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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the influence participating in a college marching band may play in the development of effective music teaching skills. A researcher-designed survey instrument was designed. The survey instrument consisted of a series of close-ended questions designed to collect demographic data, as well as a series of questions designed to determine the extent to which college marching band is perceived as a valuable part of the undergraduate music education curriculum, the extent to which participating in college marching band might aid in the development of effective teaching skills, and the extent to which certain social and musical skills identified in the review of literature may be developed as a result of participating in college marching band. The survey tool also included one open-ended question in which participants were encouraged to provide any additional information they felt may be pertinent to the study. Participants (N = 454) were public and private high school and middle school band directors selected at random from throughout the United States. Data were collected utilizing an online survey tool.

Results of this study indicated a majority of respondents perceive their participation in college marching band to have been an effective way to develop effective music teaching skills. A majority of respondents also indicated their participation in college marching band was a valuable component of their undergraduate music education coursework. Respondents ranked the personal characteristics associated with effective music teaching higher than instructional behaviors and musical skills. The skill or characteristic respondents perceived as being most developed as a result of their participation in college marching band was the “ability to work towards a goal.” The skill perceived as least developed was “proficiency on a secondary instrument.” These results are consistent with those of previous research which found in-service music educators value their participation in college performing ensembles.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

During the last decade the United States Congress passed a series of legislation designed to improve the quality of American public education. Originally entitled the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001 and reauthorized as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 2009, this legislation mandates, in part, that all students be taught by highly qualified, effective teachers (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). There is widespread agreement that a highly qualified, effective teacher is an important aspect of student achievement. There is little agreement however about how future educators are best prepared to be effective teachers. There are a number of routes individuals may follow if they wish to become a teacher. Generally speaking however, individuals develop the skills necessary to be highly qualified, effective teachers within a state college or university where they complete coursework and field experiences leading to a bachelor’s degree in education (Labaree, 2008).

American’s teacher education schools have been criticized in recent years for low academic standards and inadequate preparation of pre-service teachers. Deemed “as low as you can go on the hierarchy of academic challenges” (Labaree, 2004, p. 2) and criticized for their low admissions standards (Levine, 2006, p. 31), impractical programs, irrelevant research (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Labaree, 2004, p. 3; Levine, 2006, p. 52), and an inability to unify theory with practice (Boyle-Baise & McIntyre, 2008; Holmes Group, 1995), American education schools have been labeled “mediocre” by United States Secretary of Education Arne Duncan (Cruz, 2009). Although a sustained line of research specifically investigating teacher preparation did not develop until the 1960s (Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001), historically there has been widespread agreement that an effective teacher is perhaps the most important aspect of improving student achievement (Barr et al., 1961; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Haycock, 1998; Kelly, 2009; U.S. Department of Education, 2011; Wenglinsky, 2000).

One of the most important aspects of improving student achievement in music is the preparation of effective music teachers (Brand, 1993; MENC, 1996). Consequently, music education researchers have long sought to empirically establish the relationship between effective teaching and student achievement. Teaching is a complex process. To be an effective
teacher an individual must develop a mastery of many interconnected skills and behaviors including teaching skills, subject matter knowledge, social skills, and classroom management strategies (Brand, 1985; Kelly, 2009; Shulman, 1987). A teacher’s effectiveness may also be influenced by variables outside of his or her control, such as the student’s home environment, the school environment, community expectations, or even the time of day at which a class meets (Brand, 1985; Palonsky, 1977; Spring, 2004). Effective teaching seems to be easily identifiable (Brand, 1985; Madsen, Standley, Byo, & Cassidy, 1992; Madsen & Duke, 1993), and research investigating effective teaching has provided a profile of skills, behaviors, and personal characteristics which seem to be common among effective music teachers.

A significant amount of research suggests the music teacher’s personal characteristics and behaviors may most impact their effectiveness in the classroom (Brand, 1985; Gordon & Hamann, 2001; Juchniewicz, 2008; Kelly, 2009; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997, 2001). For example, research shows effective music teachers tend to be mature, extroverted individuals who demonstrate enthusiasm and rapport in the delivery of instruction (Brand, 1985; Gordon & Hamann, 2001; Madsen et al., 1992; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997; Yarbrough, 1975). Effective music teachers also seem to think independently (Farmilo, 1981), have a strong need to accomplish a task (Goodstein, 1984), be creative (Farmilo, 1981), have warm personalities (Brand, 1985), enable students to think for themselves, make knowledgeable decisions (Madsen & Kuhn, 1994), plan carefully, and are student-centered (Madsen & Madsen, 1998). A strong desire to help others, poise, self-confidence, good leadership skills, and good social skills have also been associated with effective music teaching (Baker, 1981; Brand, 1985; DePugh, 1987; Goodstein, 1984; Gordon & Hamann, 2001). In fact, Teachout (1997) found social skills were the highest rated characteristics of effective music teachers. Further, research completed by Madsen et al. (1989) and Yarbrough (1975) found effective music teachers are able to adjust their social behaviors in a way that positively affects student performance.

*Teacher intensity* has also been examined by music education researchers in relation to effective teaching. Defined as the “sustained control of student/teacher interaction” (Madsen & Geringer, 1989, p. 90), teacher intensity involves a teacher’s use of varying levels of enthusiasm and instructional delivery speeds during the lesson. Research investigating teacher intensity indicates the most effective teachers are able to vary the amount of intensity they display during instruction, that the skill can be taught to prospective student teachers, and that varying levels of
intensity can be quickly and easily recognized by an observer (Byo, 1990; Cassidy, 1990, 1993; Madsen, Standley, Byo, & Cassidy, 1992; Madsen, Standley, & Cassidy, 1989; Mayhew, 2010). Teacher intensity has been shown to have positive effects upon students’ achievement, their perceptions of the teacher, and their behavior (Byo, 1990; Sims, 1986; Yarbrough, 1975).

Research investigating music teacher effectiveness shows that effective teaching skills can be learned by preservice music educators (Madsen & Duke, 1993). A concern exists however that existing undergraduate curricula may not prepare preservice music educators to keep students on-task, develop teacher intensity, or other effective teacher skills (Atterbury, 1994; Conway, 1997; Colwell, 2011; Shuler, 1995; Watkins, 1992). These concerns are not new, and historically calls have been made for undergraduate music education curricula to implement new approaches designed to improve teacher effectiveness, including a better integration of theory and practice (Cheyette, 1940; Elliot, 1992; Francis, 1939; Leonhard, 1985; Meske, 1985; Reimer, 1993), development of reflective thinking skills (Apfelstadt, 1996; Gromko, 1995), the inclusion of research methodology (Conway, 1997), or even separate curricula for specific research, teaching, and performance tracks (Colwell, 2011).

Modifying undergraduate music education curricula would seem to be a logical place to implement new approaches to improve teacher effectiveness. It has been suggested however that simply adding additional coursework may not produce more effective teachers (Cochran-Smith et al., 2008; Madsen, 1999; Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001). Lizabeth Wing (1993) stated that, “While [adding courses] has been our most common response to calls for change, it has provided us with no noticeable change in our students” (p. 63). With undergraduate music education curricular requirements often exceeding state credit limits (Conway, 1997, p. 4), efforts at reform will likely need to be integrated into the existing program of study (Shuler, 1995, p. 4). It is imperative that the individual courses a preservice student takes to become a teacher are worthwhile (Spring, 2007). Consequently, the evaluation of music teacher education programs has become an important area of research within music education (Bidner, 2001; Colwell, 1985; Leglar, 1993).

Studies investigating teacher education programs generally consider the effectiveness of the music education curriculum as a whole. Very little of this research attempts to determine the value of individual music courses within a larger program of study. Some research evaluating music teacher education programs found the least valuable aspects of music teacher education
curricula may be courses in education methods taken outside the music curriculum, instrumental methods courses which focus upon performance techniques instead of pedagogical techniques, and coursework in music history (Conway, 2002; Kelly, 1998; Logan, 1993). Simmons (1979) found coursework in music theory to be a valuable part of the music education curriculum, although results of other research appear to contradict these findings (Kelly, 1998; Logan, 1983). The most valued courses within the undergraduate music education curriculum seem to be those related to applied music lessons (Conway, 2002; Simmons, 1979). Also frequently viewed as valuable are student teaching experiences, preservice fieldwork, and performing ensemble experiences (Conway, 2002; Kelly, 1998; Logan, 1983; Simmons, 1979).

A traditional performing ensemble experience in which many music education majors participate is college marching band. A number of benefits, both social and musical, have been associated with participating in the marching band activity. Some benefits may include the opportunity to perform musical styles not frequently experienced in a traditional concert band setting, as well as the opportunity to develop a variety of social skills, including leadership (American School Band Director’s Association, 1997, Madsen, Plack & Dunnigan, 2007; Rogers, 1985; Wickes, 1978). An internet search revealed many colleges and universities require instrumental music education students to participate in the school marching band for as many as three semesters. That marching band participation is required appears to suggest some college music educators deem as it to be a valuable component of the undergraduate music education curriculum.

Statement of the Purpose

Asmus (2000) suggested that “Music teacher education has never before needed a base of substantive information about how to best prepare music teachers as it does now” (p. 5). The teacher’s ability to accurately deliver classroom instruction is extremely important to student achievement (Duke, 1987). Instructional skills can be learned by preservice music educators (Madsen & Duke, 1993), but simply adding coursework into an already overloaded curriculum may not produce more effective teachers (Conway, 1997; Madsen, 1999, Wing, 1993). It appears that further research is needed which examines how individual undergraduate music education curricular requirements may influence the development of effective music teaching skills (Conway, 1997, 2002; Spring, 2007).
Previous research found in-service music educators value their participation in college performing ensembles (Conway, 2001; Kelly, 1998; Logan, 1983; Simmons, 1980), however no research is known to have investigate the role participating in a performing ensemble may have in the development of effective teaching skills. Madsen, Plack, & Dunnigan (2007) suggest participating in a college marching band may give music education majors opportunities to prepare for their future roles as music educators by assuming various leadership roles within the organization. Further, some responsible for music education curriculum development appear to feel participating in a college marching band is a valuable part of the instrumental music education curriculum. No empirical evidence could be located supporting either of these positions.

The purpose of this study is to determine the influence participating in a college marching band may play in the development of effective music teaching skills. Results of this research may provide insight into how effective teaching skills are developed in pre-service instrumental music teachers. Pre-service teachers may benefit from understanding the potential benefits of participating in a marching band. Understanding role that participating in a college marching band may play in the development of effective music teaching skills may also assist university music educators as they design and implement undergraduate music education curricula.

Specific research questions include:

1. How many in-service music educators surveyed participated in their college marching band?

2. How many in-service music educators participated in their college marching band because it was a required part of their undergraduate music education curriculum?

3. To what extent do in-service instrumental music educators consider participating in a college marching band to be a valuable part of the undergraduate music education coursework?

4. To what extent do in-service music educators who held a leadership role in their college marching band find their marching band experience to be more or less valuable than those who did not hold a leadership role?

5. To what extent do in-service instrumental music educators consider participating in a college marching band to be effective at developing effective teaching skills?
6. To what extent are the social and musical benefits often associated with participating in marching band considered valuable aspects of the experience?

7. Does the perceived value of participating in a college marching band change based upon the demographics of gender, type of undergraduate institution attended, size of college marching band, number of years of participation in college marching band, required participation, and teaching level?
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Public policy and education research has often focused on methods by which effective teachers are selected and prepared to teach (Darling-Hammond, 2000; U.S. Department of Education, 2011). A well-prepared, effective teacher is perhaps the most important aspect in improving student achievement. Likewise, a well-prepared, effective music teacher is one of the most important components of improving student achievement in music (Brand, 1985, 1993; Madsen & Duke, 1993; MENC, 1996). During the past decade a considerable amount of music education research has investigated methods for improving preservice music teacher education by identifying characteristics and behaviors common among effective music teachers. This research has shown that effective music teaching may not be the result of a single teacher characteristic or behavior, but that effective music teachers often display a wide variety of common skills, personal characteristics, and behaviors in the classroom.

Effective Music Teaching

Effective music teaching is a complex process. To become an effective music teacher, an individual must develop a mastery of many interconnected skills and behaviors including instructional skills, musical knowledge/skills, and social skills (Baker, 1982; Brand, 1985; Grant & Drafal, 1981; Kelly, 2009; Shulman, 1987; Teachout, 1997). Brophy and Good (1986) stated that “most definitions [of teacher effectiveness] include success in socializing students and promoting their affective and personal development in addition to success in fostering their mastery of formal curricula” (p. 328). Despite this definition, the terms effective teaching and teacher effectiveness are actually somewhat ambiguous, making them difficult to define and research. As summarized by Brand, “…there are almost as many conceptions of effective music teaching as there are students, principals, music supervisors, parents, and music educators and researchers” (1985, p. 13).

Brand (1985) reviewed the findings of early research on music teacher effectiveness. Based upon an analysis of these previous studies, Brand developed a profile of an effective
teacher. This profile of an effective music teacher outlines five competencies which Brand suggested are characteristic of effective teaching. These characteristics include: (1) displays enthusiasm and rapport in their instructional delivery, (2) demonstrate musicianship, (3) effectively manage the classroom environment, (4) effectively pace the delivery of the lesson material, and (5) aid students in the transfer of lesson content into different musical applications. However, given the diversity of students, schools, teachers, administrative support, and community expectations, Brand suggested, “…a single profile of the “effective music teacher” is probably too restrictive.” (1985, p. 16)

More recent research investigating effective music teaching not only reflect Brand’s (1985) findings, but have identified a large number of additional characteristics and behaviors which seem to be common among effective music teachers. Music education research continues to demonstrate that enthusiasm and rapport in the delivery of instruction are important aspects of effective music teaching (Bergee, 1992; Gordon & Hamann, 2001; Madsen et al., 1992; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997). Other more recent research demonstrated effective music teachers effectively demonstrate slow and fast pacing (Arthur, 2003; Moore & Bonney, 1987; Duke, Prickett, & Jellison, 1998), effectively control the classroom (Bergee, 1992; Madsen, 1990; Madsen & Duke, 1993), and have a strong musical background (Teachout, 1997).

Research has identified a number of additional behaviors and characteristics which seem to be common among effective music teachers. Effective music teachers seem to be friendly and have a sense of humor, are able to build and maintain a positive attitude within the classroom, have an organized way of teaching (Teachout, 1997), and display a caring attitude toward their students (Iida, 1991). Research has also demonstrated that effective music teachers create a student-centered environments (Clements & Klinger, 2010; Madsen & Madsen, 1998), encourage student participation (Clements & Klinger, 2010), encourage students to engage in higher-order, independent thinking (Brand, 1985; Madsen & Kuhn, 1994), adjust their social behaviors in a way that positively affects student performance (Madsen et al., 1989; Yarbrough, 1975), are creative, think independently (Farmilo, 1981), and have a strong need to accomplish a task (Goodstein, 1984). Other research has suggested effective music teachers have a strong desire to help others, are poised, self-confident, have good leadership skills, understand students, easily adapt to new situations, are student-centered, are sociable, have good social skills, and are extroverted (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1996; Battisti, 1999; Baker, 1981; Berliner, 1986;
Careful consideration of the effective teacher characteristics outlined above reveals many of these characteristics describe either a social behavior, or some aspect of the student-teacher interaction. Research in general education has concluded that in part, effective teaching is the result of good social skills, including the ability to maintain successful student-teacher interactions (McCombs, 2003, 2004). Findings of research in general education suggest positive social interaction between the teacher and student might also be a primary goal for all music educators (Madsen & Yarbrough, 1985). Indeed, a significant amount of music education literature does seem to demonstrate the social skills demonstrated by teachers might be among the most important aspects of music teacher effectiveness (Bergee, 1992; Brand, 1985; Mills & Smith, 2003; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Pembrook & Fredrickson, 2000/2001; Taebel 1980; Wayman, 2005). The importance of social skills in effective music teaching does not mitgate the importance of other skills such as musical knowledge or instructional skills, however. Effective music teaching is a complex process which involves the application of a wide variety of skills, personal characteristics, and behaviors in the classroom (Kelly, 2009).

**Characteristics of Effective Music Teachers**

Investigations regarding the types of skills, characteristics, and behaviors commonly associated with effective teaching are common in the music education research literature. Much of this research has surveyed the opinions of pre-service teachers, in-service teachers, and music education professors in an effort to gain insight into their perceptions of effective teaching.

In an investigation designed to construct a scale which could be used to evaluate music student teachers’ rehearsal effectiveness, Bergee (1992) surveyed secondary school music teachers, college music and music education professors, and music graduate students. Two hundred fifty-one respondents rated 54 items using a Likert-type scale as to the extent each represented an essential aspect of the music student teacher’s rehearsal effectiveness. Results indicated skills related to conducting, student/teacher rapport, and instruction were identified as most important in evaluating rehearsal effectiveness. Nine of the ten items related to conducting were specifically related to gestures demonstrated by the teacher. The tenth item was
“demonstrates high level of intensity.” Items related to student/teacher rapport included the ability to constructively and effectively manage student behavior, the ability to motivate students, the ability to accurately interpret the psychological mood of group, the ability to give precise, understandable explanations and directions, the ability to communicate confidence and assurance, the use of a variety of teaching techniques, effective rehearsal pacing, use of techniques that minimize off-task behavior, the ability to provide for individual rates of learning, and displays marked enthusiasm. Instructional skills included the use of vocabulary appropriate to level of students, being organized and efficient, effective use of instructional aids, ability to relate material to other fields, the ability to follow a lesson/rehearsal plan, asking pertinent questions, use of effective reinforcement techniques, ability to relate lesson content to prior and future learning, the use of correct grammar and pronunciation; and a professional demeanor.

In a similar study, Teachout (1997) surveyed preservice (n = 35) and experienced (n = 35) music teachers from five states to compare their opinions concerning the skills and behaviors necessary for successful music teaching. The survey consisted of forty, 4-point Likert-type items that were generated from reviews of previous literature and preliminary surveys of preservice and experienced music teachers. Results indicated the highest rated skills and behaviors for both subgroups were, “be mature and have self-control,” “be able to motivate students,” “possess strong leadership skills,” “involve students in the learning process,” “display confidence,” “be organized,” and “employ a positive approach.” The lowest rated items for both subgroups included “move toward and among the group,” “possess proficient piano skills,” and “possess excellent singing skills.” Similar to Bergee (1992), Teachout grouped the 40 items into three categories: personal, musical, and teacher skills and behaviors. Analyses using mean-rank order and two-way ANOVA procedure indicated both groups rated personal skills and teaching skills as being significantly more important than musical skills. The top items common to both group lists were: maturity/self-control, ability to motivate, strong leadership skills, involving students in the learning process, displaying confidence, organization, and a positive attitude. The findings suggest preservice and experienced music teachers seem to agree on which skills and behaviors are important for successful music teaching.

