviews were transcribed. These semi-structured interviews began with questions focusing on the participants’ experience with the tenor saxophone, their perceptions of the selected works and their experiences with techniques featured in the works. The participants were then asked more specific questions regarding the works, including sections which they, or their students, find challenging or significant, and to demonstrate their interpretations on their own instruments. Participants were also asked to guide the researcher’s interpretation of the works, further demonstrating their own approach to the music. One group interview was conducted with three
saxophonists based in the United Kingdom (Scott, London and Royer). Two interview participants did not undertake the questionnaire (Kay and Royer).

3.5 Analysis

3.5.1 Questionnaire

The results from the questionnaires were entered into an excel spread sheet and collated for comparison. Answers were then coded to identify how many participants shared an educational history, how many used the same saxophone equipment and performed in the same ensemble settings. Named pieces were tallied to determine the top three works for the focus of this investigation.

3.5.2 Demonstration interview

Transcripts were analysed using in depth content analysis. The results of the content analysis were then further grouped according to similarity or contrast. Three themes were identified: overarching performance practices and pedagogical similarities between the participants; trends as a result of educational background or performance styles; and approaches to the highest nominated contemporary tenor saxophone works and the general repertoire. These similarities and differences then formed the basis for the results and conclusion.
4 The identity of the classical tenor saxophonist

Saxophonists shared the view that the instrument was the “unwilling beast” (Bijl) of the saxophone family, due to its more remote and distinct playing. For some participants there was a separation between tenor saxophone performers and other saxophonists, emphasising that something different is required to be the latter:

“Someone once told me you can’t become a tenor player, you’re born a tenor player.” (Bijl)

The participants admitted they had all observed that a popular misconception held by inexperienced players was that the tenor saxophone can be played as if it is a “big alto”:

“The main thing I would like to tell my students, one of the main things, is to not play alto on the tenor, which is what most people worldwide in the classical world do, they play alto on the tenor. They squeeze the reed, they do not play with an open throat.” (Mellema)

Experienced tenor saxophone players understood where this misconception arose. Most performers begin their study on the alto saxophone, and are expected to seamlessly translate their skills:
“It’s often times the instrument people pick up under duress, somebody says “ok you’re on tenor” … and so there’s that automatic thing that it just doesn’t work.” (Horch)

“Unfortunately it’s not the most popular. The fundamental technique to the saxophone doesn’t give a lot of problems with playing the tenor … But the tenor saxophone is the unwanted child… in the classical saxophone family.” (Bornkamp)

While Bornkamp saw the techniques of the saxophone as compatible with playing the tenor saxophone, one participant saw that students often have difficulty approaching the instrument:

“I think the reason why it goes badly for so many people who try to play the tenor is because it’s not in their system, it’s something they’ve added.” (Bijl)

For Bijl, these performers see the tenor saxophone as something they add on depending on their chosen repertoire, and not the merits of instrument itself:

“I don’t want to be rude but if you want to be good at this treat it like a saxophone…To me I’ve had difficult moments listening to people … they think by picking up one repertoire piece they have to learn they’ll then learn how to play the tenor saxophone.” (Bijl)
In his opinion there is only one definite way of learning and developing tenor saxophone proficiency:

“If you’re an alto saxophonist and you want to learn how to play tenor… start over with the easiest etude books you have and give me six [Etudes] a week and scales.” (Bijl)

Bijl explicitly mentioned that inexperienced players view the classical tenor saxophone as a more aggressive sounding instrument than other saxophones. He suggested that this was due to the tenor saxophone’s popularity in the rock/pop genres and prevalence of these styles in the instrument’s classical repertoire:

“They [inexperienced players] approach is often way too rough, way too macho… it’s just loud and angry, on a classical set up quite often doesn’t work.” (Bijl)

This misunderstanding of the tenor saxophone’s timbral quality is also attributed to the lack of recorded examples of “real classical tenor saxophone playing,” as often performers do not capture the true nature of the tenor saxophone (Apswoude). It is important for performers that are new to the instrument to understand that the tenor itself is “not a rough instrument at all,” (Bijl) rather it possesses a rich and lyrical timbral palette. These saxophonists explained that it is imperative to have an understanding of the timbral capabilities of the tenor saxophone in order to achieve the nuances and richness of sound. During the interview Bornkamp spoke in detail about how although many classical
performers are good tenor saxophone players, they approach the instrument as merely a part of their work as a musician. As such, he felt they did not possess a personal connection to the instrument’s timbre, inferring that they do not spend the necessary time to become comfortable with the complexities of the instrument and develop their own voice. Performers in this study found that the presence of a unique voice is a requirement of true tenor saxophone performance:

“To make it really sound personal and related to voice that you hear mostly in jazz, and mostly in the older generation Coleman Hawkins, Ben Webster… that’s real tenor saxophone playing.” (Bornkamp)

4.1 Timbral identity crisis of the classical tenor saxophone

A divide was reported in the classical tenor saxophone repertoire, indicating two distinct notions held by composers towards the instrument:

“In my experience you get people who treat it as a real lyrical instrument and using it in a very lyrical sense and there are people using its dirty and darker side, whether it be a hark back to the rock n roll style but there’s either the beautiful lyrical style or wild grunting style.” (Smith)

Performers agreed that mastering the classical tone colour palette is essential for tenor saxophonists and advocated an approach similar to that heard from jazz players. The tenor saxophone is traditionally associated with jazz music and it is
in this genre where instrumentalists strive to develop a unique sound. Here, classical saxophonists recognised the potential in the instrument's variety of tone colours and qualities available to performers in any genre:

“It has this kind of depth of resonance which can also be applied beautifully in the classical sphere.” (Horch)

Performers all spoke about their desire to achieve a dark and well-rounded colour, reminiscent of renowned jazz tenor saxophonists of the past:

“As a classical player I was much more attracted to the sound of Stan Getz or more like Wayne Shorter... There was like this complexity to the shape of their oral cavity which you can hear in their sound and it's like this flexibility, rather than this raspy kind of like [sings low pitched vowel sound].” (Kay)

Kay captured the difference in approach between classical and jazz, where jazz performers embrace the resonant and dark sound possibilities, whereas classical performers are more restrained and do not realise the full potential of the instrument. Flexibility in embouchure was paramount to classical saxophone performance, with the participants advocating the embouchure styles more familiar to an older generation of jazz performers. These classical saxophonists believed they possessed an expansive depth of sound as a result of their complex and developed embouchure.
“[The style] should be more jazzy I think, not with a jazzy sound, but the approach of embouchure ... it needs subtone playing ... it’s not literal subtone... [but] it goes very much towards subtone, the jaw goes down and back a little bit, the tongue goes really high and the lips are really round and as fat as you can make them.” (Mellema)

4.2 Tenor saxophone as extension of body

The tenor saxophone was considered an ideal match to the male voice. Three of the male performers made particular reference to the range of the tenor saxophone as being the “closest to the human voice” (Kay). They viewed the range of the tenor saxophone (Ab3 to Eb6) allowed them a greater connection to the instrument:

“This fits me so well because it’s the range of my ideas of the human voice.” (Bijl)

There were parallels between the tenor saxophone and vocal abilities. As one performer explained, he viewed the instrument as an extension of his own voice as he was able to achieve the same pitches and tone colours as the instrument:

“My human voice is a bit like the tenor, I can PAW and HEE...[gesticulates a boomy low register to nasal high register] I can imagine myself [sounding like the sax].” (Apswoude)
In contrast, the alto saxophone did not inspire the same masculine impression as the tenor. Two of these performers, both from the Netherlands, felt disconnected to this higher instrument. They considered the alto saxophone, the most popular instrument in the classical saxophone’s repertoire, more feminine due to its range, which is higher than the usual male voice and a sound with which is harder for a male performer to relate.

“The alto is a very feminine instrument and the tenor is very masculine.”

(Bijl)

The performers also imagined the sounds of the different instruments as originating from different parts of their own bodies. This created a detached feeling between the performer and his instrument, where the saxophone was not a natural extension of his own sound, or a viable tool for artistic expression:

“If I play soprano my brain is here above my head [gestures a foot above his head].” (Apswoude)

4.3 Physical interaction with the tenor saxophone

The tenor saxophone, while closely resembling the alto saxophone, has a number of different features, particularly a longer, curved neck and a larger fingering position. Participants were in agreement that the tenor saxophone often requires a stronger degree of physicality to hold and control than the popular alto saxophone, due to its larger size and less ergonomic positioning:
“It’s more awkward...I think definitely you need to be stronger to play the tenor ... it all takes a little bit more physical strength.” (Kay)

Two performers related the size of the tenor saxophone as a deciding factor in when they began their study on the instrument. For one performer (Apswoude), who had always wanted to play the tenor, his tutors began his saxophone study on the alto as at age eleven he was “still a bit too small” for tenor. In contrast, for another performer (Bijl), the tenor was his first saxophone due to his larger statute and build:

“My parents said “we need one of those saxophone things” and the guy said “Is your son tall or isn’t he?” and they said “well he’s kind of tall” and the guy said “ok, I’ll bring him a tenor saxophone”... it wasn’t a conscious decision, someone decided that the tenor saxophone fits me better, physically, than the alto saxophone.” (Bijl)

Being a classical tenor saxophonist presented many challenges for the performers who specialise in this area. Their approach to the instrument was influenced by the jazz idiom, particularly in finding inspiration in the timbre of jazz tenor saxophone greats, while interpreting the repertoire in a manner more common to classical art music.

