

RECRUITING FOR THE COLLEGIATE MARCHING BAND: A STUDY OF STUDENT
PERCEPTIONS OF RECRUITMENT AND COLLEGE CHOICE FACTORS IN KANSAS
AND MISSOURI

by

Alan Douglas Whitten

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Curriculum and Instruction

Boise State University

May 2015

© 2015

Alan Douglas Whitten

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE COLLEGE

DEFENSE COMMITTEE AND FINAL READING APPROVALS

of the dissertation submitted by

Alan Douglas Whitten

Dissertation Title: Recruiting for the Collegiate Marching Band: A Study of Student Perceptions of Recruitment and College Choice Factors in Kansas and Missouri

Date of Final Oral Examination: 11 March 2015

The following individuals read and discussed the dissertation submitted by student Alan Douglas Whitten, and they evaluated his presentation and response to questions during the final oral examination. They found that the student passed the final oral examination.

Scott Willison, Ph.D. Chair, Supervisory Committee

Kenneth M. Coll, Ph.D. Member, Supervisory Committee

Roger Stewart, Ph.D. Member, Supervisory Committee

Jonathan Brendefur, Ph.D. Member, Supervisory Committee

The final reading approval of the thesis was granted by Scott Willison, Ph.D., Chair of the Supervisory Committee. The thesis was approved for the Graduate College by John R. Pelton, Ph.D., Dean of the Graduate College.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the late Professor David A. Wells, founder and director of the Keith Stein Blue Thunder Marching Band at Boise State University.

It was his guidance, inspiration, and mentorship that lead me to choose a path of service through music education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation could not be possible without the guidance and inspiration of several important people. First, I would like to thank Dr. James Cook, Professor Marcellus Brown and Professor David A. Wells for encouraging me to pursue graduate study at Boise State University. The opportunities afforded to me at this institution were invaluable to my development as a college band director.

My world view has been positively altered by some really great minds while working toward my doctoral degree at Boise State University. The teaching by Dr. Lamont Lyons, Dr. Larry Rogien, Dr. Bill Parrett, Dr. Roger Stewart, Dr. Jonathan Brendefur, and Dr. Scott Willison helped me to see education as a way for me to be an agent of change in society. I sincerely hope I can practice in my classrooms the compassion, commitment to excellence, and idealism these gentlemen have instilled.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Ken Coll for getting me back on track with this dissertation. I may well have given up without your encouragement. Likewise, thank you to Dr. Scott Willison for sticking with me during this long process. Appreciation also goes to Dr. Roger Stewart for your many hours of help bringing statistical data and analysis to life.

ABSTRACT

The marching band is an important and iconic part of the game day atmosphere at athletic events and community functions at colleges and universities throughout the United States. At many institutions, the band is a great source of pride and considerable resources are committed in an effort to have the best band possible. A key component to having the best band possible is having effective recruiting practices.

There is a large body of research on recruiting general student populations and many other sub categories of students, including music majors. However, research regarding recruitment of students that participate in marching band is missing from the literature because most marching band members are not majoring in music. It is the hypothesis in this research that these students are a unique population that likely respond to different recruiting strategies than would those who are music majors.

To determine what college choice factors and recruiting strategies are most applicable to the college marching band member, the Marching Band Participation Questionnaire was designed to measure why students chose to participate in their chosen program. Results from the study demonstrate that 70% of college marching band members are not majoring in music and that they have college choice considerations that differ from the general student population and those of music majors. Therefore, this demographic is likely to be more responsive to a recruiting and marketing campaign that treats them as a unique population.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vi
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of This Study	3
Need for This Study	4
Description of the Study	4
Limitations, Delimitations, and Assumptions	5
Terminology	6
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
General College Choice Literature	9
Conclusions	11
College Choice and Recruiting as Applied to Sub-Populations	11
Student-Athlete Recruiting	11
Minority Recruiting	14
College Music Major Recruiting Literature	16
Non-Continued Participation of High School Band Members in College	19
Conclusions	27

Conclusion of Literature Review	27
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS	29
Development of the Questionnaire	29
Pilot Study.....	37
Instrument Reliability	37
Instrument Validity	38
Participants.....	40
Protection for Participants.....	41
Analysis of Findings	42
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	46
Sample Population and Response Rate.....	46
Description of Population	47
Analysis of MBPQ Questions 8–11	51
College Choice Findings.....	53
Marching Band Participation Concerns	59
Influential People in Choice Process	67
Marching Band Recruiting Factors	70
Comparison of Recruitment Factors Between Music Majors and Non- Music Majors	77
Other Considerations	79
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION.....	81
Highlights from Findings	82
Need for This Research.....	84
Suggestions for Future Research	85

Final Thoughts	86
REFERENCES	87
APPENDIX A.....	96
Marching Band Participation Questionnaire.....	96
APPENDIX B	104
Selected Articles, Books and Dissertations Related to Marching Band	104
APPENDIX C	109
Human Subjects Approval	109

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	<i>Band Size Distribution</i>	3
Table 3.1	<i>MBPQ Section One – Background Information</i>	30
Table 3.2	<i>MBPQ Section Two – College Choice</i>	32
Table 3.3	<i>MBPQ Section Three – Marching Band Choice</i>	33
Table 3.4	<i>MBPQ Section Four – Influence of People</i>	34
Table 3.5	<i>MBPQ Section Five – Promotional Materials and Recruiting Methods</i>	35
Table 3.6	<i>Section Six – Additional Comments</i>	37
Table 3.7	<i>College Marching Band Participation and College Choice Factors as Cited by College Band Directors</i>	39
Table 4.1	<i>Respondent’s Age—Q1: I am at least 18 years of age</i>	48
Table 4.2	<i>Band Membership Status—Q2: I am a current member of a college or university marching band</i>	48
Table 4.3	<i>Athletic Affiliation—Q3: Which classification best describes your college or university</i>	49
Table 4.4	<i>Band Size—Q4: What is the size of your marching band (including color guard and other auxiliaries)</i>	49
Table 4.5	<i>Year in Band—Q5: Year in band: please indicate below</i>	50
Table 4.6	<i>Music Participation Level—Q6: Which of the following best describes your participation level in music at this college or university?</i>	50
Table 4.7	<i>College Choice—Q7: Which of the following best describes your college choice and decision to participate in marching band?</i>	51

Table 4.8	<i>College Choice Factors (N=642)—Q8: Please rate the importance of the following factors in your decision to attend this college or university.....</i>	53
Table 4.9	<i>College Choice by Athletic Affiliation—Q8: Please rate the importance of the following factors in your decision to attend this college or university.....</i>	55
Table 4.10	<i>Marching Band Participation Concerns (descriptive)—Q9: Please rate the importance of the following factors in your decision to participate in Marching Band at this college or university</i>	61
Table 4.11	<i>Band Participation Choice by Athletic Affiliation—Q9: Please rate the importance of the following factors in your decision to attend this college or university.....</i>	63
Table 4.12	<i>Influence of People (descriptive)—Q12: Please rate how influential the following people were in your decision to participate in Marching Band at this college or university.....</i>	67
Table 4.13	<i>Influence of People by Athletic Affiliation—Q10: Please rate how influential the following people were in your decision to participate in Marching Band at this college or university.....</i>	68
Table 4.14	<i>Recruiting Factors—Q11: How influential were the following factors in your choice to participate in your college’s marching band?</i>	70
Table 4.15	<i>Recruiting Factors by Athletic Affiliation—Q11: How influential were the following factors in your choice to participate in your college’s marching band?</i>	73
Table 4.16	<i>Comparison of Recruiting Factors between Music Majors and Non-Majors—Q11: How influential were the following factors in your choice to participate in your college’s marching band?</i>	77

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

No single musical organization in colleges or universities is seen and heard by as many people as is the marching band. In many cases, a single performance of a university's marching band is viewed by more people than all other concerts at that university in that same year (Janzen, 1985; Revelli, 1979). At parades, sporting events, and civic events throughout the country the marching band serves the function of an ambassador and represents to the public the character of the university. Just as the public often judges a university by the success of its football team, a school's reputation can be judged by their marching band (Whitwell, 1974).

Unlike football, where a team's success is typically determined by points on a scoreboard and its record of wins and losses, the college marching band must measure its success by the perception of the audience. It would be an exaggeration to suggest that an audience at a football game judges a marching band solely on band size, but surely it is a factor in an audience's perception of a band. As is pointed out in by Eldon Janzen (1985), regardless of how musically a band plays, "the applause sometimes goes to the loudest band" (p. 167). Indeed, a bigger marching band may not always be the better marching band—better is better—but large band size does positively affect the public's perception of that band (Holvik, 1971; Shellahamer, Swearingen, & Woods, 1986).

At the other end of the spectrum, a small marching band is rarely, if ever, the ideal size (see Figure 1). Simply, if a band is small, it will have great difficulty playing

loudly enough to be heard throughout the football stadium. Even if the small band could play loudly enough, perhaps aided by electronics, they would still present a condensed visual image. There are several articles offering directors of small bands advice on how to make the most out of the limited capabilities of a small band (Olsen, 1985; Rollins, 1985), and there are recruiting articles which show directors ways to increase their enrollment (Doerksen, 2002; Moyer, 1990; Navarre, 1990). However, I have not found any literature demonstrating or suggesting that smaller is better.

Effective recruiting and retaining of college marching band personnel is vital to building the program. It is not just about increasing or maintaining band size, it can also be about increasing or maintaining quality. At some universities, auditions are held to fill a specific number of positions available. At The Ohio State University, for example, which has one of the most celebrated marching bands in the country (Fuller, 1995), the marching band enrollment is set at 225 members (including alternates). “Some years there are well over 400 students vying for one of these positions, and this intense competition guarantees that our ranks will be filled with the highest caliber of performers,” stated director Jon Woods (Personal communication, October 1998).

There is great variety in the sizes and ability levels of college marching bands in the United States. Some bands have enrollments well over 400 members, while others prefer to maintain a smaller membership of more qualified personnel. Table 1.1 (following page) represents the percentage of bands that fit into each category of band size.

Table 1.1

Band Size Distribution

	Small (<100)	Mid (101–175)	Large (176–250)	Very Large (>251)
% of Bands in category	29%	32%	23%	16%

Notes: N=112 and band sizes were self-reported. Data obtained from:
<http://www.ucband.uc.edu/kappakappapsi/compendium/categories/size.htm>

The factors that make a band “good” is very subjective and, for the purpose of this study, a rigid definition of what makes a band good is not needed. What is important is how the band is perceived by its stakeholders (alumni, community, university, and the students themselves). At many colleges and universities, the marching band is a vital part of the school’s traditions, gameday experience, and identity (Brimmer, 1989). Whether a band is recruiting to increase enrollment or quality (or both), effective recruiting and retention aids in the meeting of each band’s unique enrollment (Straw, 1996). In short, better recruiting leads to better bands, regardless of how “better” is defined.

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study was to determine what factors influence band members’ college choice and which recruiting strategies are effective in attracting members to college marching bands. It is my hypothesis that quantifying and understanding the factors used by students in choosing a college marching band in which to participate can lead to more effective recruiting strategies.

Need for This Study

There has been considerable research done on recruiting for the general college student and many sub-populations such as recruiting student athletes, minority students, academically gifted students, and many other target groups. Indeed, there is considerable research on the recruiting of music majors. However, most members of college marching bands are majoring in something other than music (Bobbett, 1995; Casey, 1994; Compendium of College Marching Bands, 1999). Because most marching band members are not music majors, it is my hypothesis that college marching band members may respond to different recruiting practices than would a music major. At the time of this writing, I have found no research that targets the recruiting of college marching band members. Therefore, a goal of this research is to fill this gap in the literature. Further evidence of a need for this research can be found anecdotally in the employment advertisements directed towards college band directors (Higheredjobs.com, Chronicle of Higher Education, College Music Society, etc.). In nearly every vacancy notice for college band director positions, the ability to effectively recruit is listed as a priority under the qualification section.

Description of the Study

The Marching Band Participation Questionnaire (MBPQ), a survey instrument intended to help determine what factors most strongly influence college marching band member's college choice, was designed and administered to collect data about college choice factors for current members of collegiate marching bands. This instrument is broken into four sections that align with the following research questions:

1. What criteria do college marching band members use when selecting a college?

2. What criteria do students use when deciding to participate in marching band (scholarships, friends, continued musical participation, etc.)?
3. What effect does contact by the college band director (or band staff) have on high school students' college choice?
4. What other factors were influential in band members' decision to participate in the college marching band?

Limitations, Delimitations, and Assumptions

The MBPQ was administered to college band members in the states of Kansas and Missouri. This sample was chosen because it is the region in which I work as a college marching band director. Narrowing the scope of the study does reduce generalizability to other regions, but findings were highly relevant to the specific region being studied. The target population of this research is college marching band members. Because these students are primarily not music majors, findings are not representative of any other sub populations.

A limitation related to using this regionally delimited sample is that I had to rely on college band directors in the region to distribute links to the online MBPQ. Not all chose to participate. Although the study did have a sample size that exceeded minimum participation threshold and reliability and validity was demonstrated through statistical analysis, having more participation would have strengthened the power of findings.

It is assumed that the students surveyed answered questions honestly and to the best of their ability. With the questions being mostly opinion based and anonymity being guaranteed, it can be assumed that there was no reason for respondents to answer in any way other than truthfully.

A limitation of survey research in general is that often respondents may feel rushed, over busy, and may not complete the questionnaire (Delva, Kirby, Knapper, & Birtwhistle, 2002). Further, unlike a face to face interview, respondents may feel forced into responses that may not exactly express their viewpoint. In the MBPQ, this was compensated for by adding open ended response questions to allow the respondents the ability to clarify their responses or identify factors missed.

Specific to the MBPQ, a limitation is that most of the questions were generated from the review of literature. However, this study was born out of a gap in the literature, therefore, it is possible that the related literature has missed some of the college choice factors used by marching band members. To minimize factors missed in the literature review, I consulted with experts in the field, other college band directors, to validate the instrument and identify choice factors missed in the literature. Further, the questionnaire features open ended response sections to identify information that could have been missed.

Terminology

As commonly used as the terms *recruiting* and *college choice* may be, their use in this study may be subtly shaded differently than their use in other settings. Therefore the term *recruiting* is defined as the active marketing of the college or university to potential students. *College choice* is a theoretical construct used to describe the process in which individuals make decisions about pursuing post-secondary education and the process of choosing which specific post-secondary institution to attend (Blackburn, 2000). A student's choice of colleges is a result of many factors, including recruiting. However

closely related the terms may be, they are not synonymous. Other definitions will be presented throughout this document as necessary.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Student college choice is a theoretical construct used to describe the process in which individuals make decisions about pursuing post-secondary education and the process of choosing which specific post-secondary institution to attend (Blackburn, 2000). Often, but not always, the decision to attend a particular college is guided by the effectiveness of the school's recruiting strategies. However, other factors, such as location and cost, appear to be as influential in college choice as is the effect of active recruiting (Ayalon, 2004).

To date, I have found no dissertations or scholarly articles that address college choice or recruiting specific to the college marching band. There are, however, many articles and dissertations devoted to other related areas such as college recruiting and choice as applied to music majors, athletes, minorities, and to the general student population. On a basic search using Proquest Digital Dissertations, I found 358 doctoral dissertations related to "college choice." Yet none came up when marching band was added to the search. Adding music to the search yielded 73 hits. Adding athletes yielded 51 dissertations. Clearly, the recruiting of college marching band members is under-represented in the literature.