In a replication and extension of Teachout’s (1997) study, Wayman (2005) surveyed beginning music education students (n = 55) and student teachers (n = 25) to compare their opinions concerning the skills and behaviors necessary for successful music teaching. Wayman
used the same survey tool as Teachout, including the item category groupings (personal, music, teacher skills). The results of Wayman’s study were consistent with those of Teachout. Wayman found beginning music education students and student teachers agreed on many of their highest and lowest item ratings. Further, both subgroups rated music skills significantly lower than personal and teaching skills. Wayman’s findings are also similar to those reported in previous research completed by Taebel (1980) and Rohwer and Henry (2004).

Rohwer and Henry (2004) surveyed 426 university professors with expertise in choral (n = 110), instrumental (n = 196), and general music education (n = 120) to compare their opinions concerning the skills and characteristics necessary for successful music teaching. Reflecting Bergee (1992) and Teachout (1997), survey questions used in this study were related to the musical skills, teaching skills, and personality characteristics of the teacher. Results indicate university music professors ranked “teaching skills” as most important to effective teaching, followed by “personality characteristics” and “musical skills.” Within the “teaching skills category,” “classroom management” was rated as the most important skill, while “questioning skill” was rated the least important skill. In the category of “personality characteristics,” “ability to motivate” was the highest rated skill and “sense of humor” was the lowest rated. Within the “musical skills” category, musical expressiveness was the highest rated musical skill, while transposition was the lowest rated. Rohwer and Henry’s results are similar to those reported by Taebel (1980) almost 35 years earlier, who found that among in-service music teachers, teaching competencies were rated higher than music competencies regardless of teaching emphasis (i.e., elementary general, choral, instrumental).

Other studies have yielded similar results regarding the relative importance of music, teaching, and personal skills and characteristics within effective music teaching. Utilizing open-ended question survey techniques, Pembrook and Fredrickson (2000/2001) surveyed 34 experienced music teachers, and Fredrickson and Hackworth (2005) surveyed 18 first-year music teachers to examine their perceptions of skills and characteristics important for effective music teaching. In both studies, participants kept a daily journal across a 7-week period. The contents of these journal entries were subsequently analyzed and coded into five categories: (1) advantages and responsibilities of having a job (job), (2) presence or absence of music learning (music), (3) social interactions with children (students), (4) presence or absence of teaching competencies (teaching), and (5) other. Findings were similar across both studies. The most
frequently made comments pertained to job-related (>50%) and teaching-related (>25%) issues, whereas very few comments were related to music (2% to 3%).

Similar findings were reported by Mills and Smith (2003), who utilized open-ended question survey techniques to survey instrumental music teachers in England (N = 134). Participants were asked to identify the “hallmarks of good instrumental teaching” for school students. A majority of the responses were focused on teacher personality (e.g., enthusiasm, inspiring), teaching approach (e.g., planning, communication), and pupil-centered teaching (e.g., fun, participation). In contrast, only a much smaller number of comments were made concerning teaching content related to music elements, such as technical focus, repertoire knowledge, listening skills, or practice skills.

In a recent study based in part upon Teachout’s (1997) research, Miksza, Roeder, and Biggs (2010) designed a study to identify which skills and characteristics band directors perceive as being most important in effective music teaching. Items on the survey tool consisted of the 10 highest rated personal, teaching, and music skill statements from the survey developed by Teachout (1997). Respondents ranked each of the 10 items within each group on a scale from 1 to 10. The participants also were asked to rank the three broad categories of skills and characteristics (teaching, personal, music) from 1 to 3. Results indicate personal and teaching skills and characteristics were ranked higher than music skills and are generally reflective of the results of previous studies (Bergee, 1992; Fredrickson & Hackworth, 2005; Mills & Smith, 2003; Pembroke & Fredrickson, 2000/2001; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Taebel, 1980; Teachout, 1997; Wayman, 2005).

**Personality and Social Skills**

Certain aspects of a teacher’s personality may also contribute their effectiveness in the classroom (Bessom, Tatarunis, & Forcucci, 1980; Krueger, 1976; Wink, 1970). Smith (1971) suggested that “teaching behavior is so much an expression of the teacher’s personality that the skills he will use, how he will use them, and their effects on pupils’ achievement are in a large measure dependent on his personality” (p. 7). Bessom et al. (1980) agreed, stating “The importance of the teacher’s personality should not be minimized since the student who likes the teacher, and believes the teacher likes him, will learn more effectively…” (p. 5). Drawing from a review of research investigating effective music teaching, Erbes (1983) also found certain
Aspects of a music teacher’s personality, specifically the level of enthusiasm they display in the delivery of the lesson, may be linked to their effectiveness in the classroom. Erbes’ findings, as well those of Brand (1985) and Madsen et al. (1989), are consistent with other research completed outside of music education, which found an audience of college students was better able to recall a lecture when the speaker displayed “dynamism” (Coats and Smidchens, 1966).

Within music education, Hamann, Lineburgh, and Paul (1998) examined the relationship between teaching effectiveness and social skills among preservice music teachers. Music education majors and non-music education majors completed the Social Skills Inventory test (SSI), which measures emotional expressivity, emotional sensitivity, emotional control, social expressivity, social sensitivity, and social control. Participants were then video recorded teaching a lesson. The video recording was then evaluated by two adjudicators. Results indicated preservice teachers who received high ratings for their lessons also had high scores on the emotional expressivity and social control scales, and suggest that certain social skills contribute to preservice music teacher effectiveness.

Hamann, Lineburgh, and Paul’s results are similar to Juchniewicz (2008), who found that “exemplary” music teachers scored higher than “challenged” music teachers on the IPT-15, a measure of social intelligence. The findings of Hamann, Lineburgh, and Paul (1998) and Juchniewicz (2008) stand in partial contrast to those of Teachout (2001), who discovered none of the personality types investigated in his study contributed to teaching effectiveness. In a series of investigations, Kemp (1979, 1982) found that student music teachers showed higher levels of extroversion than other music majors when measured by the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. In a similar study, Wubbenhorst (1994) found no significant differences between the scores of music teachers and music performers on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Results of research investigating teacher personality traits in relationship to effective teaching have been largely inconclusive however. Kemp (1996) reviewed the results of research investigating teacher personality traits and suggested successful music teachers might be either introverted or extroverted, but that extroverted teachers might be best suited to work with students at younger age, while introverted teachers might do best with older students. Research investigating the relationship between teacher personality and effectiveness in the classroom were also summarized by Teachout (2001), who suggested that perhaps “precursors of music teaching
effectiveness which are independent of personality should be investigated, including various measures of aptitude, intellectual and/or musical competencies” (p. 190).

**Musical Skill**

Pre-service teachers, in-service teachers, and music education professors seem to consistently indicate that non-music skills are more important than musical skills for effective teaching. However musical skill has also been investigated in relation to effective teaching. There are varying perceptions regarding the importance of musical skill within the music education profession, however. For example, Taebel (1980), in a study of general, instrumental, and choral teachers’ perceptions of the teaching competencies and musical competencies they perceived to be associated with music student achievement, discovered that choral teachers rated music competencies higher than general music or instrumental teachers. These findings are reflected in the work of Baker (1982), Brand (1985), and Grant and Drafall (1991).

There is research which suggests musical skills may an important aspect of effective teaching. Kelly (2007) investigated the perceptions of high school band students to determine the influence of gender, academic grade, demographic of high school attended, ensemble conducting experience, and private lesson teaching experience on students’ perceptions of effective teaching skills and behaviors. Participants, who represented a diversity of gender, age and school settings, rated forty teaching skills and behaviors using a Likert-type scale. Results indicate background characteristics such as private teaching, ensemble conducting experiences, and school demographics did influence students’ perceptions of teacher effectiveness. Regardless of background variables however, participants identified the teachers’ musical skills to be the most important aspect of effective teaching.

In a similar study, Kelly (2008) examined high school band and orchestra students’ (N=314) perceptions of effective student teacher behaviors and characteristics. Participants rated the effectiveness of 31 skills and behaviors of music student teachers using a Likert-type scale. In addition, participants indicated how often they had come in contact with a student intern, their primary performance area, and year in school. Results indicate few significant differences in means of teacher traits between student groups. Although mean scores for each of the characteristics and behaviors were high, “is able to apply knowledge, being competent” and “has
positive behavior” were rated highest. Knowledge of technology and an ability to play piano were rated lowest.

**Instructional Behaviors**

Certain behaviors related to the teacher’s instructional delivery and the feedback they give to students have also been demonstrated to be associated with effective teaching. A set of behaviors collectively called the *direct instruction model* has been shown to increase the amount of time students are engaged on a task, student success, and lesson effectiveness (Blair, 1984; Brophy, 1979; McDonald, 1976; Powell, 1978). The direct instruction model involves four components: (1) instruction structured by the teacher, (2) fast pacing, (3) opportunities for students to practice after each step, and (4) feedback from the teacher. Although originally developed in the 1970’s by researchers working outside the field of music, the direct instruction model has been adapted for use in music education.

During the past decades a number of music education researchers have developed and refined the direct instruction model (Bowers, 1997; Price, 1983, 1985, 1989; Yarbrough & Hendel, 1993; Yarbrough & Price, 1981, 1989; Yarbrough, Price, & Hendel, 1994). Often referred to as *sequential patterns* or *teaching cycles*, the direct instruction model has been used within music education to analyze instructional units. Instructional units are delineated into three components: (1) teacher presentation, (2) student response, and (3) teacher reinforcement (Price, 1985, 1989; Yarbrough & Price, 1981). Teacher presentation can be coded as academic tasks, social tasks, conducting tasks, or off-task statements. Student response may be an ensemble performance, a sectional performance, or verbal or nonverbal responses. Teacher reinforcement is defined as verbal academic or social approval, verbal academic or social disapproval, facial approval, facial disapproval, approval errors, or disapproval errors (Yarbrough & Price, 1981). A complete instructional unit consists of a 1-2-3 sequence, or in some cases a 1-2 sequence since music may serve as its own reinforcement (Madsen & Madsen, 1998). Teaching cycles been effectively utilized in elementary music setting (Jellison & Kostka, 1987; Moore, 1981), private music studio instruction (Benson, 1989), guitar instruction (Duke & Blackman, 1989), and choral and instrumental rehearsal settings (Price, 1983, 1989). Research has found that overall, choral and band directors spend less than 35% of their rehearsal time completing teaching cycles, and
that choir directors spending almost twice as much time in teaching cycles than band directors (Yarbrough & Price, 1989).

The use of complete or incomplete instructional units has been demonstrated to be related to effective teaching. Research investigating instructional units demonstrates teaching patterns beginning with musical instruction were rated higher than those beginning with verbal instructions (Price & Yarbrough, 1993; Yarbrough & Hendel, 1993; Yarbrough, Price, & Hendel, 1994). Related research found that teaching patterns ending in approvals and specific reinforcements were rated higher than those ending in disapprovals or nonspecific reinforcement (Yarbrough & Hendel, 1993; Price, 1989; Yarbrough, Price, & Hendel, 1994). Other research investigating instructional units suggests that the most effective teachers are those who limit the amount of time spent given verbal instructions and make frequent use of performance time (Price & Yarbrough, 1993/1994; Yarbrough & Price, 1981, 1989).

Feedback

Feedback from the teacher has been found to be an important aspect of effective teaching. Madsen and Duke (1985) suggested appropriate feedback is “… of great importance to a teacher in order to further a student’s academic grasp of the subject matter as well as in shaping socially acceptable behavior” (p. 199). The type of feedback utilized by the teacher has been shown to be an important aspect of student achievement. Experienced teachers seem to utilize positive, specific feedback within the instructional unit (Bowers, 1997; Hendel, 1995; Moore, 1981). Positive, specific feedback has been shown to be an important characteristic of effective teaching and seems to have a positive effect upon student motivation (Brophy, 1981), social and academic behaviors (Forsythe, 1975; Kuhn, 1975), and on-task behavior (Madsen & Alley, 1979; Greer, 1980).

Related to teacher feedback is the use of approval, which research suggests may be the most important aspect of the student/teacher interaction (Madsen, 1982; Madsen & Duke, 1987; Marlow, Madsen, Bowen, Reardon, & Lounge, 1978). Madsen and Madsen (1981) suggested that in large part, the use of approval may account for differences effectiveness between music teachers. Overall, it appears that in addition to giving more specific feedback (Goolsby, 1997; Hendel, 1995), effective music teachers give more approvals than disapprovals (Moore, 1981). Previous research found effective teachers appear to praise and encourage students more than
ineffective teachers (Whitehall, 1970), and maintain an appropriate rehearsal atmosphere through positive, supportive verbalizations (Fiocca, 1986). More recent research examining applied music lessons and instrumental rehearsals yielded similar results (Goolsby, 1997; Siebenaler, 1997).

**Time On-Task and Teacher Talk**

The efficient use of class time, specifically the verbal behaviors of the teacher, also appears to be related to effective teaching. Research investigating time on-task demonstrates that student on-task behavior is correlated with teacher instructional behaviors (Abeles, 1975; Bergee, 1992; Madsen, 1990) and that experienced teachers use class time more effectively than less experienced teachers (Goolsby, 1996; Wagner & Struhl, 1979). Research suggests learning outcomes decrease when students are off-task more than twenty percent of the time in the classroom (Madsen, Becker, & Thomas, 1968). Efficient use of time in music classes has been shown to impact student attentiveness (Price, 1983; Spradling, 1985) because students are most attentive when actively engaged in the lesson (Dunn, 1997; Napoles, 2007; Sims, 1986; Yarbrough, 1975). The most effective music teachers then seem to be those who actively engage students in the lesson while limiting the amount of time students are required to passively listen to instruction (Brendell, 1996, Caldwell, 1980; Madsen & Geringer, 1983; Price & Yarbrough, 1993/1994; Spradling, 1985; Yarbrough & Price, 1981).

Research has found experienced and less experienced teachers utilize class time differently (Goolsby, 1996; Wagner & Struhl, 1979). Generally speaking however, music teachers appear to spend about 40% of a music class or rehearsal time speaking (Caldwell, 1980; Napoles, 2007; Pontious, 1982; Sherill, 1986; Thurman, 1977). Research suggests the most effective music teachers spend a majority of class time discussing musical material (Caldwell, 1980; Hendel, 1995; Sherill, 1986) and incorporate verbal modeling to demonstrate musical information (Thurman, 1977; Wang & Sogin, 1997). Oftentimes however, much of the verbal behavior displayed by music teachers is not directly related to the presentation of musical information (Blocher, Greenwood, & Shellahamer, 1997; Yarbrough & Price, 1989).
**Pacing and Teacher Intensity**

*Pacing* is an instructional behavior which has also been associated with effective music teaching. A large body of research has found that the most effective music educators incorporate fast pacing in their instruction (Brand, 1985; Duke, Prickett, & Jellison, 1998; Moore, 1981). However other research has found effective teachers may actually utilize both slow and fast pacing in the delivery of their lesson (Arthur, 2003). Much of the research investigating pacing has been completed within the larger context of the student/teacher interaction generally referred to as *teacher magnitude* or *teacher intensity*.

Yarborough (1975) defined an effective music teacher as one who displayed high-magnitude behaviors. In a study investigating the effects of low magnitude versus high magnitude on student attitude, attentiveness, or performance achievement, Yarborough examined students from several mixed choruses rehearsed under a high magnitude teacher, low magnitude teacher, and their regular teacher. Results indicated that while no differences were found in musical performance or attitude, students were found to be the least off-task during the high magnitude teaching. Additionally, students indicated a preference for the high magnitude teacher. Characteristics of a high-magnitude teacher included: (1) maintaining eye contact with students throughout the room, (2) varying proximity by approaching and departing the group often during rehearsal, (3) used expressive conducting gestures, (4) maintained a rapid and exciting rehearsal pace, (5) used facial expressions that reflected a sharp contrast between approval and disapproval, and (6) varied the speed, pitch, and volume their speaking voice (Yarborough, 1975). Similar studies have yielded similar results, concluding that high-magnitude behaviors contribute to effective teaching through increased student attentiveness and attitude (Fredrickson, 1992; Hendel, 1995).

Music education research investigating teacher effectiveness has refined and expanded Yarborough’s (1975) definition of teacher magnitude. In a series of studies, *teacher intensity* was examined to determine its role in effective teaching. Defined as the “sustained control of the student/teacher interaction with efficient, accurate presentation of subject matter combined with enthusiastic affect and pacing” (Madsen & Geringer, 1989, p. 90), teacher intensity incorporates Yarborough’s (1975) list of high-magnitude teacher characteristics and added behaviors associated with enthusiasm, attention to student involvement, planning, knowledge, the ability to give short, simple instructions, confidence, and the ability to maximize time on-task (Madsen,
Research investigating teacher intensity suggests effective teachers are able to vary the amount of intensity they display during instruction, that the skill can be taught to prospective student teachers, and that varying levels of intensity can be quickly and easily recognized by an observer (Byo, 1990; Cassidy, 1990, 1993; Madsen, Standley, Byo, & Cassidy, 1992; Madsen, Standley, & Cassidy, 1989; Mayhew, 2010). Further, teacher intensity has been shown to have positive effects upon students’ achievement, their perceptions of the teacher, and their behavior (Byo, 1990; Sims, 1986; Yarbrough, 1975).

Early research investigating teacher intensity found that intensity was a characteristic of music teaching which could be accurately assessed (Standley & Madsen, 1987). Further research conducted by Madsen, Standley, and Cassidy (1989) investigating differences in the amount of intensity displayed between freshman music education and senior music education/therapy students during a rote teaching demonstration indicated that intensity could be taught, demonstrated, and recognized. Further, results of Madsen et. al (1989) indicated intensity is an important part of effective music teaching. Madsen and Geringer (1989) found similar results, determining that a high correlation (.92) existed between perceptions of effective teaching and the amount of intensity displayed by the teacher.

Because previous research demonstrated intensity was related to effective teaching (Standley & Madsen, 1987), Madsen (1988) investigated whether intensity could be taught. Results indicated intensity could be taught, and that a high correlation existed between perceptions of effective teaching and teacher intensity (.84). In a replication and extension of Madsen’s (1988) study, Byo (1990) taught high/low intensity instructional behaviors to undergraduate conducting students. Results were similar to previous research on teacher intensity, leading Byo to conclude that teacher intensity is recognizable across a variety of contrast illustrations and levels of musical experience. Related research completed by Cassidy (1990) examined the effect of intensity training on preservice non-music elementary education majors. Results indicated that training did not increase high intensity teaching, but low intensity teaching could be decreased. Further, during preschool field teaching, effective delivery increased across all participants.

The extent to which teachers are able to identify behaviors associated with intensity within their own teaching has also been investigated. In three such studies, Madsen, Standley, Byo and Cassidy (1992), Cassidy (1993), and Wang and Sogin (1997) examined pre-service and
in-service teachers’ ability to identify intensity through self-observations and analyses. Results of these studies indicate that although elements of intensity and effective teaching were easily identified by all participants, both groups consistently gave higher ratings for their own instruction than expert observers. Additionally, pre-service and in-service teachers did not agree upon individual characteristic of effective teaching (Madsen, Standley, Byo & Cassidy, 1992). These findings appear to support Brand’s (1985) assertion that “…there are almost as many conceptions of effective music teaching as there are students, principals, music supervisors, parents, and music educators and researchers” (1985, p. 13).