Tenor saxophone specialists are a highly sophisticated and diverse group of performers. While they specialised in many different musical styles, such as classical and crossover, they all report shared experiences of the instrument and
relate to other each other as part of a select group. The interview participants explored their interaction with the tenor saxophone and how they express personal preferences through the instrument. This process is further explored in their approaches and responses to key tenor saxophone repertoire.
5 Significant contemporary tenor saxophone repertoire

Performers selected a number of pieces (71 in total) and multiple performers consistently nominated twenty-one individual works (See Appendix G). The most frequently selected works (Table 2) range in styles from traditional to crossover and contemporary avant-garde composition and demonstrate the diverse nature of the tenor saxophone repertoire. Of these works six (Lauba's *Hard, Hard too Hard* and *Vir, Episode Quatrième* by Jolas, and Padding’s *Shuffle* and *Five Neo-Neos*) are written in a contemporary style of composition, similar to the sphere of activity which “forms much of the style and education of composers in France today” (London). Other works are influenced by popular music, or are written in the crossover/third stream style. These works exhibit the strong connection/association between the tenor saxophone and jazz (*Grab It!* By Jacob ter Veldhuis, *Concerto for Stan Getz* by Bennett and *Beat Me* by Cockcroft). The final compositional style present in the questionnaire results is a more traditional approach, typical of the earlier classical saxophone repertoire (e.g. *The Upward Stream* by Peck, *Poem* by Hartley, *Evening Song* by Smirnov). While the original time period for the selection criteria was 1986 to 2011, it was found that certain works, which fell outside this period, were popular and deemed significant by the participants. The time period was therefore extended in order to accommodate these findings. However the three most frequently selected works fall within the original time period.
Table 2: Key tenor saxophone repertoire chosen from questionnaire of Dutch (NED), English (UK), North American (USA) and Australian (AUS) saxophonists, ranked by popularity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>NED</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>AUS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Lauba, Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grab It!</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>ter Veldhuis, Jacob</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto for Stan Getz</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Bennett, Richard Rodney</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat me</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Cockcroft, Barry</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Too Hard</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Lauba, Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Upward Stream</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Peck, Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto for Tenor Saxophone and Orchestra</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Ward, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hout</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Andriessen, Louis</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Concerto for Tenor Saxophone and Orchestra</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Ewazen, Eric</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Fitkin, Graham</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversions</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Gould, Morton</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuffle</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Padding, Martijn</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Song</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Smirnov, Dmitri</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noyz in th’ Hood</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Greenbaum, Stuart</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Hartley, Walter S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op cit</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Hurel, Philippe</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Quatrième</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Jolis, Betsy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fingers</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>van Keulen, Geert</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vir</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Lauba, Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Neo-Neos</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Padding, Martijn</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songe De Coppelius Op. 30, No. 11</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Schmitt, Florent</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is an evident trend in the results for participants from certain countries favouring particular works, or styles of composition. Participants from the Netherlands nominated a larger number of avant-garde/contemporary works and less crossover/third-stream works. This contrasts with the selections by saxophonists from the United Kingdom who tended to favour works with crossover/third-stream and traditional compositional styles. The results from performers from the United States of America, however, show a greater predilection towards works composed by American composers, while demonstrating a fairly even selection of both avant-garde and crossover works. Australian performers showed the most diverse choices with selections from all three main compositional styles, with clear propensities towards avant-garde and crossover works. One American performer, who espouses the performance style of Sigurd Rascher, admitted that he could not recall any pieces within the last 25 years that he would deem significant. Instead he chose works from prior to the original time period due to the significance of their composers.

5.1 What qualities make a work significant

Participants gave a range of motivations for deeming a work as significant within the classical tenor saxophone repertoire. However the most popular was how well the work, and composer, explored the different possibilities of the instrument. One work, which was referenced repeatedly in this way, was *Hard* (1986) by Christian Lauba, with one Dutch performer referring to this work as featuring “all the possibilities for the instrument” (Bijl). For him, *Hard* (Lauba, 1986) could be seen as a “closing statement” to what the instrument has to offer in terms of extended
techniques (Bijl). In contrast, a performer from the United Kingdom, while not having nominated *Hard* (Lauba, 1986), appreciated that music in this style “look[ed] to develop and push the boundaries of [saxophone] technique” (London) but admitted that he was “not a fan” of this style of composition. Table 3 presents the participants’ motivations, and how often those motivations occurred, for selecting the works they deemed to be significant to the contemporary tenor saxophone repertoire.

**Table 3: Participants’ Motivations for Selection of Significant Tenor Saxophone Works**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explores the capabilities of the tenor saxophone</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular among saxophonists</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Music</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well known/significant composer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resonates with participant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfully incorporates electronics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes up the core repertoire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explores Lyricism/musicality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performers were also motivated in their selection by the composers’ use of the classical tenor saxophone sound, repeatedly mentioning the “stunning lyrical qualities” (Bijl) of the instrument. One Dutch performer said his motivations to choose certain works were that they “feature the tenor in its archetypical way: as a virile, brown coloured saxophone” (Bornkamp). For English saxophonist Matt London it is the sound possibilities of the tenor and the abilities of the composers to utilise this sound which draws him to a work:
“What draws me to the tenor is its sound. I love the way it resonates and the diverse spectrum of colours and contrasts it produces. Pieces that can demonstrate this is what I look for.” (London)

Performers also chose works based on their exploration of the instrument. One performer (Hyde) explained that his motivations simply as:

“Interesting explorations of the instrument in three very different ways by three interesting composers.” (Hyde)

One technical exploration mentioned was the use of electronics in the selected work. Many participants selected works that incorporate electronics and one performer cited this as his primary motivation.

Some performers chose works first and foremost due to how often they are performed or studied by saxophonists. This reasoning gave a broad overview of what the tenor saxophone community as a larger body views as the popular, if not significant, works within the repertoire.

5.2 The performer’s role: interpreter or reproducer

Through their approaches to the tenor saxophone’s repertoire, performers were seen to adopt different roles when interpreting compositions. By comparing the views of the participants and their choices of repertoire, a trend developed which
demonstrated the effect of these approaches to music on performers’ repertoire choices.

5.2.1 Saxophonist as interpreter of composers’ intentions

Performers saw their role in music to interpret the composers’ intentions while offering an authentic and personal performance:

“It’s playing it authentically, or the way you want to play it. I mean the second movement; do you subtone those low notes? Or do you non-subtone? How many [...] turns do you add on the notes if you want to, do you add in lots? Not many? Just a few? ... I don’t know, it’s just sound wise, it’s interesting to go through it and think how you would approach it.” (London)

“In the middle section I like the freedom to add in your own little jazz inflections into it, which were typical of what Stan [Getz] would do, it does bring it alive a little bit.” (Royer)

For these performers, it was important for a work to be written in a manner which allowed them the freedom to experiment and convey their own personality. For some performers, the contemporary/avant-garde style works, such as Hard (Lauba, 1986) were incompatible with their perceived performance role:
“To me they lose the musical part of music and instead choose to focus on
the technical mechanics of music. There is a lack of freedom.” (London)

When discussing *Grab It!* (Veldhuis, 1999) Scott and London viewed the strict
nature of the soundtrack to be limiting to performers’ interpretation of the work.
They saw the soundtrack as fixing all performers of the work into the same
interpretation by forcing them to react rather than lead:

“*There’s no space for performance... you’re concentrating on being in line
with that tape... I don’t think there’s much room to interpret it in a
musical way.*” (London)

Other performers, however, saw *Grab it!* (Veldhuis, 1999) as offering ample
opportunity to interpret both personally and successfully. Two Dutch performers,
Bornkamp and Mellema, reported working with Jacob ter Veldhuis on their
interpretations of *Grab It!* (Veldhuis, 1999). Mellema stated that the composer was
more than happy with different interpretations:

“*[Working with the composer] made me feel more secure about what I
was doing because he liked it...Arno played it more classically but with a
lot of energy which is great, but he also liked how I played it which is
more rocky more jazzy.*” (Mellema)
5.2.2 Saxophonist as reproducer of composers’ score

Participants acknowledged that some performers and composers see the musicians’ role as to recreate the score and the composer’s intentions. In these instances the performer’s interpretation and musical expression will hold less importance than the composer’s musical vision:

“Londeix on the other hand was only speaking about the text. “You have to play exactly what is written,” ... he liked to work on that as if it was a contemporary composer, you have to do exactly the dynamics and exactly the tempo.” (Bornkamp)

When meeting and working with composers on specific repertoire the performers were guided by the composers’ ideas and adhered to their intentions:

“The cadenza in the first movement [Of Concerto for Stan Getz (Bennett, 2001)] is directly split into two and the first half of that I remember him [Bennett] saying “just play it bang in time,” because all the rubato is written out, so he said “ I just want you to play the first half of that cadenza metronomically and with more a straight players’ sound I think, fewer inflections.” (Scott)

“I would play that bit more [Sings section of Grab It! (Veldhuis, 1999) in a smooth manner], but he [the composer] really wanted something “Louis Andriessen”... really aggressive, loud and short, marcato.” (Mellema)
One saxophonist viewed the clearly defined roles of the composer, as the creator, and the performer, as the realiser, as paramount. For Bijl the act of performing from memory was a disservice to the composer and negatively impacted the realisation of the composers’ intentions:

“I was in Chicago... just before the concert he [Wolfgang Laufer] was teaching a student... and he [student] sat down with no music... But why?

“Oh I know it so well”... but he [Laufer] said, “Then what we’re going to have now is ... we’re going to listen to you and we’re not going to listen to the composer”... It's rude because you can think you’re above the music.” (Bijl)

5.3 The obvious influence of jazz style

Eight of the top twenty-one works identified within the questionnaire feature strong jazz influences, particularly in terms of tonality, rhythm and improvisation. This influence in the repertoire was attributed by one performer to the “iconic” nature of the tenor saxophone’s sound within peoples’ perception of jazz.