This review of literature is divided into four sections: (a) general college choice literature, (b) college choice and recruiting as applied to two sub-populations (student-athletes and minority students), (c) college choice and recruiting of music students, and

(d) the non-continued participation of high school band members in college. It is from these extant areas of research that I constructed a survey instrument to help identify college choice factors specific to the target group, college marching band members.

General College Choice Literature

Lang (1999) sought to identify factors predicting postsecondary attendance among high school seniors by collecting survey data from 1,350 students and their parents. The analysis indicated that 80% of the students were seriously contemplating attending an institution of higher education. Interestingly, Lang's sample demonstrated that students of lower economic status were considering higher education at similar rates as those whose families were more affluent.

Although Lang found that 80% of high school students intend on going to college, only 20% of these families have set aside money for the student's postsecondary education. Further, as of the fall semester of their senior year, many students had not yet chosen the college or university of which they plan on attending. Despite late planning, common factors were identified by students and parents when shopping for a postsecondary school. These factors are as follows: (a) Good academic reputation, (b) reasonable cost of attendance, (c) availability of financial aid, (d) good teachers, and (e) location.

Glass (2004), a writer and parent, offers his perspective on ways in which colleges can market themselves to students and their parents. He contends that colleges need to put themselves in the place of parents and students and suggests strategies that may help colleges to increase enrollment. Specifically, the author's story tells of how the

friendliness of the professors and student tour guides helped them choose one school over a much higher rated institutions in which they felt less welcomed.

Goff, Patino, and Jackson (2004) examined the relative importance of the preferred information sources of high school students for educational services. Participants were 716 senior and junior high school students in 14 urban schools in the Southwest who planned to attend college. The results revealed that important information sources for potential community college and university students included media, social normative, and direct sources. Moreover, they indicated that there were communication source differences based on race and on intent to attend two-year versus four-year institutions. In short, this study shows that those who are planning to attend local college (community college or four-year school) tend to find their information through mass media, such as television ads or internet. Whereas those who plan on “going away” to college place more importance on personal contact.

Through all of the college choice articles and dissertations that were examined, the many factors students use to choose a college remains constant. However, each study identifies one specific thing as the most import factor in the college selection process. A sample of these studies that have attempted to determine what factors have the greatest influence on students' college choice include a study by Spies (1978), which found that academic reputation of the institution was more important than financial considerations. More recently, Sevier (1993) studied college-bound high school juniors and reported that availability of desired major and total cost of attending college were the most important factors. Galotti and Mark (1994) noted that parents/guardians, friends, and guidance center materials were rated as most important in the college search process. Even more

recently, Hu and Hossler (2000) found that students were most influenced by family input and finance-related factors. With the proliferation of new computer technologies come new factors that affect college choice. Feilitz (2000) found that internet chat rooms, response forums, and websites are becoming primary ways to attract students.

Conclusions

The variation in “most important” factors in the college selection process can be attributed to when the surveys were administered, populations sampled, and other factors. Although there was not a consensus found as to the main factor students use in choosing a college, each study yielded a similar body of factors that students take into consideration.

College Choice and Recruiting as Applied to Sub-Populations

Student-Athlete Recruiting

There are many studies on recruiting college athletes. This area of research is related to the recruiting of marching band members for two reasons: First, college marching bands generally perform at athletic functions and, therefore, have a direct interest in the team’s success. Secondly, studies show that the success of athletic teams has an impact on recruiting students for the general population (Toma & Cross, 1996). It is likely that this impact is also a factor in college choice for marching band students and will be assessed in the data collection.

Faulkner (2005) conducted a study of the college choice factors for student athletes at Greenville College, a small private Christian college affiliated with the NCAA at the Division III level. Like all Division III schools, student athletes at Greenville

College are not awarded athletic scholarships. However, these athletes are allowed to apply for the same academic scholarships and other financial aid as the general student population. Factors identified for choosing this school include the following:

(1) Athletics—stated as an important factor in their college choice decision-making process more than any other factor, (2) Personal contact—many of the students expressed that one of the biggest factors for them attending Greenville was the personal contact they had with coaches, other student athletes, and other Greenville College employees, (3) Degree offerings—the data indicate there is more concern on behalf of students regarding degree offerings than academic reputation, (4) Playing time—this was more relevant than the winning reputation for student athletes. (5) Other contact—student athletes choosing Greenville College preferred, in order, phone contact, campus visit, and contact with student athletes, and letters regarding specific recruiting methods. (6) Head coaches, parents, and student athletes—these made the biggest impact on their decision to attend Greenville College. By substituting the word “band director” for coach, all of these factors are in alignment with college choice factors stated by music students (reviewed below).

In contrast, Teeples (2005) surveyed student athletes at the University of Tennessee, a NCAA Division 1 institution with a long history of conference and national championships in many different sports. These athletes often had a different rationale for their college choice than did students choosing to attend smaller colleges. Having an opportunity to win championships was the major reason they chose the University of Tennessee. Other criteria identified were (1) the school's athletic conference reputation, (2) athletic facilities, (3) the school's sports programs reputation, and (4) comfort with

other players. The lowest ranked college choice criteria for the student-athletes included recommendations from their high school coach, college guides and publications, recommendation of friends, school alumni, and their high school guidance counselors.

In a study designed to identify college choice factors for high-level student-athletes, Letawsky, Schneider, and Pederson (2003) state recruiting of athletes is even more strategic (than recruiting for the general student population) due to the potential increase in undergraduate admissions and booster donations that a championship season may bring. The study sought to determine if the factors that influence the college choice of high-level student-athletes was different than research results focusing on non-athletes. The findings of this study suggest that, although student-athletes have different factors that influence college choice, non-athletic-related factors are just as important as athletic-related factors.

Similarly, Lally and Kerr (2005) found that the values and aspirations student-athletes have while being recruited change over their academic careers. Two retrospective in-depth interviews were held with four male and four female university student athletes. Participants entered the university with vague or nonexistent career objectives and invested heavily in their athletic roles. In the latter years of their college career, the participants discarded their sport career ambitions and allowed the student role to become more prominent in their identity hierarchies.

The literature related to recruiting of student-athletes shows that some students choose their college based on the opportunity to compete for championships or to develop skills needed to become a professional athlete, but for most, the academic and social factors that are used by non-athletes to choose a college remain the same. As is

stated in the NCAA's recent advertising campaign, "Most NCAA student-athletes will go professional in something other than sports."

Conclusions

The body of research regarding recruiting for college sports does have many similarities to the recruiting of college band members. However, the relationship is not direct. Simply, very few college bands compete. There is a series of "Battle of the Bands" for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) that culminates with a national championship competition. However, for the vast majority of college marching bands in the United States, there are no formal competitions. Therefore, the college choice factors presented in Teeple's study at the University of Tennessee yielded results that appear not to correspond with the choice factors of a general population student or of college marching band members.

Minority Recruiting

Perry (2004) states that students were likely to apply to those institutions that were similar to the high school in which they were attending. Students are, therefore, likely to attend institutions that closely mirror their high schools and their communities. In other words, white students are most likely to apply for admission to predominantly white colleges and students of color are likely going to seek schools with more diversity.

Perna's study (2000) compared the college enrollment decisions of African-Americans, Hispanics, and whites. Results demonstrated that after controlling for differences in costs, benefits, ability, and social and cultural capital, African-Americans are approximately 11 percent more likely than whites to enroll in a college or university

in the fall after graduating from high school. Findings indicated that college enrollment rates for Hispanics and whites were comparable. Results revealed that social and cultural capital is an important factor in the college-enrollment decisions of all three groups and that academic ability is an important predictor of enrollment. In addition, results suggested that grants are unrelated to college enrollment among all three groups and that loans reduce the likelihood of African-Americans enrolling in college.

Nuby and Doebler (2000) also researched recruiting and retention of black students for teacher education programs. A survey was conducted to address the attitudes and perceptions of students who were the recipients of minority teacher program scholarships. A series of focus group sessions was conducted in which students' responses indicated: (a) factors relating to the choice of a university; (b) the role of the College of Education in recruitment and retention; (c) the importance of social activities; (d) concerns about discrimination; and (e) general suggestions for improving recruitment and retention. The results of the survey indicate that any efforts to recruit more minority teachers need to address the above-stated concerns.

Conclusions

From this sampling of literature related to the recruiting of minority students, many congruencies were found with the recruiting of other sub groups. Stated simply, to market a university to students, effort has to be made to determine their specific needs. Then, an effort has to be made to fill those needs and alleviate the target group's fears. For minority students, the thought of going to a campus with little diversity can be frightening. Active recruiting of minorities helps increase the diversity of a campus, thus making the campus more attractive to future minority students.

College Music Major Recruiting Literature

Faber (2010) aimed to determine reasons why non-music majors participated in the musical ensembles at small liberal arts colleges in Indiana. Three main trends emerged from his study: 1) there was a drastic decline in the number of non-music majors who performed music in high school as compared to those who continued in college, 2) student advisors did not encourage students to participate in musical ensembles, and 3) the influence of factors to continue participating were those categorized more as extrinsic rather than those intrinsic.

Moder (2013) researched non-music majors' participation in college bands. Self-pride of being a member of the college band, social aspects involved with the college band, and quality and reputation of the college band are the primary reasons that she found influence students' decisions to continue playing after high school. Students enrolled in athletic bands (marching and pep bands) displayed higher motivation to continue playing from social influences whereas students enrolled in concert ensembles (concert and jazz bands) appeared to be more influenced by musical aspects. Findings from this study suggest that participants' intrinsically motivated desire to continue playing is largely due to the enjoyment started in beginning band and continued throughout high school.

Lee (1998) conducted a study of recruiting practices of the 91 schools of music in Region 6 of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) that examined the following topics: (a) The use of web sites, (b) recruitment outside the United States, (c) unethical practices in recruitment and/or admissions, (d) recruitment for non-traditional programs, (e) degree programs that have the largest enrollments, (f) pressures on

admission standards on music recruiting, (g) discounting tuition, and (h) most successful recruiting practices. With 52 of the 91 schools responding, Lee (1998) described the most common recruiting practices in the region and asserted that there was a battle to balance the quality of new recruits with quantity. In other words, recruiting is not just about attracting more participants, it is also about getting better musicians.

Ten years prior to Lee's study, Brimmer (1989) looked at the recruiting practices of colleges and universities across the United States and found there were little or no differences between the recruiting practices from school to school, regardless of region or funding base. Further, he found that over 80% of music schools have lower enrollments than is desired, suggesting a need for a greater level of recruiting.

Carlson (1999) conducted a study on recruiting practices of college music programs by first exploring marketing practices outside of academia, then designed the Undergraduate Music Student Recruitment Questionnaire (UMSRQ), a survey instrument to gauge how well schools of music are marketing their music programs based on the body of marketing literature. This instrument was sent to the faculty or staff member who was charged with music department recruiting in all schools of music in the United States (N=303). There were 194 (64%) questionnaires returned and data gathered from this instrument was used to describe the state of college music department recruiting (as of 1999). Carlson's findings suggest that most music schools and departments do not take a very organized approach to recruiting. She suggests that institutions would be best served to develop a comprehensive written recruiting plan.

Locke (1982) looked at college music recruiting from the viewpoint of the student. He found the most significant factors students used to determine where to study

were the: (a) overall reputation of the music program, (b) location of the institution, (c) reputation and friendliness of the music faculty, (d) opportunity to perform in a top ensemble, (e) financial considerations, (f) availability of specific music degree programs, (g) reputation of the performing groups, and (h) reputation of the school. It is interesting to note that this study investigated recruiting from the student's point of view. This is in contrast to other studies, such as Carlson (1999) and Brimmer (1989), that viewed recruiting from the administrative view.

The majority of studies on music recruiting are descriptive of trends and practices. Rees (1983) presented the methods used in a highly effective recruiting campaign at Willamette University. In her presentation at the College Music Society symposium in the fall of 1983, Rees stated that the key to success was the full participation by the faculty. This is similar to Locke's findings that friendly faculty members were a major reason a student chose one school over another.

Peterson (2005) echoes Rees' findings that it is often the student/faculty relationship that prompts a student's college choice. The teacher/student relationship is very important in music student recruiting because of the large amount of time students will spend with their music professors, especially applied lesson teachers and ensemble directors. A key component to finding the best fit in a music program is to take private lessons with the applied professor for the student's specific instrument (flute student take a flute lesson, etc.). It is often in this one-on-one setting that the music major decides on which university to attend.

Conclusions

The literature on recruiting for college music programs does address a need for targeted recruiting and identifies what attracts students to a particular university or music program. However, it does not adequately cover the need for research specific to college marching bands because the members are not usually music majors (Casey, 1994). In fact, according to the Compendium of College Marching Bands (1999), only 27% of colleges' marching band members choose music as their academic major. The vast majority of college marching band members play in the band in order to continue with music as a form of recreation, for the social opportunities, or for other extra-musical benefits (Bobbett, 1995). It is logical to see that college marching band members may respond to different recruiting strategies than would a person who is planning on majoring in music. Hence, there is a clear need to study recruiting in the context of a college marching band.

From this body of literature, many of the factors used by students when choosing a college or university were identified. Although the college marching band member is most often not majoring in music, methods for their recruitment are often the same as recruiting music majors. It is my position in this study that the factors used by non-music majors may be different than those used by those pursuing a career in music. Therefore, an effective recruiting strategy would look different for a non-major.

Non-Continued Participation of High School Band Members in College

According to a longitudinal study that used the NELS: 88 database for data, students who participated in their high school band attended college at a significantly

higher rate than those that did not (Catterall, Chapleau, & Iwanaga, 1999). With this in mind, it would seem logical that most college bands would have a large talent pool from which to recruit new members. However, the reality is that many bands are struggling to attract new members (Locke, 1982; Brimmer 1989). This is not a new phenomenon. Band non-participation on the college level by former high school musicians has been documented for over five decades (McDavid, 1999). The literature on the non-continued participation in college band by former high school band members shows that indeed, there are many former high school band members on college campuses, but many choose not to continue their band participation (Casey, 1994; Clothier, 1967; McDavid, 1999; Stanley, 1964). According to Casey (1994), between 40 to 50% of college students end their band participation before ever entering college.

Stanley (1964) sought to identify factors influencing college freshman with previous band experience to either participate or not in college bands. The issues he considered were (a) loss of interest in one's instrument, (b) negative high school band experience, (c) whether or not participation in college band was viewed as a worthwhile endeavor, and (d) pressure from parents, teachers and counselors to eliminate outside activities that may take time away from one's academic major. Stanley's survey was administered to two groups of incoming freshmen at Ohio University. One group had chosen to participate in a band, while the other group had chosen not to participate. All participants were personally interviewed and the interviewer filled out the responses to the survey instrument.

The primary reason given for lack of participation in bands was a perceived lack of time. Additional factors included (a) the students' positive or negative feelings toward

their high school band director, (b) a period of 7–9 years of participation produced a higher percentage of college band participants (greater time investment = more likely to continue), (c) student confidence level regarding their proficiency on their instrument (d) parent or counselor recommendation to limit activities outside academic major, and (e) schedule conflicts. One important finding was that the higher a student placed in his/her high school section, the more likely he/she was to participate in college band.

The Clothier study (1967) was similar to Stanley's in that it looked at continued participation by students who participated in high school band. Where this study differed, was that it looked only at band participation in small colleges in Iowa (enrollment under 1,100 students) with the rationale being that continued participation is especially important in a small college because it is harder to get enough members to ensure a full and appropriate instrumentation from such a limited student body.