Lesson delivery has also been found be related to teaching effectiveness. Results of research investigating lesson delivery indicates that teacher-delivery skills may have the most influence on students’ perception of teaching effectiveness, regardless of the quality or accuracy of the material being presented (Hamann, Baker, McAllister, & Bauer, 2000; Madsen, 2003). Hamann, Baker, McAllister, and Bauer (2000) found that good delivery skills were perceived as the most interesting and likeable component of teaching episodes. Madsen (2003) examined delivery skills and accuracy of instruction on perceived teaching effectiveness. Participants were middle school, high school, undergraduate, and experienced teachers who received accurate and inaccurate information during the course of eight teaching episodes which were presented in high and low intensity delivery styles. Results indicated that regardless of experience or training, teachers were viewed as more effective during high-delivery conditions, even when presenting inaccurate information.

Researchers have successfully trained music teachers to increase the number of sequential patterns completed during an instructional episode (Bowers, 1997; Price, 1992; Yarborough, Price, & Bowers, 1991). Further, training on the use of complete instructional units, specifically teacher feedback, has been demonstrated to lead to an increase the specificity (Bowers, 1997) and use of teacher approval and reinforcement behaviors (Jellison & Wolfe, 1987; Madsen & Duke, 1985, 1987). Although research suggests effective teaching techniques and behaviors can be taught, a concern exists that existing undergraduate music education curricula may not adequately prepare preservice music educators to become effective music teachers (Atterbury, 1994; Conway, 1997; Colwell, 2011; Shuler, 1995; Watkins, 1992). As such, research investigating the methods by which preservice music education majors are
prepared to teach is important area of study within music education (Colwell, 1985; Leglar, 1993; Lehman, 1992).

**Preservice Music Teacher Preparation**

Preservice music teacher preparation programs are responsible for providing students with coursework that teaches, develops, and combines a broad set of skills necessary for effective music teaching. Music teacher preparation programs must integrate various aspects of performance practice, music teaching pedagogy, and instrumental performance/pedagogy skills into the confines of a four-year undergraduate degree program (National Association of Schools of Music, 2010-2011). Further, music teacher preparation programs must also integrate skills such as teacher professionalism, music content knowledge, developmental psychology, and professional ethics into the curriculum to provide preservice teachers with a comprehensive understanding of the music education profession (Kelly, 2009; Ballantyne, 2007).

Specific competency expectations for preservice music education majors are determined by the individual institution they choose to attend. Efforts have been made to standardize the music teacher education curricula, however. The organization most responsible for developing music teacher standards is the National Association of Schools of Music (Mark, 1996). The National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) acts as an advisory council for music education programs and has made a series of recommendations concerning not only who should teach music, but also professional and musical competencies each music educator should be capable of displaying upon completion of the curriculum (NASM, 2010-2011). NASM recommends perspective music teachers should demonstrate personal commitment to the art of music and be competent in a number of music-related skills including conducting, performing, and arranging (2010-2011). Additionally, NASM recommends perspective music teachers display competence in each of six teaching competencies including child growth and development, current pedagogical techniques, and evaluative techniques.

There are more than 1,300 teacher education schools in the United States, each with an individual philosophy of teacher preparation, and each free to define its own specific preservice teacher competency expectations based upon that philosophy (Grossman & Loeb, 2008). Likewise, each of the more than 615 member institutions of NASM also has an individual philosophy of music teacher preparation and is also free to define its own specific preservice
music teacher competency expectations. Differences in institutional philosophy combined with the broad nature of NASM’s undergraduate music education requirements has resulted in an undergraduate music education curriculum which, although similar, varies greatly across the country (Cutietta, 2007; Henery, 1981; Garrison, 1984; Keeler, 2008; Kennedy, 2005; Meaux, 2004).

In three similar studies, Kennedy (2005), Keeler (2008) and Meaux (2004) found core undergraduate music curricular requirements varied greatly between institutions. Kennedy (2005) found 491 different course titles between just 17 public and private music institutions located across the United States. Meaux (2004) discovered many institutions do not address all NASM standards and that few follow NASM guidelines for course credit in ensemble participation. Keeler (2008) examined music teacher programs in selected Iowa colleges and universities and found significant differences between the NASM guidelines and the curricular requirements of the institutions included in the study. Garrison (1984) examined the content, organization, and perceptions of instrumental music education courses at 208 colleges and universities in the North Central, Southern, and Southwestern divisions of the Music Educators National Conference and found that although some topics were covered in all courses, there was a great deal of variation from program to program. Henery (1981) examined the undergraduate music education curricula in New York State during the period of 1948-1973 and concluded that although curricular requirements relating to instrumental pedagogy and professional education were similar throughout the state, “Ultimately… degree programs are local creations bearing the stamp of the parent institution” (p.ii).

The structural guidelines for the bachelor’s degree in music education set forth by NASM are widely accepted (Jones, 2009). The NASM guidelines have been commended for their inclusion of programs such as composition, electronic music, guitar, ethnic music, jazz, and keyboard (Hope, 2007). Critics however, claim the NASM standards focus too little on the development of musical knowledge and skill (Colwell 2006; Jorgenson, 2008), are outdated (Deal, 2002), and allow for the development of music teachers who “…applied music specialists consider less than adequate as a performer, whom musicologists consider deficient as a musical scholar, whom theorists view as lacking basic musicianship, and whom school administrators consider unprepared to relate music to the total school program” (Leonard, 1995, p.11).
Music Education Program Review

Research investigating music teacher effectiveness has shown that effective teaching skills can be learned by preservice music educators (Madsen & Duke, 1993). However, given that undergraduate music education curricula competencies may vary greatly between institutions, it is difficult to guarantee each new music teacher fully understands their art or how to teach it effectively (Fowler, 1996). A concern exists within music education that existing undergraduate curricula may not adequately prepare preservice music educators to be effective in-service teachers (Atterbury, 1994; Colwell, 2011; Conway, 1997; Leonard, 1995; Shuler, 1995; Watkins, 1992). These concerns are not new, and historically calls have been made for undergraduate music education curricula to implement new approaches designed to improve teacher effectiveness, including a better integration of theory and practice (Cheyette, 1940; Elliot, 1992; Francis, 1939; Leonhard, 1985; Meske, 1985; Reimer, 1993), development of reflective thinking skills (Apfelstadt, 1996; Gromko, 1995), the inclusion of research methodology (Conway, 1997), or even separate curricula for specific research, teaching, and performance tracks (Colwell, 2011).

Modifying undergraduate music education curricula seems a logical place to implement new approaches to improve teacher effectiveness. However previous research suggests simply adding additional coursework may not produce more effective teachers (Cochran-Smith et al., 2008; Madsen & Kaiser, 1999; Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundi, 2001). Lizabeth Wing (1993) stated that, “While [adding courses] has been our most common response to calls for change, it has provided us with no noticeable change in our students” (p. 63). Further, undergraduate music education curricular requirements often exceed state credit limits (Conway, 1997, p. 4). Therefore, efforts at reform will likely need to be integrated into the existing program of study (Shuler, 1995, p. 4). It is imperative that the individual courses a preservice student takes to become a teacher are worthwhile (Spring, 2007). Consequently, program review of music teacher education programs is an important area of research within music education (Bidner, 2001; Colwell, 1985; Leglar, 1993). A number of studies investigating teacher education programs have considered the effectiveness of the music education curriculum as a whole. However, a number of studies have also attempted to determine the perceived value of individual music courses within a larger program of study.
Some research investigating the perceived value of individual music courses has examined the perceptions of undergraduate music education students who are asked to evaluate their experiences in a particular course. Silvey (2011) completed a study which investigated undergraduate music education majors’ perceptions of instrumental conducting curricula and their perceived level of conducting and rehearsal preparedness upon completion of conducting coursework. Results indicated lower ratings for survey items related to rehearsal preparedness than those related to conducting skill preparedness. Further, respondents indicated they were most confident about their conducting patterns and least confident about error detection and correction skills. Many participants also indicated the need for additional podium time during undergraduate conducting courses.

Most research investigating the value of individual music education courses examines the perceptions of in-service music educators who are asked to reflect upon and evaluate their undergraduate coursework. For example, Jones (1977) found that first year teachers perceived courses in music history, music literature, composition and orchestration, and educational psychology to be the least valuable coursework in the undergraduate music education curriculum. Coursework perceived as being most valuable were applied music, instrumental conducting, participating in large performance ensembles, music methods, and fieldwork experiences.

The results of other research have yielded conflicting results concerning the value perceived value of certain music education coursework. Simmons (1979) found applied music and music theory courses were the most valued components of the undergraduate music education curriculum. However, Logan (1983) found many in-service music educators felt coursework in music theory, music education methods courses, and applied music did not adequately prepare them to teach. Similar to Logan, Jennings (1988) found student teaching experiences, large ensemble participation, and music methods courses were perceived as valuable components of the undergraduate music education curriculum, while music theory was not. Contrary to Jones (1977), who found music methods and conducting were considered valuable components of the undergraduate music education curriculum, Simmons (1980) also found courses in conducting, music methods, and elementary music may not adequately prepare preservice music education majors for their future roles as in-service music educators. Kelly (1998) found preschool teachers valued musical training in movement activities, the use of
rhythm instruments, and singing to be valuable, but did not perceive music skills taught in courses such as music theory and history to be useful.

In a more recent study designed to evaluate the preservice music teacher preparation program at a large Midwestern university, Conway (2002) examined the perceptions of beginning teachers, their mentors, and school administrators. Data for this study included individual interviews, focus group interviews, a review of teacher journals, classroom observations, interview of mentors, and interview of administrators. All interviews and observations were completed by the researcher. Additionally, participants also completed an end-of-year questionnaire regarding their first year experiences and the teacher preparation program. Results indicate the most valuable aspects of the teacher preparation program were: (1) student teaching, (2) preservice fieldwork experiences, and (3) growth of musicianship, which included applied lessons and large ensemble experiences. The least valuable experiences of the teacher preparation program were: (1) teacher education courses taken outside the school of music, (2) early observation without context, and (3) some instrumental methods courses, particularly those designed to develop performance skills secondary instruments, which focus more on performance skills than pedagogical skills. Beginning teachers, their mentors, and administrators generally agreed that student teaching experiences should be extended, and that music education programs should be "detracked" to aid in the development of music educators who have some experience in all areas of music education.

Much of the research which has investigated the value of individual music education courses has found participation in a performing ensemble is an experience in-service music teachers value (Leonhard, 1985). However, no research is known to have investigated the role participating in a performing ensemble may have in the development of effective teaching skills. A traditional performing ensemble experience in which many music education majors participate is college marching band. An internet search revealed many colleges and universities require instrumental music education students to participate in the school marching band for as many as three semesters. That marching band participation is required appears to suggest some college music educators deem it as a valuable component in the undergraduate music education curriculum. Further, some researchers have suggested that participating in a college marching band may give music education majors opportunities to prepare for their future roles as music
educators by assuming various leadership roles within the organization (Madsen, Plack, & Dunnigan, 2007). No empirical evidence could be located supporting either of these positions.

The College Marching Band

Probably the most well-liked outdoor instrumental performance ensemble in the United States today (Dawes, 1990), the college marching band is a uniquely American phenomenon (Teske, 1985). With the increased popularity of football over the last century, the marching band’s performance has become a respected tradition at many colleges and universities. William D. Revelli, Director of Bands Emeritus at the University of Michigan stated:

While a good majority of the fans attending these weekly football classics are not familiar with the finer points of the game, everyone is able to appreciate the maneuvers and evolutions of the band. Somehow, whether the home team has been victor or loser, there has been great satisfaction in witnessing the performance of the bands… Thousands of persons who never hear the band on the concert stage become ardent supports of high school and college bands simply through their exhibitions on the gridiron. It is no small matter when we consider that our bands perform during the football season before audiences numbering thousands of people (1979, p.8)

The origin of the modern American marching band may be traced to the Revolutionary War drum and fife and drum corps. These early musical ensembles existed primarily to accompany soldiers into combat (Wells, 1976). In 1775 The Continental Congress passed a bill which created the Marine Corps. This bill also created a Marine Corps Band, which was to consist of “one drum major, one fife major, and 32 drums and fifes” (Wells, 1976, p.7). The American band’s relationship with military units continued through the Civil War. After the Civil War, most regimental bands were discharged. With the establishment of land grant institutions in the late 1800’s, many bands appeared on college campuses throughout the United States (Hansen, 2004). Oftentimes these bands were associated with the institution’s Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) unit (McCarrell, 1972).
Evidence suggests some college bands may have been organized in the early 1800’s (Hansen, 2004), however it is likely these groups did not march. Harvard and Yale had bands intermittently throughout the 1820’s but these groups were directed by students and were loosely organized. Founded by faculty member Reverend Father Gouesse in 1846, the band at the University of Notre Dame has claimed for itself the title as “the oldest college band in continuous existence” (McCarrell, 1972, p. 32). This claim is challenged by the University of Michigan, where in 1845 a band of nine musicians served as accompaniment to the singing at university church services. There is no evidence this group sustained itself however, and the first University of Michigan Band to sustain its existence was founded in 1896 under student leadership (McCarrell, 1972).

College bands developed rapidly throughout the 1900’s. In 1904, Paul Spotts Emrick, director of the Purdue University Band, broke the military marching ranks and formed the block letter “P” on the field (Dunscomb, Norberg, & Wright, 1987; Patzig, 1983; Teske, 1985; Wells, 1976). Albert Austin Harding is credited with introducing concert selections and concert formations in the halftime show in the 1930’s at the University of Illinois (Haynie, 1971; Patzig, 1984, White, 1979). Glenn Cliff Bainum of Northwestern University is the first band director to duplicate field charts based upon the five-yard intervals of the football field, a technique still in common use today (Haynie, 1971; Patzig, 1983). In the late 1940’s, Manley R. Whitcomb, then the director of the Ohio State University Marching Band, contributed to the development of the 22 ½ marching step (Lee, 1955), which is also in common use today.

After World War Two student enrollment at many American universities increased rapidly. Likewise, enrollment in university marching bands also expanded, prompting new innovations in drill design. Elaborate picture formations performed by bands in the late 1940’s suggest much time and effort was spent on “football pageantry” (McCarrell, 1973). By the mid 1950’s music publishers began to offer marching band music with a central unifying theme (Mark & Pattern, 1976). In the late 1950’s, A.R. Casavant, a high school band director in Tennessee, developed precision drill techniques and published a series of manuals explaining line and block drill maneuvers and evolutions (Patzig, 1983; Teske, 1985). Techniques outlined by Casavant influenced William Moffit, who wrote the one of the first, and perhaps most influential, drill design books “Patterns of Motion,” while serving as director of the Michigan State University Marching Band (Arnold, 1981). In the late 1960’s, techniques which allowed
curvilinear and circular drill patterns to be created on the field were developed (Patzig, 1983). Curvilinear and circular drill techniques were further developed by drum and bugle corps in the 1970’s. The swell of popularity for drum and bugle corps resulted in one of the most influential movements in marching band history, as the drill techniques used by these groups were adapted for use by the college marching band (Snoeck & Blackford, 1975).

**Research Investigating the College Marching Band**

A review of music education trade journals reviews a great deal of writing has been completed during the past decades on the general topic of marching bands. Much of this writing is not research-based and focuses primarily upon varying aspects of the *high school* marching band. Little research-based writing could be located which specifically focuses upon *college* marching band.

Several studies have specifically investigated the college marching band. Outside of music education, Libbon (2008) found that participation in a two-hour, outdoor marching band practice was not more detrimental to the auditory functioning of a band member than everyday noise exposure. However, Libbon also found *long-term* exposure to marching band music may subtly influence auditory functioning of marching band members. In a study designed to explore the extent to which musician experience flow, Steckel (2006) studied 155 college marching band students. Results indicated collegiate marching band members experience flow in a manner consistent with college athletes, that individuals experience flow in varying intensities, and that having fun while performing, a positive attitude, and being mentally prepared to perform contributed to the flow experience.

Within music education, two studies sought to describe college marching band programs. Patzig (1983) described the organizational structures, marching concepts employed, and the use of auxiliary units within the ten Southeastern Conference (SEC) marching band programs during the 1981 season. Although some similarities existed, overall results of Patzig’s study indicated organizational structures, marching concepts, and use of auxiliary units varied widely between SEC marching band programs. Fuller (1995) completed a similar study which sought to describe marching band programs of the Big Ten Conference during the 1994 season. Results of Fuller’s study show every marching band in the Big Ten conference was performing quality music that was specifically arranged for individual performance needs and instrumentation, most bands
have their music specially arranged, most bands are utilizing marching fundamentals that are balanced between high step traditional and corps style techniques, most students receive academic credit for participating in marching band, and that all Big Ten marching band directors had an entertainment philosophy that emphasized excellence in marching and playing. Young (2001) used a number of musical and non-musical demographic factors to predict non-music majors persistence in marching band.

Some research has investigated the role marching band may play within the undergraduate music education curriculum. Two studies completed by Jennings (1988) and Williamson (2009) found music educators value their experience in college marching band. Further, Williamson (2009) found Ohio music educators felt participating in a college marching band as a student helped prepare them for their future roles as high school marching band directors. Satterwhite (1987) examined changes in student perceptions of high school marching band as a result of four years of participation in a college marching band. Results were mixed, leading Satterwhite to conclude: “…college marching band experiences effected some change in the student’s perceptions of some…aspects and apparently had little or no effect on the perceptions of other aspects” (p.61). Legette (1988) found that undergraduate marching band techniques courses may provide useful skills to music education students preparing to become high school band directors, and some studies have sought to design a marching band techniques course based upon the recommendations of in-service music educators (Ammann, 1989; Caldwell, 1976; Tracz, 1987).

Research has found some college marching band directors consider the marching band experience to valuable for students (Holvik, 1971). However, marching band is a controversial musical activity (Dunnigan, 2007; Rogers, 1985). Detractors of the marching band activity are often critical of its cost, the large amounts of rehearsal time it requires, its insignificant musical value, and its inability to further the goals of music education (Acquaro, 1979; American School Band Director’s Association [ASBDA], 1997; Dunnigan, 2007; Rogers, 1985; Schwadron, 1974; Snapp, 1980; Wells, 1976). Marching band proponents often cite the extramusical benefits of marching band, which may include an improvement in student motivation, increased student discipline, public relations, increased financial support for the band program, and increased administrative support for the band program (ASBDA, 1997; Isch, 1965; Revelli, 1979; Wells, 1976; Wickes, 1978). Other benefits of marching band participation may include the
development of leadership skills (ASBDA, 1997; Dunnigan, 2007; Madsen, Plack, & Dunnigan, 2007), a heightened sense of belonging, accomplishment, self-worth, or pride (Isch, 1965), the development of musical technique, the opportunity to perform music of varying styles (ASBDA, 1997; Dunnigan, 2007; Isch, 1965; Revelli, 1979, Wickes, 1978), a chance to perform for a large audience (ASBDA, 1997; Revelli, 1979), the opportunity to travel (ASBDA, 1997), or the chance to involve non-instrumental music students in the band program by providing performance opportunities in the auxiliary units (Wells, 1976).