“It's so iconic... of jazz and all that jazz is in peoples’ imaginations, that I suppose its inevitable composers would use it as that colour. If you’re an artist you’ll use orange if you want that and tenor sax is kind of orange... it is a bright provocative colour.” (Horch)
However, creating this tone colour as a classically trained saxophonist does not always result in a successful performance:

“The problem of classical saxophone is that if we are trying to do something more jazzy it can be cheesy instead of jazzy and it doesn’t really work.” (Bornkamp)

Classical compositions that borrow heavily from the jazz genre are commonly referred to as crossover works, due to their crossing between jazz and classical styles. Saxophonists, however, are not always completely convinced by the composers’ approach to the idiom. One performer viewed these crossover works as being compositionally insubstantial, often only consisting of a weak chord structure with a melody over the top, demonstrating the notions of how the composer, often not a jazz musician, believes the jazz saxophone is meant to sound:

“Jazz based pieces written for [classical] saxophone are often so thin.”

(Bijl)

Two performers questioned the need for the classical tenor saxophone repertoire to be so intrinsically linked with jazz through crossover works, believing that it can stand on its own as a classical instrument. Horch, in particular, saw the instrument as possessing the versatility of a woodwind instrument, but with “the nobility of a French horn” (Horch). With these qualities, he questions the popularity of jazz
influences in the repertoire and why the instrument has not gained more prominence in the classical sphere:

“It would be a pity if the repertoire had to be all crossover. I think the instrument is better than that, or it has more potential than just that.”

(Horch)

One of the most contentious aspects of jazz music that appears within third stream works is improvisation. For most classical saxophonists free improvisation with chord symbols is seen as inappropriate within the classical repertoire. They viewed it as representative of very limited idea of the composer. Classical performers saw their role as to interpret and perform the composer’s intention rather than to create and improvise:

“If, as a classical saxophonist, you have a piece for tenor saxophone and orchestra and a composer comes up with this [jazz improvisation], you give it back and say could you please compose, because this is not composing.” (Bijl)

While many saxophonist have experience performing jazz it is not always a priority in their professional lives. Two performers, who have some experience and abilities in jazz improvisation, felt they lacked the necessary level of skill needed to successfully perform sections that feature jazz improvisation. For them, effectively learning the art of improvisation was like a “whole other life”
(Bornkamp). When performing works featuring improvisation they advocated the involvement and assistance of a third party, who would notate an appropriate solo. The classical performer could then devote their time to effectively interpreting and performing the work as a whole:

“You only live once... you should have someone write for you then you can show that you can do it, you can play that” (Bornkamp)

5.4 Advanced techniques required for performance

Within the questionnaire results, seven pieces heavily utilise extended techniques, showing a general trend to their employment and importance in the repertoire. However performers have different opinions on their use, as some view extended techniques as unnecessary to musical ideas of a work:

“I haven’t heard many pieces where I’ve thought ‘that’s a good use of that effect, that sort of makes sense or is necessary” (Scott)

“I prefer the music without the extended techniques. The only person who I think makes it sound quite cool and hip is Tony Davis, from what I’ve come across. Everything else is used in a really obnoxious way to make it sound bad.” (Royer)

For one participant the idea and sounds of extended techniques, even early in his study, fit naturally in his idea of sound and music:
“I like crazy sounds ... my ears are always open and I whistle all the time and I try to make crazy sounds all the time. So to me trying to make crazy sounds on the saxophone is not really something strange for me, it’s normal. Like why should you only play legato lines... it felt great when I found out these techniques are possible on the saxophone.” (Apswoude)

Many performers have integrated extended techniques into their regular playing style and as a result no longer view these processes and sounds as an exotic aspect of tenor saxophone performance:

“The mysteries been taken out for me now, so I just use them and try and use them expressively.” (Kay)

“They’re another tool in the toolkit... I’m surprised if there’s a new piece with no extended techniques.” (Apswoude)

Some styles of repertoire do not call for the use of extended techniques and the saxophonists who predominately perform this style of repertoire are not as familiar, or at ease, with the techniques. One performer who routinely uses extended techniques saw this approach as indicating a gap in tenor saxophone knowledge:
“[Extended Techniques] should always be part of your technique... you kind of sidestepped something that’s part of the saxophone culture and because it’s such a big part of the repertoire through the ages you need to be able to play them.” (Bijl)

For Bijl, all possibilities of the instrument should be known and mastered by the performer before they are able to truly master the instrument. For some performers however, while they see the knowledge and ability as necessary, other factors hinder their development of this skill:

“I’ve never had the time, or quite frankly the inclination... to get into that stuff, but that’s my personal decision... but if you’re a teacher and you’re teaching at a music college you have to know that stuff and you have to be able to play these extended techniques.” (Scott)

Often composers rely on saxophonists to demonstrate the potential and limitations of extended techniques. This collaboration gives the composer a greater understanding of the instrument's capabilities and is particularly useful for composers adopting a more aural approach to their works as opposed to relying on harmonic structures:

“We sat down and recorded all the ones that worked well as an aural recording. Then what he did is he sat down at the computer and picked the ones he liked the sound of the most and superimposed them to see
which ones worked ... he’s gone “well if it doesn’t speak well I don’t want
to use it” ... he chose ones he liked the sounds of.” (Smith)

For many performers their first encounter with extended techniques was through repertoire early in their study:

“I think when I first played the Noda's Improvisation, which was sometime
during my puberty...but before, maybe after a year, I had friend who was
a couple of years older than I was and they were already starting
experiment with multiphonics” (Mellema)

“Let’s say my real first serious encounter with that was when I started to
play Denisov.” (Bornkamp)

Bornkamp also encountered extended techniques, such as subtone, through his saxophone quartet, however he admitted that these instances did not have the same level of intensity or impact as those in the solo repertoire. One performer (Bijl), however, first encountered extended techniques early in his undergraduate degree, while participating in a saxophone quartet with older students:

“Saxophone quartets easily get into glissando and slap tongue and
multiphonics quicker than the repertoire pieces.” (Bijl)
Bijl explains this early encounter with extended techniques through quartet repertoire as being directly related to the way the two different repertoires (solo and quartet) are categorised:

“In repertoire pieces there are simply pieces for grades and there’s a build-up, but for saxophone quartet music there is simply professional music and amateur music and you don’t play amateur shit when you go into the conservatorium you play the full on shit.” (Bijl)

To learn and perfect extended techniques, participants all stressed the need for students to spend time experimenting with and becoming familiar with the sounds they were aiming to produce:

“Sometimes we just need to spend time playing multiphonics so they have the facility to play them and it’s not so separate from their [the students’] playing” (Murphy)

“I would encourage an exploratory attitude rather than ... giving someone these things that have been codified... you can really lock them in...I’m much more a fan of getting the student to figure out some of that stuff for themselves.” (Kay)

Indeed, Bijl recounted that he developed his slap tongue while experimenting with articulation during wind orchestra rehearsals:
“Slap tongue I learnt while being really bored in wind orchestra rehearsals at the conservatorium and I was farting around with articulation trying to annoy the conductor and suddenly I realised I was doing slap tongue.” (Bijl)

Two UK saxophonists agree with this experimental approach (Scott, London), however they promote the use of a pedagogical or reference book as a starting point for students:

“You can get hold of it [Les Sons Multiples Aux Saxophones (Kientzy, 1982)] and go through it and figure out and make decisions yourself and explore.” (Scott)

Another UK performer saw demonstration to students as being paramount in their development of extended techniques:

“I just try to de-mystify it and I think often times what people need to play multiphonics is just to hear someone else do it and if you just demonstrate a few they usually quickly cotton on to how to do it really.” (Horch)

For Horch this was an important step to give students the sonic fundamental for their own exploration of the technique. To develop their control, Horch
commented that it is a matter of making small adjustments “like Alexander Technique”.

The majority of the participants mentioned the need for students to incorporate these techniques into repertoire as soon as possible:

“Choose the right pieces... I think he [Barry Cockcroft] is a great composer to introduce [extended techniques]... and Noda is also great as an introduction. The Lacour etudes are also great, in a contemporary style.”

(Mellema)

In particular, Bijl directs students to the music of Ryo Noda to gain an appreciation of extended techniques:

“In classical teaching the easiest way to make students appreciate these techniques is through the music of Ryo Noda, that’s step one and you simply encounter modern techniques. Noda’s requiem is only multiphonics but the build-up, you start low and add colours to the sound.” (Bijl)

However, the approach to these works should be, as one Dutch performer notes, like learning any other piece:

“Like a normal piece, just play. I think studying means just studying. Just work on it. Some pieces are about melody and some pieces are about
virtuosity and some pieces are about special techniques. Of course that [special techniques] involves a lot more explaining which fingers you can use so maybe that’s more in your head than feeling the music... or telling the story so that’s a difference. But for the rest you to just work, open the first page.” (Apswoude)
6 Archetypal contemporary tenor saxophone works

Saxophonists collectively selected three works with strong contemporary or popular influences:

“It’s no coincidence that these pieces all have a very strong influence of popular music upon them. That is the way composition was in the 1990s and I think that’s what we’ll look back on in that period.” (Nightingale)

The works themselves are representative of the diverse compositional styles present in the classical tenor saxophone repertoire.