Clothier's questionnaire was broken into two parts and was administered to 282 freshmen from five small Iowa colleges. Section 1 identified common characteristics of the respondents while section 2 dealt with the reasons for their participation or non-participation in college band. It is important to note that this survey had a high response rate (91.9%) and that most of the respondents were not planning on playing in band in college. Most students were not planning on participating in band (68%), while only a third (32%) were planning on participating. Time conflicts with classes and study time were cited as the major reasons for non-participation in band. The four other common reasons students in this survey gave for non-participation were (a) the grade in which the student last participated in high school, (b) amount of time spent practicing his/her

instrument in high school, (c) the student's estimation of his/her ability on his/her instrument, and (d) ownership of an instrument.

McClarty's study (1968) was designed to examine which factors influenced more than 93.5% of potential band members who chose not to participate in band at the University of Montana. Participants in his study (n=178) were all freshmen and were identified from files obtained by the Director of Admissions and were defined as students who had participated in their respective high school band. Of these, 166 chose not to be involved in the college band and 12 were active in the band program. Investigating those not participating in college band helped McClarty determine that the main reasons students chose not to participate in college band include (a) non-musical demands or conflicts prevented participation, (b) students lost interest in band upon entering college or had a greater interest in other areas, (c) students doubted their ability to meet music expectations, and (d) students decided not to participate while still in high school. New data gathered revealed that students may not participate in college band because they were apprehensive regarding auditions and that students felt more academic credit should be given for participation in campus band.

The previous three studies all queried college students about the reasons they chose to (or not to) participate in college band. One commonality was finding that the decision of whether or not to participate was often made while students were still in high school.

Mountford (1977) took a slightly different approach at trying to identify the variables that predicted a student's retention or non-participation in band in college. Based on the findings from Clothier and McCarty where students chose whether or not to

participate in college band while still in high school, Mountford chose high school students as the population to study.

This study was designed to examine the retention of band members while still in high school and as they transitioned to college through the use of three questionnaires: (a) *The Musical Experience and Attitude Inventory* (MEAI), (b) *The College Questionnaire*, and (c) the *Music Aptitude Evaluation*. The first two were developed by Mountford (1977) and administered to the sample population of students while the third, developed by Edwin Gordon (1965), was administered to the band directors whose students participated in the study.

The MEAI (Mountford, 1977) involved gaining responses from high school band members in the following areas: (a) geographical information (rural or urban high school) and their intentions toward participation in college band, (b) experiences and attitudes of the participants toward their high school band participation, (c) home musical environment of the participants, (d) participants' community musical activities and intention of future community activity, (e) participants' personal musical values, and (f) influence of other people (band director, counselor, parent, peers) on their decision to continue band participation in college.

The *College Questionnaire* (Mountford, 1977) gathered information about the student's decision whether or not they intend to participate in college band, the factors influencing that decision and follow-up information pertinent to the MEAI. The *Music Aptitude Evaluation* (Gordon, 1965), which was administered to the band directors of the students in the study, contained two items. The first question documented the director's personal evaluation of each student's level of success on his/her instrument. The second

collected details on the student's seat placement (ranking) within his or her section of the band.

In line with the previously reviewed studies, the majority of students in Mountford's study decided whether to participate in college band while they were still in high school. Furthermore, it was found that those students who sat in the lower third of their section tended to not have enough confidence in their playing ability to continue band participation at the college level.

Other findings in this study are that students did not discuss college band participation with their high school band directors, students wanted to participate in other extracurricular activities while in college, and many students reported a lack of enjoyment playing their instrument. It is highly likely that some students will choose to participate in activities other than band in college, and it is possible that some lose the enjoyment of playing their instrument. However, there is evidence students do discuss their college choices with their high school band directors (Bobbet, 1995). Having taught in public schools, the author discussed college choices and band participation with all of the seniors in his bands. Similarly, many of his college band members at Pittsburg State University reported having discussions with their high school band directors. The author is not sure if the discrepancy between Mountford's findings and his personal experiences are due to the date of his study (1975) or the location (rural Montana), but it is only in this study that there is evidence that there was little discussion between band members and their high school directors regarding college choice or the student's participation in college marching band.

With the intention of examining factors that influence band participation specifically at Kent State University, Delano and Royse (1987) sought to determine whether the findings from other studies would apply to their population (Kent State University students who had been involved with their high school band). The students sampled in this study were former high school band members who had chosen not to play in the Kent State band after enrolling at that institution. Specific areas examined were those identified in the studies by Clothier, McCarty and Mountford such as previous high school instrumental experience, the influences of parents and directors and external collegiate factors. Unlike the McCarty study, the following factors were not significantly influential in a student's choice of whether or not to participate in the college band: (a) issues such as time limitations, scheduling conflicts, and the extensive rehearsal and performance time commitments, (b) effect of recruiting contact, (c) lack of performance proficiency, (d) and lack of extrinsic incentives such as academic credit or available scholarships. It is possible that these results differed from other studies due to a low (43%) response rate. Logically, this low response rate may be due to the fact that the potential respondents had already self-selected themselves out of music participation. In other words, because they were not planning on participating in band, they had no interest in taking the time to participate in the survey.

Despite contradicting other studies into the non-continued participation of high school band members in college with the findings above, this study identifies the social aspect of band as an important variable and indicator of college band participation. Simply, many people join band because they want to make new friends or their friends

from high school are participating. This assertion concurs with my observation of my own bands.

Although Delano and Royse found different predictors for the participation in college band than did McCarty, they were aligned with the other studies that documented the decision to participate was made while the student was still in high school. Furthermore, that decision was found to be largely based on the experiences the student had in high school band.

The body of research on continued participation in band has been aimed primarily at individual institutions, but two studies looked more broadly. Clothier (1967) looked at band participation at multiple small schools and McDavid's (1999) explored whether the findings from this body of research would be replicable at large universities (10,000 + enrollment). For his study, McDavid (1999) sought out college freshmen that were in high school bands but decided not to play in college bands (concert or marching). Students from eight Pac-10 Universities (n=196) responded to the survey. A significant finding was that 93.6% chose not to play in a college band while still in high school. Their decision was based on college course load, a declining interest in band, course scheduling conflicts and work scheduling conflicts. Additional findings were that 60% of respondents felt that they might still be interested in band participation at some point in their undergraduate education.

Factors in McDavid's study that were found not to be significant in the decision of whether or not to participate were social activities such as Greek System or intramural sports, instrument availability, or the advice of parents or their high school band director.

These findings imply that high school band directors should work to foster the perception that continued participation in band in college is a natural progression and is an essential facet of their college experience.

Conclusions

In reviewing studies related to non-participation in bands, four major themes have emerged: (a) most college band non-participants chose not to participate while still in high school, (b) the majority of potential band members (ranging from 40–75% depending on study) are opting out of college band (c) the choice of whether or not to participate was largely based on the quality of experience the student had in high school band, and (d) the quality experience in high school band can be viewed by either positive social interactions or a higher confidence in their music ability.

Conclusion of Literature Review

In this review of literature, I have investigated studies that look at the recruiting of student-athlete and minority students because they are a similar demographic to the college marching band member. Likewise, I have reported on studies regarding the recruiting of collegiate music majors. Although similar, no literature has been found that specifically addresses the college marching band participant, who often is not a music major. It is the purpose of this study to fill this void in the literature by investigating the college choice process of college marching band members.

It appears, based on the literature concerning non-continued participation of high school band members in college, that the recruiting practices used to attract music majors may not be effective at recruiting marching band members. Therefore, simply using an

extant survey instrument that was designed to rate music school recruitment methods is not appropriate because, in the case of a music major, music will become their primary academic focus. In contrast, for the majority of marching band members, the role of music is often for entertainment and, possibly, a distraction from their academic load.

Reviewing the literature on college choice, recruiting of student athletes, minority students, music majors, and why students choose not to participate in their college bands has demonstrated that college choice and the decision to participate in college marching band is very complex and individualistic. For some students, basic affordability is a key choice factor. To others, a schools “name brand” or being part of a tradition trumps the cost factor. There are many different factors that influence where a student eventually ends up attending college. Then, it is whole different set of factors that lead music students to continue their band involvement once on campus.

This literature review looked at many areas related to the recruiting of college marching band members. However, there is no existing literature that looks directly at recruiting college band members, who are not usually music majors nor the other related populations that I reviewed. Therefore, this study is designed to fill this void in the literature. The methods used to describe college band members choice factors are presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

This study was designed to determine what factors influence band members' college choices and which recruiting strategies are effective in attracting members to college marching bands. I hypothesized that quantifying and understanding the factors used by students in choosing a college marching band in which to participate can lead to more effective recruiting strategies. With this in mind, I developed a questionnaire to collect data with the purpose of answering the following research questions:

1. What criteria do college marching band members use when selecting a college?
2. What criteria do students use when deciding to participate in marching band (scholarships, friends, continued musical participation, etc.)?
3. What effect does contact by the college band director (or band staff) have on students' college choice?
4. What other factors were influential in band members' decision to participate in the college marching band?

Development of the Questionnaire

The MBPQ was designed to collect data on why students chose to participate in a specific marching band. Please see Appendix A for the questionnaire used in this study.

Questions were developed out of the reviewed literature, a pilot study, and post-pilot follow-up questions posed to college marching band were organized into six sections:

Section 1 – Background Information

Section 2 – College Choice

Section 3 – Marching Band Choice

Section 4 – Influence of People

Section 5 – Influence of Promotion Materials and Media

Section 6 – Additional Comments

The first section of the MBPQ contains seven questions that are intended to provide filters for data analysis and a basic description of the sample. Please see Table 3.1 for these questions.

Table 3.1

MBPQ Section One – Background Information

1. I am at least 18 years of age
 - a. _____yes
 - b. _____ no

2. I am a current member of a college or university marching band
 - a. _____ yes
 - b. _____ no

3. Which classification best describes your college or university
 - a. _____ Community College or Junior College (2 year school)
 - b. _____ NAIA College or University
 - c. _____ NCAA Division 2 or 3
 - d. _____ NCAA Division 1 – Football Championship Subdivision (1AA)

- e. _____ NCAA Division 1 – Football Bowl Subdivision (1A)
4. What is the size of your marching band (including color guard and other auxiliaries)?
- a. Less than 100 members
 - b. 100 - 175 members
 - c. 176 - 250 members
 - d. 251 or more members
 - e. I don't know
5. Year in Band: please indicate below:
- a. _____ a Freshman.
 - b. _____ a Transfer student.
 - c. _____ new to the marching band, but not a freshman.
 - d. _____ other (please specify)_____
6. Music participation - Which of the following best describes your intended participation level in music at this college or university:
- a. _____ Music Major.
 - b. _____ Music Minor.
 - c. _____ Not music major or minor but plan to perform in multiple ensembles.
 - d. _____ Not a music major or minor and will participate only in marching band.
7. Which of the following best describes your college choice and decision to participate in marching band:
- a. _____ I chose the school first, and then decided to participate in marching band.
 - b. _____ I chose my school because of the marching band.
 - c. _____ I am only participating in the marching band because it is required as part of my major in music.
 - d. _____ I am only participating in marching band for the scholarships/ stipends.
 - e. _____ Other: Please describe_____
-

Section 2 focuses on college choice. Questions from this section were designed to address research question #1. Using a 5-point Likert-type format, respondents were asked to rate the influence of college choice factors that surfaced through the literature reviewed. Please see Table 3.2 for questions in Section 2.

Table 3.2

MBPQ Section Two – College Choice

Please rate the importance of the following factors in your decision to attend this college or university:

5=Very Important; 4=Somewhat Important; 3=Neutral; 2=Not Very Important; 1=Not a Consideration

	5	4	3	2	1
1. School's academic reputation					
2. Ease of admission					
3. School had your major					
4. Quality of facilities					
5. Location of university					
6. Overall cost of university					
7. Amount of academic scholarships					
8. University student teacher ratio					
9. Academic course offerings in my major					
10. Size of institution					
11. Football team's reputation					
12. Campus atmosphere					
13. Housing opportunities					
14. Distance from home					
15. Friends/family at school					

16. Campus activities					
-----------------------	--	--	--	--	--

The review of literature revealed that there are several factors that often prevent students from participating in college marching band. Section 3 is intended to determine the importance of these factors. Please see Table 3.3 for questions in Section 3.

Table 3.3

MBPQ Section Three – Marching Band Choice

Please rate the importance of the following factors in your decision to participate in Marching Band at this college or university:

5=Very Important; 4=Somewhat Important; 3=Neutral; 2=Not Very Important; 1=Not a Consideration

	5	4	3	2	1
1. Time commitment concerns					
2. Availability of a school-owned instrument for use					
3. Band stipend or scholarship					
4. Reputation of band director(s)					
5. Reputation of band members					
6. Observed performance quality of marching band					
7. Music department					
8. Travel opportunities					
9. Friends/family in band					
10. Social opportunities in band					
11. Size of band					
12. Opportunity to continue making music					
13. Type of music band performs					

14. Band's marching style					
15. Opportunity to perform for large crowd					
16. Opportunity to be part of exciting dynamic organization					

Section 4 (Table 3.4) addresses the impact people have on the college choice process. The review of literature indicated that the opinions of friends, teachers, counselors and other individuals could have an impact on college choice (Goff et al., 2004; Sevier, 1993; Carlson, 1999). All of the questions in this section were adapted with from Carlson's UMSRQ (1999). Permission to adapt Carson's questionnaire was granted via email correspondence on March 7, 2007.

Table 3.4

MBPQ Section Four – Influence of People

Please rate how influential the following people were in your decision to participate in Marching Band at this college or university:

5=Very Influential; 4=Somewhat Influential; 3=Neutral; 2=Not Very Influential; 1=Not in Contact

	5	4	3	2	1
1. Current college band members					
2. Music faculty (other than band director)					
3. College or university band director(s)					
4. Parents					
5. High school band director					
6. High school counselor					
7. Alumni of college					
8. College university admissions personnel					

9. Alumni of my high school					
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Section 5 concentrates on the effectiveness of various recruiting tools (see Table 3.5). Questions 1-20 are all adapted from Carlson's UMSRQ (1999). Permission to adapt Carson's questionnaire was granted via email correspondence on March 7, 2007. Questions 24-26 reflect growing use of the internet in the college choice process as identified by Feilitz (2000).

Table 3.5

MBPQ Section Five – Promotional Materials and Recruiting Methods

How influential were the following in your choice to participate in your college's marching band?

5=Very Important; 4=Somewhat Important; 3=Neutral; 2=Not Very Important; 1=Not a Consideration

	5	4	3	2	1
1. Brochures from the college or university					
2. Brochures from my academic major					
3. Brochures from music program					
4. Brochures from band					
5. Phone call from music faculty					
6. Phone call from band director					
7. Phone call from alumni					
8. Phone call from current band member					
9. Campus tour					
10. Visit with current band member(s)					
11. Visit with band director					

12. Visit with other music faculty					
13. Visit with band alumni					
14. Availability for scholarships from music program					
15. Availability for marching band participation money					
16. Out of state tuition waiver/reduction					
17. Media (radio, TV, billboard, or magazine advertisement):	X	X	X	X	X
a. for the college or university					
b. music program					
c. marching band					
18. Honors music camp or festival					
19. Summer music camp					
20. Hearing band at concert(s)					
21. Hearing/seeing marching band at football game					
22. Hearing/seeing marching band at parade					
23. Hearing/seeing marching band at competition					
24. Internet Web Page (Feilitz, 2000)					
25. Internet Chat Rooms					
26. Social Networks or Blogs such as "Facebook," "Myspace," "Twitter," etc.					

Section 6 is designed to allow participants to describe any recruiting practices or strategies that were not addressed in the MBPQ (see Table 3.6). Surveys used in other related studies often used a similar open ended question to gather additional information (Brimmer, 1989; Carlson, 1999; McDavid, 1999).

