A Case Study of a Summer Music Camp and the Impact of Participation on Perceptions of the College of Music and the Hosting University

Chris Hampton
A CASE STUDY OF A SUMMER MUSIC CAMP AND THE IMPACT OF PARTICIPATION ON PERCEPTIONS OF THE COLLEGE OF MUSIC AND THE HOSTING UNIVERSITY

By

CHRIS HAMPTON

A Dissertation submitted to the Department of Art Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Degree Awarded:
Spring Semester, 2008
The members of the Committee approve the Dissertation of Chris Hampton defended on March 5th, 2008.

Marcia Rosal  
Professor Directing Dissertation

Marc Gertz  
Outside Committee Member

Linda Schrader  
Committee Member

David Gussak  
Committee Member

Approved:

Marcia Rosal, Chair, Art Education

Sally McRorie, Dean, School of Visual Arts, Dance, and Theatre

The Office of Graduate Studies has verified and approved the above named committee members.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables ........................................................................................................ v
List of Figures ....................................................................................................... viii
Abstract ............................................................................................................... ix

1. An Introduction to the Study .......................................................................... 1
   Review of Academic Marketing ................................................................. 1
   Purpose ......................................................................................................... 6
   Justification ................................................................................................. 7
   Research Questions ..................................................................................... 10
   Definitions .................................................................................................. 10
   Overview of the Study ................................................................................ 11

2. Review of Related Literature ....................................................................... 13
   Importance of College Choice ................................................................. 13
   Models of College Choice ......................................................................... 14
   Student Characteristics and College Choice ........................................... 20
   Additional Issues Important to College Choice ....................................... 21
   Summer Programs ....................................................................................... 23
   Location and College Choice ..................................................................... 25
   Athletics and College Choice .................................................................... 25
   Marketing .................................................................................................... 26
   Conclusion .................................................................................................. 27

3. The Design of the Study .............................................................................. 30
   Research Questions ..................................................................................... 30
   Research Design ......................................................................................... 33
   Research Procedures ................................................................................... 34
   The Sample ................................................................................................. 37
   The Instruments .......................................................................................... 37
   Validity ......................................................................................................... 39
   Description of Data Analysis ...................................................................... 40
   Brief Summary of the Study ...................................................................... 43
4. Findings .............................................................................................................. 45
   Biographic and Demographic Analysis.......................................................... 45
   Opinions of the College of Music ................................................................. 57
   Pre Opinions .................................................................................................. 58
   Post Opinions ............................................................................................... 61
   Summary ......................................................................................................... 71
   Focus Group Findings .................................................................................. 72
   Opinions of the College of Music ................................................................. 73
   Opinions of the University ........................................................................... 79
   Additional University Related Focus Group Topics ..................................... 82
   Summary ......................................................................................................... 83
   A Summer on Campus – Brittany and Julian go to Music Camp .................. 85
   Music Camper Profiles ................................................................................ 99
   Brittany ........................................................................................................... 99
   Julian ............................................................................................................. 102
   Summary ......................................................................................................... 105

5. Summary and Conclusions ............................................................................. 108
   Summary of Results for Research Question One ......................................... 108
   Summary of Results for Research Questions Two and Three .................... 109
   Summary of Results for Research Question Four ....................................... 111
   Implications of the Findings ........................................................................ 112
   Participant’s Profile ...................................................................................... 112
   Factors Influencing Perceptions of the College of Music ........................... 116
   Limitations of the Study .............................................................................. 118
   Suggestions for Further Research .............................................................. 120

APPENDICES ........................................................................................................ 123
   A Letter of Informed Consent ..................................................................... 123
   B Initial Focus Group Questions .................................................................. 124
   C Music Camp Pre Survey ......................................................................... 125
   D Music Camp Post Survey ....................................................................... 127
   E Coding Classifications ........................................................................... 129
   F Coded Transcriptions ............................................................................. 135
   G Human Subjects Approval Memorandum ............................................ 172