6.1 Grab It! (1999) – Jacob Ter Veldhuis

Saxophonists nominated two key works as the most significant within the classical tenor saxophone repertoire. Grab it! (Veldhuis, 1999) for tenor saxophone and boombox was one of these two equal significant works. Written by Dutch composer Jacob Ter Veldhuis, also known as Jacob TV, the work pits the tenor saxophone against a soundtrack based on spoken word audio samples from the documentary Scared Straight! (Shapiro, 1978) in which prisoners attempt to scare juvenile offenders away from a life of crime. The rhythm and melody of these audio samples, particularly the different “perpetual range of syllables, words and sentences,” (Veldhuis, 1999) are used by the composer as the basis for the musical themes of the work.
For one performer, the content of the piece did not resonate with his musical preferences:

“In terms of the actual content of the piece itself I find it just a bit embarrassing, maybe that’s the age I’m at. It’s not that I’m offended by it, it’s just a bit cringe-worthy to me.” (Scott)

However he did acknowledge what this compositional style, with its blending of pop/rock styles with classical saxophone, could achieve for the classical tenor saxophone:

“What Jacob TV has done by developing this whole new area within the classical saxophone genre is astounding, you know? He’s created this whole thing that is quite hip and you think about the extra people and the audience that he must have introduced to the classical saxophone through his concept ... taking [the classical tenor saxophone] into a new area.” (Scott)

In the score, the performer is asked to “respect the serious content of the piece” and is told that as the piece progresses the gravity and meaning of the lyrics become clear. To assist in the reception and understanding of the work, the performer is instructed to provide the audience with lyric transcriptions of the tape track. This allows for a more accessible approach to the serious nature of the work as well as deeper connection to “hopeless situation” of the prisoners. For
some performers, explaining the context of the work prior to performance can also ensure the success of the work:

“If you don’t give the background to the piece it’s a little bit overwhelming, but it’s actually a really fantastic piece when you give the entire story behind it, it’s really fascinating... It’s accessible in the way you bring it out in the concert.” (Royer)

One UK saxophonist, however, saw the need to establish the context of the work as a failing in the compositional process. In particular, he argued that the work should be able to stand on its own, without any extra musical information:

“Oh should you have to set up a whole context to make something work like that? ... you should be able to play and people should be able to get it without having this story and so on.” (London)

Other performers, however, argued that there are deeper levels to the work resulting from the composer’s instructions to play in the style of eminent jazz/pop saxophonists, such as Sonny Rollins and Clarence Clemons. The performer must therefore change their approach to performance in order to emulate these professionals, while continuing to create a connection between the saxophone and the soundtrack:
“If you call this one dimensional you can do it but the extra dimensions is can you dive into sounding like those saxophonists as you play it...there should be a clear and better connection to the documentary it’s based on.”

(Bijl)

This can be quite challenging for strictly classical tenor saxophonists, especially due to the typical classical mouthpiece and reed set up. Some performers viewed the soundtrack as a backing track with which the performer must play alongside in order to present a successful performance of the work:

“I've got mixed feelings about it as a piece... most times when I've seen students play it here in their final recitals and I've given them lessons and stuff, I've kind of thought yeah its good they can get together with a backing track and they sound good and they're getting round it and they're meeting those challenges.” (Scott)

This however, is not the intention of the composer who described the work in the accompanying program notes as a duet or “dual” for the tenor saxophone and soundtrack. One Dutch performer emphasised the importance of unity between the two parts of this work in the creation of an ensemble performance, with the saxophonist assuming the role of leader:
“[The performer must] become really [...] unified with the tape, so it becomes not that you are playing with the tape, but that you are showing the tape when to play.” (Bornkamp)

This complex rhythmical work requires a variety of approaches and steps in order to achieve the proper level of familiarity and control. The score contains detailed performance practice suggestions written by Connie Frigo. They stressed the importance of understanding the rhythmic complexities of the instrumental part before using the soundtrack. To achieve this, Frigo directs the performer to prepare the saxophone part independently, and with a metronome, before adding the soundtrack. While undertaking this study the performer is instructed to begin listening to the work in full to gain a better understanding of how the lyrics control the phrasing and direction of the piece. Following this, the performer should begin to both sing and play the saxophone part with the full recording which will provide a guide as to where possible rhythmic inaccuracies are occurring. The final steps of these suggestions involve studying each individual section using the practice tracks provided on the CD to further polish the rhythmic synchronisation of each section. Frigo also instructs the performer to pay close attention to the lyrics, as they are not always notated 100% correctly. In these instances the performer should follow the soundtrack line (Frigo, 1995).

Rhythmic synchronisation between the performer and tape was imperative to a successful performance of the work. Participants who had performed or studied
the work approached the notes and rhythm in a way, which closely mirrored the performance suggestions:

“For me it works like this, I put on the metronome and maybe I’m going to practice this one in 8ths because [of] the feel and irregular bars. And getting the piece in tempo so there is no technical limit.” (Bornkamp)

Two performers indicated that bars 77-79 might cause rhythmic difficulties for the performer as the beat moves to the offbeat. One performer’s approach, which is more active, relies heavily on the use of a metronome to gain an “absolute” understanding of the tempo of the work and the consistent quaver pulse. During the interview he expressed his disbelief that some performers are not able to play this section correctly, stating that it shows that they have not followed the right process or have been too “loose” in their practising.

“I never had problems with that because I followed that process I explained, so the beat was very absolute in my ear. So when I was playing it I directly did it right because I did not go for the other beat to follow, because it was not that absolute tempo.” (Bornkamp)

Another approach to this section was more reactive to the soundtrack with repetition and score study forming the basis of his study:
“This you really have to study with the score, at 79, because everyone always turns the beat around… it’s something really illogical… you have to do it millions of times…” (Mellema)

To reinforce rhythmic precision, Frigo advises that performers practise singing the saxophone line against the CD. Performers also endorse this approach to rhythmic precision:

“I would practice singing along with it to get those fine differences of where it’s actually different to how it’s notated slightly.” (Kay)

For Kay, his singing went concurrently with rote learning sections of the work to aid his rhythmic understanding and precision:

“I’m a big fan, just in terms of getting the feel for things, rote learning, just memorising chunks of it and just walking around playing it … I find that when I do that I am singing it more any way.” (Kay)

This process of rote learning not only helped Kay become rhythmically steady and precise, but also allowed him to gain a better musical understanding of the piece, admitting “different things occur to me when I memorise it” (Kay).

In *Grab It!* (Veldhuis, 1999), Jacob TV utilises his knowledge and experience in rock music to create a very energetic, raw, and “groove” (Bornkamp) based atmosphere.
Participants had varying identification for their approaches, however, all the presented styles were distinctively non-classical:

“That was the approach, to play it rock and roll.” (Mellema)

“Act really gangster with it... grab it, by the throat!” (Kay)

While this level of energy and drive is important in the work, one participant warned that to successfully perform the work, the saxophonist must always observe and internalise the tempo:

“You have to be self-supporting, because sometimes what is tricky with the pieces of Jacob is the adrenalin is a very big factor in how good it will be, so in practising and rehearsing we are usually a bit slow and in performances we are usually a bit fast.” (Bornkamp).

For two performers, the directional energy and attitude in *Grab It!* (Veldhuis, 1999) came from the performers’ approach to the thematic material. Mellema stressed the importance of the performer’s approach to articulation and inflection:

“I think at [measure] 246 you can do whatever you like ... take the articulation with a grain of salt...and you have to add a lot of energy.” (Mellema)
Obtaining an appropriate sound for the work can be an issue for classical performers. Particularly as the desired sound may not work with the performer’s current equipment:

“Actually I could imagine ... to play it with a more jazz sound but maybe I would have to change material. Because if you do that on the C*[a standard classical saxophone mouthpiece], which I play on at the moment, then it would be forced and not working.” (Bornkamp)

For Bornkamp however this limitation in sound does not necessarily preclude the presence of jazz stylistic features:

“It doesn’t mean there could not be inflection that is related to pop or jazz but that’s something else. I think that I do that... in more or less a good way, but maybe a jazz player would do that different.” (Bornkamp)

### 6.2 *Hard* (1986) – Christian Lauba

Equal in the questionnaire results with *Grab it!* (Veldhuis, 1999) was *Hard* (Lauba, 1986) with a total of ten votes; four from Australia, and three each from USA and the Netherlands. Described by one performer as the “ultimate show piece” (Bijl) *Hard* (Lauba, 1986) utilises a plethora of extended saxophone techniques including multiphonics, slap tongue and altissimo to create a “synthesis between the present contemporary music and the more popular music (hard rock, soul Music),” through
an acknowledgement of the elements common to both the musical styles (Lauba, 1986).

While some performers in the study had taught or studied the work, and acknowledged the significance it held within the repertoire, they did not wish to perform the work in the future. Their reluctance was primarily due to the complex performance challenges of *Hard* (Lauba, 1986) and that it did not fit within their personal music preferences. All the interviewed performers, even those who admitted they do not want to perform *Hard* (Lauba, 1986), viewed the work as important to the repertoire, particularly as it “has everything” (Bijl) which characterises contemporary classical tenor saxophone performance:

“*Opening a new world, because the piece is full of abstract writing... there is a tempo but the tempo is not always written in a traditional way and there are a lot of new techniques... but very typical for the instrument.*”

*(Bornkamp)*

While the aim of the composer was to create a work that gives the impression of a long improvisation, the work is written in a very precise style (Lauba, 1986). According to Bornkamp, within this “quasi aleatoric” style Lauba has chosen each note for a specific purpose and it is important for performers to ensure the intention of each technique and phrase is clear to the audience.
“All the different techniques you find in this piece, play them as clear as possible ... [because] half the piece sounds like a mistake already and when everything sounds like an accident the whole piece is an accident.”