Table 3.6

Section Six – Additional Comments

Please describe any additional factors used in your decision to participate in Marching Band at this college or university. Please write responses below or on back of this questionnaire.

Pilot Study

To ensure the validity of the MBPQ, I piloted the instrument to 37 marching band students at Pittsburg State University in the fall of 2006. The goal of this first pilot was to determine its success in the following areas: (a) Form and design - were the response items sequenced appropriately? (b) Questionnaire clarity - are the questions understandable? (c) Response clarity - does the instrument elicit clear responses? (d) Content clarity – are the questions understandable to the subject? (e) Length of time to complete questionnaire. All 37 participants in the pilot test completed the questionnaire in 15 minutes or less. Further, the students indicated that the questionnaire was well written, allowing for clear easy responses. In addition to the formal pilot study, a second pilot was conducted in the spring semester of 2007 to test for reliability.

Instrument Reliability

Because the MBPQ is an opinion survey, reliability is less important than in an achievement test (Rea & Parker, 1992, p. 36). With this in mind, I tested for reliability using a small number of respondents (n=10). The method used for calculating the coefficient of stability was test-retest (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2002). In this test, ten members of the Pittsburg State University marching band were first administered the

questionnaire on March 23rd, 2007. I then retested the same group of ten band members five weeks later (May 1, 2007). Each test was coded with a number to ensure that the same respondents were used in each proctoring and that each test matched.

Using Microsoft Excel, I compared the data from each respondent using the correlation function (CORREL). This calculation yielded a correlation coefficient (Pearson's r) of .66. Because .70 is the generally accepted minimum standard for attitude instruments, instrument reliability was not demonstrated in the pilot, likely due to the insufficient N . However, in the actual survey, with an appropriate number of responses, instrument reliability (internal consistency) was clearly demonstrated by calculating a Chronbach's Alpha score of .992.

Instrument Validity

Once the questionnaire was completed, I wondered if the literature reviewed truly represented the factors college marching band members used in selecting their college. In order to determine what may have been missed in the literature review and to strengthen the content validity of the MBPQ, I queried experts in the field about college choice factors by sending an email to 25 members of the College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA). The directors that were chosen for this project were recommended by David A. Wells, former director of the Boise State University marching band, and all have large bands with enrollments over 250 members. These band directors were asked to list the major factors that they thought students consider when choosing a college marching band in which to participate. In other words, why do students choose one school/band over another (scholarships, academic reputation, etc.)? Table 3.7 lists the 20 different factors presented by the 18 college band directors that responded. It is

important to note that some of these respondents listed one or two factors, while some listed as many as ten. Also presented in the table are how many times these factors were mentioned.

This email survey yielded three factors not found in the literature. These factors were added to Section 3 the MBPQ as questions 6, 15, and 16 (bolded in Table 3.3).

These factors were further reflected in questions 21–23 in Table 3.5.

Table 3.7

College Marching Band Participation and College Choice Factors as Cited by College Band Directors.

College/Marching Band Choice Factors	Number times mentioned
Cost of school	3
Scholarships	9
Academic reputation	4
School reputation (social/environmental)	2
Parents/family are alumni	5
Athletic teams	9
High school band director recommendation	8
Band reputation of excellence	6
Quality of band (as observed by student)	3
Required as part of degree (usually music education)	3
Continued music participation	3
Opportunity to perform for large crowd	2
Being a member of an exciting organization	1
Personality of/relationship with band director	8

Friendliness or excitement level of current students	2
Anticipated future employment opportunities due to association with a particular program (networking)	
Friends in band/social possibilities	12
Travel opportunity	3
Positive high school experience	4
Connection to school from attending clinic or other campus event	2

Notes:

1. Number of Band Directors responding was 25.
2. Question asked was, "In short, could you please list the major factors students consider when choosing a college marching band in which to participate. In other words, why do they choose one school/band over another (scholarships, academic reputation, etc.)."
3. Purpose of query was to validate survey questions and categories as determined by the literature review.

The MBPQ was developed for use in the collection of data in support of his research on recruiting college marching members. The pilot study and other procedures outlined above show preliminary work at demonstrating reliability and validity.

Participants

Current members of college or university marching bands in the states of Kansas and Missouri were selected to participate in this study. This regional sample was selected because it was an easily accessible and relevant population to me. Although this convenience sample lowers the ability to generalize findings to a national level, it is highly relevant to me because it is the region in which I direct a college marching band and actively recruits band members.

A request was sent via email to directors of all 18 college or university marching bands in the two state region. These directors were asked to encourage their students to participate in an online survey using *Survey Monkey* (www.surveymonkey.com) that was designed to quantify the factors used by current marching band members when choosing to participate in their college or university marching band. Further, the directors were to reply with the number of people to which the questionnaire was sent.

Of the 18 potential participating colleges or universities, 12 responded that they sent a link to the questionnaire to their band members. Responding institutions included:

- 2 NCAA Division 1 Football Bowl Subdivision schools
- 2 NCAA Division 1 Football Championship Subdivision schools
- 7 NCAA Division 2 schools
- 1 NAIA school

Based on the band enrollments as reported by the 12 participating band directors, a potential population of 1,435 band members were directed to the online questionnaire. Of these, 642 (48%) completed the questionnaire.

Protection for Participants

I was granted exempt approval from the Committee for the Protection of Human Research Subjects (see Appendix C) at Pittsburg State University to administer the MBPQ to college students who were 18 years of age or older. The instrument had filter questions to determine eligibility and to aid in the analysis of data, but no questions were designed to identify individual respondents or their specific institution. Only in the open-ended questions could a specific school or other identifier be collected. However, neither

in this dissertation nor any reports later published from the collected data will personal or institutional identifiers be used.

Analysis of Findings

Questions 1–7 of the MBPQ constitute section 1 of the MBPQ and serves the purpose of providing a description of the population sampled. Much of this data was later used as independent variables during analysis. Findings in section 1 are expressed using only descriptive statistics.

Questions 8–11 are Likert-type questions that rate the importance of choice factors. These questions are reported using descriptive statistics such as mean scores and standard deviation. These scores will then be disaggregated according to athletic affiliations (NCAA Division 1, NAIA, etc.) and compared using one way ANOVAs with the intent of determining if students from different types of schools use different college choice factors. Bonferroni posthoc tests were performed to calculate the significance between these factors.

Question 11 rates the importance of different recruiting efforts to students. In addition to comparing the importance of these factors to students from differing athletic affiliations, I compared the responses to students who are majoring in music to non-music by performing a series of 2 sample t-tests (2 tail) using the data analysis add-on in Microsoft Excel.

Question 12 was designed to identify choice factors that may have been missing from the questionnaire. This open-ended question asked respondents to, “Please describe any additional factors used in your decision to participate in Marching Band at this

college or university.” Responses from this and the other open-ended questions are used throughout the next chapter (Chapter Four: Results) to clarify the quantitative data and identify information that may have been missed in the literature review.

Limitations to Analysis Method

Data was analyzed by comparing the mean score from each item using t-tests and ANOVA, both of which are parametric tests. Some statisticians have no concerns with analyzing individual Likert-type items using t-tests or other parametric procedures (Sisson & Stocker, 1989). However, statisticians such as Stevens (1946) and Knapp (1990) take issue with using parametric tests with Likert-type scales because these tests assume that the interval in the scale is equal while it may not actually be. To quote other critics of parametric analysis of Likert-type data, Robbins & Heibeger (2011):

Assigning the value 5 to strongly agree, 4 to agree, and continuing down to 1 for strongly disagree and then taking means is a common practice. However, it is controversial since there is no assurance that there is even spacing between the descriptions of attitude. There is no reason to assume that the distance between agree and strongly agree is the same as the distance from agree to neither agree nor disagree. Even if it were acceptable to take means, it is not very useful. One hundred respondents giving a score of three tells a very different story from 50 respondents giving a score of five and 50 respondents giving a score of one, yet these two situations both have a mean of three.

It is not uncommon for research in Music Education to treat ordinal data like interval data. For example, Moder (2013) used mean score for individual Likert-type responses to quantify her data while looking at reasons for why college non-music majors choose to

participate in college music programs. Nearly all research in music recruiting literature that I reviewed (Carlson, 1999; Casey, 1994; McDavid, 1999; Moder, 2013; Stanley, 1964) used means and standard deviations to describe the tendencies of their populations. None of these studies went beyond descriptive statistics in their research. Therefore, I cannot claim that use of parametric statistics for ordinal data is the standard practice in music recruiting research, but using the mean as the measure for central tendency clearly is quite common. In wanting to express the results of my analysis in a manner congruent with my field, I chose to use parametric statistical tests that compare data using means rather than other forms of central tendency such as the mode or median or categorical data analyses using frequencies and Chi square.

While acknowledging that non-parametric tests such as Chi square or the Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon (MWW) are the accepted method for analyzing Likert-type data by most statisticians, there is research suggesting that parametric tests are also appropriate. According to de Winter & Dodou (2010), for five-point Likert items, the "t" test and MWW generally have similar power. The consequence of using parametric tests on Likert-type data is a potential reduction of power when drawing conclusions from the research. According to Grace-Martin (2008), using a more stringent alpha level can offset the loss of power. "If you have p-values of .001... it's pretty clear what the result is, even if parameter estimates are slightly biased." Further, Sisson & Stocker (1989) compared the findings of several different Likert-type data sets using both chi-square and ANOVA. Both tests identified the same significant differences between groups. This study found for many types of research that use of ANOVA and t-test on ordinal data is

not only appropriate, but is often preferred because it is more convenient to report mean scores than complicated tables produced by chi-square or non-parametric tests.

In summary, I acknowledge that my methods of analysis do have limitations and that others might have chosen other types of analyses based on the common practices in their respective fields. But for my purposes, the use of parametric statistics is appropriate and supported in the literature.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The Marching Band Participation Questionnaire was developed to collect data to aid in answering the following research questions:

1. What criteria do college marching band members use when selecting a college?
2. What criteria do students use when deciding to participate in marching band (scholarships, friends, continued musical participation, etc.)?
3. Who most influences college band members' decision to participate in their college marching band?
4. What other factors were influential in band members' decision to participate in the college marching band?

Sample Population and Response Rate

A request was sent via email to directors of all 18 college or university marching bands in the three-state region of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. These directors were asked to encourage their students to participate in an online survey using *Survey Monkey* (www.surveymonkey.com) that was designed to quantify the factors used by current marching band members when choosing to participate in their college or university marching band. Further, the directors were to reply with the number of people to which the questionnaire was sent.

Of the 18 potential participating colleges or universities, 12 responded that they sent a link to the Marching Band Participation Questionnaire (MBPQ) to their band members. Responding institutions included:

1. 2 NCAA Division 1 Football Bowl Subdivision schools
2. 2 NCAA Division 1 Football Championship Subdivision schools
3. 6 NCAA Division 2 schools
4. 1 NAIA school
5. 1 Community College (2 year school)

Based on the band enrollments as reported by the participating 12 band directors, there was a potential population of 1,435 band members who were directed to the online questionnaire and 642 (48%) of the population completed the questionnaire. Of these, four were discarded because the respondent indicated that they were younger than 18, and five were discarded because respondents indicated that they were not current members of a college or university marching band. After responses from these nine disqualified participants were deleted, there was a sample population of 633 (n=633) and the response rate was reduced to 44% of the potential respondents from participating institutions.

Description of Population

Questions 1–7 constitute section 1 of the MBPQ and serve the purpose of providing a description of the population sampled. Much of this data was later used as independent variables during analysis. Expressed as raw responses and percentages, the findings of section 1 of the MBPR are presented below in Tables 4.1 through 4.7.

Table 4.1

Respondent's Age—Q1: I am at least 18 years of age

Answer Choices	Responses	Percentages
Yes	638	99.38%
No	4	0.62%
Total	642	

Any data collected from the four respondents who reported that they were not at least 18 years of age was excluded from analysis.

Table 4.2

Band Membership Status—Q2: I am a current member of a college or university marching band

Answer Choices	Responses	Percentages
Yes	638	99.39%
No	4	0.62%
total	642	

This study was investigating choice factors related to current members of a college or university marching band. Therefore, question 2 was used to filter out data received from respondents that do not fit this categorization. Data collected from the four ineligible respondents was excluded from analysis.

Responses to questions 3–7 were collected to help describe the sample population and provide sub categories (independent variables) for further analysis.

Table 4.3

Athletic Affiliation—Q3: Which classification best describes your college or university

Answer Choices	Responses	Percentages
Community College or Junior College (2 year school)	13	2.05%
NAIA College or University	50	7.9%
NCAA Division 2 or 3	217	34.28%
NCAA Division 1 - Football Championship Subdivision (1AA)	45	7.11%
NCAA Division 1 - Football Bowl Subdivision (1A)	167	26.38%
I don't know	141	22.27%
Total	633	

Table 4.4

Band Size—Q4: What is the size of your marching band (including color guard and other auxiliaries)

Answer Choices	Responses	Percentages
Less than 100 members	73	11.53%
100-175 members	175	27.65%
176-250 members	95	15.01%
251 or more members	255	40.28%
I don't know	35	5.53%
Total	633	

Table 4.5

Year in Band—Q5: Year in band: please indicate below

Answer Choices	Responses	Percentages
Freshman (in first year of college band)	224	35.39%
Sophomore (2nd year in band)	132	20.85%
Junior (3rd year in band)	127	20.06%
Senior (4 + years in band)	126	19.91%
Grad Student	4	0.63%
Other (please explain below)	20	3.16%
total	633	

Of the 20 respondents who answered “other,” all indicated that they either transferred from a college that didn’t have marching band or that it was their first year in marching band but not their first year in college.

Table 4.6

Music Participation Level—Q6: Which of the following best describes your participation level in music at this college or university?

Answer Choices	Responses	Percentages
Music Major	226	35.70%
Music Minor	44	6.95%
Not music major or minor but plan to perform in multiple ensembles	158	24.96%
Not a music major or minor and will participate only in marching band	205	32.39%
Total	633	

Table 4.7

College Choice—Q7: Which of the following best describes your college choice and decision to participate in marching band?

Answer Choices	Responses	Percentages
I chose the school first, and then decided to participate in marching band.	375	59.24%
I chose my school because of the marching band.	135	21.33%
I am only participating in the marching band because it is required as part of my major in music.	38	6.00%
I am only participating in marching band for the scholarships/stipends.	43	6.79%
other (please explain)	42	6.64%
Total	633	

Of the 42 respondents who chose “other,” most indicated that their college choice was a combination of the above categories.

Analysis of MBPQ Questions 8–11

Questions 8–11 of the MBPQ were designed to address research questions 1–4. The data presented in the first table for each research question ranks the many college choice factors and other factors related to recruiting of college marching band members without disaggregating the data. This first table will report the descriptive statistics of average rating (M) and the standard deviation (SD).

Simple descriptive statistics and presenting findings in ranked order show the importance of each factor associated with each research question. However, according to the review of literature, different sub populations make their college choices for different

reasons. For example, according to Teeples (2005), a student-athlete who wants to play a sport while attending college but has his or her priority focused on their academic major is more likely to choose an NCAA Division 2 or 3 school than someone who is focused on “going pro” in that sport. Likewise, according to Spies (1978), a student from a low socio-economic background, regardless of academic ability, will usually prioritize affordability of their college over most other factors. Because it is likely that marching band members have similar college choice considerations, I created a second table for each research question that compare results disaggregated by athletic affiliation.