Summary of Chapter Two

Effective music teaching is a complex process. To become an effective teacher one must develop not only a mastery of their subject area, but also a mastery of a number of interconnected instructional and social skills. Music education research has indicated that effective teaching behaviors can be taught (Madsen & Duke, 1993), however a concern exists that existing undergraduate music education curricula may not adequately prepare preservice music educators to become effective music teachers (c.f.: Atterbury, 1994; Conway 1997, 2002; Colwell, 2011). Consequently, some researchers have investigated the perceived value of individual undergraduate music education courses within a larger program of studies. Results of these investigations have indicated participation in a performing ensemble is an experience in-service music educators consider to be a valuable component of their undergraduate music education coursework (Leonhard, 1985). However, no research is known to have investigated the role participating in a performing ensemble may have in the development of effective teaching skills. To what extent might effective teaching characteristics such as musical skill, effective rehearsal pacing, classroom management techniques, and communication skills be developed by participating in a performing ensemble?

A traditional performing ensemble experience in which many music education majors participate is college marching band. A great deal of writing has been completed during the past decades on the general topic of marching bands, however much of this writing is not research-based and focuses primarily upon varying aspects of the high school marching band. Little research-based writing could be located which specifically focuses upon college marching band, and no research based literature could be located which specifically investigates the role
participating in a college marching band may play in the development of effective teaching
skills.

Restatement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to determine the influence participating in a college marching
band may play in the development of effective music teaching skills. Results of this research
may provide insight into which undergraduate music education experiences contribute most to
the development effective music teaching skills. Understanding which curricular experiences
most contribute to the development of effective teaching skills may assist undergraduate music
education majors as they make decisions concerning their course of study. Further,
understanding role that participating in a college marching band may play in the development of
effective music teaching skills may assist university music educators as they design and
implement undergraduate music education curricula.

Specific research questions include:

1. How many in-service music educators surveyed participated in their college
   marching band?

2. How many in-service music educators participated in their college marching
   band because it was a required part of their undergraduate music education
   curriculum?

3. To what extent do in-service instrumental music educators consider participating
   in a college marching band to be a valuable part of the undergraduate music
   education coursework?

4. To what extent do in-service music educators who held a leadership role in their
   college marching band find their marching band experience to be more or less
   valuable than those who did not hold a leadership role?

5. To what extent do in-service instrumental music educators consider participating
   in a college marching band to be effective at developing effective teaching
   skills?

6. To what extent are the social and musical benefits often associated with
   participating in marching band considered valuable aspects of the experience?
7. Does the perceived value of participating in a college marching band change based upon the demographics of gender, type of undergraduate institution attended, size of college marching band, number of years of participation in college marching band, required participation, and teaching level?
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Participant Selection

Participants in this study were public and private high school and middle school band directors selected at random from throughout the United States. Initially, the participant pool was comprised of the names of member states included in each of the administrative divisions of The National Association for Music Education (NAfME). NAfME is organized into six administrative divisions: Eastern, North Central, Northwest, Southern, Southwestern, and Western (www.menc.org/about/view/tour-of-menc-membership-menc-s-structure). Each state-level music educators association, including the District of Columbia and the European Music Educators Association, is categorized by NAfME into one of these six divisions based upon geographic location. The name of each state included in NAfME’s Eastern Division, excluding the European Music Educators Association, was entered into an online randomization tool (www.random.org). The first three states returned in the resultant randomized list were compiled. The same procedure was followed for each of the five remaining NAfME divisions, resulting in a total of 18 states in the participant pool.

The Department of Education website for each selected state was carefully examined. A list of every public and private school system operating within each state was created. Each list was then entered separately into an online randomization tool (www.random.org). The names of the first 30% of school systems returned in the resultant randomized list were compiled. The website for each selected school system was thoroughly examined. The name and Email address of every middle school and high school band director within each selected school system were collected and compiled into a database. Only band directors with a publically accessible email address available either directly on the school website or on a website administered by the school band program were included in the final list of potential participants. If a selected school employed more than one band director, the name and Email address of each individual was collected. It was assumed that potential participants were males and females who represent many different educational and cultural backgrounds, and have a wide range of teaching experience.
Survey Design

Based upon the results of previous research investigating effective music teaching characteristics, music education program review, and college marching band (American School Band Director’s Association [ASBDA], 1997; Bergee, 1992; Conway, 2002; Dunnigan, 2007; Madsen, Plack, & Dunnigan, 2007; Miksza, Roeder, & Biggs, 2010; Revelli, 1979; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997; Wayman, 2005; Wickes, 1978), a survey tool was developed by the researcher. This survey tool (see Appendix C) consisted of a series of close-ended questions designed to collect demographic information including: gender, size of undergraduate institution attended, type of undergraduate institution attended, whether or not the participant participated in college marching band, whether or not the held a leadership role in their college marching, the size of college marching band, the number of years the participant participated in college marching band, and current teaching level. Two additional closed-ended questions were included to determine the reasons participants chose to participate in college marching band and whether they had attained a leadership role within the organization.

The survey tool also included a series of questions which utilized 7-point Lykert-type scales where 1 = “Not at All” and 7 = “A great Deal.” These questions were designed to determine the extent to which college marching band is perceived as a valuable part of the undergraduate music education curriculum, the extent to which participating in college marching band might aid in the development of effective teaching skills, and the extent to which certain social and musical skills identified in the review of literature may be developed as a result of participating in college marching band. Additionally, the survey tool included one open-ended question in which participants were encouraged to provide any additional information they felt may be pertinent to the study.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was performed utilizing graduate music education majors at a large southeastern university. Each participant had public or private school teaching experience and was recruited to participate in the pilot study on a voluntary basis. The pilot study was conducted to: (1) determine the viability of the electronic survey distribution and data collection method, (2) determine if the expected time provided for completion of the survey was adequate,
and (3) allow participants the opportunity to give feedback and suggestions. Results of the pilot study guided the final design of the survey tool and distribution method.

Survey Distribution

Data for this study was collected utilizing electronic survey distribution and data collection methodologies. Electronic survey distribution and data collection has gained popularity in recent decades and has been successfully utilized by researchers in a diversity of fields, including music education (c.f. Dillman, Smyth, & Christian 2009; Miksza, Roeder, & Biggs, 2010; Richards, 2012; Roster, Rogers, Hozier, Baker, & Albaum, 2007).

There are a number of advantages associated with electronic survey distribution and data collection methodologies. For example, surveys which are administered electronically can sample a larger segment of the target population (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian 2009; Miksza, Roeder, & Biggs, 2010) and often have a higher response rate than traditional survey methodologies (Reynolds, Woods, & Baker, 2007). Electronic data collection is also more cost-effective than many traditional survey methodologies (Kaplowitz et al., 2004) and has been shown to be a faster means of collecting data than paper survey methods (Mehta & Sivadas, 1995). There is some research which suggests participants completing an electronic survey write significantly more words in open-ended items than those completing a paper survey (Mehta & Sivadas, 1995). Further, data collected electronically can be easily exported into most commercially available data-analysis software packages (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian 2009).

Upon approval from the Florida State University Human Subjects Committee (see Appendix A), potential respondents were sent an invitation to complete the survey. The invitation was distributed electronically via Email to the addresses contained in the database of potential respondents developed during participant selection. The invitation email contained informed consent information, a brief narrative regarding the purpose and voluntary nature of the study, a request to complete the survey, and an electronic link to the survey (see Appendix B). Data were collected utilizing Qualtrics (www.qualtrics.com), an online survey tool available free-of-charge to faculty and graduate students of Florida State University. Two follow-up emails were sent at seven day intervals throughout the data collection period thanking respondents for participating and reminding potential respondents about the study (See Appendix B). To protect privacy, the survey software did not store cookies on the respondents’ computers.
or record Internet Protocol (IP) addresses. This data collection procedure is similar to previous music education research which utilized electronic data collection procedures (Miksza, Roeder, & Biggs, 2010; Richards, 2012). Data were collected during a three-week period in April 2012.

**Data Analysis**

To avoid data-entry error, quantitative data were exported directly from Qualtrics into the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS) software for statistical analysis. Data were analyzed utilizing descriptive and comparative techniques. Summary statistics for all variables were compiled. Differences between demographic groups were determined utilizing t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures.

Open-ended responses were initially sorted by the researcher into broad categories of responses using a series of key words, which were derived from previous research investigating effective music teaching characteristics, music education program review, and college marching band (ASBDA, 1997; Bergee, 1992; Conway, 2002; Dunnigan, 2007; Madsen, Plack, & Dunnigan, 2007; Miksza, Roeder, & Biggs, 2010; Revelli, 1979; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997; Wayman, 2005; Wickes, 1978). These initial broad categories were expanded or collapsed as needed until a final taxonomic structure was determined. Responses containing more than one key word were identified as belonging to multiple categories. To establish reliability of the researcher-designed taxonomy, two graduate music education students with previous experience in research methodology read and resorted each of the qualitative responses into the pre-determined categories. Reliability for the distribution of free responses between the determined categories was determined using the formula agreements ÷ agreements + disagreements (Madsen & Madsen, 1998).
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Respondent Demographics and Data Analysis for Research Question One

A total of 1,282 survey invitation emails were sent. Thirty invitation emails were returned as undeliverable, reducing the total number of potential respondents to 1,252. Four hundred sixty two (36.8%) potential respondents answered the survey invitation. Eight respondents did not fully complete the survey. Incomplete surveys were excluded from analysis, resulting in a final response rate of 36.3% \(N = 454\). This response rate is lower than was expected based upon previous research (Miksza, Roeder, & Biggs, 2010), yet was higher than other research (Richards, 2012).

Research question one asked: *How many in-service music educators surveyed participated in their college marching band?* To address research question one, respondents completed the first item on the survey tool (see Appendix C). The first item on the survey tool was a multiple choice question to which respondents selected *yes* if they had participated in a college marching band, or *no* if they had not participated in a college marching band. Sixty-six percent \(n = 301\) of respondents indicated they had participated in a college marching band; 34\% \(n = 153\) indicated they had not. Because this study investigated the effect of marching band participation upon the development of effective teaching skills, only respondents who indicated they had participated in a college marching band were invited to complete the remainder of the survey. Thus, all further data analysis for this study considers data collected from respondents who indicated they had participated in a college marching band.

Of the 301 respondents who completed the full survey, 69% were male \(n = 208\) and 31% were female \(n = 93\). Respondents received their undergraduates degree from both public \(n = 269\) and private \(n = 32\) colleges and universities whose enrollments ranged from less than 500 students to more than 30,000 students. Survey respondents taught at both the high school and middle school level \(n = 124\), the middle level school only \(n = 81\), or the high level school only \(n = 96\). Table one provides a summary of demographic information defining the participants of this study.
Respondents indicated they had participated in their college marching band from one year to four or more years (see Table 2). The college marching bands in which respondents participated ranged in size from fewer than 100 students to 400 or more students. Sixty-nine percent ($n = 207$) of respondents indicated they had held some form of leadership role within their college marching band, while approximately 31% ($n = 94$) indicated they had not.

Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics for Gender, Type of Undergraduate Institutions Attended, and Enrollment of Undergraduate Institutions Attended by Number and Percent of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Undergraduate Institution Attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500 students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-1,999 students</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-4,900 students</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000, 9,999 students</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 – 14,999 students</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 – 19,999</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 - 29,000</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30,000</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis for Research Question Two

Research question two asked: *How many in-service music educators participated in their college marching band because it was a required part of their undergraduate music education curriculum?* Participants responded to item five of the survey tool (see Appendix C) to answer research question two. Item five was a “yes or no” type question which asked respondents if participation in college marching band was a required part of their undergraduate music education curriculum. Fifty-five ($n = 165$) of respondents indicated yes, they were required to participate in their college marching band. Forty-five percent of respondents ($n = 136$) indicated no, they were not required to participate in their college marching band. Statistical analysis
using chi-square procedures indicated the number of respondents who were required to participate in their college marching band did not differ significantly from those who were not required to participate in their college marching band ($\chi^2 (1, N=301) = 2.79, p > .05$).

### Table 2

*Descriptive Statistics for Years of Participation in College Marching Band, Size of College Marching Band, and Leadership Position Held by Number and Percent of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Participated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or More Years</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of College Marching Band</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 100 students</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-199 students</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-299 students</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-399 students</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 or more students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Analysis for Research Question Three

Research question three asked: *To what extent do in-service instrumental music educators consider participating in a college marching band to be a valuable part of the undergraduate music education coursework?* Research question six was answered by survey item six (see Appendix C). Survey item six asked that respondents rate the statement: *Marching band was a valuable part of my undergraduate music education curriculum* using a Likert-type scale in which 1 = “Not Valuable at All” and 7 = “Very Valuable.”

Data analysis indicated that, overall, respondents considered marching band to be a somewhat valuable component of their undergraduate music education curriculum ($M = 5.75, SD = 1.48$). However, chi-square analysis indicated respondents differed significantly in their responses ($\chi^2 (6, N = 301) = 272.33, p < .05$). Forty percent ($n = 122$) rated
the value of their marching band experience as “very valuable.” Considerably fewer respondents considered their experience to be neutral \((n = 25)\) or of no value \((n = 7)\). A summary of responses, including the overall mean score and standard deviation, to research question number three are provided in Table 3.

Table 3

*Summary of Responses to Research Question Number Three by Frequency of Response, Overall Mean, and Standard Deviation.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>Not Valuable at All ((1))</th>
<th>Neutral or No Opinion ((4))</th>
<th>Very Valuable ((7))</th>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>(M)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis for Research Question Four**

Research question four asked: *To what extent do in-service music educators who held a leadership role in their college marching band find their marching band experience to be more or less valuable than those who did not hold a leadership role?* To answer this research question, data collected from survey item number six (*Please rate the following statement: Marching band was a valuable part of my undergraduate music education curriculum.*) was further analyzed by the demographic of leadership. Data analysis indicated respondents who held some form of leadership role within their college marching band \((n = 207)\) rated the value of their college marching band experience higher \((M = 5.91, SD = 1.38)\) than those who had not \((n = 94)\) held a leadership role \((M = 5.40, SD = 1.64)\). An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the perceived value of the college marching band experience between respondents who held a leadership role in their college marching band and those who had not. Results indicated a significant difference between the mean scores of those who held a leadership role and those who did not hold a leadership role \((t (299) =2.75, p< .05)\). Those who held a leadership role considered their college marching band experience to be more valuable than those who did not.
Data Analysis for Research Question Five

Research question three asked: *To what extent do in-service instrumental music educators consider participating in a college marching band to be effective at developing effective teaching skills?* Participants responded to survey items 11, 12, and 13 (see Appendix C). Survey item 11 contained a list of eight musical skills commonly associated with effective music teaching. A list of seven instructional behaviors commonly associated with effective music teaching was contained in survey item 12. Survey item 13 contained a list of nine personal characteristics commonly exhibited by effective teachers. Respondents rated the extent to which they felt each characteristic or skill had been developed as a result of their participation in college marching band using a Likert-type scale in which 1 = “Not at All” and 7 = “A Great Deal.” In total, respondents rated 24 individual skills or characteristics. A list of these skills and characteristics grouped by category (Musical Skill, Instructional Behavior, and Personal Characteristics) and ranked in descending order by mean score and is provided in Table 4.

Table 4

*Descriptive Statistics for Effective Teaching Skills and Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill/Characteristic</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Musical Skill</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain high musical standards</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight reading skills</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual musicianship</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General musical knowledge</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear training/error detection skills</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate conducting gestures</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to effectively interpret a musical score</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency on a secondary instrument</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to motivate students</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize time-on-task</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to present information clearly</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain an effective rehearsal pace</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve students in the learning process</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain student behavior</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management techniques</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work towards a goal</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership skills</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A mean score and standard deviation was calculated for each skill or characteristic. The three musical skills commonly associated with effective music teaching which respondents felt were most developed by their participation in college marching band were: “Ability to maintain high musical standards” ($M = 4.91, SD = 1.62$), “Sight reading skills” ($M = 4.75, SD = 1.77$), and “Individual musicianship” ($M = 4.69, SD = 1.65$). “Ability to effectively interpret a musical score” ($M = 3.79, SD = 2.09$) and “Proficiency on a secondary instrument” ($M = 3.29, SD = 2.12$) were the musical skills respondents felt were least developed by their participation in college marching band.

Respondents indicated the instructional behaviors commonly associated with effective music teaching which were most developed by their participation in college marching band were “Ability to motivate students” ($M = 5.58, SD = 1.58$), and the ability to “Maximize time-on-task” ($M = 5.43, SD = 1.64$). The instructional behavior respondents rated lowest was “Classroom management techniques” ($M = 4.77, SD = 1.81$)

The personal characteristics commonly associated with effective music teaching respondents felt were most developed by their participation in college marching band included “Ability to work towards a goal” ($M = 5.92, SD = 1.43$), “Confidence” ($M = 5.78, SD = 1.46$), and “Leadership skills” ($M = 5.74, SD = 1.51$). Respondents indicated “Professionalism” ($M = 5.38, SD = 1.57$) and “Ability to manage stress” ($M = 5.33, SD = 1.64$) were the personal characteristics least developed by their participation in college marching band.

To determine which category of skills and characteristics (musical, instructional, or behavioral) respondents felt were developed most as a result of their participation in college marching band, total mean scores for each category were calculated by adding the mean score of each of the individual characteristics or skills within the category. Results indicated personal characteristics were ranked highest ($M = 5.61, SD = .20$), followed by instructional behaviors...
and musical skills ($M = 4.26, SD = .57$). Statistical analysis utilizing one-way ANOVA procedures showed a significant difference between the mean scores for musical skills, instructional behaviors, and personal characteristics ($F(2, 21) = 15.53, p < .05$). Post hoc analysis using Tukey HSD procedures indicated musical skills commonly associated with effective music teaching were rated significant lower than mean scores for instructional behaviors and personal characteristics.

To determine an overall ranking of the 24 skills and characteristics commonly associated with effective music teaching, each of the 24 individual skills and characteristics were ranked in according to mean score and standard deviation. The personal characteristic, “Ability to work towards a goal” ($M = 5.92, SD = 1.40$) was rated the highest, followed by “Confidence” ($M = 5.78, SD = 1.46$), and “Leadership skills” ($M = 5.74, SD = 1.51$). The lowest rated items were musical skills, including “Ability to effectively interpret a musical score” ($M = 3.79, SD = 2.01$) and “Proficiency on a secondary instrument” ($M = 3.29, SD = 2.12$). Table 5 provides the overall ranking of the 24 individual skills and characteristics in descending order by mean score and standard deviation.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill/Characteristic</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work towards a goal</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership skills</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Motivate Students</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity and Self-Control</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization skills</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize time-on-task</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to present information clearly</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain an effective rehearsal pace</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to manage stress</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve student in the learning process</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain high musical standards</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain student behavior</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management techniques</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 – continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill/Characteristic</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sight reading skills</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual musicianship</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General musical knowledge</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear training/error detection skills</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate conducting gestures</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to effectively interpret a musical score</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency on a secondary instrument</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis for Research Question Six

Research question six asked: To what extent are the social and musical benefits often associated with participating in marching band considered valuable aspects of the experience?