(Apswoude)

To ensure this level of detail is achieved, one performer suggested that saxophonists studying this work should “work so small,” (Mellema) and focus on the smallest inconsistencies or errors in their playing, even if this means studying only one or two notes at a time.

Three of the performers gave stoic accounts about the sheer time dedication needed to realise the composer’s vision:

“You have to give up other parts of your other than musical life to learn this...you have to marry this piece otherwise it won’t work.” (Mellema)

“What I remember is it’s one of those pieces you have to learn page by page, week by week. It took me a year, you simply put things together and the first run through you realise everything’s connected.” (Bijl)

“It took me a long time, I think it took me 9 months to practice the piece.”

(Bornkamp)
The challenge of *Hard* (Lauba, 1986), is what drove Bijl to study the work. Upon hearing *Hard* (Lauba, 1986) during his first year at the conservatory he believed it to be unplayable and strove to learn this work for the final recital of his study. Another performer spent months studying the work before deciding it was not worth the effort needed to properly perfect the work. This dichotomy demonstrates the personal investment needed by performers of this work and how the work can become a driving force in their musical study.

Performers heard the jazz/pop influences within *Hard* (Lauba, 1986), and one drew comparisons between Lauba’s compositional style and elements of the experimental jazz of great John Coltrane. One saxophonist suggested that these influences be incorporated in each performance to fully realise the composer’s intentions:

“I don’t think it’s good enough to play the piece just as a piece of European contemporary music … [it] has other potentials inside it… and I’m pretty sure he [Lauba] wanted people to bring those elements into performances of the piece.” (Horch)

One performer saw these jazz/pop influences as a turning point in Lauba’s compositional career, with the composer discovering a musical aspect recognisable in the musical language of *Hard* (Lauba, 1986):
“What was decisive in his career... he found something recognisable, related to folkeristic music, like jazz is folkeristic... (sic) immediately the language worked... he became famous for that.” (Bornkamp)

The participants stressed the importance of the introduction when approaching Hard (Lauba, 1986):

“Like a lot of Christian’s pieces it’ll start in almost this introduction before... and at least musically that is the more difficult thing, and the rest plays itself.” (Murphy)

“Whenever I teach this piece it’s about the first two pages. If you can play the first two pages you’re done.” (Bijl)

The work itself is in two distinct sections, with the first characterised by the following rhythm, initially heard on the lowest note of the instrument:

\[
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During this section Lauba also introduces the primary multiphonics of the work, gradually building from thin, soft use to a thicker, more percussive use. The second section of the introduction features running passages marked “as fast as possible,” pushing the performer to the extremes of their technical ability. The introduction serves to present the thematic and musical ideas of the work to the performer and
once the performer understands these different aspects, the rest of the piece becomes more approachable:

“I think the most difficult is the first two pages plus the line... the introduction... it would be worth to spend one week without seeing the rest... everything in the piece is already there and if you get that right, if you get the tempo right, if you get the dynamics, the articulations, the multiphonics are already there... and the runs... I think the rest of the piece will sort of open itself to you.” (Bornkamp)

Multiphonics feature heavily throughout Hard (Lauba, 1985) and in the score, Lauba directs the performer to respect the written intervals of the multiphonics. If the presented multiphonic fingerings are too difficult to use for the performer, the composer instructs the performer to discover alternate fingerings.

These multiphonics are, as one participant described them, like walking a “tight rope” (Mellema) and the performer must be completely centred within in the multiphonic, to achieve the desired pitches. To overcome the fragile nature of the multiphonics, the performer must develop the ability to alter their embouchure position:

“There is a flexibility development necessary in the embouchure, in the way to approach the technique, the multiphonic, it’s not just you hit and
it’s there, you need quite a lot of [...] sensitivity to play the multiphonics, loud multiphonics and you need that flexibility.” (Bornkamp)

While the multiphonics can present an issue, they also offer a unique opportunity for the performer to gain mastery over them:

“I learnt so many extended techniques through this piece. I knew how to do them kind of, and then you have to develop them... I learnt how to appreciate multiphonics through this piece, because multiphonics are actually used as multi phonics and not as loud squeaky noises.” (Bijl)

Performers recounted that different factors can affect their successful performance of the extended techniques, in particular reed position. During the interview one performer explained his first performance of the work in which the reed was not in the correct position, resulting in a version of the work that was unfamiliar to him:

“I did the performance, maybe I was a bit nervous or something because it was a really big moment ... I had to change saxophones and I didn’t even look anymore at the place of the reed and I forgot that I put the reed down a bit so I started to play immediately with a reed that was perhaps half a centimetre down ... so it was twelve minutes of horror because I missed so much because I didn’t feel anything that was similar to what I practised.” (Bornkamp)
When teaching this work to students Bijl was careful to alert them to specific problematic sections:

“Page 7. Keep control; treat it as the 2nd movement. Relax. Make sure when you dive into it your heartbeat’s down so you don’t lose control...
And master the top of the last page because after all that Christian Lauba suddenly makes you show that you can actually play the saxophone.” (Bijl)

While the composition and title of Hard (Lauba, 1986) infers an aggressive approach one saxophonist was quick to dispel this idea:

“People have a concept of “rough rough rough!” “Tough! Macho! This isn’t that rough. It starts out explosive... but then immediately relaxes... in the end if you want to play Hard, first of all don’t make it sound that it is hard, and use delicacy... Don’t try to be a macho idiot playing this. It’s a fragile piece.” (Bijl)

6.3 Concerto for Stan Getz (1990) - Richard Rodney Bennett

The Concerto for Stan Getz (Bennett, 2001) was the third most selected work within the questionnaire results with a total of 6 votes; two from the United Kingdom and four from Australia. Although the questionnaire results indicate the popularity within the questionnaire results it is interesting to note that the votes were limited to only two of the four countries of origin.
The work, scored for solo tenor saxophone, strings and timpani, was originally written for jazz legend Stan Getz and is Bennett’s first composition written in the crossover/third stream style. In the accompanying program notes the work is described as a “true cross-fertilisation of ideas” with “no hint of musical compromise” (Bradshaw, 2001). Concerto for Stan Getz (Bennett, 2001) is written in three movements; the first features three motivic characters, percussive “rat-a-tat” ideas, triplets in the strings and a “generally more sustained idea” through syncopation (Bradshaw, 2001). The second movement is described by Bradshaw as a “song without words”, and is set against a calm sixteen bar melody. The third and final movement features a waltz-like feel and sees the gradual return of the first movement’s opening ten-note theme, creating a “circle of melodic influence” (Bradshaw, 2001).

For one performer, the Concerto for Stan Getz (Bennett, 2001) was one of the most interesting works he had studied as it presented many different musical approaches:

“I took it to three different people and stylistically I guess there was a lot of different interpretations that were offered in the way you would interpret it.” (Henshaw)

One of the most noticeable features of the Concerto for Stan Getz (Bennett, 2001) is the inclusion of improvised solos in each movement. As is typical with many jazz
solo sections, these improvisation sections are accompanied by chord changes to direct the performer. For one UK performer, however, the work did not necessarily call for improvisation in a jazz style:

“It’s a funny name for the piece. It’s not a jazz piece or influenced really. The language that [Richard Rodney Bennett] uses, it’s a classical contemporary language so I say in context improvising within that, if you did it in a jazz way it would just sound completely out of context within the way he’s written it, because it is contemporary classical music he’s written there.” (London)

Bijl viewed the improvisation sections as a reason he would never study or perform the work and many participants saw these sections, and the need to be a fluent improviser, as the reason why more strictly classical trained saxophonists have not performed the work.

Some performers, however, particularly those who were more closely associated or familiar with jazz and crossover styles, saw the solos as offering a chance for classical performers to explore processes and approaches to jazz improvisation, but advocated using a notated solo during performances:

“Leave it [improvisation] alone if you’re a classical player approaching that piece... but then I’d absolutely encourage doing certain listening and
getting certain books and having certain lessons to add to that area.”

(Scott)

One Australian performer suggested that saxophonists should perform a personal solo, but have this solo notated prior to performances:

“I would strongly discourage, if not ban them from say transcribing John Harle’s solo or playing Andy Scott’s solo … I think as part of learning of the pieces they should write one [a solo]. I wouldn’t really expect them to improvise one.” (Kay)

While Kay, much like Scott, promoted the process of listening to and transcribing other solos, to him the most important approach for the performer to understand was how the improvised solos relate to the written material:

“I think to understand that they’re taking small ideas out of the piece that the composer put in there as the core material [of the solo] and learn how to develop that would be a very valuable exercise.” (Kay)

Another Australian saxophonist was encouraged to investigate Getz’s playing style, by his teacher, and incorporate this into his improvisation:

“But I guess probably one of the interesting things about that was … Col [teacher] actually told me about it, he was like why don’t you look into the
playing of Stan Getz, ... why don't you get into the style of his playing.”