A college or university’s athletic affiliation does not always translate directly into the size of the institution or academic prestige. Rather, it loosely relates to media exposure and competitive success in sports (Teeples, 2005). The affiliations being researched in this study include the following:

- NCAA Division 1 Football Bowl Subdivision
- NCAA Division 1 Football Championship Subdivision
- NCAA Division 2
- NAIA
- NJCAA (Community College/Jr. College – 2 year programs)

To compare the choice factors in questions 8-11 by the athletic affiliations (presented above), one-way ANOVAs were run on each factor. These factors are presented in a table to follow the table with descriptive statistics. Significant differences for each factor found between different athletic affiliations are notated with an asterisk.

College Choice Findings

Question 8 of the MBPQ addresses research question 1 (What criteria do college marching band members use when selecting a college?). The top college choice factor considered by students who completed the questionnaire was that the school had the student's academic major. Other important factors included academic reputation, costs, and campus atmosphere. These findings echo what was identified in the review of literature.

Factors identified in question 8 that are the least important are the reputation of the football team, student teacher ratio, friends at the institution, and ease of admission. Please see Table 4.8 for a full list of findings presented in descending order of importance according to the respondents.

Table 4.8

College Choice Factors (N=642)—Q8: Please rate the importance of the following factors in your decision to attend this college or university

Factor	M	SD
School had your academic major	4.69	.487
School's academic reputation	4.47	.644
Overall cost of university	4.37	.709
Campus atmosphere	4.24	.723
Quality of facilities	4.22	.647
Amount of academic scholarships	4.15	.753
Location of university	4.06	.802
Distance from home	3.76	.954
Size of institution	3.67	.882

Student - teacher ratio	3.71	.92
Campus activities (clubs, fraternities, etc.)	3.53	.996
Ease of admission	3.48	1.01
Housing opportunities	3.45	.993
Friends/family at school	3.03	1.03
Football team's reputation	2.38	1.14

Note: Scale Ranged from “not a consideration” (1) to “Very Important” (5).

Although the ranked listing of college choice factors presented in Table 4.8 demonstrates the most important college choice factors for marching band students enrolled in schools in the region being studied, I wanted to probe deeper than simply reporting descriptive statistics. For student athletes, Toma and Cross (1996) suggest that students who attend colleges with different athletic affiliations have different college choice rationale. To investigate if there is a college choice difference for college marching band members, a series of one-way ANOVAs for each factor being rated in question 8 were performed using SPSS. Factors with a P value of less than .05 demonstrate that there is a significantly different rating between groups. These significant values are presented in Table 4.9 with an asterisk.

Table 4.9

College Choice by Athletic Affiliation—Q8: Please rate the importance of the following factors in your decision to attend this college or university

Factor	Mean of all Participants	D1A Mean	D1AA Mean	D2&3 mean	NAIA Mean	JUCO Mean	P value
School had your academic major	4.69	4.6	4.73	4.75	4.76	4.23	.48
School's academic reputation	4.47	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.51	3.62	.002*
Overall cost of university	4.37	4.19	4.46	4.53	4.14	4.85	.000*
Campus atmosphere	4.24	4.16	4.39	4.01	4.37	3.77	.000*
Quality of facilities	4.22	4.44	4.56	4.32	4.22	3.77	.51
Amount of academic scholarships	4.15	4.14	4.02	4.31	4.35	4.69	.002*
Location of university	4.06	3.96	4.22	4.03	3.98	4.15	.707
Distance from home	3.76	4.14	3.73	3.78	3.67	4.24	.547
Size of institution	3.67	3.6	3.37	3.84	4.12	3.00	.013*
Student - teacher ratio	3.71	3.24	3.71	3.94	3.9	4.38	.000*
Campus activities (clubs, fraternities, etc.)	3.53	3.73	3.98	3.43	3.86	2.85	.001*
Ease of admission	3.48	3.09	3.68	3.53	3.67	4.23	.000*
Housing Opportunities	3.45	3.37	3.63	3.49	3.49	4.85	.123
Friends/family at school	3.03	3.16	3.41	2.88	3.00	3.15	.85
Football team's reputation	2.38	2.92	2.88	2.27	1.88	2.62	.000*

Note: Scale Ranged from “Not a Consideration” (1) to “Very Important” (5). *Indicates statistically significant difference between groups.

The results in Table 4.9 only show that there is a difference between groups, not what those differences are. Therefore, a Bonferroni posthoc test was performed to show where those differences lie. Significant findings between groups are as follows:

A school's academic reputation is rated more important to band members attending four-year colleges than to those attending a community college. There is no statistical difference in the rating between all the athletic affiliations except community college participants. Looking at the descriptive statistics in Table 4.9, one can see a clearly lower mean score for community college participants. The calculated P values for comparing community college rating against schools from other athletic affiliations are as follows:

- Community College compared to NAIA – P=.003
- Community College compared to NCAA Divisions 2 and 3 – P=.004
- Community College compared to NCAA Division 1AA (FCS) – P=.008
- Community College compared to NCAA division 1A (FBS) – P=.001

Statistically different ratings of the importance of the overall cost of the school exist between NCAA Division 2 and 3 participants and members from NAIA and NCAA Division 1A schools. A look at the descriptive statistics shows that although school cost is important to all college marching band members (all schools rated cost in the 4/5 range out of 5), cost is significantly more important to Division 2 and 3 students than it is to NAIA and 1AA students. The calculated P value for this difference between Division 2 and 3 and NAIA and Division 1A are .04 and .002 respectively.

Related to the overall cost of a school, amount of scholarships available produced statistically different ratings between NCAA Division 1A students and Division 2 and 3 students. A look at the descriptive statistics shows that although scholarships are important to all college marching band members (all schools rated cost in the 4/5 range out of 5), there is a significant gap between these two groups. The calculated P value for this comparison is .004.

Ratings of importance for campus atmosphere vary greatly between respondents from the different athletic affiliations. Community college students rated campus atmosphere lower as a choice factor than did members of four-year colleges and universities. However, the Bonferroni post hoc test indicates the following significant differences between groups:

- Community College compared to NCAA Division 1AA (FCS) – $P=.047$
- NCAA Division 2 and 3 schools compared to Division 1A and Division 1AA – $P= .003$ and $.000$ respectively

The importance of the size of the institution rates an average of 3.67 out of 5 to college marching band members. However, with a P value of .047, significant differences are shown between the importance ratings of community college band members and those in NCAA division 2 and 3 institutions.

Student to teacher ratios rate 3.7 out of 5 for importance in college choice for marching band members. This ratio is less important to members of NCAA division 1A and 1AA schools. Indeed, there is no significance between their ratings. In contrast, there is a significant rating difference between members of bands from the largest schools

and those from community colleges, NAIA and division 2 and 3 schools. These calculated P values are as follows:

- NCAA Division 1AA students compared to Community college, NAIA, and Division 2 and 3- P= .024, .007, and .016 respectively.
- NCAA Division 1A students compared to Community college, NAIA, and Division 2 and 3- P= .002, .000, and .000 respectively.

The review of literature revealed that campus activities, such as fraternities and clubs, are important choice factors for the general student population. With an average rating of 3.35 out of 5, it may not be as important of a factor for band students as other factors rated, but on average, it is taken under consideration when students choose their college. By looking at the descriptive statistics, it is clear that campus activities are far less important to community college students than to other groups. The greatest differences occurred between community college students and those from NAIA and NCAA Division 1 AA schools. The calculated P values for these differences are .047 and .020 respectively.

With a rating of 3.09 out of 5, Ease of Admission was a less important choice factor for students at a Division 1A school than to students at schools from all of the other categories. In contrast, with a rating of 4.23, it was rated as a very important factor for people attending a community college. Although the greatest gap between mean scores exists between community college and NCAA Division 1A schools as to the importance of ease of admission as a choice factor, band members from Division 1A schools show a significant rating difference with other four-year schools. Ratings for members of Division 1A bands regarding ease of admission differ significantly from

those at NAIA, Division 2 and 3 schools, and Division 1A schools with P values of .027, .004, and .044 respectively.

The reputation of the football team was pointed out in the review of literature as a major college choice factor for members of college marching bands. The results of the MBPQ do not confirm this assertion. In fact, the average rating for football reputation was only 2.38 out of 5. This ranked the factor last out of all the factors identified in the review of literature. Nevertheless, football reputation is most important to schools at Division 1 (1A and 1AA). This is not surprising since these are the schools most associated with major football programs and have the lion's share of media exposure. There is a significant difference between the importance of football at Division 1 schools and schools associated with "lower" tiers of athletic affiliations. The calculated P values for these differences are presented below:

- NCAA Division 1A ratings compared to NAIA and Division 2 and 3 – P=.000
- NCAA Division 1AA compared to NAIA – P=.002

Marching Band Participation Concerns

Question 9 addresses research question 2 (What criteria do students use when deciding to participate in marching band (scholarships, friends, continued musical participation, etc.?). The top criteria used when choosing to be in marching band includes having the opportunity to be part of an exciting and dynamic organization, opportunity to continue making music, and wanting to be part of the band based on having observed the band in performance. Least important factors include friends/family in band, availability of a school-owned instrument for use, marching band rehearsal

facilities, size of band, marching band performance facilities, travel opportunities, and band's marching style. See Table 4.10 for full findings presented in descending order of importance to the respondents.

Table 4.10

Marching Band Participation Concerns (descriptive)—Q9: Please rate the importance of the following factors in your decision to participate in Marching Band at this college or university

Factor	M	SD
Opportunity to be part of exciting dynamic organization	4.40	.731
Opportunity to continue making music	4.33	.771
Observed performance quality of marching band	4.08	.790
Music department reputation	3.97	.883
Reputation of band director(s)	3.93	.853
Reputation of band members	3.80	.886
Time commitment concerns	3.75	.874
Social opportunities in band	3.75	.904
Opportunity to perform for large crowd	3.68	.970
Band stipend or scholarship	3.58	1.032
Type of music band performs	3.55	.992
Band's marching style	3.37	1.018
Travel opportunities	3.32	.966
Marching band performance facilities	3.23	.946
Size of band	3.22	.903
Marching band rehearsal facilities	3.14	.908
Availability of a school-owned instrument for use	3.08	1.301
Friends/family in band	3.03	1.051

Note: Scale Ranged from “Not a Consideration” (1) to “Very Important” (5).

In addition to choosing which college to attend, college marching band members also have to make the decision whether or not to participate in their college marching

band. As was shown in Table 4.7, only 6% of respondents indicated that they are participating in marching band because it is required for their academic major. Table 4.10 ranks the importance of each band participation choice factor to the students that participated in this study. However, according to the review of literature, these choice factors may be different for students attending universities or colleges affiliated with different levels of athletic competition. To investigate if the factors used to decide whether or not to participate in the college marching band are different between students attending schools associated with different athletic divisions, a series of one-way ANOVAs for each factor being rated in question 9 were performed using SPSS. Factors with a P value of less than .05 demonstrate that there is a significantly different rating between groups. Table 4.11 shows each choice factor with its average rating by athletic affiliation as well as the average for all respondents. Factors that have a significantly different rating between groups (P is less than .05) are indicated with an asterisk.

Table 4.11

Band Participation Choice by Athletic Affiliation—Q9: Please rate the importance of the following factors in your decision to attend this college or university

	Mean	D1A	D1AA	D2&3	NAIA	JUCO	P (Sig)
Time commitment concerns	3.75	3.66	4.13	3.8	3.65	3.92	.151
Availability of a school-owned instrument for use	3.08	3.16	3.65	2.97	2.83	3.08	.072
Band stipend or scholarship	3.58	3.01	3.38	3.85	3.98	4.5	.000*
Reputation of band director(s)	3.93	3.77	4.15	3.88	4.29	3.58	.026*
Reputation of band members	3.80	3.75	3.98	3.76	4.1	3.33	.104
Observed performance quality of marching band	4.08	4.17	4.55	3.98	4.1	3.83	.019*
Music department reputation	3.97	3.62	4.28	4.05	4.38	3.25	.000*
Travel opportunities	3.32	3.62	3.73	2.91	2.98	3.25	.000*
Friends/family in band	3.03	3.05	3.55	2.91	2.88	3.25	.063
Social opportunities in band	3.75	3.86	4.22	3.7	3.73	3	.006*
Size of band	3.22	3.4	3.55	3.2	3.27	2.5	.022*
Opportunity to continue making music	4.33	4.21	4.6	4.34	4.5	3.58	.005*
Type of music band performs	3.55	3.43	3.77	3.6	3.71	3.25	.278
Band's marching style	3.37	3.29	3.8	3.4	3.58	3.42	.152
Marching band performance facilities	3.23	3.1	3.58	3.3	3.13	3.25	.179
Marching band rehearsal facilities	3.14	2.9	3.38	3.26	3.06	3	.025*
Opportunity to perform for large crowd	3.68	3.9	4.05	3.61	3.4	3.5	.009*
Opportunity to be part of exciting dynamic organization	4.40	4.52	4.75	4.3	4.33	3.92	.003*

Note: Scale Ranged from “Not a Consideration” (1) to “Very Important” (5).

Table 4.13 shows that there are differences between groups the mean scores of each group, but not what those differences are. Therefore, a Bonferroni posthoc test was performed to show where those differences lie. Significant findings between groups are as follows.

Stipend or scholarship availability for participation is a choice factor that came up often in the review of literature. Table 4.7 shows that only 6.79% of respondents are participating in band because of the money. However, in Table 4.8, cost of school and availability of scholarships rate highly as a college choice factor (ranked #3 and #6 respectively). As a reason to choose to participate in band, availability of scholarships or stipends rated 3.58 out of 5. Since the rating is above a 3, it is of importance, but it is clearly less influential than several other identified factors to the full sample.

Stipends and scholarships are the least influential to members of Division 1A bands. The difference between D1A schools and Juco, NAIA, and D2 and 3 schools is statistically significant with P values of .000 for all three athletic affiliations. The difference between NCAA 1A respondents and 1AA is not significant. The other significant difference in ratings exists between D1AA and community college respondents with a P value of .031. The take away from the impact of stipends and scholarships on the decision to participate in college marching band is less important to students from schools affiliated with the highest levels of athletic competition.

The reputation of the band director rates 3.93 out of 5 as a choice factor for the average respondent. When this factor is disaggregated between athletic affiliations, a significant difference in ratings of this factor exists between students at NAIA schools

and those attending Division 1A schools. With a P value of .047, this factor is most influential to students at the smaller NAIA schools.

The importance of the observed quality of the band rates 4.08 out of 5. There exists a significant difference between the importance of the observed quality of a band as a choice factor between NCAA Division 1AA and their Division 2 and 3 counterparts. The calculated P value for this difference is .014. With an average rating of 4.55 out of 5, students from 1AA schools scored this factor highest among all of the other factors considered when choosing to participate in their college marching band.

The reputation of the music department is a choice factor that yields significant differences between groups. It is least influential to band members at the 1A schools and those at community colleges. Significant difference does occur between community college students and those at NAIA schools and those at NCAA D1AA schools and with P values of .015 and .045 respectively. Likewise, Division 1A schools rate the reputation of the music department at their school as an influential choice factor lower than those at NAIA schools, Division 2 and 3 schools, and those at Division 1AA schools. The significance of this difference is demonstrated with P values of .000, .003, and .007 respectively.

The review of literature indicates that students choose to participate in marching band at the college level for social reasons. Indeed, according to Table 4.9, the average student rated social opportunities a 3.75 out of 5. It may not be a top factor, but is clearly a consideration for many students. A significant difference in the rating of this factor exists between students at community colleges and those at 1AA schools. The calculated

P value for this difference is .008, with the choice factor being most important to the 1AA students.