REFERENCES .................................................................................................... 173

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH ............................................................................... 178
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Relationship of Research Questions to Data and Analysis....... 32
Table 2: Gender Frequency of Participants in Summer Music Camp..... 46
Table 3: Race and Ethnicity Frequency.................................................. 46
Table 4: Age of Music Camp Students................................................... 47
Table 5: Instrument Frequencies............................................................ 48
Table 6: Academic Achievement Frequency........................................ 50
Table 7: Academic Aspiration Frequency............................................. 50
Table 8: Religious Affiliation Frequency .............................................. 51
Table 9: Importance of Financial Aid Frequency .................................. 52
Table 10: Type of High School Frequency ......................................... 53
Table 11: Emphasis on Technology Frequency ..................................... 54
Table 12: Emphasis on Fine Arts Frequency ........................................ 55
Table 13: Distance from FSU Frequency .............................................. 56
Table 14: Concern for Students ............................................................ 58
Table 15: Faculty Accessibility ............................................................... 58
Table 16: Professional Acumen ............................................................. 58
Table 17: Teaching Ability ................................................................. 59
Table 18: Emphasis on Professional Values ........................................ 59
Table 19: Practical Learning Opportunities .......................................... 59
Table 20: Job Placement Program........................................................ 60
Table 21: Library that Meets Student Needs .......................................... 60
Table 22: Excellent Technological Facilities ........................................... 60
Table 23: Student Social Interaction ....................................................... 60
Table 24: Caring and Accessible Staff ................................................... 61
Table 25: International Dimension .......................................................... 61
Table 26: Concern for Students: Mean & Standard Deviation ................. 62
Table 27: Concern for Students $t$ test ................................................ 62
Table 28: Faculty Accessibility: Mean & Standard Deviation ................. 62
Table 29: Faculty Accessibility $t$ test ................................................... 63
Table 30: Professional Acumen: Mean & Standard Deviation ................. 63
Table 31: Professional Acumen: $t$ test ............................................... 63
Table 32: Teaching Ability: Mean & Standard Deviation ....................... 64
Table 33: Teaching Ability: $t$ test ....................................................... 64
Table 34: Student Social Interaction: Mean & Standard Deviation ......... 65
Table 35: Student Social Interaction: $t$ test ......................................... 65
Table 36: Caring and Accessible Staff: Mean & Standard Deviation ...... 65
Table 37: Caring and Accessible Staff: $t$ test ....................................... 66
Table 38: International Dimension: Mean & Standard Deviation .......... 66
Table 39: International Dimension: $t$ test ........................................... 66
Table 40: Emphasis on Professional Values: Mean & Standard Deviation 67
Table 41: Emphasis on Professional Values: $t$ test ............................. 67
Table 42: Practical Learning Opportunities: Mean & Standard Deviation. 68
Table 43: Practical Learning Opportunities: $t$ test ........................................ 68
Table 44: Job Placement Program: Mean & Standard Deviation .............. 69
Table 45: Job Placement Program: $t$ test ................................................... 69
Table 46: Library that Meets Student Needs: Mean & Standard Deviation 70
Table 47: Library that Meets Student Needs: $t$ test .............................. 70
Table 48: Excellent Technological Facilities: Mean & Standard Deviation 71
Table 49: Excellent Technological Facilities: $t$ test .............................. 71
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Chapman College Choice Model ................................. 16
Figure 2: Hanson and Litten College Choice Model ..................... 17
Figure 3: Hossler and Gallagher College Choice Model ............... 18
Figure 4: Gildersleeve College Choice Model ........................... 19
ABSTRACT

This study focuses on a group of students participating in a summer music camp on a large public university's main campus. The study investigates their characteristics and illuminates some of the influences and important factors within their college choice process. Ultimately, the study is intended to increase the knowledge about potential students within the fine arts so that more of the best, brightest and most prepared can be matched with institutions of higher education.

The study began with an observation of the demographic and biographic characteristics within a sample of music campers enrolled in a summer program for high school students at the hosting university. The analysis of this data was used to uncover the type of students interested in pursuing further education in the fine arts. In addition, the study examined student perceptions of the College of Music and the hosting university during and after participation in the program as related to four selected college choice factors identified in the literature on academic marketing. Furthermore, an aim of the research was to observe the importance of college choice factors for these individuals.