(Henshaw)

Similarly Scott was in favour of students researching the background and context of the work:

“I think it's an understanding of stylistic area, the musical area that we’ll be operating in and there's research and listening to be done before you even start practising the piece yourself. So you can appreciate what we're even trying to tackle here with this piece. But in terms of the actual music itself... everything he wants is on the paper.” (Scott)

Without this prior background research and understanding of the musical styles involved, an unsuccessful performance is likely:

“There's nothing worse than hearing an out and out classical person playing a piece like that. The one thing that's worse is when that person is arrogant... they haven't bothered to think where did this come from? How did this piece come to be in existence? ... There's massive amount of background and respect that I think should go into something like this...you got to really understand what's going on musically.” (Scott)
“A straight classical player might go over the top and add all these [turns] between every note, but a proper jazz person might not add any in but just pace it differently.” (London)

However, during the development phase, their understanding and approach to the work underwent change:

“I put quite few in but the more I played it I took lots out and less and less.” (London)

Saxophonists in this study reported on utilising different mouthpieces to achieve varying styles of tone colour in the performances of this work:

“I'm used to a more open set up than someone who plays a C* [classical mouthpiece] but when I played this... I borrowed from a friend of mine and practiced on it for a few months, an old ebonite mouthpiece, which is similar to what Getz, played. Not particularly because Getz played that but it really helped me to get into the area I wanted to be in ... it did help but I think I could do it on the Selmer E [Scott’s usual mouthpiece choice], that would be fine.” (Scott)

“I used a Meyer 6 when I played it, but I use that generally for everything, so kind of crossover sound as a whole, but a little bit bigger than the
smaller more focused sound, I think it adds character when it’s got a little more edginess to it.” (Royer)

“The first time I played it was a Meyer 6 as well, it was ok but I always found that a bit bright...I now play on a Brillhart Eboline, but the second time I played it was on a Tonalin, which Getz would have played, but I didn’t play it in a jazz way, I played it in a classical way, but using that set up.” (London)
7 Discussion

In this study, professional tenor saxophonists gave their insights into the classical tenor saxophone, its unique sound, repertoire and pedagogy. Saxophonists agreed that the classical tenor saxophone is remarkably different from other classical saxophones and possesses a significantly different tone concept for both composer and player. They acknowledged that its timbre shares a strong connection with its jazz counterparts, but felt that there was no doubt the classical tenor saxophone is a separate beast. While they felt that other saxophonists often see the tenor as the “black sheep” of the classical saxophone family, they had instead been attracted to the tenor saxophone as a perfect match for their musical voices and identities. These saxophonists were protective of the tenor’s position and legitimacy within the instrument group and were conscious of their need to further its acceptance as a voice for classical repertoire.

For these saxophone professionals, the tenor saxophone’s unique sound and intriguing repertoire confers an exclusive position within the saxophone family. Performers in this study saw the ideal classical tenor saxophone sound as being illustrated by jazz performers, such as Stan Getz, who generate a broad and expansive tone. While participants related the optimal classical tenor saxophone timbre to jazz performers, none located themselves wholly within the jazz tradition. Rather, they were drawn to the tone colour of the classical tenor saxophone as it resonated with their personal characteristics. Performers were not limited by the parameters of each style (jazz or classical), rather they were able to
create and synthesise their own unique approaches and notions of the classical tenor saxophone.

The saxophonists in this study agreed that the tenor sound was a specific specialty, which could not be achieved through the “big alto” approach, and pitied inexperienced saxophonists for their inability to capture the timbral possibilities of the instrument. The professionals’ view of inexperienced players and their approaches to the instrument highlight the differences in understanding of the tenor saxophone and further enforce the performers’ inclusion into the tenor saxophone community. This is particularly true for specialists as they are more likely to maximise the differences between experienced performers and the inexperienced in order to signal their membership of the classical tenor saxophone community and accentuate the validity of their identity group. This is much like how free jazz musicians elevated the standing and perception of their own identity group, while dismissing the performance skills of other communities (MacDonald & Wilson, 2005).

Saxophonists believed that inexperienced performers often view the tenor saxophone as a loud and aggressive instrument, but as professionals they see the instrument as capable of supreme lyricism and subtle nuances. For them, novices’ views were a result of the tenor saxophone’s iconic use and standing within the jazz/pop/rock genres and the stereotyping of the instrument that comes from this. The three works in this study deemed the most significant in the instrument’s contemporary repertoire all display influences from these genres and this may
strengthen novices’ view of the classical tenor saxophone. Stereotyping of certain instrument groups by other groups within ensembles occurs frequently and often results in negative connotations (Lipton, 1986). These stereotypes can be a result of individuals’ attempts to increase their own group’s standing within the music profession. The view of the tenor saxophone as solely a jazz instrument by non-tenor classical saxophonists could be interpreted as an attempt to minimise the disparity between their self-image as performers and their inability to perform equally on all the saxophones. By minimising this disparity, there would be less contradiction between the non-tenor classical saxophonist’s self-identity and their actual abilities, which serve to protect them from any psychological distress (Oakland et al., 2014).

The prevalence of jazz influences within the repertoire makes it reasonable to infer that composers also associate the tenor saxophone with the “jazz sound.” One participant brought to light that just as painters will use a certain colour to evoke and represent a particular emotion to the public, composers use the tenor saxophone to evoke a jazz sound or feeling. These saxophonists hoped that composers would investigate the classical tenor saxophone’s true nature through an exploration of the instrument’s true lyrical and nuanced abilities and adjust their perception of the instrument from a crossover/jazz to a purely classical instrument.

Tenor saxophone specialists were able to view the instrument as an extension of their bodies due to a high level of expertise and experience. This proficiency
removes the presence of the instrument from the musician’s consciousness to the point where it is absorbed into their bodily concept (Nijs et al., 2013). For some participants in the study, this embodiment or “oneness” with the instrument went a step further as they were keenly aware that the range of the instrument mirrored their own vocal range. Just as singers locate the origin of their sound vibration within their bodies (Howard, 1982), saxophonists could also pinpoint internally the origin of certain sounds and reported experiencing distinct internal sensations for each sound produced by their instrument. The saxophonists, however, needed to repeatedly experience these sensations before they were adopted into the working memory and could be automatically related to the produced sound. These practical experiences gave them the necessary knowledge to analyse and determine what a student was or was not doing internally to create the audible sound.

Membership in the “tenor saxophone” community provided these professionals with relevant information regarding their profession, the significance of being within that profession and helped define their own performance priorities. Past experiences, such as hearing the instrument at a young age or being assigned tenor saxophone in an ensemble, contributed to the formation these professionals’ musical and professional identity. Exposure to different music performing contexts both as audience and performer, particularly during early life stages, has been shown to shape how individuals perceive and relate to music (Davidson, 2002). These early musical experiences, particularly for performers, are important factors in the formation of their musical identities.
For musicians, personal and professional identities often overlap due to the amount of time in which they spend within their “musician” identity (Oakland et al., 2013). The specialist professional identity of “tenor saxophonists” demonstrated how inclusion in a particular group can also impact their social identity (Oakland et al., 2012). These professionals held their saxophone identity as a “badge” or mask which placed them firmly within the saxophone community, with their instrument defining them as a specific instrumentalist (Bennett, 2007; Oakland et al., 2014). The degree to which the individual employs their identity is predicated on the context of the situation (Davidson, 2002). While some participants in this study did not identify primarily as “tenor specialists”, their expertise in saxophone performance and pedagogy meant it was socially and professionally appropriate for them to fully assume the tenor saxophonist “mask” and maintain an expert position within the identity group.

Saxophonists in this study were united through a shared understanding and use of descriptors when explaining aspects of saxophone performance and describing the selected significant works. The participants repeatedly employed similar terms when describing tone colour, demonstrating a shared code or language to define the instrument and their instrument group (MacDonald et al., 2005). The saxophonists’ use of these popular terms is in line with investigations of both string descriptors (Fritz et al., 2012) and brass tone colour descriptors (Cavitt, 1996) which found that while there are a range of terms available to professionals they will often choose those which convey the intended meaning more
successfully. Such studies demonstrate that the meanings of terms can differ between instrument groups and are predicated on the understanding and context shared by members of that particular instrumental groups. Saxophonists’ consensus of the definition of descriptive language, therefore, confirmed them as an exclusive community formed through their common held values, interests and understandings (MacDonald et al., 2005).

Professional saxophonists were protective of the unique sound colour of the tenor saxophone. They saw inexperienced performers as merely adding the tenor saxophone to their current skill set, without developing a comprehensive understanding of its abilities and potential. Saxophonists were aware that often students begin to play the tenor saxophone under duress, usually to satisfy the instrumentation requirements of an ensemble, and this can create a reluctance to spend time developing a thorough understanding of the instrument. Being forced to learn a new instrument may contest with the performer’s perception of their ideal self, causing an identity crisis to occur as they lose their sense of control over their own musical direction (Oakland et al., 2013). This may be particularly true for students whose concept of the classical tenor saxophone does not encompass its full capabilities and potential. Participants were conscious that proper education was imperative to change the perception of the tenor saxophone to both a jazz and classical instrument.

These tenor saxophonists had shared priorities for the classical tenor saxophone sound, evident through their choices of significant tenor saxophone compositions.
Although they selected a number of different pieces, their key motivation was the success of the repertoire in exploring and presenting the classical tenor saxophone. This shared priority exemplified their memberships of the tenor saxophone identity group, which in turn, confirmed their self-identity as tenor saxophonists (MacDonald & Wilson, 2005). Performers also displayed shared priorities for the future of the classical tenor saxophone’s repertoire. While not all believed the repertoire should develop in the same manner, many agreed that it needed to go beyond the current popular styles of repertoire particularly jazz influenced works and those featuring a heavy use of extended techniques. By moving past these styles the classical tenor saxophone could find its new voice within classical music. Performers often collaborate with composers in an effort to further the repertoire (Hooper, 2012) and for the classical tenor saxophone repertoire this may be a possible avenue of development. Both these priorities indicate the saxophonists’ desire to raise the public perception of the classical tenor saxophone as a legitimate classical instrument, thereby validating their identity group.