To answer this research question study participants responded to survey item 14 (see Appendix C). Survey item 14 contained a list of twelve benefits, four musical and eight social, which the review of literature suggested are commonly associated with a marching band experience. Respondents rated the perceived value of each benefit using a Likert-type scale in which 1 = “Not at All” and 7 = “A Great Deal.”

A mean score and standard deviation was calculated for each musical and social benefit. Results indicate the highest ranked benefits were social in nature. The top ranked benefits included “Opportunity to have an enjoyable social experience” (M = 6.24, SD = 1.09), and “A sense of belonging” (M = 6.23, SD = 1.22). Overall, the lowest ranked benefits were musical in nature. “Development of instrumental technique” (M = 4.90, SD = 1.60) was the lowest ranked benefit commonly associated with marching band participation. Statistical analysis utilizing T-test procedures indicated no significant difference between the mean scores of the musical and social benefits (t (10) = 1.75, p > .05). Table 6 provides a list of the social and musical benefits commonly associated with participating in college marching band arranged in descending order by mean score and standard deviation.

Data Analysis for Research Question Seven

Research question three asked: Does the perceived value of participating in a college marching band change based upon the demographics of gender, type of undergraduate institution attended, size of college marching band, number of years of participation in college
marching band, required participation, and teaching level? To answer research question seven, the data from research question three (To what extent do in-service instrumental music educators consider participating in a college marching band to be a valuable part of the undergraduate music education coursework?) was further analyzed by demographic (see Table 7). Statistical tests including one-way ANOVA and T-Test procedures determined the effects of selected demographics upon the perceived value of the college marching band experience. To control for the number of statistical tests performed, Bonferroni adjustments were made to the rejection level a priori, resulting in $\alpha = .01$.

Table 6

**Ranking of Social and Musical Benefits by Mean and Standard Deviation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Social/Musical</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to have an enjoyable social experience</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sense of belonging</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to perform for a large audience</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased sense of pride or self-worth</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to have an enjoyable musical experience</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased personal discipline</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to travel</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to attend athletic events</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in personal motivation levels</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to play a variety of musical styles</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to develop musical skills</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of instrumental technique</td>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the perceived value of marching band by demographic indicated females ($M = 5.82$, $SD = 1.38$) value their experience in college marching band more than males ($M = 5.72$, $SD = 1.53$). An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the perceived value of the college marching band experience between males and females. No significant difference was found between the mean scores for these groups ($t(299) = -.51$, $p > .01$). Further analysis indicated respondents who attended a public college or university ($M = 5.77$, $SD = 1.50$) rated the value of their college marching band experience higher than respondents who attended a private college or university ($M = 5.59$, $SD = 1.34$). Again however, independent-samples t-test procedures indicated no significant difference between the mean scores for these groups.
(t (299) = .63, p > .01). Respondents who were not required to participate in their college marching band (M = 5.83, SD = 1.46) also rated the value of their college marching band experience higher than respondents who were required to participate (M = 5.68, SD = 1.51). Independent-samples t-test procedures indicated no significant difference between the mean scores for these groups (t (299) = -.847, p < .05).

Data analysis found the perceived value of participation in college marching band increases based upon the size of the marching band. Respondents who participated in marching bands of less than 100 students (M = 5.40, SD = 1.49) rated their experience lowest. Those who participated in marching bands of 400 or more students (M = 7.00, SD = .00) rated their experience highest. A one-way between subjects ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of size of college marching band upon the perceived value of the college marching band experience. Results indicated the size of the college marching band had a significant effect upon the perceived value of the marching band experience (F (4, 296) = 5.29, p < .01). However, post hoc comparisons utilizing Tukey HSD procedures found no differences in the perceived value of participation in college marching band based upon the size of the band at the .01 level of significance (p = .04).

Table 7

Perceived Value of Participation in College Marching Band by Demographic, Mean, and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Undergraduate Institution Attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Only</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Only</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years of Participation in College Marching Band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or More Years</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of College Marching Band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 or more students</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-399 students</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-299 students</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-199 students</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 100 students</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analysis for the demographic *number of years of participation in college marching band* indicated participants who participated in college marching band for *four or more years* ($M = 6.12, SD = 1.23$) valued their college marching college marching band experience more than those who participated for *three years* ($M = 5.64, SD = 1.29$), *two years* ($M = 4.82, SD = 1.92$), or *one year* ($M = 4.70, SD = 1.68$). A one-way between subjects ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of number of years of participation in college marching band on the perceived value of the college marching band experience. Results indicated the number years of a respondent had participated in college marching band had a significant effect upon their perceived value of the college marching band experience ($F(3, 206) = 3.26, p<.01$). Post hoc analysis utilizing Tukey HSD procedures indicated respondents who participated in college marching band for only one or two years rated their experiences significantly lower than respondents who participated in their college marching band for three, or four or more years.

Results indicated the perceived value of the college marching band experience also varies according to the respondent’s teaching assignment. Respondents who indicated they taught at both the high school and middle school level rated the value of their college marching band experience higher ($M = 5.90, SD = 1.48$) than those who teach only high school ($M = 5.84, SD = 1.39$) or only middle school ($M = 5.41, SD = 1.71$). A one-way between subjects ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of teaching assignment on the perceived value of the college marching band experience. Results indicated current teaching assignment
did not have a statistically significant effect upon the perceived value of the college marching band experience ($F(2, 298) = 3.03, p > .01$).

**Analysis of Qualitative Data**

A number of respondents ($n = 78$) chose to include additional comments at the end of the survey. Open-ended responses were initially sorted by the researcher into broad categories of responses using a series of key words, which were derived from previous research investigating effective music teaching characteristics, music education program review, and college marching band (ASBDA, 1997; Bergee, 1992; Conway, 2002; Dunnigan, 2007; Madsen, Plack, & Dunnigan, 2007; Miksza, Roeder, & Biggs, 2010; Revelli, 1979; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997; Wayman, 2005; Wickes, 1978). These initial broad categories were expanded or collapsed as needed until a final taxonomic structure was determined (see Table 8).

Table 8

*Summary of Taxonomy Used to Categorize Qualitative Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ET</strong></td>
<td>Effective Teaching Characteristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETG</td>
<td>Refers to the development of non-specific effective teaching skills/characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETM</td>
<td>Specifically refers to the development of musical skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETI</td>
<td>Specifically refers to the development of instructional behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETP</td>
<td>Specifically refers to the development of personal characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RE</strong></td>
<td>Personal Reflection or Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REN</td>
<td>Neutral in nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE+</td>
<td>Positive in nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-</td>
<td>Negative in nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>General Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Social benefit of marching band participation (not teaching-related)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>Musical benefit of marching band participation (not teaching-related)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>Financial – Marching band participation is related to financial gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Employment – Marching band participation is related to future employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U</strong></td>
<td>Undefined Response – Response is vague or unrelated to the study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final taxonomic structure contained twelve categories. Each of these categories assigned a code letter designation. A number of responses were found to relate to effective teaching skills (ET) and were categorized according to their specific reference to musical skills (M), instructional behaviors (I), or personal characteristics (P). Other comments were found to be quite general in nature (G). These responses were categorized according to their reference to either a musical (M) or social (S) experience. A small number of responses were found to reference either an employment (E) or financial (F) aspects/benefit of the college marching band experience. Other respondents chose to provide a brief narrative offering either a personal opinion about their own college marching band experience or some aspect of the marching band activity. These responses were categorized generally as reflections or experiences (RE), and were further identified as being either neutral (N), positive (+) or negative (-) in nature. Responses which were found to be vague or unrelated to the study were labeled as undefined (U). Responses which were found to contain references to more than one category were coded as belonging to multiple categories. Table 9 provides a complete distribution of coded comments.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETG</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REN</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Many comments received multiple codes, resulting in total percentage > 100%
To establish reliability of the researcher-designed taxonomy, two graduate music education students with previous experience in research methodology read and resorted each of the qualitative responses into the pre-determined categories. Using the formula agreements ÷ agreements + disagreements (Madsen & Madsen, 1998), reliability of the researcher-designed taxonomy was found to be 0.973 and inter-judge reliability was found to be 0.897. Appendix D contains a complete list of the coded free-responses as they were entered by survey respondents, including all grammatical and spelling errors.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine the degree of influence that participating in a college marching band may play in the development of effective music teaching skills. Specific research questions included: (1) How many in-service music educators surveyed participated in their college marching band? (2) How many in-service music educators participated in their college marching band because it was a required part of their undergraduate music education curriculum? (3) To what extent do in-service instrumental music educators consider participating in a college marching band to be a valuable part of the undergraduate music education coursework? (4) To what extent do in-service music educators who held a leadership role in their college marching band find their marching band experience to be more or less valuable than those who did not hold a leadership role? (5) To what extent do in-service instrumental music educators consider participating in a college marching band to be effective at developing effective teaching skills? (6) To what extent are the social and musical benefits often associated with participating in marching band considered valuable aspects of the experience? (7) Does the perceived value of participating in a college marching band change based upon the demographics of gender, type of undergraduate institution attended, size of college marching band, number of years of participation in college marching band, and teaching level?

Summary of Findings

Results of this study indicated a majority of respondents perceived their participation in college marching band to have been influential on the development of their music teaching skills. A majority of respondents also indicated their participation in college marching band was a valuable component of their undergraduate music education coursework. In fact, over 80% of respondents had an overall positive perception of their college marching band experience compared to less than 10% who had an overall negative perception of the experience. Respondents ranked the personal characteristics associated with effective music teaching higher than instructional behaviors and musical skills as the skills most influenced by their participation.
in marching band. Overall, the skill or characteristic respondents perceived as being most
developed as a result of their participation in college marching band was the “ability to work
toward a goal.” The skill perceived as least developed was “proficiency on a secondary
instrument.” The results are consistent with previous research which found in-service music
educators value their participation in college performing ensembles (Conway, 2001; Jennings,

**Perceived Value of the Marching Band Experience**

One purpose of this study was to determine the extent music educators felt various
effective teaching skills and characteristics were developed as a result of their participation in
college marching band. These skills were grouped into three broad categories: musical skills,
instructional behaviors, and personal characteristics. Overall, respondents ranked the personal
characteristics associated with effective music teaching higher than instructional behaviors and
musical skills. These finding replicate the results of previous studies (e.g., Conway, 2002; Mills
& Smith, 2003; Miksza, Roeder, & Biggs, 2010; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Taebel, 1980;
Teachout, 1997; Wayman 2005).

Marching band proponents often cite the extramusical benefits of marching band
participation as important aspects of the marching band experience. Results of this study suggest
extramusical benefits may be the most important aspects of the marching band experience. It
may be that, given the relative low overall ranking of musical skills and characteristics, in-
service music teachers perceive these skills as being best taught or developed in other courses. It
may also be many respondents found the musical value of their particular marching band
experience to be insignificant. Still others may have found their individual musical skills to be
significantly well-developed and therefore choose to stress the development of instructional
skills and personal characteristics during their participation in college marching band.
Regardless, it seems music education students who wish to develop various instructional skills
and personal characteristics related to effective music teaching might choose to participate in a
college marching band. They also may be encouraged by music education teacher training
programs to participate. However, results of the current study suggest students who wish to
develop or refine musical skills in musical ensembles as well.
Despite the low overall rankings, it appears that in-service music educators perceive participation in college marching band to be a somewhat influential way to develop musical skills. Results suggest “ability to maintain high musical standards” is the music teaching skill respondents consider to have been most influenced and developed by their participation in college marching band. This finding is reflective of previous research which found “ability to maintain high musical standards” to be the most important musical skill demonstrated by effective teachers (Miksza, Roeder, & Biggs, 2010). It seems noteworthy that “ability to maintain high musical standards,” which is a general musical skill, is ranked higher than other more specific skills such as sight reading or conducting. That a general music skill is ranked more highly than specific music skills may suggest respondents consider participating in college marching band to be an effective method by which to develop as an all-around musician. It may also be the case that while more specific music skills are perceived as being best taught in other classes, marching band is perceived as an opportunity to further develop, practice, or apply these skills.

To better prepare music education majors to become effective teachers, individuals responsible for administering college marching bands may consider implementing methods by which musical skills valuable in effective teaching may be better developed through marching band participation. For instance, the musical skill respondents perceived as being least developed as a result of their marching band participation was “proficiency on a secondary instrument.” This may indicate that respondents primarily performed on their major instrument as students in college marching band. It might be reasonable to suggest music education majors who participate in college marching band be required to perform on a secondary instrument to help build instrumental skills which are considered necessary for effective music teaching. It is possible a number of students performing on secondary instruments will have a somewhat negative effect on the musical integrity of the marching band. However it should be noted that individuals appear to participate in college marching band primarily for social reasons, not because they find it to be highly musically rewarding.

Previous research found “ability to motivate students” to be the most important (Miksza, Roeder, & Biggs, 2010) or second most important (Teachout, 1997) instructional behavior demonstrated by effective teachers. Results of the present study indicated “ability to motivate students” and “maximize time-on-task” are the instructional behaviors in-service music
educators feel were most developed by their participation in college marching band. These skills seem to be particularly relevant for instrumental music teachers, many of whom must sustain successful recruiting for their ensembles and prepare students for various performance events in a timely manner. It seems not only are instrumental music students able to develop their personal motivation levels and time-management skills as a result of their participation in marching band, but that they are then able to then apply these skills in their own classrooms. That marching band participation may develop instructional behaviors important to effective music teaching may have profound implications for individuals responsible for developing music education curricula. It seems reasonable to suggest undergraduate music education students should be required, or at least encouraged to participate in college marching band for as many years as possible. Further, those responsible for administrating college marching bands might consider adapting the college marching band experience in such a way that music education students have the opportunity and experience to develop a variety of effective instructional behaviors.

The personal characteristic associated with effective teaching respondents indicated was most influenced and developed as a result of their participation in college marching band was the “ability to work towards a goal.” These results are reflective of previous research in which “ability to work toward a goal” was identified as an important aspects of effective music teaching. Additionally, “ability to work toward a goal” is similar to finding of Pembrook and Fredrickson (2000/2001) and Fredrickson and Hackworth (2005), who when analyzing advice given by veteran teachers to new teachers, identified a common topic which referenced a sense of perseverance in regard to attaining long-term program goals. Developing and attaining long – term goals are important aspects of music teaching. It appears marching band participation may develop the ability to work towards a goal. Therefore, it seems marching band participation may be an effective way for an undergraduate music education major to build skills necessary to work toward school much program goals. Further, other personal characteristics necessary for effective teaching including “flexibility” and “patience” were ranked highly. These personal characteristics are important when building positive interpersonal relationships.

Positive interpersonal relationships with other teachers, staff, administration, and parents are an important component of building or sustaining a successful school band program. That these skills might be developed as a result of participation in college marching band may
reinforce the assertion college marching band is a valuable experience for undergraduate music education majors. This finding appears particularly pertinent for university music educators as they consider undergraduate music education curricula designed to develop effective music teaching skills. It is reasonable to suggest undergraduate music education students should be required, or at least encouraged, to participate in college marching band for as many years as possible in order to influence the development of personal characteristics necessary for effective music teaching.

Perceived Value of the Marching Band Experience by Demographic

Results indicated the perceived value of the college marching band experience within the music education curriculum was rated similarly across the demographics of gender, type of undergraduate institution, teaching level, required participation, and size of college marching band. Data analysis found even groups who rated the value of their marching band participation lowest still had a more positive than negative overall perception of the experience. Further, qualitative data was found to contain a large percentage of free-responses which were primarily positive in nature. Additional comments such as “Marching band experience in college is very beneficial to any future music teacher” were common and appear to mirror the findings of the quantitative data. Based upon these data, it further suggests that college marching band is a valuable performing ensemble experience within the undergraduate music education curriculum. Furthermore, participation in college marching band may be an effective means individuals develop a wide variety of effective music teaching traits such as the ability to work toward a goal, confidence, and leadership skills. That marching band participation may be an influential means by which undergraduate music education majors might develop effective teaching skills could have implications for those responsible for designing undergraduate music education curricula. It may be that undergraduate music education majors should be encouraged, or even required, to participate in college marching band specifically to develop effective music teaching skills.

Respondents who held a leadership role in their college marching band seemed to consider marching band participation to be a more effective venue to develop music teaching skills than those who did not hold a leadership role. Leadership skills are commonly identified as a prominent trait among effective music teachers (c.f., Battisti, 1999). Therefore, it may be
that respondents who held a leadership role in their college marching band perceive the experience to be a more valuable component of their undergraduate music education coursework specifically because it provided an opportunity to learn or develop leadership skills before entering the classroom. That respondents who held a leadership role in their college marching band seemed to value the experience because it provided an opportunity to learn or develop leadership skills reflects previous research which suggested music education majors may participate in college marching band because of the leadership opportunities often available within these ensembles (Madsen, Plack, & Dunnigan, 2007). The current study is limited however in that the data did not indicate whether respondents choose to participate in college marching band specifically because they wished to develop leadership skills or, if upon reflection, they perceived participating in college marching band to have been an effective way to develop leadership skills. Given the results of this study, which seem to indicate participants value the social aspects of marching band participation a great deal, it seems likely many respondents participated in college marching band simply because they enjoyed the experience. It may be only in retrospect that participants recognized their marching band participation to have been an experience which was effective at developing leadership skills. Nevertheless, given that leadership skills are an important component of effective music teaching and that these skills may be developed by obtaining a leadership position within a college marching band, it seems music education majors who participate in college marching band should strive to acquire a leadership role within the band.

High school band directors, as well as band directors who teach high school and middle, school rated the value of marching band within the music education curriculum higher than band directors who only teach middle school. Many of the effective teaching skills which may be acquired as a result of participating in a college marching band are applicable outside of the marching band setting in both high school and middle school music classrooms. Therefore, though all groups seemed to consider marching band to be of similar value within the undergraduate music education curriculum, it may be those responsible for teaching marching band in the public schools, most commonly high school band directors, value college marching band participation more because the marching band-specific techniques and concepts they learned as a student in college marching band transfer directly to their work with their school marching bands. Participating in a college marching band may be an important component of
the music education curriculum for many undergraduate music education majors. These results seem to indicate participating in a college marching band may be an even more influential component of the music education curriculum for those music education majors who anticipate a career as a high school band director.