The study involved quantitative and qualitative analysis including pre and post-camp surveys and focus groups, a t test along with means and standard deviation were conducted. Four focus groups were conducted with campers to augment the pre and post-survey data. Questions asked in the groups mirrored the survey’s focus on perceptions of the four college choice factors: faculty, facilities, social atmosphere and academics. The focus group results were intended to offer insight into perceptions of College of Music and the hosting university’s qualities, but delve much deeper into the camper’s experience, their feelings, thoughts, and priorities regarding the four college choice factors. A descriptive narrative was created from the transcriptions and two camper profiles were also created to further understanding of the college choice dynamic among fine arts students in the music camp at the hosting university.
CHAPTER ONE
An Introduction to the Study

In its most ideal state, the American university has been described as “a community of scholars and students engaged in the task of seeking truth” Karl Jaspers (as cited in Kirp, 2003). This ideal may not have been achieved often in the past or at present, but most academics would agree that this quote describes the dream that drives their institution. The individuals responsible for striving toward this ideal are the faculty and students. From an administrative perspective, it would make sense to seek out the best and the brightest of both and learn as much as possible about them so that they may be more easily brought into institutions of higher education.

To go about achieving this ideal a university administrator must first focus on one or the other as faculty and students are quite dissimilar. They serve very different roles within an academic institution, and require different recruitment methods. This study focuses a group of students participating in a music camp located on large public university’s main campus. The study investigates their characteristics and the influences on their college choice process during and after the camp. While conducting this study, it was important to consider the influence of the contemporary academic marketplace on the university and college choice decisions made by students in the 21st century. A contemporary philosophical approach to administration in higher education is to think of the university as a market with students as consumers and educated citizens as the product (Kirp, 2003). To understand this dynamic, it is helpful to begin with the history of academic marketing in American higher education.

Review of Academic Marketing

The field of academic marketing emerged as a specialized administrative activity in higher education during the 1960s. As the 1960s progressed, authors such as Alden Thresher (1966) began investigating the utilization of marketing principles from the business world in higher education. During the same decade, the appropriateness of decisions to use for-profit marketing principles in education became a topic of debate. Thresher (1966) wrote, “It is permissible, at least, to query whether what College X thinks is good for it is indeed good for the United States and in the public interest” (p.26). In the early years, the field of for-profit marketing offered admissions personnel convenient, but sometimes inappropriate, values and solutions for increasing college recruitment (Litten, 1980, 1982; Chapman, 1981; Kealy &
Rockel, 1987; Absher & Crawford, 1996; Driscoll & Wicks, 1998). As a result, the beginning of academic marketing was plagued by unsuitable methodologies adapted from the for-profit sector.

In retrospect, it is obvious that organizations in the for-profit industry are different from institutions of higher learning and thus their respective marketing practices should also be different. The purpose of a for-profit business is to sell products or services for a profit where the main purpose of higher education is to offer an intangible commodity of education, or what is known as the “college product” (Litten, 1980; Kirp, 2003). The education of college students has been described as “the assistance of persons during a period of growth to make satisfactory adjustments to their physical and social world by helping them discover and face the issues which these worlds present and by placing at their disposal every available resource of knowledge, standards, and techniques which the experience of the past has deposited” (Emme, 1931, p.7). This enterprise is certainly more complex than a consumable product. Since the college product is far more subtle than most products, marketing principles designed to sell tangible items cannot be completely appropriate for institutions of higher education (Litten, 1980). The marketing of opportunities offered at a specific university to persons interested in pursuing a college education is an activity that requires sensitivity and connoisseurship that is not immediately achievable by transferring for-profit marketing principles to academia. Therefore, it was imperative for administrators in the ’70s and ’80s to create specialized marketing techniques for use in higher education (Litten, 1980).

Although there were advancements in student centered, “consumer driven” approaches to recruitment including trends toward responsibility, accountability, and total quality, the challenge of winning the college admissions game did not end in the 1970s and 1980s. Research since then has broadened the scope and understanding of college choice and the addition of new technologies used by academic marketers has improved efficiency and accelerated communication between colleges and the college bound community (Kinzie, Palmer, Hayek, Hossler, Jacob & Cummings, 2004).

The decade of the 1990s as well as the first few years of the twenty-first century has been marked by numerous factors that separate the past fifteen years from the ’60s, ’70s, and ’80s. First, a population boom of college-bound students has resulted in a new opportunity for colleges and universities. According to Kinzie et al. (2004), there will be a 26% increase in the number of high school graduates between 1996 and 2008. Kinzie et al. (2004) also reported that in
Florida there will be a 51% increase in the number of high school graduates during the same time frame. This means that admissions personnel have a wider range of potential applicants to choose from and can become more selective.