Similarly, band size is most important to those in 1AA bands and this contrasts significantly with its importance as a choice factor for community college students. The P value for this comparison is .037. The different value of band size between these groups is not surprising because the community college bands surveyed were the smallest bands in the study and the 1AA bands were among the largest.

According to the review of literature, a common reason college students choose to participate in their college marching band is that it represents an opportunity to continue making music. According to Table 4.6, only 35.7% of respondents are majoring in music. This means that the majority of marching band students are doing the activity for reasons other than academic. Significant differences for this factor exists between respondents at schools affiliated with differing athletic levels. Community college respondents significantly value the opportunity to continue making music lower than those at NAIA and D1AA schools. The calculated P values representing this difference are .025 and .010 respectively.

The quality of a school's rehearsal facilities rates 3.14 out of 5 as a factor used by students when choosing to participate in their college's marching band. The only significant difference in the importance of this factor exists between students at 1A schools and those attending division 2 and 3 schools. The P score for this difference is .032.

The last factor that had a significant difference between groups was the opportunity to be part of a dynamic organization. This factor was most important to

members of 1AA affiliated bands with a rating of 4.75 out of 5. Their ratings differed significantly from those from community colleges and division 2 and 3 schools with p-values of .039 and .030 respectively.

Influential People in Choice Process

Question 10 of the MBPQ addresses research question 3 (Who most influences college band members' decision to participate in their college marching band). Contact by the college band director and the recommendation of the student's high school band director were the most influential interactions that led the student to participate in his/her college marching band. High school counselors and college admissions personnel ranked as the least influential people in the student's choice. See Table 4.12 for a complete list of findings presented in descending order of importance.

Table 4.12

Influence of People (descriptive)—Q12: Please rate how influential the following people were in your decision to participate in Marching Band at this college or university

Factor	M	SD
College or university band director(s)	3.82	1.003
High school band director	3.60	1.188
Current college band members	3.44	1.112
Parents	3.41	1.043
Friends	3.39	1.089
Music faculty (other than band director)	3.31	1.125
Alumni of my high school	2.68	1.211
Alumni of college	2.64	1.164
College university admissions personnel	2.46	1.089
High school counselor	2.17	1.029

Note: Scale Ranged from "Not a Consideration" (1) to "Very Important" (5).

The influence of people on a student's decision to participate in college marching band was further analyzed in SPSS by running one-way ANOVAs on the ratings disaggregated by athletic affiliation. See Table 4.13 for the results. Significant differences between groups are notated with an asterisk.

Table 4.13

Influence of People by Athletic Affiliation—Q10: Please rate how influential the following people were in your decision to participate in Marching Band at this college or university

	Mean	D1A	D1AA	D2&3	NAIA	JUCO	P (sig.)
Music faculty (other than band director)	3.31	2.98	3.7	3.27	3.8	2.83	.000*
College or university band director(s)	3.82	3.59	4.13	3.81	4.15	4	.020*
Parents	3.41	3.43	3.98	3.19	3.79	3.75	.001*
High school band director	3.60	3.45	3.88	3.58	3.91	3.73	.147
High school counselor	2.17	2.04	2.33	2.12	2.23	2.33	.580
Alumni of college	2.64	2.67	2.7	2.53	3.21	2.5	.039*
College university admissions personnel	2.46	2.39	2.63	2.4	2.23	2.33	.161
Alumni of my high school	2.68	2.61	3.33	2.63	2.72	2.42	.038*
Friends	3.39	3.34	3.7	3.35	3.4	3.58	.556
Current College Band Member	3.44	3.43	4	4.41	3.47	3.17	.079

Note: Scale Ranged from “Not a Consideration” (1) to “Very Important” (5).

The college marching band director was the most influential person in the recruiting process to all students surveyed except to those at the NCAA Division 2 and 3

levels. However, although current marching band members were more influential in their choice, the band director did not rate significantly different than to students from other athletic affiliations. Significant things between groups' differences are noted below.

The influence of music faculty other than the band director was more important to students at NAIA and NCAA D1AA institutions than to those at D1A schools with significance levels of .001 and .017 respectively.

The influence of parents on a marching band member's college choice was lowest for students at NCAA Division 2 and 3 schools with a rating of 3.19 on a scale to 5. This differed significantly with students from NCAA 1AA schools, who rated parents 3.98 out of 5. The P value for this significance is .003. Similarly, NAIA students differed significantly from 1AA students by rating parents' influence as 3.70 out of 5. The P value for this difference is .032.

Most influential to NAIA students surveyed were the school's alumni. In contrast, The group that rated the influence of alumni the lowest were students affiliated with NCAA division 2 and 3 schools. With a calculated P value of .017, this difference is statistically significant.

There is a difference between groups in how students rate the influence of alumni of their high school. Members of Division 1 AA bands differ from those at Division 1A and those at 2 and 3 schools. The P value for these differences are .032 and .031 respectively.

Marching Band Recruiting Factors

Question 11 of the MBPQ addresses research question 4 (What other factors were influential in band members' decision to participate in the college marching band?).

This question is designed to measure the effectiveness of commonly used recruiting strategies. The top factors to which students responded were a visit with the college band director, having observed the band in performance, and the availability of scholarships or other financial assistance for participation in marching band, campus tour, visits with current band members, and email correspondence with the band director. See Table 4.14 for a full report of results presented in descending order of importance to the respondents.

Table 4.14

Recruiting Factors—Q11: How influential were the following factors in your choice to participate in your college's marching band?

Factor	M	SD
Visit with band director	3.61	1.255
Hearing/seeing marching band at football game	3.52	1.333
Availability for scholarships from music program	3.46	1.218
Availability for marching band participation money	3.42	1.215
Campus tour	3.34	1.197
Visit with current band member(s)	3.33	1.201
email from band director	3.28	1.259
Hearing/seeing marching band at parade	3.16	1.361
Visit with other music faculty	3.10	1.208
Brochures from band	3.09	1.114
email from music department	3.06	1.169

Hearing band at concert(s)	3.06	1.255
Hearing/seeing marching band at competition	3.00	1.174
Internet Web Page	2.91	1.174
Brochures from music program	2.90	1.320
email from other music faculty	2.85	1.45
Social media (Facebook, twitter, etc.)	2.85	1.215
email from college or university admissions office	2.79	1.125
Brochures from the college or university	2.69	1.071
Phone call from current band member	2.67	1.198
Visit with band alumni	2.65	1.135
Phone call from band director	2.64	1.196
Phone call from music faculty	2.61	1.169
Brochures from my academic major	2.57	1.120
Honors music camp or festival	2.54	1.229
Summer music camp	2.53	1.216
Media (radio, TV, billboard, or magazine) advertisement for the college or university	2.49	1.155
Media (radio, TV, billboard, or magazine) advertisement for the marching band	2.48	1.134
Media (radio, TV, billboard, or magazine) advertisement for the music program	2.37	1.179
Phone call from alumni	2.30	1.043
Out of state tuition waiver/reduction	2.29	1.204

Note: Scale Ranged from “Not a Consideration” (1) to “Very Important” (5).

The influence of these recruiting factors on a student’s decision to participate in college marching band was further analyzed in SPSS by running one-way ANOVAs on

the ratings disaggregated by Athletic Affiliation. See Table 4.15 for the results.

Significant differences between groups are notated with an asterisk.

Table 4.15

Recruiting Factors by Athletic Affiliation—Q11: How influential were the following factors in your choice to participate in your college's marching band?

	Mean	D1A	1AA	D2&3	NAIA	JUCO	P (sig.)
Brochures from the college or university	2.69	2.71	3.03	2.6	2.78	2.42	.421
Brochures from my academic major	2.57	2.5	2.74	2.53	2.91	2.25	.276
Brochures from music program	2.90	2.76	3.21	2.86	3.24	2.33	.064
Brochures from band	3.09	3.25	3.49	3.02	3.22	2.33	.041*
email from college or university admissions office	2.79	2.56	3.15	2.81	3.16	2.83	.024*
email from music department	3.06	2.76	3.15	3.21	3.44	2.75	.008*
email from band director	3.28	3.11	3.33	3.4	3.56	3.25	.307
email from other music faculty	2.85	2.56	3.13	2.94	3.2	2.33	.009*
Phone call from music faculty	2.61	2.38	2.69	2.57	3.09	2.42	.035*
Phone call from band director	2.64	2.44	2.74	2.65	3.07	2.42	.100
Phone call from alumni	2.30	2.18	2.56	2.19	2.71	2.17	.028*
Phone call from current band member	2.67	2.76	2.97	2.41	2.89	2.33	.028*
Campus tour	3.34	3.35	3.59	3.17	3.91	3.25	.018*
Visit with current band member(s)	3.33	3.37	3.62	3.17	3.76	2.5	.010
Visit with band director	3.61	3.37	4	3.57	4.2	3.83	.005*
Visit with other music faculty	3.10	2.76	3.21	3.15	3.82	2.17	.000*
Visit with band alumni	2.65	2.67	2.77	2.48	3.16	2.17	.018*

Availability for scholarships from music program	3.46	2.9	3.33	3.63	4.04	4.33	.000*
Availability for marching band participation money	3.42	2.84	3.38	3.74	3.76	4.25	.000*
Out of state tuition waiver/reduction	2.29	2.12	2.46	2.37	2.38	2.25	.408
Media (radio, TV, billboard, or magazine) advertisement for the college or university	2.49	2.56	2.72	2.39	2.6	2.67	.539
Media (radio, TV, billboard, or magazine) advertisement for the music program	2.37	2.31	2.51	2.28	2.62	2.17	.430
Media (radio, TV, billboard, or magazine) advertisement for the marching band	2.48	2.59	2.64	2.32	2.62	2.58	.303
Honors music camp or festival	2.54	2.49	2.9	2.44	2.84	2.17	.142
Summer music camp	2.53	2.4	3.05+	2.51	2.76	2.5	.093
Hearing band at concert(s)	3.06	2.84	3.4	2.99	3.42	2.5-	.041*
Hearing/seeing marching band at football game	3.52	3.83	4.03	3.26	3.62	3.25	.002*
Hearing/seeing marching band at parade	3.16	3.03	3.59+	2.98	3.32	3	.109
Hearing/seeing marching band at competition	3.00	2.97	3.38	2.81	3.24	2.92	.164
Internet Web Page	2.91	3.03	3.15	2.81	3.07	2.08-	.083
Social media (Facebook, twitter, etc.)	2.85	2.86	2.85	2.78	2.96	2.75	.957

Note: Scale Ranged from “Not a Consideration” (1) to “Very Important” (5).

Email from the music department rated 3.06 out of 5 for all respondents, but there was a significant difference between students from schools from two different athletic affiliations. Students from NAIA institutions rated this factor highest with 3.44 out of 5 while Division 1A students only rated it 2.76. The calculated value for this significant difference is .033. Similarly, a phone call from music faculty was more influential to NAIA students than to Division 1A students. The difference is statistically significant with a P value of .018.

The impact of the campus tour influenced NAIA students greater than students from other categories of schools. The difference between NAIA students and those at Division 2 and 3 schools was most significant with a P value of .012.

Meeting with current marching band members was influential to most students rating 3.33 out of 5. This factor, however, was far less influential to community college students who, on average, rated it only 2.55. The significance of the difference between community college students rating and those from NAIA schools is calculated with a P value of .045.

A visit with the college marching band director was the highest rated factor to influence the student's college choice. This was also demonstrated in question 11 (influence of people). Although a visit with the band director was highly influential across all groups surveyed, there was a significant difference between students at Division 1A schools and those at NAIA schools. The P value for this difference is .007, with NAIA students rating it more influential.

Visiting with music faculty other than the band director was similarly most influential to NAIA students. However, in this case, there was significant difference

between not only 1A students, but also, Division 2/3 students and community college students. The calculated P values for these differences are .000, .037, and .003 respectively.

Visiting with alumni of the college marching band is a factor that continues the trend of being most important to members of NAIA bands. The P value for the difference between NAIA students and those at Division 2 and 3 students is .018.

The availability of scholarship money from the music program and availability of marching band participation money were factors that followed clear linear trends. These moneys were most important to those in schools associated with lower levels of athletic competition.

The calculated P value for the difference in ratings of influence of music department scholarships between NCAA 1A schools and those from Division 2/3 and NAIA schools is .000. The P value between D1A and community college is .006.

Marching band participation money is less influential to NCAA D1AA students than those at Division 2/3, NAIS, and community college students. The P value for these differences are .000, .001, and .007 respectively.

Observing the marching band in a performance at a football game was most influential to band members at NCAA 1AA schools followed closely by those at 1A schools. The factor was least influential to those at Division 2 and 3 schools. The P value for the significant of the difference between Division 2 and 3 schools with those in 1A and 1AA are .005 and .033 respectively.

Comparison of Recruitment Factors Between Music Majors and Non-Music Majors

One of the purposes of this study was to investigate what factors college marching band members use when choosing the program in which they chose to participate. There had already been studies looking of college choice of music majors, but as was shown in the review of literature, most marching band members are not music majors (Bobbett, 1995; Casey, 1994; Compendium of College Marching Bands, 1999). Indeed, results from question 6 of the MBPQ indicate that only 35.6% of students surveyed that are participating in their college marching band are majoring in Music.

To compare the influence of the recruitment factors in question 11 of the MBPQ between music majors and non-music majors, a series of 2 sample t-tests (2 tail) were performed using the data analysis add-on in Microsoft Excel. The mean scores for music majors, non-majors, and their respective one tailed P value (significance) are presented in Table 4.16. All statistically significant values ($P < .05$) are notated with an asterisk.

Table 4.16

Comparison of Recruiting Factors between Music Majors and Non- Majors—Q11: How influential were the following factors in your choice to participate in your college's marching band?

Factors	All	Music Major	Non-Music Major	P-value
Brochures from the college or university	2.69	2.61	2.74	.291
Brochures from my academic major	2.57	2.85	2.41	.000*
Brochures from music program	2.90	3.25	2.72	.000*
Brochures from band	3.09	3.23	3.01	.172
email from college or university admissions office	2.79	2.91	2.73	.000*

email from music department	3.06	3.37	2.89	.000*
email from band director	3.28	3.57	3.12	.000*
email from other music faculty	2.85	3.33	2.58	.000*
Phone call from music faculty	2.61	2.93	2.43	.000*
Phone call from band director	2.64	2.97	2.46	.000*
Phone call from alumni	2.30	2.35	2.27	.513
Phone call from current band member	2.67	2.83	2.59	.059
Campus tour	3.34	3.34	3.35	.936
Visit with current band member(s)	3.33	3.51	3.23	.030*
Visit with band director	3.61	3.89	3.46	.001*
Visit with other music faculty	3.10	3.62	2.8	.000*
Visit with band alumni	2.65	2.8	2.57	.062
Availability for scholarships from music program	3.46	4.01	3.14	.000*
Availability for marching band participation money	3.42	3.63	3.3	.008*
Out of state tuition waiver/reduction	2.29	2.27	2.4	.752
Media (radio, TV, billboard, or magazine) advertisement for the college or university	2.49	2.32	2.59	.014*
Media (radio, TV, billboard, or magazine) advertisement for the music program	2.37	2.29	2.41	.269
Media (radio, TV, billboard, or magazine) advertisement for the marching band	2.48	2.37	2.55	.098
Honors music camp or festival	2.54	2.74	2.43	.014*
Summer music camp	2.53	2.69	2.44	.048*

Hearing band at concert(s)	3.06	3.47	2.83	.000*
Hearing/seeing marching band at football game	3.52	3.45	3.56	.379
Hearing/seeing marching band at parade	3.16	3.17	3.15	.939
Hearing/seeing marching band at competition	3.00	3.08	2.97	.454
Internet Web Page	2.91	2.86	2.94	.553
Social media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)	2.85	2.7	2.92	.084

Note: Scale Ranged from “not a consideration” (1) to “Very Important” (5).