The number of years a respondent participated in college marching band may influence their perception as to the value of that experience. Results suggest the longer a respondent participated in college marching band, the more valuable they perceived the experience to have been. These results are not surprising given it is unlikely an individual would choose to continually participate in an activity they do not perceive as being valuable or enjoyable in some way. It is likely these results reflect unequal sample sizes more so than a reflection of the actual perceived value of the experience, however. Over 60% of respondents indicated they had participated in college marching band for “4 or more years” compared to less than 10% who indicated they had participated for only “1 year.” Again, this study is limited because it is not clear from these data if the perceived value of college marching band participation increased as a result of continued participation, or if those who chose to participate on a continual basis did so because they valued the marching band experience highly a priori. Given the results of this study which indicate participants valued the social aspects of marching band participation a great deal, it seems most likely respondents continued to participate in college marching band as students simply because they enjoyed the experience and upon reflection perceived it as having been an effective way to develop effective teaching skills. Regardless, to achieve the full benefit of the experience, it seems undergraduate music education students, particularly those who anticipate a career as a high school band director, should consider participating in college marching band for as many years as possible.

Results also indicated the size of the college marching band in which a respondent participated seemed to influence their perceived value of the experience within the music education curriculum. Given that mean scores for each of these groups are similar to other demographic groups, it is unlikely respondents who participated in larger college marching bands actually value their experiences more than those who participated in smaller band. It seems likely these results are a result of unequal sample sizes more so than they are a reflection of the actual perceived value of the experience. Only three respondents indicated they had participated in a college marching band with an enrollment of “400 or more students.” Each of
these respondents rated the value of their college marching band experience as a “7” on a seven-point Likert-type scale. Comparatively, far more respondents indicated they had participated in a college marching band with an enrollment of “100-199 students.” Although this group appears to rank the overall value they placed upon their marching band experience lower, the sample size and dispersion were much larger. Allowing for unequal sample sizes, it is likely respondents in college marching bands of all sizes actually valued their experiences similarly. Because participating in a college marching band may be an effective way for undergraduate music education majors to develop effective teaching skills and the size of the band may not actually impact the perceived value of that experience, it seems those responsible for designing undergraduate music education curricula should strive to provide a marching band experience for music education majors. Institutions without a marching band might consider creating a marching band. Irrespective of the size of the marching band, it is likely the experience will be highly valued as an influential means by which undergraduate music education majors might develop a variety of effective teaching skills.

The perceived value of the college marching band experience within the undergraduate music education curriculum did not vary significantly between respondents who were required to participate and those who were not required to participate. It was expected that individuals who were required to participate in college marching band would consider it to have been a less valuable component of the undergraduate music education curriculum than those who participated voluntarily. This study is limited in that it did not describe the perceptions of in-service teachers while they are college students. It may be that while participating in college marching band, students who are required to participate and students who are not required to participate value their experiences quite differently. However, upon reflection, both groups may perceive their college marching band experience as having been influential and valuable - perhaps because they have had the opportunity to apply many of the skills learned in college marching band to their own teaching. These findings may have tremendous implications for those responsible for designing undergraduate music education curricula. It is unlikely individuals who do not value the marching band experience a priori will elect to participate in college marching band. Given in-service music educators generally consider participating in a college marching band to have been a valuable component of their music education coursework,
it may be advisable to require marching band participation for all music undergraduate music education students.

That the value of the college marching band experience is rated similarly by each demographic group considered as part of this study may be reflective of the multidimensional nature of the marching band activity. As indicated in the review of literature, students who participate in college marching band may be presented with a variety of social and musical opportunities and experiences, as well as opportunities for personal growth. It is likely the availability of these opportunities and experiences vary greatly from band to band. It is also likely the perceived value of these opportunities and experiences varies from student to student. It may be the case that students who participate in college marching band take advantage of the opportunities and experiences available to them in a somewhat *a la carte* fashion, crafting an experience that is uniquely valuable to them. In this manner, one student might choose to take advantage of available leadership opportunities while another student may choose to pursue experiences which are more social in nature. If this is indeed the case, it seems those responsible for administering college marching bands should strive to provide as many opportunities, social and musical, as possible to their students.

**Social and Musical Benefits of Marching Band Participation**

Outside of building effective teaching characteristics, a number of benefits, both social and musical, are often associated with participating in a marching band. The findings of the current study indicate the most important benefits of college marching band participation are “opportunity to have an enjoyable social experience” and “a sense of belonging.” That the social benefits of marching band participation are considered more valuable than the musical benefits of the experience is consistent with other findings of this study.

Based upon these data, it appears college marching band participation is already a widely valued experience for undergraduate music education majors. Further, it may be appropriate to suggest those responsible for administrating college marching bands should consider stressing the social benefits of marching band participation more so than the musical benefits. For example, when appealing to music education majors, marching band directors might stress marching band’s potential influence upon the development of effective music teaching skills such as leadership, flexibility, and the ability to work towards a goal. For non-music majors,
marching band directors might stress the sense of belonging or self-worth associated with marching band participation. For all students, marching band directors might stress participation is an experience they are likely to enjoy and value a great deal. Also, it may be beneficial to consider adaptations to the marching band experience which might increase the perceived musical value of the experience. For instance, performing a wider variety of musical styles or encouraging the development of instrumental technique may result in a marching band experience which is more musically valuable. In general, it seems marching band directors should stress the importance of musical and social benefits of the marching band experience equally. Furthermore, to better appeal to as many students as possible, marching band directors should strive to provide students with a diversity of social and musical experiences.

Qualitative Responses

Only about 25% of respondents chose to include written comments with their survey. These comments covered a variety of topics however and provided a much more detailed understanding of the influence college marching band participation may have upon the development of effective music teaching skills than might have been possible analyzing only the quantitative data. Written comments were found to be largely reflective of the overall findings of this study. They were also reflective of the controversial nature of the marching band.

The written comments were found to be largely representative of the quantitative data. That the written comments are reflective of the quantitative data appear to further validate the findings of this study. A large number of written comments such as “Marching band experience in college is very beneficial to any future music teacher...,” and “I believe that college marching band is very valuable to the undergraduate student” are representative of many written responses. It might be noted many comments which were found to be supportive of marching band participation as a means by which effective teaching skills might be developed are general in nature. Very few comments reference a specific musical skill, instructional behavior, or personal characteristic which may be developed as a result of participating in a college marching band.

That general music teaching skills are mentioned more frequently than specific music teaching skills may suggest respondents consider participating in college marching band to be an effective method by which to develop as an all-around teacher as opposed to a way in which any one effective teaching skill may be developed. Therefore, it seems marching band directors should
strive to provide music education students who participate in marching band a wide variety of opportunities to develop a diverse set of effective music teaching skills.

Comments such as “Marching abdn [sic] is, unfortunately, not the best place to learn musicianship” were also common and seem to further indicate marching band is not perceived as an effective way to develop specific music skills associated with effective teaching. Other comments such as “College band helped me to have patience with undisciplined students...,” and “When you march in college you are more aware to what techniques and teaching attributes you would like to emulate from your teachers and instructors” seem to further indicate marching band is perceived as an valuable way by which specific effective music teaching skills related to personal characteristics or instructional behaviors might be learned or developed. Additionally, that college marching band directors may be viewed as role models was a new finding of this study. Although the idea that college marching band directors may serve as role models for music education students is not surprising, this finding seems to reinforce that college marching band directors should strive to model effective teaching characteristics during the course of their instruction.

A large number of written comments referenced a social benefit or experience the respondent associated with their college marching band experience. It should be noted nearly all comments determined to be social were also overwhelming positive in nature. That the social aspects of marching band participation are recollected so positively would further reinforce findings of this study which indicate the social aspects of college marching band participation may be the most important aspects of the experience. Many comments such as, “I made many life-long friends that I still keep in touch with, including that I met my husband in marching band. We will be celebrating our 14th anniversary this summer” refer to long-term friendships and relationships formed during the respondent’s time in college marching band. Other comments, including “…it was a lot [sic] of fun!” and “... I really did enjoy my experience socially” would seem to suggest respondents enjoyed their marching band experience simply because it was a generally enjoyable activity. Other comments suggested marching band may be a way to connect to campus life (i.e.: “…we attended so many campus events and functions for performances I felt very in-tune to what was happening campus wide.), develop a variety of job skills (i.e.,“ Experiences with marching band ... allow participants to develop all-important "soft skills" employers are looking for such as flexibility, working within a large organizational
structure, personal skills, negotiations, empathy, awareness of others, and pride in self and group.”), or as a way to become part of a reputable campus organization (i.e., “I joined the marching band at my college because of its incredible reputation.”). That the college marching band experience is valuable for such a diversity of reasons by so many individuals also seems to be reflective of the multidimensional nature of the marching band activity and suggests college marching band directors should strive to provide students with as diverse an experience as possible.

A number of respondents elected to include written comments which were determined to be reflective in nature. These comments commonly reflected upon a diversity of personal experiences and opinions concerning college marching band, or the marching band experience in general. For instance, reflective comments such as: “Undergrad in a small marching band. Graduate participation in a large marching band. Surprisingly similar experiences” and “I enjoyed college marching band but it was not a step up from what I had in high school” seem to be neutral in nature and simply describe various marching band experiences. Other comments were decidedly more negative in tone. For instance, “Marching Band has become a BOA/DCI NIGHTMARE [emphasis in original]... I'm frankly ashamed of the state it's in!” and “From my perspective, marching band actually took away from my education by eating valuable practice time and studying time.” are representative of the negative comments, many of which are critical of the high school or college marching band activity. Contrasting the negative reflections is a large number of reflections which are clearly positive in nature. Examples of positive comments include: “[marching band] was the best experience of my college career,” and “Marching band is a vital part of musical development for school music programs.”

Concerning the reflective comments, it is interesting the word choices respondents made when composing these comments. Each comment seemed to convey a clearly positive, negative, or neutral tone. However in many cases, respondents also chose strong descriptors such as “nightmare,” “vital,” or “love” when writing about their marching band experiences and opinions. That respondents elected to use such strong descriptive language when writing about marching band seems to reflect just how controversial the marching band activity is within music education. Further, although it is likely respondents who used strong positive or negative language in their written comments responded similarly on the quantitative portion of the survey,
the additional written comments seem to provide a more clear understanding of the extent that many music educators hold their convictions concerning the marching band experience.

Several respondents included written comments indicating they valued their college marching band experience for reasons not considered as part of this study. Some comments such as: “College marching band offered valuable scholarship resources, which greatly reduced the out-of-pocket expense for tuition, room/board, books, etc.” indicate for some, participating in a college marching band may be rewarding on a financial level. Other comments indicate in some parts of the country, college marching band participation may be helpful when seeking employment (i.e., “My marching band and drumline experience also opened up a wide field of employment for me, and when I entered the education field as a licensed band teacher, I already had 4 years or [sic] experience directing high school marching bands and drumlines in the area.”). Again, these findings seem to reflect the multidimensional nature of the marching band experience and reinforce the assertion that students who participate in college marching band take advantage of the opportunities and experiences available to them in a somewhat a la carte fashion, crafting an experience that is uniquely valuable to them. It seems important that college marching band directors should strive to provide students with as diverse an experience as possible.

Limitations

Although respondents were selected at random from throughout the United States and likely represent a diversity of musical, educational, and cultural backgrounds, the relatively low response rate achieved for this study should be considered before making generalizations based upon these findings. The present study provides only a limited demographic analysis of college marching bands. Marching band participation was used only as a demographic grouping for this study and was thus not investigated in-depth. Likewise, a full determination of the extent to which marching band participation may be a required component of undergraduate music education curricula nationwide was also beyond the scope of this study. It should be noted this study was perceptual in nature. No attempt was made to determine the extent to which respondents are effective music teachers or the degree to which they display any of the teaching skills investigated in this investigation during the course of their instruction.
For the purpose of this study, the college marching band experience was considered as a whole. However, “college marching band” is not a monolithic entity. College marching bands may be found in a variety of sizes, perform in a variety of styles, and may be guided by a variety of philosophies. It is likely that the “college marching band experience” varies widely from band to band. Therefore, it should be noted this study made no attempt to control for a specific type of college marching band. No attempt was made to control for the age of the respondent. It is likely respondents who participated in a college marching band more recently had a different overall experience than those who participated a number of years ago.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

No previous research investigating the influence participating in a college marching band may play in the development of effective music teaching skills is known to exist in the music education research. Results of the present study suggest marching band participation may be a valuable component in the undergraduate music education curriculum, as well as an effective way to develop various music teaching skills. Further research seems warranted. Suggestions for future research may include:

1. A study which compares the perceptions of undergraduate music education majors and in-service band directors as to the influence participating in a college marching band may play in the development of effective music teaching skills.

2. An in-depth study which investigates the extent to which college marching band is a curricular requirement for undergraduate music education majors.

3. A study investigating specific musical skills, instructional behaviors, and personal characteristics undergraduate music education majors may develop through participation in other college performing ensembles.

4. Does the perceived value of college marching band participation increase as a result of continued participation, or do those who chose to participate on a continual basis do so because they value the marching band experience highly a priori.

5. Does the perceived value of the college marching band experience change based upon the size of the band?
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Survey Invitation and Informed Consent Letter

Dear Colleague,

I am a doctoral student in the College of Music at Florida State University working with Dr. Steven Kelly, and am conducting a research study concerning the effects of college marching band participation upon the development of effective teaching skills.

I am requesting your participation, which will include completing a short questionnaire that will address the following:

- Demographic information including gender, the approximate enrollment of the undergraduate institution you attended, the type of undergraduate institution you attended, whether or not you participated in college marching band, the size of your college marching band, the number of years you participated in college marching band, and current teaching position.
- Your feelings concerning various aspects of your college marching band experience.

There is no compensation for participating in this study. Your participation is strictly voluntary and there are no known risks or direct benefits to you if you choose to do so. There will be no penalty for choosing not to participate. Completion of the questionnaire will take approximately 10 minutes. You may withdraw from the study at any time. The results of this research may be printed, but your name or other personal information will not be known. Records of this study will be kept private and confidential to the extent permitted by law. The completed surveys will be stored securely and only the researcher will have access to the records.

If you have any questions concerning this research study, please contact me via email: *****@my.fsu.edu, or phone: ***-***-****. Additionally, you may also contact the Florida State University Institutional Review Board at 2010 Levy Avenue, Suite 276-C, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2742, or 850-644-7900, by email at humansubjects@magnet.fsu.edu, or phone at 850-644-7900. You may also contact my advisor, Dr. Steven Kelly, at: SKelly@admin.fsu.edu, or 850-644-4069.

To complete the study please click on the following link:

https://fsu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_efHaQOMfbgebRwU

Return of the completed questionnaire will be considered your consent to participate. Thank you in advance for your time participation.

Sincerely,

Erik W. Richards
Doctoral Candidate
College of Music
The Florida State University
Dear Colleague,

I would like to thank those of you who have already completed the Effective Music Teaching survey. If you have not yet done so, please consider this a friendly reminder that I would value your input. Completing the survey will take less than 5 minutes. Results of this study may provide a deeper understanding of the ways in which effective music teaching behaviors are developed at the undergraduate level.

To participate, please follow this link to the survey:

https://fsu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsSurveyEngine/?SID=SV_efHaQOMfbGEbRwU&_=1

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:

https://fsu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_efHaQOMfbGEbRwU

The survey will remain open until April 27, 2012.

Thank you again for your time and participation!

Sincerely,

Erik Richards

Doctoral Student
College of Music
Florida State University
Dear Colleague,

Thank you again to those who have completed the Effective Music Teaching survey. I know how busy you are, so please know how much I appreciate your time and assistance! If you have not yet completed the survey, please consider doing so as I would value your input. Completing the survey will take less than 5 minutes of your time.

To participate, please follow this link to the survey:

https://fsu.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsSurveyEngine/?SID=SV_efHaQOMfbGEbRwU&_=1

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:

https://fsu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_efHaQOMfbGEbRwU

The survey will remain open until April 27, 2012.

Thank you again for your time and participation!

Sincerely,

Erik Richards

Doctoral Student
College of Music
Florida State University
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Survey Tool
Development of Effective Teaching Skills Survey

1. As an undergraduate, did you participate in college marching band?
   - Yes
   - No

2. While you were an undergraduate, approximately how many students participated in your college marching band?
   - Fewer than 100
   - 100 - 199
   - 200-299
   - 300-399
   - 400 or more

3. Did you hold a leadership role in your college marching band?
   - Yes
   - No

4. How many years did you participate in your college marching band?
   - 1 year
   - 2 years
   - 3 years
   - 4 or more years

5. Was participation in marching band a required part of your undergraduate music education curriculum?
   - Yes
   - No
6. Please rate the following statement: Marching band was a valuable part of my undergraduate music education curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not valuable at all</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Neutral or no opinion</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Very Valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please describe the institution from which you earned your undergraduate degree

- Public
- Private

8. What was the approximate enrollment of the institution from which you earned your undergraduate degree?

- Less than 500 students
- 500-1,999 students
- 2,000-4,999 students
- 5,000 - 9,999 students
- 10,000 - 14,999 students
- 15,000 - 19,999 students
- 20,000 - 29,999 students
- More than 30,000 students

9. Currently, what is your primary teaching assignment?

- High School
- Middle School
- Both

10. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
11. To what extent do you feel each of the following characteristics were developed as a result of your participation in college marching band?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>A great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain high musical standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual musicianship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency on a secondary instrument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate conducting gestures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight reading skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General musical knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear training/error detection skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to effectively interpret a musical score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. To what extent do you feel each of the following characteristics were developed as a result of your participation in college marching band?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>A great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to motivate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain student behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Maintain an effective rehearsal pace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve students in the learning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize time-on-task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to present information clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. To what extent do you feel each of the following characteristics were developed as a result of your participation in college marching band?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership skills</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>A great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to manage stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work towards a goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. To what extent do you consider each item listed below to be a valuable aspect of the college marching band experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>A great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in personal motivation levels</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased personal discipline</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sense of belonging</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to perform for a large audience</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased sense of pride or self-worth</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of instrumental technique</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to play a variety of musical styles</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to travel</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to attend athletic events</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to have an enjoyable musical experience</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to have an enjoyable social experience</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to develop musical skills</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Do you wish to share any additional information which may be pertinent to this study?
APPENDIX D

Coded Qualitative Responses
My experience may be a bit different than that of many of your responders, as I was a member of the Yale Precision Marching Band, which is an undisciplined scatter band with a light rehearsal schedule.

No

In college I was a Piano/Vocal major. All of my friends including my then boyfriend were in the band. My motivation for getting in the band was strictly social. As a Piano major I played Bass Drum, Cymbals and Bells. I did enjoy the experience.

I was Drum Major of my college marching band for 4 years. I don't believe you can be an affective marching band director if you don't participate in College Marching band... or drum corps.

I feel the marching band was a valuable part of my music education, however it is not the only part. It takes a full, well rounded curriculum to truly create a future teacher.

I consider my marching band experience in college to be one of the most influential experiences on my whole life. My biggest regret of college is not doing it all four years.