Second, by the end of the 1990s, suburban high schools were sending many as 80% of their students on to college and up to 67% of all graduating high school seniors were applying to college (Abel, 2000). The combination of increases in the overall high school population and the percent of those students trying to get into college have boomed. The recent increases in the applicant pool meant greater numbers of high quality applicants, but increased competition between colleges to recruit the largest number of high academic achievers, also became tougher. Third, the general demand for a college education has increased, and places pressure on colleges and universities to expand to meet those needs.

Colleges rose to this challenge by using new technology in the recruitment process. According to the Enrollment Management Review (1999), by the late 1990s more than 75% of all colleges and universities had an Internet presence. Considerable growth in the utilization of electronic enrollment management tools such as web services and geo-demographic databases became commonplace (Enrollment Management Review, 1999). In addition to new technology, colleges and universities began placing greater emphasis on a technique called “early decision.” Early decision offers students an early admissions decision from a particular institution and is a binding contract between the college and the student that requires enrollment upon acceptance (Hawkings, 2003). Hawkings indicated in 2003, 25% of private colleges offered early decision as well as 10% of public institutions. These tools and tactics have become important strategies to not only manage the size of entering classes, but also secure top recruits.

With increases in the population of the college-bound community the 1990s could have been a new golden era for higher education. Ironically, just as new and larger waves of high school students were applying to college, a policy shift occurred on the federal and state levels which caused significant changes on campuses across the nation. This shift involved a change in the government’s philosophy regarding higher education. Until the early 1990s, federal and state governments operated from the view that higher education was of benefit to society as a whole because it produced an enhanced workforce which was more informed and better equipped to compete in a global economy (Kinzie, et al. (2004). In addition, Kinzie et al. (2004) indicated that by the end of the 1980s a view emerged from federal and state governments that measured
the value of higher education by the earning power of the recipient and no longer upheld the idea that higher education promotes a greater society. The result of this new philosophy was a reduction in fiscal support for higher education and greater emphasis on student loans instead of grants for student aid programs (Kinzie et al, 2004). Since the government reduced funding for institutions of higher education a greater burden was placed on individuals to pay for education.

This burden of paying for higher education was compounded by an increase in cost as the price of higher education rose significantly at public colleges and universities during the same period (Tierney, 1999). In fact, expenditures for student services in higher education increased by 48% between 1975 and 1990 (Tierney, 1999). As Tierney (1999) indicated, these costs reflect institutional attempts to keep pace with the changing needs of the college-going community. Students are demanding more access to majors in computer science, engineering and other expensive academic concentrations, which has forced institutions to offer instruction that costs more to provide (Hauptman, 1990; Tierney, 1999). Potential students in the contemporary college marketplace also expect certain resources such as high quality living facilities, career placement and 24 hour computer labs. If a particular college does not provide these resources, then applicants will pursue educational opportunities elsewhere (Hauptman, 1990; Lydon, 1997; Tierney, 1999).

Ultimately, reduced government support, increased demand from the market, and the increased institutional costs required to meet those market demands have all contributed to the rising stakes of college admissions and increase tuition. To counter these changes, students have become savvy consumers. The college-bound student of today has more academic options and information sources at hand than in the past. Members of the college-bound community are refining academic searches by requesting more information regarding academic programs, majors, and course offerings; the results of which get compared to similar characteristics from competing institutions (Kinzie et al, 2004). No longer is a college selected after considering only one or two sources. Contemporary college applicants peruse information sources including campus viewbooks, direct mail requests, visit multiple campuses and college websites while examining school rankings via the Internet; all earlier than their college bound predecessors a generation ago (Kinzie et al, 2004).

Improved access to information regarding institutions has resulted in the evaluation and analysis of larger quantities of information before making college choice decisions. To meet
these new needs an industry has developed to aid in the college choice decision. More affluent students can now hire a private college counselor to help wade through the fathoms of information that must be considered in order to make the best college decision (McDonough, Korn & Yamasaki, 1997). The price of private college consultation differs according to the amount of time spent as well as the specific needs of the student. Fees for a private college counselor can cost anywhere between $500 and $3,000 depending on the service (Gose, 2000).

Since getting into the right college is a high stakes venture, the need for potential students to have the best information regarding academic institutions has never been as great. Furthermore, public institutions of higher education are increasingly fiscally constrained while competition for the best students continues to grow. The need to market efficiently is imperative.