Of the 31 recruiting/marketing factors identified through the review of literature, 20 demonstrated a significantly different rating of importance between music majors and non-music majors. Only the factors of “media advertisement for the college or university” and “social media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)” were more influential to non-music majors. All 18 other significant recruiting or marketing factors were most influential to music majors.

Other Considerations

Question 12 was designed to identify choice factors that may have been missing from the questionnaire. The open-ended question asked respondents to, “Please describe any additional factors used in your decision to participate in Marching Band at this college or university.” Of the 171 participants who responded, most addressed factors already accounted for in questions 8–11. Most commonly, respondents stated that they do college marching band because it is fun. Thirteen of the respondents indicated that

they chose to attend a college because it had a marching band even though it wasn't their first choice for academic reasons.

A term repeated by 17 respondents that is not reflected in the factors derived from the literature (questions 8–11) is “tradition.” The term is used by respondents in different ways. One stated, “I joined marching band because I wanted to be part of a tradition that is bigger than myself.” Others simply stated that they chose to be part of “the tradition.” It is clear that the construct of tradition is a factor that was missing from my review of literature.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

The goal of this research was to isolate effective recruiting practices for college marching bands. To find this information, I designed and administered the Marching Band Participation Questionnaire (MBPQ), a survey instrument that directly targeted college students who had chosen to participate in their college marching band. The questionnaire was built around the following specific research questions:

1. What criteria do college marching band members use when selecting a college?
2. What criteria do students use when deciding to participate in marching band (scholarships, friends, continued musical participation, etc.)?
3. Who most influences college band members' decision to participate in their college marching band?
4. What other factors were influential in band members' decision to participate in the college marching band?

The review of literature, conversations with other college band directors, personal observations, and personal experience indicate that college choice and successful recruiting is a delicate balance of marketing, personal interactions, and factors which are completely out of the band director's or other recruiter's control. For example, the student may really want to be part of one school's marching band, but simply can't afford it. There are clearly a lot of considerations a student uses when choosing a college.

Having highly effective recruiting won't lure all prospective marching band members to your program, but it will help put your program under consideration for a larger pool of candidates.

Highlights from Findings

Roughly 65% of college marching band members chose their school first, then decided whether or not to participate in the marching band. This is important for band directors to consider when marketing their program to prospective members. Although more than 20% chose their university because of the marching band, students are concerned about their academic majors, the academic reputation of the school, and other college experiences, too. Certainly, the quality of the band is a factor, but a more whole-school approach to recruiting would seem most appealing to many students.

The review of literature and discussions with other college band directors indicates that the quality of the school's football team has a large impact on recruiting for the marching band. The results of the MBPQ indicate that this factor is not as important as had been previously thought. In fact, it rated last of the factors being studied. A rival explanation for this low rating could be that none of the NCAA Division 1 schools participating in this questionnaire have football teams that are perennially competing for national championships. However, at the Division 2 level, two of the schools have football teams that have recently won multiple national championships. At least in the region surveyed, football success is not highly related to successful band recruiting.

The factors that did show most important as to why a student chooses to be part of the marching band were that the students wanted be part of a dynamic organization, wanted to continue making music, and chose to be involved with a high quality group

that they actually observed in action. According to Broh (2002), one of the reasons marching band members score higher on standardized tests and have a higher graduation rate than their non-marching band peers, is the sense of community developed by the many hours spent on the field. It appears, based on results from this survey, these students are looking to be part of a similar peer group in their college, regardless of academic major.

College choice is rarely a decision that a student makes in isolation. The primary person influencing this decision is the college band director followed closely by the student's high school band director. Surprisingly, college admissions personnel and high school counselors were at the bottom of the list as far as influential people in the decision process. Similarly, visits, phone calls, and emails with the college band director, as well as observing the band in performance were the most influential recruiting practices. Having a good website, sending brochures, and other ways of educating prospective students about your program may be important, but the results of this research indicate the students are primarily basing their college choice on interpersonal relationships and perceiving a sense of belonging.

One factor not identified in the literature, but was revealed in the open-ended sections of the MBPQ, was the concept of "tradition" being an important choice factor. Other students used terminology such as "being part of something bigger than myself" as factors as to why they chose a specific band in which to participate. These factors, along with the interpersonal relationships further demonstrate that a major impetus for a student's choice to perform in the college marching band is to have a sense of belonging

Scholarships, school affordability, and other financial factors were not as much of a consideration for most students as were the interpersonal relationships. However, they were still important to most students. Interestingly, the colleges and universities with the largest marching bands were those that offered the least amount of marching band scholarships or stipends. The survey results showed that a school's availability of marching band scholarships or stipends was a significant choice factor for NCAA Division 2, NAIA, and community college students, but it was not as important to those attending schools associated with the top tiers of athletic competition.

From the results of the MBPQ, a few generalizations can be made and put into action when developing an effective recruiting plan. First, students generally are looking at their academic major as their top priority when choosing a college. This demonstrates that an effectively recruiting band director should be well versed in the academic offerings and successes outside the music department. Secondly, once a student finds his or her academic major, it is the relationship with the director and the sense of community that will sway their college choice decision. Lastly, although money matters, it does not always translate to increased band size.

Need for This Research

One of the reasons for this research was my perception that there was a gap in the literature regarding the recruitment of college marching band members. There have been studies on recruiting music majors, but, as was demonstrated with the results of the MBPQ and the literature review, most college marching band members are not majoring in music. In fact, roughly 70% of college marching band members are not music majors and they respond to different recruitment factors than their music major counterparts.

By running a series of 2 tailed t-tests on the recruitment factors (see Figure 4.18), it was demonstrated that music majors respond to different recruiting factors than do non-majors. Therefore, treating all band members as music majors for recruiting purposes is inappropriate and there was a clearly demonstrated need to study college marching band members as a unique population.

Suggestions for Future Research

This research was regionally focused. Therefore, results may not be generalizable to other regions or on a national level. I chose to do a regional sample in order to be able to control for different variables such as school size, NCAA affiliation, and have contact with the band directors at institutions participating in the project. The regional limit strengthens its validity and reliability to the data for the selected region, but makes generalizations to the national scope severely limited. Therefore, since instrument reliability and validity has been demonstrated, it would be a logical next step to administer the MBPQ on a larger scale.

Recruiting is an important factor in the development of any college marching band program. However, it is not the only factor that affects having a band's ranks filled with quality personnel. Retention and training are at least equally vital to a band's success. Lamb (2007) and Zomboni (2011) both investigated retention factors of band students in the k-12 school system, but I have not found any scholarly research related to retention of collegiate band members. It is my opinion that this area of research is greatly underrepresented in the literature.

Final Thoughts

It has been an underlying theme to this dissertation that the college marching band member is a demographic that is under represented in the literature. In this study, I found many references in the literature to the fact marching band memberships are primarily non-music majors. Indeed, results of the MBPQ identified that less than 1/3 of respondents were majoring in music.

The data collected from administering the MBPQ paints an important picture of what factors college marching band members use when choosing a college. A glance at the descriptive statistics in Chapter 4 ranks what factors students most strongly consider when choosing their school and what recruiting practices seem important to the respondents. By itself, this data can help a college band director or recruiting personnel better reach their target audience. However, the biggest “take-away” from this study is that since most college marching band members are not majoring in music, the demographic will be more responsive to a recruiting and marketing campaign that treats them as a unique population.

REFERENCES

- Ayalon, A. (2004). A model for recruitment and retention of minority students to teaching: lessons from a school-university partnership. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(3), 7-23.
- Blackburn, J.B. (2000). *The search stage of student college choice: How students discover the range of college consideration sets*. (Doctoral dissertation, Baylor University, 2000). Dissertation Abstracts International 61/10, 3913.
- Bobbett, G.C. (1995). *The forgotten and uninformed college band student: a comparison of activities, experiences, and musical independence among non-music majors and music majors*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Biloxi, MS. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services NO. ED393755).
- Brimmer, T.R. (1989). *A perspective on the current state of college and university music student recruiting*. (Doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, IN). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54/08, 2963.
- Broh, B. A. (2002). Linking extracurricular programming to academic achievement: Who benefits and why? *Sociology of Education*, 75(1), 69-95.

- Carlson, M.C. (1999). *Undergraduate music student recruiting practices and strategies in public colleges and universities*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1999). UMI Microform No. 9953849.
- Casey, P.F. (1994). *A status study of nonselective concert bands at selected colleges and universities*. (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University). Dissertation Abstracts International, A54/08, 2936.
- Catterall, J.S., Chapleau, R., & Iwanaga, J. (1999). *Involvement in the arts and human development: General involvement and intensive involvement in music and theater arts*. Retrieved October 13, 2002 from <http://www.doodlestudio.com/TeacherParent/ChampionsofChange.htm>
- Clothier, R. I. (1967). *Factors influencing freshmen with high school band experience to elect or not to elect band membership at five liberal arts colleges in Iowa*. (Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1967). Dissertation Abstracts International, 28, 1836A-18367A. (University Microfilms No. 6713671).
- Compendium of College Marching Bands (1999). Retrieved from <http://www.ucband.uc.edu/kappakappapsi/compendium>
- de Winter, J.C.F. & Dodou, D. (2010). *Five-Point Likert items: t test versus Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon. Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation. 15/11*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from <http://www.pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=15&n=11>

- Delano, A., & Royse, D. (1987). Factors influencing the decision of college freshman to participate in Kent State University music ensembles. *Contributions to Music Education, 14*, 9-19.
- Delva, M. D., Kirby, J. R., Knapper, C. K. & Birtwhistle, R. V. (2002). Postal survey of Approaches to learning among Ontario physicians: Implications for continuing medical education. *British Medical Journal, 325*, 1218-1222.
- Doerksen, P.F. (March 2002). Student membership grows with a structured recruiting plan. *The Instrumentalist, 56*, 44-48, 103.
- Faber, A. (2010). *A study of factors that influence first-year non-music majors' decisions to participate in music ensembles at small liberal arts colleges in Indiana.* (Doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, 2010). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. 3426246.
- Faulkner, D.C. (2005). *A case study at Greenville College: Key factors influencing college choice for student athletes.* (Doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 2005). Dissertation Abstracts International 66/08, 2853.
- Feilitz, L.R. (2000). Using the internet for athletic recruiting. *Journal of physical education, recreation and dance, 71*(2), 13-15.
- Fuller, J. (1995). *A descriptive analysis of the eleven Big Ten Conference marching band programs.* (Electronic Thesis or Dissertation). Retrieved from <https://etd.ohiolink.edu/>
- Gall, M.D., Gall J.P., & Borg, W.R. (2002). *Educational research: An introduction.* (7th Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

- Galotti, K.M. & Mark, M.C. (1994). How do high school students structure an important life decision? A short-term longitudinal study of the college decision-making process. *Research in Higher Education*, 35(5), 589-607.
- Glass, R. (2004). Marketing your institution effectively: A parent's perspective. *Journal of College Admission*, 183(2-4), 2-4.
- Goff, B., Patino, V., & Jackson, G. (2004). Preferred information sources of high school students for community colleges and universities. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 28(10), 795-803.
- Gordon, E. (1965). The new musical aptitude profile: A new and unique music aptitude test battery. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*. 6, 12-16.
- Grace-Martin, K. (2008). *Can Likert Scale data ever be continuous? The analysis factor*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from <http://www.theanalysisfactor.com/can-likert-scale-data-ever-be-continuous>
- Hu, S. & Hossler, D. (2000). Willingness to pay and preference for private institutions. *Research in Higher Education* 41(6), 685-701.
- Holvik, K.J. (1971). The present status of and future plans for college marching and pep bands: Survey of sixteen mid-western colleges and universities. *Journal of band Research*, 8(1), 37-47.
- Janzen, E.A. (1985). *Band director's survival guide: Planning and conducting the successful school band program*. West Nyack, NY: Parker Publishing, Inc.
- Knapp, T. (1990). Treating ordinal scales as interval scales: An attempt to resolve the controversy. *Nursing Research*, 39(2), 121-123. Retrieved from

http://www.mat.ufrgs.br/~viali/estatistica/mat2282/material/textos/treating_ordinal_scales%5B1%5D.pdf

Lally, P.S. & Kerr, G.A. (2005). The career planning, athletic identity, and student role Identity of intercollegiate student athletes. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 76(3), 275.

Lamb, M.C. (2007). *Analysis of data on retention of high school band students*.

(Master's Thesis, University of Wisconsin – Stout, 2007). Retrieved March 23, 2015 from

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.390.7058&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Lang, S.L. (1999). *Identification of factors that influence college selection by high school seniors*. (Doctoral dissertation, Baylor University, 1999). Dissertation Abstracts International-A60/11, p. 3858.

Lee, R. (1998). A survey of NASM region 6 members regarding selected recruiting and admission practices. *Proceedings of the National Association of Schools of Music*, 86, 115-120.

Letawsky, N.R.; Schneider, R.G., & Pederson, P.M. (2003). Factors influencing the college selection process of student-athletes: Are their factors similar to non-athletes? *College Student Journal*, 37(4), 604-10.

Locke, J.R. (1982). *Influences on the college choice of freshmen music majors in Illinois*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 82, 18512.

- McClarty, J.L. (1968). *An investigation to determine the reasons former high school band members elect to participate or not to participate in band upon entering the University of Montana.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Montana, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts International, 29 (5), 1368A-1369A.
- McDavid, J.B. (1999). *A study of factors influencing nonparticipation in collegiate band programs among first-year students in the Pacific-10 Athletic Conference.* (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1999). UMI Microform No. 9931644.
- Moder, J.A. (2013). *Factors influencing non-music majors' decisions to participate in collegiate bands.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri Kansas City, 2013). Retrieved from <https://mospace.umsystem.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10355/35938/ModerFacInfNon.pdf?sequence=1>.
- Mountford, R.D. (1977). *Significant predictors of college band participation by college freshmen with high school band experience.* (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 38 (5), 2404A.
- Moyer, R.A. (May 1990). Marching band draft. *The Instrumentalist*, 44, 30.
- Navarre, R.A. (May 1990). Creative recruiting of future musicians. *The Instrumentalist*, 49, 30.
- Nuby, J.F. & Doebler, D. (2000). Issues affecting the recruitment and retention of black students in teacher education. *The Negro Educational Review*, 51(3/4) 125-37.

- Olsen, W. (March 1985). For the smaller marching band. *The School Musician*, 56, 18-19.
- Perna, L.W. (2000). Differences in the decision to attend college among African Americans, Hispanics, and whites. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(2), 117-41.
- Perry, K.F. (2004). *The perceived factors that influence college choice among low and middle-income African American high school seniors: A comparison between a predominately white and a predominately black high school*. (Doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 65/06, 2118.
- Peterson, S. (October 2005). Meet students, take a lesson: Choosing a music school. *The Instrumentalist*, 60, 56. Proquest Digital Dissertations (2006). Retrieved October 29, 2006 from <http://il.proquest.com.libproxy.boisestate.edu/>.
- Rea, LM and Parker, RA (1992). *Designing and conducting survey research: A comprehensive guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Rees, M.A. (1983). College student recruitment: The importance of faculty participation. *College Music Symposium*, 23(2), 38-45.
- Revelli, W.D. (1979). Marching is an education plus. *The School Musician*, 51(1), 8-9.
- Robbins, N.B. & Heiberger, R.M. (2011). *Plotting Likert and other rating scales*. *Section on survey research methods – JSM 2011*. Retrieved from http://www.amstat.org/sections/srms/Proceedings/y2011/Files/300784_64164.pdf
- Rollins, D. (July 1985). Special challenges of the small marching band. *The Instrumentalist*, 39, 18-21.