Undergrad in a small marching band. Graduate participation in a large marching band. Surprisingly similar experiences. Though more overall participation from the community and students at the larger school

No, Good luck with the study.

While Marching Band does not push the envelope of musical technique very often, it does solidify social interactions within the group. It also provides an opportunity for people to see the band that will NEVER attend a concert, thus hopefully giving them a positive feeling about the music department based upon the bands involvement and performance at the athletic events.

I really enjoyed my college marching band experience. I attended a large university and because of the week of camp before classes actually started, I was able to feel like there were many people that I already knew and felt a connection to the university. This helped put me at ease with the transition to college and because we attended so many campus events and functions for performances I felt very in-tune to what was happening campus wide. I made many life-long friends that I still keep in touch with, including that I met my husband in marching band. We will be celebrating our 14th anniversary this summer. :)
Marching band is important to all music educators today. At very small schools, a vocal teacher could also be the band teacher! I feel sorry for those students who just have vocal training and no marching band experience and then go out and get jobs starting out at smaller schools. ALL music majors should take marching band! ALL music majors should sing in a choir!

I think this is an interesting topic, and have no idea if you are comparing the two, but I would be curious as to what the difference is between music / music ed majors and non-music majors on similar questions. I feel the majority of my musical training and growth in college was in my private lessons, chamber ensembles, and advanced concert groups. Marching / Basketball Band were more just for fun for me.

My information probably isn't applicable for today. I was in marching band in 1969/1970. I think marching bands are VERY different today.

College marching band has some valuable aspects, musicality was not a focus of the ensemble in which I participated which was disappointing as a music education major. Although it was a requirement of the music education degree the majority of the ensemble was non-majors and it had a detrimental effect on the ensemble as a whole as far as musicianship and possible outcomes of the ensemble.

No...but thank you

Marching Band's greatest contribution to undergraduate education is the hard work towards a common goal, the development of a shared vision and teamwork, and like athletics, the dedication to an ideal.

The only way I learned to march corps style was by being in college marching band, which is what I teach currently at my school. I had come from a show band, which was very different from the school that hired me, which was a competition band school. That college now has done away with marching band for instrumental majors, and I feel it is a detriment. They only provide a pep band for football games.

The quality of my college marching band was a decrease from my high school marching band. This was a major factor that resulted in me only participating in the college marching band for 1 year.

I did not see the value of my college marching band experience until long after it was over. At the time, all I could see was a requirement to check off a list and an organization that was wildly different from my competitive high school experience. Looking back, I regret not making an effort to find the value your survey asks about. I can see it now!
My experience skewed some of the questions because not only were majors required to be in marching band for two years, but our percussion professor made it a required event to perform in the percussion ensemble at our school, which at the time traveled across the country and recorded. So that being said, he would pay attention to who was playing well on the drum line and who had a good attitude throughout the experience so when the ensembles were put together, the best people from the drum line were picked first. So when it came to musicality and reading etc., the percussionists had another pressure on top - besides the fact that the studio re-arranged all of the marching band music. Finally, we were not allowed to read it during a performance, we had to memorize it.

Marching band experience in college is very beneficial to any future music teacher; I highly recommend it.

Memorizing a halftime show's worth of music in one week helped me learn how to practice more efficiently and effectively. Throughout my 5 years in marching band, I slowly learned how I learn best, and what I need to do to truly learn something. This also directly correlated to how I studied for academic classes. I feel like my experience in marching band was more valuable than many of the "music education" classes I took in college, and I feel it should be a requirement for all instrumental music ed majors. My marching band and drumline experience also opened up a wide field of employment for me, and when I entered the education field as a licensed band teacher, I already had 4 years or experience directing high school marching bands and drumlines in the area.

College marching band offered valuable scholarship resources, which greatly reduced the out-of-pocket expense for tuition, room/board, books, etc.

I believe that the subject of marching band and how it is taught should be taken more seriously at most institutions of higher learning. Many times it is looked upon as the "step-child" of the music college when in fact it is a crucial part of most of the future music educator's world if they have any desire to become a high school music educator. The most visible aspect of any high school program to the general public is the marching band and I believe because the attitude that is pervasive at most colleges of marching band being a less serious element within the music school many future educators are left woefully unprepared to utilize an aspect of their program that can generate huge interest and potential growth within their program.

My college marching band experience has been invaluable to me as a professional music educator.

Marching abdn is, unfortunately, not the best place to learn musicianship. It is a good place to learn tenacity and how to perform under great stress. It is also (usually) fun and (sometimes) financially rewarding.
Was part of a big stage band. 8 bones, 8 tenor saxes, 8 altos, 16 trumpets, 8 Besson up bell basses, 8 s10 horns 8 percussion, 2 bari saxes and one piccolo. It was on the up-swing side of the drum and bugle corps style. We had 96 guys, a doll [twirler] and a drum major. Marched on the football field at 180 high step, not the shuffle step. It was listed as a football band under the football program.

I think college and high school bands should spend more time on playing less on marching. Tons of music. Accurate rhythms. Correct keys. All styles.

I also staff with a High School Marching Band along with my regular teaching assignment. Staffing with the High School Marching Band has taught me more about the questions in your survey then participating in College Marching Band. It is my view that college marching bands and high school marching bands serve two completely different purposes. High school, at least in this area, is more like the feeder to the DCI corps and more competitive, while college marching bands are there strictly for the entertainment value of the audience, and for the most part it does not offer a challenge musically or intelectually to the performer because the majority of college audiences just doesn't "get it" when it comes to marching band as a competion/artistic format, in my opinion. I feel college music educations students would gain a greater value staffing, or even observing, for a local high school that participates in competitive marching band activities. Being in marching band in college for me, though not a degree requirement, was a scholarship requirement, had it not been I might have not participated, and I am a very big fan of Marching Bands.

I used to teach middle and high school band and am now teaching elementary general music. There wasn't that category on the questionnaire.

Music ed majors should have to take marching band. It changes over the years and we lose touch if we don't participate.

College marching band had a profound effect on my collegiate experience.

I was not a band member in high school and participated in college marching band as a color guard member for the extra scholarship money but found the experience to be enjoyable.

Experiences with marching band and drum corp allow participants to develop all-important "soft skills" that employers are looking for in individuals, such as flexibility, working within a large organizational structure, personal skills, negotiations, empathy, awareness of others, and pride in self and group.
Having been a member of a Drum and Bugle Corps, college marching band was kind of a joke. Though my college marching band always sounded great and the leadership opportunities were very valuable to my ability to educate students, the rehearsals were generally undisciplined and the marching style antiquated and nonsensical. College band helped me to have patience with undisciplined students and techniques that are frustrating or don't make sense. It taught me that, even as a band director, I can't change everything. You can't always do things in a way that makes sense to you. If you try to change everything at once, you will meet great opposition. Though the marching arts have evolved greatly over the last 75 years, not everyone is on the same page and many are extremely resistant to change.

Spent 6 years in the Kansas State University Pride of Wildcat Marching Band-1 year as an assistant section leader, 2 years as Assistant Drum Major, and 2 years as Head Drum Major. I was given many opportunities to see what really went on "behind the scenes" not afforded to most undergrads. My experiences were a valuable part of musical education, and gave me some of my fondest memories from college.

I think as an undergraduate music education major it was essential for me to be in a marching band to simply watch both directors and graduate assistants teach and instruct in both a large ensemble and sectional setting. When you march in high school you think about yourself in the present. When you march in college you are more aware to what techniques and teaching attributes you would like to emulate from your teachers and instructors.

I attended a private college that did not have a marching ensemble. For me to march as a college student I open enrolled into another college (not private) so while I was attending a private college I was marching for another university. I would say that mostly what I learned from the teaching side of college marching was what I did NOT want to do as a band director. I make sure that in my teachings I stick to my own standards and do not make the same mistakes that my former marching director made.

my college experience was 35 years ago. i would like to see master classes for us oldies to get the new technology and show writing help.

I enjoyed playing in m college marching band and think it serves me well as a teacher today.

I certainly keep in touch with my marching band friends than I do fellow music educators. I also find that marching band is often a goal for my students which is important. They need to see what success looks like.
Boise State did a research project a few years back that showed those who were involved in marching band did not join gangs. Seems like an "oh duh" to those of us who were in marching band but apparently there are those who didn't get the picture.

Jay Bocook was my marching band director. It's hard not to want to be good with him as your director.

Because college marching band was, for me, such a different experience than my high school marching band, I was challenged to view marching band differently. I feel very strongly that not only did my own involvement in college marching band prepare me for my own teaching career in many significant ways, but it also has allowed me to not simply teach as I was taught, but to creatively structure the ensemble environment that best suits my current students needs. Truly, I would not have traded my four years of meaningful experiences in the Bowling Green State University Marching Band for anything. Finally, working with high school marching bands during their band camps as a brass instructor was a great supplement to the collegiate experience...highly recommended for any preservice instrumental music educator!

The purpose of college marching is different than that of competitive marching. However, procedures and techniques can be used that are still applicable in teaching in a school setting. The use of pyware, define technique, and musicality can all be applied that prospective teachers can use. Very little if any of that was used in my experience in college.

Marching Band has become a BOA/DCI NIGHTMARE.......way too much spent on an activity that has NO professional counterpart, NONE! The emphasis on doing 3 tunes for a show is at the height of Stupidity, it's no longer entertaining to the crowd and thus it's been pulled from TV on a collegiate and national level. We have completely lost the focus and manageability of the marching band, I'm frankly ashamed of the state it's in.

Noi

Yes

Survey note: I marked participation as only 2 years in marching band. I transferred after 2 years from a junior college without a marching, to a 4 year school with a marching band. Had I had the opportunity to march for 4 years, I would have. Marching band was a great experience for me.
College marching band in no way prepared me to teach and design marching shows for my high school. High School vs. College are extremely different. If colleges want to actually help prepare teachers they should offer drill writing and music arranging classes instead of requiring students to be in marching band. If a college wants a marching band, they need to give full ride scholarships to students who participate, just like you would to athletes. Marching band is a sport and should be treated as such as as far funding goes. From my perspective, marching band actually took away from my education by eating valuable practice time and studying time. I received two degrees in my undergraduate studies in four years and marching band about killed me, due to all of the rehearsals.

Marching Band was the reason I chose to attend the University of Minnesota. I had followed the U band through my high school years and knew I wanted to be a part of it in college. It was the best experience of my college career.

YBP! (Yea, Big Purple!)

Not at this time.

My involvement in marching band lead directly to my student teaching/ internship position, (which was an exceptional opportunity, giving me outstanding and rare experience) and also lead directly to employment in two separate jobs.

The aspects of marching band are not necessarily musical, but are a major portion of the complete band experience. I work in Illinois, and the knowledge of marching, combined with experience, elevates my credibility as a teacher.

Marching band is a vital part of musical development for school music programs. Our society is driven by free enterprise ideals that push us to be better in whatever we're doing. In our inherently athletic society marching band helps bridge the gap between athletics and art and gives students a chance to experience things they would have never previously experienced had they not been brought into band through the fun of athletic band.

I'm love this topic. I feel that directors who don't have marching band experience are setting themselves up for failure. If you are a school in our area, 1/3 of your year is going to be marching band. Your town and administration will base the success of your program on what they see every Friday night.

I could have used a marching band techniques class but it wasn't required and so I skipped it in order to graduate sooner. FUNDRAISING, to support the program, has been a constant need. Some ideas on this might have been helpful. I don't know if that is pertinent stuff or not...
More than anything, it gave me a reason to memorize music; which is a necessary ability.

Without marching band experience in undergrad you can forget about getting a band director gig in my state. As a flute player, it did nothing for me musically, but the best musicians do not necessarily make the best HS band directors anyway...everything else I learned in marching band helped me there....and I still had the musical skills from concert band and my own personal practice.

Marching band was the single most reason why I decided to become a music educator and performer. I joined the marching band at my college because of its incredible reputation and its amazing opportunities within.

High school marching was fun. College marching ranged from OK to tedious. We were always glad when it was over and we could get into music with significant aesthetic content. There are plenty of social opportunities in college that don't take nearly as much time to get the same limited rewards that marching band provides.

My college was smaller, friendlier, social, and diverse. Opportunities were limited, but good. Several of my professors were inadequate due to being older, tired, stale, and not up on current trends. Competitive level was laid back and motivation levels were low, so in my opinion lacked in pushing me to full potential. In others words, my musical skills only reached as far as I could take them myself. I needed higher levels presented to me and more pressure to excel further.

I would have done more than one year of marching band if the time commitment was not so high, particularly for a music education/performance major in which a great deal of time is spent practicing and rehearsing in other ensembles. However, playing in marching band brings many great experiences and should be a must for HS teachers.

I believe that college marching band is very valuable to the undergraduate student. Many of the developments that survey asks about (leadership, musical skills, etcetera) can be fostered a great deal by this activity. Many of my answers to these questions were not at all, as a result of the semantics of the question language. My high school marching band experience, coming from a BOA finalist band provided me with these personal growth opportunities to such an extent that I do not feel college marching band enhanced them at all. For a student without my background, or a non-competitive marching band background, I believe they can get a great deal from from the college marching band experience.
Marching band at the university level is a critical role in the education process. Those that do not participate are lacking the instruction on how/what to do when they have their own program. It is also in college marching band where individuals from different marching band backgrounds see the differences in style, instruction, etc from school to school.

My marching band years were over 30 years ago but I watch my college children go through Marching Band as they prepare to be Music Teachers and I know how important a strong marching experience is in this day and age.

n/a

Marching is not the pertinent to the small schools many music teacher work with.

As an educator, I feel it very important for music education students to participate in marching band at the college level, and really should be toward the end of their career and not just at the beginning. At the high school level, this is a major part of the exposure of the music department to the community.

My low marks were due to my lack of participation in college marching band, but I feel it can be a valuable experience for those that do. I had military band experience prior to college and so did not participate.

As a band manager, I was given the opportunity to develop important organizational and management skills that were a type of "on the job training" for my music education career. Plus, it was a lot of fun!

My College marching band was not directed or run all that well. I enjoyed college marching band but it was not a step up from what I had in high school. In fact, in my case, my experience in high school marching band is why I became a band director. I learned more about how to teach and how to run a marching band from my high school band director than I did in college.

What one gets out of the collegiate marching band experience musically is completely tied to the faculty member(s) who lead the group. The social aspects of such a group will take place regardless and are not necessarily in step with any quality musical experience. Repertoire, attention to musical detail, and a quality rehearsal technique can cause a tremendous advance in musical skills for the members. Weighing quality literature versus what the alumni will accept is the real balancing act.
I was involved in a large marching band my freshman year of college. The next year I transferred to a more conservatory type school, and they did not have a marching band. Never-the-less, I think marching band has many valuable opportunities to gain social skills, musicianship, physical skills, rhythmic awareness, etc. It's a great opportunity for many students to participate, not just a few.

My participation in a year of marching band was my decision as I attended a conservatory of music where most majors in music were performance majors. I enjoyed the experience and probably should have done so multiple years for what I am currently doing as a teacher. This was impossible with the music education/performance and educational foundation requirements.

I was in marching band to satisfy a scholarship requirement. But I really did enjoy my experience socially. Playing wise, it was not a challenge in anyway but it was great fun. I got out of the band as soon as I qualified for one the wind ensemble. If i wouldn't have had to work while attending college, I would have continued with marching band, but the time demands were huge and I had to quit.
APPENDIX E

List of States and School Districts Included in the Study
## Northeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>District Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Addison Northeast Supervisory Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albany School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alburg School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnard School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barre City School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barre Supervisory Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bellows Falls Union High School District 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bennington Rutland Supervisory Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benson School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Country Supervisory Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rutland City School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wallingford School District, Wardsboro School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waterville School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weathersfield School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wells School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Windsor School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whiting School District, Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whitingham/Wilmington Joint District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Windham Southeast Supervisory Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Windsor Central Supervisory Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodstock School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Allegany County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calvert County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cecil County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fredrick County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montgomery County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somerset County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Mary's County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wicomico County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Barkhamsted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bloomfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Branford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colchester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Columbia
Connecticut Technical High School System
Danbury
East Lyme
Enfield
Greenwich
Lebanon
New Canaan
New Fairfield
New Haven
New London
Newtown
North Canaan
North Haven
Norwich
Old Saybrook
Orange
Preston
Regional School District 05
Regional School District 08
Regional School District 09
Regional School District 15
Regional School District 18
Regional School District 19
Salem
Salisbury
Seymour
Sherman
Simsbury
Southington
Sprague
Stafford
Stonington
Thomaston
Tolland
Trumbull
Union
Voluntown
Wallingford
Waterford
Watertown
West Haven
Westport
### North Central

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>District Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calhoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dekalb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hancock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jo Daviess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Putnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Randolph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saint Clair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wabash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whiteside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohio

Ada Exempted Village School District
Adena Local School District
Alexander Local School District
Alliance City School District
Amanda-Clearcreek Local School District
Arcanum Butler Local School District
Arlington Local School District
Aurora City School District
Austintown Local School District
Avon Lake City School District
Avon Local School District
Ayersville Local School District
Barnesville Exempted Village School District
Batavia Local School District
Bath Local School District
Beachwood City School District
Beaver Local School District
Bedford City School District
Bellaire Local School District
Benton Carroll Salem Local School District
Berea City School District
Bettsville Local School District
Big Walnut Local School District
Bluffton Exempted Village School District
Boardman Local School District
Bradford Exempted Village School District
Bright Local School District
Bristol Local School District
Brooklyn City School District
Brunswick City School District
Buckeye Central Local School District
Buckeye Local School District
Cambridge City School District
Canfield Local School District
Cardington-Lincoln Local School District
Chagrin Falls Exempted Village School District
Champion Local School District
Chardon Local School District
Chillicothe City School District
Cincinnati City School District
Clark-Shawnee Local School District
Cleveland Hts-Univ Hts City School District
Cloverleaf Local School District
Clyde-Green Springs Exempted Village School District
Columbiana Exempted Village School District
Crestline Exempted Village School District
Dalton Local School District
Danbury Local School District
Deer Park Community City School District
Dover City School District
Dublin City School District
Eastern Local School District
Edison Local School District
Elida Local School District
Elmwood Local School District
Euclid City School District
Evergreen Local School District
Fairborn City School District
Fairfield Local School District
Fairlawn Local School District
Fairless Local School District
Fairview Park City School District
Federal Hocking Local School District
Felicity-Franklin Local School District
Field Local School District
Findlay City School District
Firelands Local School District
Fort Frye Local School District
Fort Recovery Local School District
Franklin City School District
Fredericktown Local School District
Galion City School District
Gibsonburg Exempted Village School District
Goshen Local School District
Greeneview Local School District
Hardin-Houston Local School District
Harrison Hills City School District
Heath City School District
Highland Local School District
Hillsboro City School District
Holgate Local School District
Hudson City School District
Indian Hill Exempted Village School District
Jackson Center Local School District
Jackson-Milton Local School District
Jefferson Area Local School District
Jefferson Township Local School District
Johnstown-Monroe Local School District
Kelley's Island Local School District
Kent City School District
Kenton City School District
Lebanon City School District
Leetonia Exempted Village School District
Leipsic Local School District
Lexington Local School District
Liberty Local School District
Licking Heights Local School District
Licking Valley Local School District
Lockland City School District
Lorain City School District
Lordstown Local School District
Loudonville-Perrysville Ex Vil
Lynchburg-Clay Local School District
Madison Local School District
Madison Local School District
Manchester Local School District
Mapleton Local School District
Maplewood Local School District
Margaretta Local School District
Marietta City School District
Martins Ferry City School District
Marysville Exempted Village School District
Massillon City School District
Mathews Local School District
Mayfield City School District
Maysville Local School District
McComb Local School District
Medina City School District
Miami East Local School District
Miami Trace Local School District
Middletown City School District
Milford Exempted Village School District
Miller City-New Cleveland Local School District
Milton-Union Exempted Village School District
Minster Local School District
Mogadore Local School District
Morgan Local School District
Mount Vernon City School District
National Trail Local School District
Sylvania City School District
Toronto City School District
Triad Local School District
Trimble Local School District
Tri-Valley Local School District
Tuslaw Local School District
Twin Valley Community Local School District
Urbana City School District
Valley Local School District
Valley View Local School District
Vinton County Local School District
Walnut Township Local School District
Wauseon Exempted Village School District
Waverly City School District
Weathersfield Local School District
Wellington Exempted Village School District
West Geauga Local School District
West Muskingum Local School District
Western Reserve Local School District
Western Reserve Local School District
Westfall Local School District
Williamsburg Local School District
Wilmington City School District
Woodmore Local School District
Worthington City School District
Wyoming City School District
Xenia Community City School District