While some performers identified as a “tenor” saxophonist, they were aware they each possessed a principal performance style (classical, crossover, contemporary), which helped to define their musical identities and their unique place within the tenor saxophone community (MacDonald et al., 2002). Just as Gardikiotis and Baltzis (2012) found that individuals were drawn to a particular musical style due to a resonance between the characteristics of the music and their personal values, saxophonists were drawn to particular styles of music which resonated with their own preferred musical preferences and values. This accounts for their varying
opinions on whether or not the work should be significant within the tenor saxophone’s repertoire. However, through their understanding of music and musical knowledge they were able to appreciate other musical performance styles and the associated performers.

The performers also utilised a variety of instrument equipment, particularly mouthpieces, in their performance practices. Performers make choices about their mouthpieces depending on how effectively the equipment allows them to create a true representation of their musical voice and preferences. However, as the sound produced is affected by the individuals playing style, particularly their manipulation of their vocal tracts and embouchure (Wyman, 1972), performers will not sound exactly alike even if they are using the same style and make of mouthpiece. While performers choose equipment set ups which correspond to their personal preferences, they are not averse to utilising different mouthpieces if the repertoire requires a different tone colour. This is particularly true for works that feature a more jazz, or pop influenced sound, such as *Grab It!* (Veldhuis, 1999) or *Concerto for Stan Getz* (Bennett, 2001). In these instances the performers were open to experimenting with and performing on jazz style mouthpieces, which create a larger and more edgy tone colour (Vanderheyden, 2010). This openness to altering their tone colour may indicate that the performers realise and acknowledgement that the classical tenor saxophone is not a set ideal, rather the identity of the instrument, and therefore the performer, will change depending on the context of the repertoire.
These performers’ musical preferences affected their perceptions and opinions of the tenor saxophone’s repertoire, which subsequently disclosed what they perceive as their role within music performance. Performers acknowledged that the tenor saxophone’s iconic standing within the jazz genre has permeated the instruments repertoire and resulted in many jazz influenced works. Many classical performers, however, were not supportive of the presence of these jazz influences, in particular improvisation as the performance style and repertoire went against their concept of the classical tenor saxophone and their notion of classical music. Improvisation was historically an important part of classical music but is now usually associated with jazz (Moore, 1992; Silverman, 2007). For these saxophonists, improvisation is inappropriate within the classical repertoire as their performance style tends to place a greater degree of attention towards notation based musical activities whereas jazz performance places greater emphasis on memorisation and improvisation skills (Creech et al., 2008).

Participants opposed to jazz improvisation in the repertoire saw achieving the level of knowledge needed to successfully improvise as a completely different path in life than the one they had chosen. All the interviewed participants, even those supportive of the inclusion of improvisation in the repertoire, were hesitant to suggest that classically trained performers should improvise in a performance. Improvising in this situation can place them outside their comfort zone and lead to an unsuccessful performance. This can then negatively affect their confidence levels by forming an inconsistency between their self-image and abilities, which result in physiological distress, harming their professional identity as a tenor
saxophonist (MacDonald et al., 2002). Classically trained performers saw the option of having someone else write a solo for them as giving them the opportunity to deliver an individual performance, while allowing them to follow the musical processes they were trained in, such as interpreting and performing composed music.

This reaction towards jazz influences and jazz style improvisation in the classical repertoire, such as in works like *Concerto for Stan Getz* (Bennett, 2001), may be due to some performers adopting an inappropriate approach to the compositional style. As *Concerto for Stan Getz* (Bennett, 2001) falls firmly within the category of third stream music, these performers may need to apply different criteria to their evaluation of the work (Joyner, 2000). Both jazz and classical musicians will regularly apply the evaluation criteria used to judge their usual performance styles to third stream music due to the presence of both western art music and jazz. However in doing so they disregard the other style and do not acknowledge that third stream is an independent compositional style.

Saxophonists’ reactions were reversed in the case of contemporary/avant-grade music, particularly those which feature extended techniques. The use of these techniques is characteristic of European contemporary saxophone music and there was a distinct preference by Mainland European saxophonists for these works. For the UK saxophonists (Scott, Royer, London), whose repertoire selections exhibited more inclination to crossover/third stream works, this style of music was too precisely and rigidly written and did not allow the same level artistic freedom to
the performer as crossover and traditionally written works. However, within this style of music there is still the potential to develop personal interpretations. While the fixed media “tape” part of *Grab It!* (Veldhuis, 1999) was seen by many participants as forcing them into one interpretation, or leading the performer, others saw it as offering them a chance to more deeply explore the content of the work. The fixed media components of this style offer a multitude of information for the performer, however to access this information the individual must approach it as another member of an ensemble, rather than a backing track (Ding, 2006). *Hard* (Lauba, 1986) presents the same problems for performers in that it is written in a very strict and precise manner. However as the work is composed with the intention of sounding like a long improvisation performers may be able, through various interpretation methods, to utilise the written notation to their advantage. The inclusion of a rather substantial improvised solo at the end of the work will aids and facilitates this freedom.

These reactions to the repertoire demonstrate two polarised responses to the role of the performer, interpreter or reproducer. Those who assume an interpreter role adopt a subjective view of the written score and see the responsibility of creating meaning as placed with them. However, one participant warned that when interpreting, performers must be careful not to hold themselves, and their musical opinions, above the music and the composer, as it is their job to interpret rather than create. On the other end of the spectrum are the performers who see their role as to reproduce the composers’ intentions. These classical performers were more inclined to adhere as closely as possible to the composer’s directions and
recreate an exact representation of the score for the audience. The roles that the performers assume, however, may change depending on the context and style of different repertoire.

The challenge in this reproduction approach is that performers must rely on the notation and score to deduce the composers’ intentions, but there is a limit to the depth of knowledge the written music can disclose (Velimirović, 1986). To overcome the limitations of notation, the performer must employ varying degrees of improvisation to create a successful interpretation (Gould & Keaton, 2000). Within this study this reproduction interpretation approach can be seen in the recounts of two participants’ contrasting interpretations of Grab It! (Veldhuis, 1999) both of which the composer was equally supportive. While not technically “creating” to same extent that jazz improvisation requires, all performers accept the position of creator, or an interpretative stance, when performing written scores.

The participants all agreed that emerging saxophonists and students should have some level of understanding and ability with extended techniques, particularly if they plan on teaching this knowledge to others in the future. While some saxophonists admitted they would not perform a particular work because of its style and the presence of extended techniques, they acknowledged that there might be a time when they will need to guide students in its study. The saxophonists advocated a structured and sequential approach to learning the technical advances needed to perform this contemporary repertoire. They placed a
great deal of importance on the performer’s ability to effectively learn and remember the internal movements needed to perform the techniques and their ability to use them automatically. While not expressly disclosing which learning approach they used in order to learn these extended techniques, the participants’ answers indicated they tended to favour encoding, which allowed them to learn and understand the new skills and information in the context of pre-existing information (Biggs & Moore, 1993; Hattie & Yates, 2014). This process was particularly evident in their approach to learning multiphonics by isolating various pitches of a multiphonic is compared with the act of voicing overtones (Sinta, 1992; Weiss & Netti, 2009).

Performers consistently had their first exposure to extended techniques, particularly multiphonics, through repertoire choices. For them this made the techniques much more understandable as they could place the techniques within the context of a work. In order to make extended techniques automatic, performers suggested that students incorporate them into their study and performance practice as soon as possible. For many students, however, this will not occur until they reach a certain performance standard due to the lack of “easier” works incorporating extended techniques (Taylor, 2012). For performers, however, the early and continual use of extended techniques in their performance practice altered their perceptions of the techniques. They no longer viewed these new and untraditional techniques as isolated effects; rather they had become another facet of contemporary tenor saxophone performance.
This project presents an overview of the multifaceted nature of the classical tenor saxophone and the classical tenor saxophonist. Members of this distinct community are distinguished by their shared understanding of the ideal tone colour of the classical tenor saxophone and the challenges, capabilities and possibilities of the instrument. While the specialists represent an array of musical styles, and hold varying roles within their performance practice, they all view the tenor saxophone as the most appropriate and successful medium for them to express their musical voice.

7.1 Limitations and future directions

The scope of this doctoral study provided a focused view of the tenor saxophone community. The majority of participants could trace their influences to particular playing styles, with many associating with the French school of saxophone performance. This may account for commonalities in their repertoire selections and their approaches to performance, however these commonalities did not overwhelm the general diversity in the participant’s answers.

This study has provided a foundation for future avenues of research. Future research could determine if the results of this current study holds true against a larger and more diverse sample worldwide, with the possible inclusion of jazz tenor saxophonists and to discover their perception of the classical tenor saxophone. It may also be important to consider the ways in which other members of the saxophone family, and indeed the classical woodwind family, view the classical tenor saxophone. This would help establish whether or not tenor
saxophone players and non-players share similar perceptions of the instrument. The perceptions of non-tenor saxophonists may also provide insight into why individuals are reluctant to utilise the instrument in their performance practice. This could highlight possible directions for the tenor saxophone community to explore in order to raise the level of understanding of the instrument and its popularity among other performers.

7.2 Conclusion

The tenor saxophone is a versatile instrument, gaining prominence within classical music as a result of its continued use by composers and the development of its repertoire. This study provides a snapshot of the classical tenor saxophone identity by demonstrating that the instrument possesses its own unique identity, setting it apart from the rest of the saxophone family. Professionals approach the instrument’s repertoire in a variety of ways, particularly in respect to how it resonates with their own musical preferences and the role they assume in its performance. When educating and guiding the next generation of saxophonists the participants employ a variety of novel approaches, particularly in respect to extended techniques. These diverse results suggest that the identity of the classical tenor saxophonist is not one singular identity rather it is composed of many different musical styles, approaches and preferences. The members of the classical tenor saxophone identity group, however, were united through a shared understanding of the integral sound of the instrument and the desire to see the instrument further accepted as a valid classical instrument. Discovering how tenor saxophonists view their chosen instrument and its potential offers an insight to
both performers and composers and has profound implications for the future of classical tenor saxophone performance and its classical repertoire.
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(1) What is the study about?
You are invited to participate in a survey of leading 21st century saxophonists' approaches to new tenor saxophone repertoire and the resulting demands on their performance practice.