- Sevier, R.A. (1993). Recruiting African-American undergraduates. A national survey of the factors that affect institutional choice. *College and University*, 68(1), 48-52.
- Shellahamer, B., Swearingen, J., & Woods, J. (1986). *The Marching Band Program*. Oskaloosa, IA: C.L. Barnhouse Co.
- Sisson, D.A., & Stocker, H.R. (1989). *Analyzing and interpreting Likert-type survey data*. *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, 31(2): 81-85.
- Spies, R.R. (1978). *The effect of rising costs on college choice: A study of the application decisions of high-ability students*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services NO. ED154686).
- Stanley, D. (1964). *Why former high school bandmen do or do not participate in the college band program*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio University, Athens, OH, 1964. As excerpted in McDavid, J.B. (1999). A study of factors influencing nonparticipation in collegiate band programs among first-year students in the Pacific-10 Athletic Conference. (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1999). UMI No. 9931644.
- Stevens, S. S. (1946). On the theory of scales of measurement. *Science*, 103 (2684), 677-680.
- Straw, M.M (1996). *Missouri high school music students' perceptions of recruitment techniques utilized by college and university music departments*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59/02, 451.

- Teeple, J.P. (2005). *College choice decisions of student athletes*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 2005). Dissertation Abstracts International, 67/02, 490.
- Toma, J.D. & Cross, M. (1996). *Intercollegiate athletics and student college choice: Understanding the Impact of championship seasons on the quantity and quality of undergraduate applicants*. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper. (ED404895). Retrieved October 22, 2006, from <http://eric.ed.gov>.
- Whitwell, D. (1974). *A new history of wind music*. Evanston, IL: Instrumentalist Co.
- Zamboni, K.A. (2011). *Factors influencing the retention of instrumental music students of rural school districts in the Somerset and Cambria counties of Pennsylvania*. (Master's Thesis, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 2011). Retrieved March 23, 2015 from <https://dspace.iup.edu/bitstream/handle/2069/498/Kate%20Zamboni%20-%20thesis.pdf?sequence=1>

APPENDIX A

Marching Band Participation Questionnaire

2013 Marching Band Participation Questionnaire

1. Questionnaire Information

1. The Purpose of this questionnaire is to determine which factors are most important to students when choosing a college marching band in which to participate.
2. Results are intended to be presented at the CBDNA (College Band Directors National Association) Athletic Band Symposium and be included in support of the researcher's doctoral dissertation.
4. Names of participants and their institutions will remain anonymous in any presentations of findings.
5. If you are under age 18 you may not complete the questionnaire.
6. Completing the questionnaire is voluntary and participants may decide not to complete the questionnaire at any time.
7. Please answer questions as honestly as possible.
8. If a question is unclear, please indicate it in the comment box provided.

2. Background Information

***1. I am at least 18 years of age:**

- yes
 no

***2. I am a current member of a college or university marching band:**

- yes
 no

***3. Which classification best describes your college or university:**

- Community College or Junior College (2 year school)
 NAIA College or University
 NCAA Division 2 or 3
 NCAA Division 1 - Football Championship Subdivision (1AA)
 NCAA Division 1 - Football Bowl Subdivision (1A)
 I don't know

2013 Marching Band Participation Questionnaire***4. What is the size of your marching band (including color guard and other auxiliaries)**

- Less than 100 members
- 100-175 members
- 176-250 members
- 251 or more members
- I don't know

***5. Year in band: please indicate below:**

- Freshman (in first year of college band)
- Sophomore (2nd year in band)
- Junior (3rd year in Band)
- Senior (4 + years in band)
- Grad Student
- Other (please explain below)

Other (please specify)

***6. Which of the following best describes your participation level in music at this college or university:**

- Music Major.
- Music Minor.
- Not music major or minor but plan to perform in multiple ensembles.
- Not a music major or minor and will participate only in marching band.

***7. Which of the following best describes your college choice and decision to participate in marching band:**

- I chose the school first, and then decided to participate in marching band.
- I chose my school because of the marching band.
- I am only participating in the marching band because it is required as part of my major in music.
- I am only participating in marching band for the scholarships/ stipends.
- other (please explain)

Other (please specify)

2013 Marching Band Participation Questionnaire

3. College Choice Factors

***1. Please rate the importance of the following factors in your decision to attend this college or university**

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Neutral	Not Very Important	Not A Consideration
Housing Opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
School's academic reputation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ease of admission	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
School had your academic major	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Quality of facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Location of university	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall cost of university	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Amount of academic scholarships	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student - teacher ratio	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Academic course offerings in my major	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Size of institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Football team's reputation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Campus atmosphere	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Distance from home	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Friends/ family at school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Campus activities (clubs, fraternities, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify)	<input type="text"/>				

4. Marching Band Choice

2013 Marching Band Participation Questionnaire

***1. Please rate the importance of the following factors in your decision to participate in Marching Band at this college or university:**

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Neutral	Not Very Important	Not A Consideration
Time commitment concerns	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Availability of a school-owned instrument for use	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Band stipend or scholarship	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reputation of band director (s)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reputation of band members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Observed performance quality of marching band	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Music department reputation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Travel opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Friends/ family in band	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Social opportunities in band	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Size of band	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunity to continue making music	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Type of music band performs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Band's marching style	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Marching band performance facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Marching band rehearsal facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunity to perform for large crowd	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Opportunity to be part of exciting dynamic organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify)	<input type="text"/>				

5. Influence of People

2013 Marching Band Participation Questionnaire

***1. Please rate how influential the following people were in your decision to participate in Marching Band at this college or university**

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Neutral	Not Very Important	Not A Consideration
Current college band members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Music faculty (other than band director)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
College or university band director(s)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
High school band director	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
High school counselor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Alumni of college	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
College university admissions personnel	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Alumni of my high school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Friends	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify)	<input style="width: 100%; height: 15px;" type="text"/>				

6. Promotional Materials and Recruiting Methods

2013 Marching Band Participation Questionnaire

*1. How influential were the following factors in your choice to participate in your college's marching band?

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Neutral	Not Very Important	Not A Consideration
Brochures from the college or university	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Brochures from my academic major	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Brochures from music program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Brochures from band	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
email from college or university admissions office	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
email from music department	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
email from band director	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
email from other music faculty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Phone call from music faculty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Phone call from band director	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Phone call from alumni	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Phone call from current band member	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Campus tour	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Visit with current band member(s)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Visit with band director	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Visit with other music faculty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Visit with band alumni	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Availability for scholarships from music program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Availability for marching band participation money	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of state tuition waiver/reduction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Media (radio, TV, billboard, or magazine) advertisement for the college or university	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Media (radio, TV, billboard, or magazine) advertisement for the music program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Media (radio, TV, billboard, or magazine) advertisement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2013 Marching Band Participation Questionnaire

for the marching band

Honors music camp or festival	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Summer music camp	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hearing band at concert(s)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hearing/ seeing marching band at football game	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hearing/ seeing marching band at parade	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hearing/ seeing marching band at competition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Internet Web Page	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
social media (Facebook, twitter, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify)	<input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>				

7. Additional Comments

1. Please describe any additional factors used in your decision to participate in Marching Band at this college or university.

8. End of Survey

Thank you for your time!

APPENDIX B

Selected Articles, Books and Dissertations Related to Marching Band

Selected Articles, Books and Dissertations

Related to Marching Band

The purpose of this document is to show the body of literature that has led me to researching recruiting for the college level marching band. The bulk of these articles and books are geared towards the practicing high school band director. Further, this document is added as an appendix because the materials listed were used as background information and very few of the sources are directly related to recruiting for the college marching band.

The following represents materials published from 1980 to 2005 that were primarily focused on the marching band. They have been placed under the subject heading that defines their main topic.

The Total Marching Band Program

Bailey, W., & Caneva, T. (1994). *The complete marching band resource manual: Techniques for teaching, drill design, and music arranging*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Baumgardt, R. (1994). *Marching band techniques*. Muncie, IN: Arrangements Unlimited.

Dunnigan, P. (1998). *Marching band techniques*. Northfield, IL: The Instrumentalist Co.

Holston, K. (1984). *The marching band handbook*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Co.

Raxdale, W. (1985). *The marching band director: A master planning guide*. New Berlin, WI: Jensen Publications.

Shellhammer, B., Swearingen, J. & Woods, J. (1986). *The marching band program: Principles and practices*. Oskaloosa, IA: C.L. Barnhouse Co.

Marching Band Competition (Techniques, Analysis, and Philosophy)

Bailey, W (1992). What do judges really look for in a marching band show. *Today's Music Educator*: 5(1), 20-22.

Buckner, R. (1994). Bring your band back down to earth. *Fanfare* 7(2), 4-5.

Clayton, N. (1981). Battle of Flowers: Corps style. *The school musician, director and teacher*: 53(1), 24-25.

Clemmons, J.D., (1984). A survey of loss of academic class time in Texas 4A high schools due to University Interscholastic League sponsored activities. (Doctoral Dissertation, Texas A&M University, 1984). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 45 (9), 2708.

Note: University Interscholastic League (UIL) is the governing body of high school activities, including band, in Texas, Oklahoma and other states. This dissertation lists marching band as one of the activities that often requires students to miss academic classes.

Dawes, B.L. (1989). A survey of Alabama band directors regarding marching band competitions and music performance achievement. (Doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1989). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51 (4), 1037.

Guegold, W.K., (1989). An analysis of the adjudication results in the 1986-1988 Ohio Music Educators Association State Marching Band Finals with an emphasis on adjudicator consistency. (Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, 1989). *Dissertation Abstracts International* 50(9), 2821.

Note: Ratings were consistent over the 3 year period. However, rankings were not.

Hopkins, G. (1992). It's not about winning, It's about personal growth. *Today's Music Educator*. 5(1), 30, 32-34.

Knighen, C. (1992). Redefining the value of competition. *Today's Music Educator*. 5(1), 23.

Lautzenheiser, T. (1994). Competition or cooperation. *Fanfare*. 7(3), 2.

Putnam, R. (1992). Thoughts on adjudication and entertainment. *Today's Music Educator*. 5(1), 15.

Rogers, G.L. (1982). Attitudes of high school band directors, members, parents, and principals toward marching band contests. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1983). *Dissertation Abstracts International* 43(11), 3534.
 Conclusions: Marching band contests are viewed much more in terms of sociological and personal benefits than in terms of music education. Participants value the contests highly as sources of excitement, self-discipline, pride, and group identity.

History of the Marching Band

Aho, E.W. (2005). A descriptive analysis of the fourteen Mid-American Conference athletic band programs. (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International* 66(6), 2009.

Arnold, E.P. (1981). Patterns of motion and soundpower: Their significance to the school marching band. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1981) *Dissertation Abstracts International* 42(04),1527.

Note: Contends that the *Patterns in Motion* and *Soundpower* (some of the first commercially available “stock” drills and arrangements) greatly influenced and changed the direction of the marching band movement in schools in the United States.

Beier, D.H. (1983). Bands at the University of Colorado: An historical review, 1908-1978. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder, 1983). *Dissertation Abstracts International* 44(4), 903.

- Brozak, G.A. (2004). A history of the bands at Ohio University, Athens. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International* 65(4), 1293.
- Dunnigan, P. (1995). The growing complexity of marching bands. *The Instrumentalist*. 50(1), 74-77, 193-194.
Note: Gives a good description about marching band arrangements and drills from the 1940s to present.
- Fuller, J.A. (1995) A descriptive analysis of the eleven Big Ten conference marching band programs. (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1995) *Dissertation Abstracts International*. 57(3), 1068.
- Grimes, P.L. (1985). *The pride of Arizona: A history of the University of Arizona band*. Tuscon, AZ: Arizona Lithographers.
- Hollman, H. (1998). A history of the UNA band: A once in a halftime experience. Humbolt,TN: Rose Publishing.
- Knedler, J.M. (1994). A history of the University of Oklahoma band to 1971. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma,1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International* 55(10), 3032.
- Patzig, H.C. (1983). A description of the ten Southeastern Conference marching band programs. (Doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1983). *Dissertation Abstracts International* 44(9), 2704.
- Rice, S. (1993). The evolution of creative marching: function, sport, craft, and art. Salt Lake City, UT: Flatland Press.
- Sedatole, K. (1988). A century of marching: a short history of marching at the University of Michigan. *The Instrumentalist* 53(4), 59-60, 62.
- Sell, C. (1994). Tracking the trends of marching band. *The Instrumentalist* 49(2), 10-17.
- Sell, C. (1994). Tracking the trends of marching band Part 2. *The Instrumentalist* 49(3), 18-29.

APPENDIX C

Human Subjects Approval

This is a fillable form

Pittsburg State University

**Pittsburg State University
Application for Approval of Investigations
Involving the Use of Human Subjects**

This application must be completed by the Investigator and sent to the Office of Continuing and Graduate Studies by the first Tuesday of the month during the fall and spring academic semesters to be considered for full review on the second Tuesday of the month. Expedited and exempt reviews can be turned in any time. For questions about the review process contact Brian Peery in Russ Hall, #112, Ext. 4175.

1. Investigator(s) Name(s): Alan Douglas Whitten Department: Music

2. Local Address: 212B South Broadway Pittsburg, KS 66762

3. Phone: 620.235.4070 E-mail Address: awhitten@pittstate.edu

4. Project Title: Recruiting for the College Marching Band

5. Expected Starting Date may 2013 Expected Completion Date: December 2013

6. Is this project (check all that apply): Use review criteria in Form CR-1 to determine which category of review applies.

<input type="checkbox"/> Application for Full Review	<input type="checkbox"/> Protocol Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Thesis/Special Investigation
<input type="checkbox"/> Application for Expedited Review	<input type="checkbox"/> Continued Review	<input type="checkbox"/> Being submitted for external support
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application for Exempt Review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Faculty Research	<input type="checkbox"/> Being conducted in a foreign country
	<input type="checkbox"/> A Class Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Publishable research

7. If notification of human subject approval is required give date required : _____

Name of agency: _____

8. If you are a student, complete the following:

Faculty Sponsor: _____ Department: _____ Phone: _____

**** If submitted externally, a complete copy of the proposal must be submitted to the IRB.****

CERTIFICATION AND APPROVAL

Certification by Investigator: I certify that (a) the information presented in this application is accurate, (b) only the procedures approved by the IRB will be used in this project, (c) modifications to this project will be submitted for approval prior to use, and that all guidelines outlined in the PSU Policy and Assurance Handbook for the Protection of Human Research Subjects will be followed as well as all applicable federal, state and local laws regarding the protection of human subjects in research as outlined in Form VA-1.

Alan Douglas Whitten
Signature of Investigator

4/16/2013
Date

Faculty Sponsor: If the Investigator is a student, his/her Faculty Sponsor must approve this application.

I certify that this project is under my direct supervision and that I accept the responsibility for ensuring that all provisions of approval are met by the investigator.

Signature of Faculty Sponsor

Date

Department Review Committee Chair: I acknowledge that this research is in keeping with the standards set by our department, university, state and federal agencies and I assure that the student principal investigator has met all departmental requirements for review and approval of this research.

Signature of Department Review committee Chairperson

Date

Arnold L. Jones
CPHRS Chairperson

4-17-13
Date

Paul K. Kehr

4/22/13 pph