Michigan

Adrian Public School District
Aitkin Public School District
Albert Lea Public School District
Alexandria Public School District
Aston School District
Becker Public School District
Benson Public School District
Bertho-Hewitt Public School District
Brainerd Public School District
Breckenridge Public School District
Browerville Public School District
Burnsville Public School District
Byron Public School District
Carlton Public School District
Cedar Mountain School District
Centennial Public School District
Chatfield Public Schools
Chisago Lakes School District
Clarkfield Charter School
Cleveland Public School District
Climax-Shelly Public Schools
Clinton-Graceville-Beardsley
Cologne Academy
Columbia Heights Public School District
Comfrey Public School District
Cook County Public Schools
Crosslake Community Charter School
Dilworth-Glyndon-Felton
Discovery Public School Faribault
Dover-Eyota Public School District
East Central School District
East Metro Integration District
Edina Public School District
Esko Public School District
Fairmont Area School District
Fergus Falls Public School District
G.F.W.
General John Vessey Jr. Leadership
Glacial Hills Elementary
Glencoe-Silver Lake School District
Goodridge Public School District
Granada Huntley-East Chain
Grand Rapids Public School District
Great Expectations
Grygla Public School District
Hancock Public School District
Hayfield Public School District
Hendricks Public School District
Heron Lake-Okabena School District
Hibbing Public School District
Hinckley-Finlayson School District
Hopkins Public School District
Houston Public School District
International Falls School District
Inver Grove Heights Schools
Isle Public School District
Ivanhoe Public School District
Kaleidoscope Charter School
Kasson-Mantorville School District
Kelliher Public School District
Kimball Public School District
Lafayette Public Charter School
Lanesboro Public School District
Leroy-Ostrander Public Schools
Lester Prairie Public School Dist.
Lesueur-Henderson School District
Lewiston-Altura Public School Dist
Lighthouse Academy Of Nations
Little Falls Public School District
Luverne Public School District
Lyle Public School District
Lynd Public School District
M.A.C.C.R.A.Y. School District
Mabel-Canton Public School Dist.
Mahnomen Public School District
Maple River School District
Marshall Public School District
Mcgregor Public School District
Milroy Public School District
Minneota Public School District
Minnesota Online High School
Mn International Middle Charter
Montevideo Public School District
Moorhead Public School District
Mountain Iron-Buhl School District
Murray County Central School Dist
N.W.Suburban Integration District
Nerstrand Charter School
Nett Lake Public School District
Nevis Public School District
New City School
New Heights School, Inc.
New Ulm Public School District
New Visions Charter School
Nicollet Public School District
Norman County West School District
North St Paul-Maplewood School Dist
Nrhg School District
Oklee Public School District
Osakis Public School District
Paideia Academy Charter School
Parkers Prairie Public School Dist.
Pelican Rapids Public School Dist.
Perham-Dent Public School District
Pine City Public School District
Pine Point Public School District
Pipestone Area School District
Plainview-Elgin-Millville
Prior Lake-Savage Area Schools
Proctor Public School District
Red Lake Falls Public School Dist.
Red Rock Central School District
Red Wing Public School District
Ridgeway Community School
River's Edge Academy
Rochester Math And Science Academy
Rochester Stem Academy
Rosemount-Apple Valley-Eagan
Roseville Public School District
Rothsay Public School District
Sauk Rapids-Rice Public Schools
Shakopee Public School District
Sojourner Truth Academy
Southland Public School District
Spectrum High School
St. Clair Public School District
St. Francis Public School District
St. Louis County School District
St. Paul City School
Step Academy Charter School
Stephen-Argyle Central Schools
Stillwater Area Public School Dist
Swanville Public School District
Tracy Area Public School District
Trio Wolf Creek Distance Learning
Truman Public School District
Twin Cities German Immersion Chrtr
Twin Cities International Elem Sch.
United South Central School Dist.
Upsala Public School District
Verndale Public School District
Virginia Public School District
Wabasha-Kellogg Public School Dist.
Wabasso Public School District
Waconia Public School District
Watershed High School  
Wayzata Public School District  
West Central Area  
West Metro Education Program  
Westbrook-Walnut Grove Schools  
Wheaton Area Public School District  
White Bear Lake School District  
Willow River Public School District  
Wrenshall Public School District  
Yellow Medicine East  
Zumbrota-Mazeppa School District  

Northwest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>District Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Aberdeen School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Falls School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boise School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Butte County Joint School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caldwell School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cascade School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Castleford District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challis Joint School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeur d'Alene School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culdesac Joint School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filer School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fremont County Joint School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genesee Joint School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gooding Joint School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grace School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hagerman School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idaho Falls School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lakeland Joint School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lapwai School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewiston Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marsh Valley Joint School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marsing School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain Home School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notus School District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parma School District
Plummer-Worley School District
Pocatello/Chubbuck School District
Post Falls School District
Preston School District
Twin Falls School District
Valley School District
Weiser School District
West Bonner County School District
Wilder School District

Alaska
Bristol Bay Borough School District
Copper River School District
Cordova City School District
Denali Borough School District
Galena City School District
Haines Borough School District
Hoonah City School District
Hydaburg City School District
Iditarod Area School District
Juneau School District
Ketchikan Gateway Borough School District
Lake and Peninsula School District
Nome Public Schools
Pribilof School District
Saint Mary's School District
Sitka Borough School District
Unalaska City School District
Valdez City School District
Wrangell Public School District

Wyoming
Albany County School District #1
Carbon County School District #1
Crook County School District #1
Fremont County School District #14
Fremont County School District #24
Fremont County School District #38
Johnson County School District #1
Laramie County School District #1
Natrona County School District #1
Niobrara County School District #1
Park County School District # 6
Platte County School District #2
Sheridan County School District #1
Sublette County School District #9
Sweetwater County School District #1  
Sweetwater County School District #2  
Teton County School District #1  
Uinta County School District #6  
Weston County School District #1  
Weston County School District #7  

**Southern**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>District Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Louisiana    | Assumption Parish School Board  
               | Avoyelles Parish School Board  
               | Belle Chasse Academy Inc.-Agency  
               | Bossier Parish School Board  
               | Caddo Parish School Board  
               | Calcasieu Parish School Board  
               | Caldwell Parish School Board  
               | Central Community School System  
               | East Carroll Parish School Board  
               | East Feliciana Parish School Board  
               | Jackson Parish School Board  
               | Jefferson Davis Parish School Board  
               | Lafourche Parish Public Schools  
               | Madison Parish School Board  
               | Morehouse Parish School Board  
               | Natchitoches Parish School Board  
               | New Orleans Public School  
               | Rapides Parish School Board  
               | Richland Parish School Board  
               | Saint Landry Parish School Board  
               | Saint Tammany Parish School Board  
               | Tangipahoa Parish School Board  
               | Tensas Parish School Board  
               | Vernon Parish School Board  
               | Washington Parish School Board  
               | West Baton Rouge Parish School Board  
               | West Carroll Parish School Board  
               | West Feliciana Parish School Board  
               | Winn Parish School Board  
| West Virginia | Braxton County Schools  

105
Gilmer County Schools
Grant County Schools
Hardy County Schools
Jefferson County Schools
Marshall County Schools
Mason County Schools
Mercer County Schools
Nicholas County Schools
Ohio County Schools
Pendleton County Schools
Preston County Schools
Randolph County Schools
Ritchie County Schools
Tucker County Schools
Tyler County Schools
Wood County Schools
Wyoming County Schools

Kentucky
Adair County Schools
Anchorage Independent Schools, Anchorage
Anderson County Schools
Ballard County Schools
Barbourville Independent Schools, Barbourville
Bellevue Independent Schools
Berea Independent Schools
Boyd County Public Schools, Ashland
Breckinridge County Schools
Calloway County Schools
Campbellsville Independent Schools
Carlisle County Schools
Carter County Schools
Casey County Schools
Christian County Public Schools
Cloverport Independent Schools
Corbin Independent School District
Covington Independent Public Schools
Cumberland County Schools
Daviess County Public Schools
East Bernstadt Independent School
Edmonson County Schools
Elliott County Schools
Eminence Independent Schools
Fleming County Schools
Franklin County Public Schools
Green County Schools
Hardin County Schools
Harlan County Public Schools
Hart County Schools
Hazard Independent Schools
Henry County Schools
Jackson County Public Schools
Letcher County Public Schools
Mason County Schools
McLean County Schools
Meade County Schools
Menifee County Schools
Monroe County School District
Montgomery County Schools
Monticello Independent School
Nelson County School District
Owen County Schools
Paducah Public Schools
Paris Independent Schools
Pike County Schools
Pikeville Independent Schools
Pulaski County Schools
Russell County Schools
Russell Independent Schools
Russellville Independent Schools
Shelby County Public Schools
Taylor County Schools
Washington County Schools
Wayne County Schools
Webster County Schools

Southwestern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>District Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Advance R-IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albany R-III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altenburg 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alton R-IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arcadia Valley R-II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ash Grove R-IV
Atlanta C-3
B. Banneker Academy
Bakersfield R-IV
Ballard R-II
Bell City R-II
Better Learning Community Academy
Bevier C-4
Blackwater R-II
Blair Oaks R-II
Blue Eye R-V
Bolivar R-I
Bradleyville R-I
Brookfield R-III
Callao C-8
Cameron R-I
Carrollton R-VII
Carthage R-IX
Centerville R-I
Centralia R-VI
Chadwick R-I
City Garden Montessori
Clarksburg C-2
Couch R-I
Crane R-III
Crawford County R-I
Crocker R-II
Dadeville R-II
Dallas County R-I
Davis R-XII
Delta C-7
Delta R-V
Dora R-III
Drexel R-IV
Dunklin R-V
El Dorado Springs R-II
Everton R-III
Excelsior Springs 40
Exeter R-VI
Fairview R-XI
Farmington R-VII
Fayette R-III
Franklin County R-II
Ft. Zumwalt R-II  
Gallatin R-V  
Gasconade County R-I  
Gasconade County R-II  
Glasgow  
Glenwood R-VIII  
Gordon Parks Elem.  
Grain Valley R-V  
Grandview R-II  
Grundy County R-V  
Hale R-I  
Hamilton R-II  
Hardeman R-X  
Hardin-Central C-2  
Hayti R-II  
Hermitage R-IV  
High Point R-III  
Hogan Preparatory Academy  
Hope Leadership Academy  
Humansville R-IV  
Hume R-VIII  
Johnson County R-VII  
Junction Hill C-12  
Kingston 42  
Kirksville R-III  
Knox County R-I  
Laclede County C-5  
Laclede County R-I  
Ladue  
Laredo R-VII  
Lathrop R-II  
Leesville R-IX  
Lewis County C-1  
Liberal R-II  
Lindbergh Schools  
Logan-Rogersville R-VIII  
Louisiana R-II  
Luray 33  
Macon County R-I  
Malden R-I  
Marceline R-V  
Maries County R-I  
Marion C. Early R-V
Marion County R-II
Maysville R-I
McDonald County R-I
Meramec Valley R-III
Mexico 59
Miami R-I
Middle Grove C-1
Miller R-II
Missouri City 56
Monett R-I
Moniteau County R-I
Moniteau County R-V
Monroe City R-I
Montgomery County R-II
Morgan County R-I
Morgan County R-II
Mountain View-Birch Tree R-III
Naylor R-II
New Bloomfield R-III
Niangua R-V
North Callaway County R-I
North Harrison R-III
North Nodaway County R-VI
North Pemiscot County R-I
North Platte County R-I
North St. Francois County R-I
Northwest R-I
Norwood R-I
Odessa R-VII
Oran R-III (100-065)
Orchard Farm R-V
Osage County R-I
Park Hill
Pattonsburg R-II
Pemiscot County R-III
Pemiscot County Special School District
Pettis County R-XII
Phelps County R-III
Pilot Grove C-4
Platte County R-III
Pleasant View R-VI
Portageville
Potosi R-III
Ralls County R-II
Raymore-Peculiar R-II
Reeds Spring R-IV
Rich Hill R-IV
Risco R-II
Ritenour
Riverview Gardens
Rock Port R-II
Rolla 31
Roscoe C-1
Salem R-80
Santa Fe R-X
Scott County Central
Shelby County R-IV
Shell Knob 78
Skyline R-II
South Harrison County R-II
South Iron County R-I
Southland C-9
Spokane R-VII
Spring Bluff R-XV
St. Charles R-VI
St. Clair R-XIII
St. Louis Charter School
Stoutland R-II
Success R-VI
Swedeborg R-III
Tarkio R-I
Thornfield R-I
Trenton R-IX
Troy R-III
Union Star R-II
University Academy
Valley Park
Valley R-VI
Verona R-VII
Walnut Grove R-V
Warrensburg R-VI
Waynesville R-VI
Webb City R-VII
Webster Groves
Willard R-II
Winston R-VI
Woodland R-IV
Worth County R-III
Zalma R-V

New Mexico
Animas Public Schools
Bernalillo Public Schools
Capitan Municipal Schools
Central Consolidated Schools
Chama Valley Schools
Cimarron Public Schools
Clayton Municipal Schools
Cloudcroft Municipal Schools
Corona Public Schools
Deming Public Schools
Des Moines Municipal Schools
Dexter Consolidated Schools
Grants-Cibola County Schools
Hobbs Municipal Schools
Jemez Mountain Public Schools
Jemez Valley Public Schools
Lordsburg Municipal Schools
Los Alamos Public Schools
Loving Municipal Schools
Peñasco Independent Schools
Quemado Independent Schools
Reserve Independent Schools
Roy Municipal Schools
Ruidoso Municipal Schools
Silver Consolidated Schools
Taos Municipal Schools
Truth or Consequences Municipal Schools
Tucumcari Public Schools
Tularosa Municipal Schools
Vaughn Municipal Schools

Kansas
Abilene USD 435
Argonia USD 359
Arkansas City USD 470
Atchison USD 409
Auburn-Washburn USD 437
Baldwin City USD 348
Barber County North USD 254
Baxter Springs USD 508
Belle Plaine USD 357
Blue Valley (Johnson County) USD 229
Blue Valley (Riley County) USD 384
Bluestem USD 205
Chapman USD 473
Cheney USD 268
Cimarron-Ensign USD 102
Circle USD 375
Derby USD 260
Dexter USD 471
Douglass USD 396
Elkhart USD 218
Ell-Saline USD 307
Eudora USD 491
Fairfield USD 310
Fort Larned USD 495
Garden City USD 457
Golden Plains USD 316
Grainfield USD 292
Greeley County USD 200
Greensburg USD 422
Grinnell USD 291
Hamilton USD 390
Hanston USD 228
Hays USD 489
Highland USD 425
Hugoton USD 210
Hutchinson USD 308
Jefferson County North USD 339
Jefferson West USD 340
Kinsley-Offerle USD 347
Labette County USD 506
LaCrosse USD 395
Leroy-Gridley USD 245
Liberal USD 480
Marysville USD 364
McLouth USD 342
Midway USD 433
Mill Creek Valley USD 329
Mission Valley USD 330
Moscow USD 209
Ness City USD 303
Niekerson USD 309
North Jackson USD 335
North Ottawa County USD 239
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Northeast USD 246
Norton USD 211
Oakley USD 274
Olathe USD 233
Onaga USD 322
Osage City USD 420
Otis-Bison USD 403
Ottawa USD 290
Paradise USD 399
Phillipsburg USD 325
Pittsburg USD 250
Pleasanton USD 344
Prairie View USD 362
Pratt USD 382
Pretty Prairie USD 311
Quinter USD 293
Rawlins County USD 105
Renwick USD 267
Riverside USD 114
Rock Creek (Westmoreland) USD 323
Rose Hill USD 394
Rural Vista USD 481
Russell USD 407
Saint Francis Schools USD 297
Santa Fe Trail USD 434
Shawnee Heights USD 450
Shawnee Mission USD 512
Smoky Hill USD 302
Solomon USD 393
Southeast of Saline USD 306
Southern Cloud County USD 334
Southern Lyon County USD 252
Spearville USD 381
Stanton County USD 452
Sublette USD 374
Thunder Ridge USD 110
Triplains USD 275
Troy USD 429
Twin Valley USD 240
Valley Center USD 262
Vermillion USD 380
Victoria USD 432
West Franklin USD 287
## Western

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>District Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Beaver District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Box Elder District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Davis District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duchesne District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garfield District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granite District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juab District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murray District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rich District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salt Lake District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sevier District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wasatch District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weber District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Ash Fork Joint Unified District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benson Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Ridge Unified District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cave Creek Unified District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinle Unified District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Verde School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dysart Unified District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fountain Hills Unified District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fredonia-Moccasin Unified District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gilbert Unified District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Canyon Unified District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humboldt Unified District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian Oasis-Baboquivari Unified District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph City Unified District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingman Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Havasu Unified District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peach Springs Unified District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peoria Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pinon Unified District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red Mesa Unified District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safford Unified District
Sedona-Oak Creek Jusd
Seligman Unified District
Snowflake Unified District
Sunnyside Unified District
Tanque Verde Unified District
Tombstone Unified District
Tucson Unified District
Vail Unified District
Whiteriver Unified District
Wickenburg Unified District
Willcox Unified District

Nevada
Carson City
Churchill
Humboldt
Lander
Storey
White Pine
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