(2) Who is carrying out the study?
The study is being conducted by Peter Leung and will form the basis for the degree of Doctor of Musical Arts at The University of Sydney under the supervision of Dr Helen Mitchell, Lecturer.

(3) What does the study involve?
You will be asked to participate in a survey, concerning the performance of tenor saxophone works from 1986 - 2011. The content of this survey will range from general background information, playing style and personal opinions on tenor saxophone works.

The survey will take place via email.

(4) How much time will the study take?
The survey will take approximately twenty minutes.

(5) Can I withdraw from the study?
Being in this study is completely voluntary - you are not under any obligation to consent and - if you do consent - you can withdraw at any time without affecting your relationship with The University of Sydney.

Being in this study is completely voluntary and you are not under any obligation to consent to complete the survey. Submitting a completed survey by return email is an indication of your consent to participate in the study. You can withdraw any time prior to submitting your completed survey by email.
(6) Will anyone else know the results?

All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants. The information you provide is important to contemporary saxophonists and if you agree, I would like to keep your contribution in perpetuity and to attribute your words / quotes to you.

(7) Will the study benefit me?

We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from the study.

(8) Can I tell other people about the study?

Yes

(9) What if I require further information about the study or my involvement in it?

When you have read this information, Peter Leung will discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact Peter Leung, E: pleu7882@uni.sydney.edu.au, M: +61 431 007 387.

(10) What if I have a complaint or any concerns?

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact The Manager, Human Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 8627 8176 (Telephone); +61 2 8627 8177 (Facsimile) or ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au (Email).

This information sheet is for you to keep.
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DEMONSTRATION INTERVIEW PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT

(1) What is the study about?
You are invited to participate in a study of leading 21st century saxophonists’ approaches to new tenor saxophone repertoire and the resulting demands on their performance practice.

(2) Who is carrying out the study?
The study is being conducted by Peter Leung and will form the basis for the degree of Doctor of Musical Arts at The University of Sydney under the supervision of Helen Mitchell, Lecturer.

(3) What does the study involve?
You will be asked to participate in a demonstration interview, concerning the performance of tenor saxophone works from 1986 – 2011. The content of this interview will range from musical perspectives, performances issues and methods to overcome challenges present in the work.

The interview will take place in person in a setting of your choosing.

The interview will be video recorded.

(4) How much time will the study take?
The interview will take approximately one hour.

(5) Can I withdraw from the study?
Being in this study is completely voluntary - you are not under any obligation to consent and - if you do consent - you can withdraw at any time without affecting your relationship with The University of Sydney.

You may stop the interview at any time if you do not wish to continue, the video recording will be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study.

(6) Will anyone else know the results?
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All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants. The information you provide is important to contemporary saxophonists and if you agree, I would like to keep your contribution in perpetuity and to attribute your words / quotes to you.

(7) Will the study benefit me?

We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from the study.

(8) Can I tell other people about the study?

Yes.

(9) What if I require further information about the study or my involvement in it?

When you have read this information, Peter Leung will discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact Peter Leung, E: pleu7882@uni.sydney.edu.au, M: +61 431 007 387.

(10) What if I have a complaint or any concerns?

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact The Manager, Human Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 8627 8176 (Telephone); +61 2 8627 8177 (Facsimile) or ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au (Email).

This information sheet is for you to keep.
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I, ..................................................................................[PRINT NAME], give consent to my participation in the research project.

TITLE: Trends and directions of tenor saxophone performance.

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The procedures required for the project and the time involved have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

2. I have read the Participant Information Statement and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher/s.

3. I understand that being in this study is completely voluntary – I am not under any obligation to consent.

4. I understand that my involvement is strictly confidential. I understand that any research data gathered from the results of the study may be published however no information about me will be used in any way that is identifiable. I understand that the research data gathered will be kept indefinitely.

6. I understand that I can stop the interview at any time if I do not wish to continue, the audio or video recording will be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study.
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Version 1 04/0712

- Audio-recording
  - YES
  - NO
- Video-recording
  - YES
  - NO
- Receiving Feedback
  - YES
  - NO
- Data being kept in perpetuity
  - YES
  - NO
- Being named and having my quotes attributed to me.
  - YES
  - NO

If you answered YES to the “Receiving Feedback” question, please provide your details i.e. mailing address, email address.

**Feedback Option**

**Address:**

_______________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________

**Email:**

_______________________________________________________

--------------------------------
Signature

--------------------------------
Please PRINT name

--------------------------------
Date

---

139
APPENDIX E: Questionnaire

Survey

1. As part of my DMA research I am investigating solo significant role tenor saxophone repertoire of the last 25 years. I am approaching some of the leading performers/educators of saxophone chamber music throughout the world to contribute to the study. My aim is to investigate performance practices associated with new tenor saxophone repertoire and document and disseminate current works and their performance for emerging saxophonists.

Returning this survey indicated your consent to take part in the study.

1) Where did you study the saxophone?

2) Is there a school of saxophone performance or stylistic school? With which you readily identify?

3) In what settings do you usually perform? E.g.: Solo, chamber groups, classical, jazz?

4) What tenor saxophone and equipment/set-up do you normally use?

5) Please could you name some of the significant works of the last 25 years that feature the tenor saxophone? There is no limit on how many works you may name, however please name more than three.

6) What are your motivations for your choices?

7) Are you willing to be named in this study?

8) Would you be interested in being contacted for possible interviews and demonstration interviews? Y/N

I would like to thank you in advance for taking the time to participate in my research.
APPENDIX F: Interview Questions

Interview Schedule, Topic Areas and Prompt Questions:

• Musical interpretations of selected works
  o Prompt question: Which sections of this work do you feel are particularly
    challenging for saxophonists?
  o What processes lead you to your interpretation of this section of [WORK]?

• Extended techniques.
  o Prompt question: which techniques did you find most challenging?
  o How did you learn these techniques and incorporate them fluidly into your
    performance/compositional style

• Performance logistics.
  o Prompt question: In performances what types of issues have you encountered
    in your performances?
  o and how have you dealt with them
  o (Page turns or equipment placement?)
APPENDIX G: Complete List of Key Tenor Saxophone Repertoire Selected by Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>NED</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>AUS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Lauba, Christian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grab It!</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>TV, Jacob</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto for Stan Getz</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Bennett, Richard Rodney</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat me</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Cockcroft, Barry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Too Hard</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Lauba, Christian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Upward Stream</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Peck, Russell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto for Tenor Saxophone and Orchestra</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Ward, Robert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hout</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Andriessen, Louis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Concerto for Tenor Saxophone and Orchestra</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Ewazen, Eric</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Fitkin, Graham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversions</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Gould, Morton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuffle</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Padding, Martijn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Song</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Smirnov, Dmitri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noyz in th' Hood</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Greenbaum, Stuart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Hartley, Walter S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opcit</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Hurel, Philippe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Quatrième</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Jolas, Betsy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fingers</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>van Keulen, Geert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vir</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Lauba, Christian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Neo-Neos</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Padding, Martijn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songe De Coppelius Op. 30, No. 11</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Schmitt, Florent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>NED</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of Line</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Caird, Adam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorns</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Beamish, Sally</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzama Stories</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Bennett, Ed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballad in Memory of Shirley Horn</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Bennett, Richard Rodney</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadly Pleasures</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Casken, John</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaito</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Coatman, Graham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entartung</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Coatman, Graham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of freedom</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Coatman, Graham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Davis, Tony</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocturnal</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Davis, Tony</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iguacu, come down and dance</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Davis, Tony</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata for tenor saxophone and piano</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>DeBoor Canfield, David</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Donatoni, Franco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song for my Mother</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Eales, Geoff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soliloquy ... Pinter</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Fage, Shane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sancanthus</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Frances-Hoad, Cheryl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakana Dai Fujikira</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Fujikira, Dai</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incandescence</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Gotkovsky, Ida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungle Fever</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Hindson, Matthew</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana Strange</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Irvin, Brian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music for tenor saxophone and piano</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Karlins, M. William</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Tango with Martin</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Kay, Martin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW16 Songbook 1 for mezzo-soprano, tenor saxophone, piano and percussion</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Lang, Bernhard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyn</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Lauba, Christian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Votes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate echoes</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Lemay, Robert</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pervasive Force</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>London, Matt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biota</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Martin, Ed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballade</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Martin, Frank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actaeon</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>Matthews, David</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Pieces</td>
<td>1999-2004</td>
<td>Meechan, Peter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periple</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Mefano, Paul</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go!</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Scott, Andy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonatine</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Rae, James</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passacaille</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Robert, Lucie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And Everything is Still</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Scott, Andy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighteen</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Scott, Andy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Mountain Top</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Scott, Andy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Blue</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Scott, Andy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBM</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Scott, Andy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHP</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Scott, Andy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto for tenor saxophone orchestra</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Sharafyan, Vache</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreaming with Open eyes</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Smith, Tommy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata No.1 Hall and Mirrors</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Smith, Tommy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muros de dolor...l</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Sotelo, Mauricio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slant Rhymes</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Stewart, Ian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lime Groves of South Kensington</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Stewart, Ian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Man Descending</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Turnage, Mark Anthony</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatata</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>TV, Jacob</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musique pour l’ange</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Voustine, Alexander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>