In this new era of academic marketing a process that incorporates personalized, consumer oriented efforts directly from specific academic departments makes sense. One type of program operated through academic departments at some universities may offer a combination of personalized treatment, specified information, contact with faculty and a virtually unique opportunity to gain first hand experience on the college campus. This program is a summer camp; it allows high school students to take classes in a particular academic department and provides direct contact with professors.

High school summer camps sponsored by academic departments provide first hand experiences for potential students as they attend classes geared to particular academic preferences. Students and families gain valuable information about academic institutions that simply cannot be delivered as effectively by other sources. Camp participants live in college dorms, eat in campus cafeterias, and walk to class just like college students. The summer camp process allows the student to see if they fit in at the university and experience what it would be like if they attended college majoring in the discipline sponsoring the camp.

In addition to providing first hand experiences on campus, the summer camp is more affordable than many private college choice counselors. Summer camps operated through public institutions often cost under $500 to attend for one week and allow participants to make college decisions personally (www.music.fsu.edu, 2007; Gose, 2000).

Another benefit of the camp model, from the institution’s perspective, is that the program can be operated on a for-profit structure. Students pay to attend like any other summer camp and
the tuition can be adjusted to match the production and operation expenses. The camp can exist without need of additional funds from the university and the individual department can showcase its best qualities to highly motivated, high-achieving college bound students. Never before has the need or the opportunity existed for such an easy and accurate transfer of information on a college’s characteristics to the college bound community than through the summer camp process.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to increase the knowledgebase regarding potential students within the fine arts so that more of the best and brightest will be recruited. To this end the study examined characteristics of students participating in a summer camp operated through a music department located on a large public university’s campus, observed the way they perceived the institution and illuminated some of the influences and important factors within their college choice process.

Administrators want to improve the quality and accomplishments of their departments. An important aspect of academic accomplishment is the success of students. According to Karl Jaspers (1946) the success of the university is dependent upon its ability to attract the best people and the qualities of its participants. The more talented and better prepared the participants, in this case the students, the more likely that success is achievable while in the department and later in the field.

Once a fine art department identifies the characteristics of successful students they can identify future students who possess these attributes. Departments can then enroll students who are better prepared for study in the fine arts, more likely to graduate, and ultimately become contributing members of the field.

A case study of the participants enrolled in the music camp, a program intended for high school students interested in pursuing collegiate level study in the fine arts was conducted. Demographic and biographic characteristics of students interested in studying the fine arts were collected. Student perceptions of the university before and after participation in the program were studied. The importance the participants placed on four college choice factors identified in the literature on academic marketing were examined.

This study represents an initial step in gathering descriptive data on students in the fine arts, examining their college choice process, identifying important factors within that process, and finding if these students fit into any of the extant models of college choice published in the
literature. As more is learned about the college choice process of students interested in collegiate study in the fine arts, department administrators may attract more of the best and most prepared potential art students to their schools.

Results of this study inform administrators of fine art departments as to how best to communicate with and recruit the brightest applicants. Potentially, summer camp administrators can develop more effective recruitment programs using the factors that influence college choice among art students. Therefore, the study of potential fine arts student’s characteristics and their college choice process can increase the competitiveness of fine art departments in contemporary institutions of higher education.

Justification

At the turn of the 21st century institutions of higher education must include a departmental focus on student recruitment. The rationale for individualized recruitment involves the larger philosophical movement that has occurred in the last 30 years. The modern idea of the university has declined and has been replaced with the postmodern world. Postmodernism has changed the way higher education operates (Bloland, 1995; Tierney, 2001). In the modern world the university stood as a bastion of objective research and knowledge. Discoveries made during this philosophical period were interpreted as a means to set humanity free, or at least improve the daily lives of citizens (Tierney, 2001). The focus of higher education institutions was inward. Faculty determined the scope, design and evaluation of their studies. Members of the same discipline established standards that determined if particular research projects were meritorious or not (Tierney, 2001).

In the postmodern world, the focus is outward and knowledge is created under different circumstances. Discoveries are generated through individuals and groups based on cultural and ideological positions. There are rarely, if ever, universal truths that can be applied across the board or work in all situations (Tierney, 2001). Since knowledge is produced by people working in groups, then academic institutions, governments, as well as nations all play a role in the creation, distribution, and consumption of knowledge (Bloland, 1995; Tierney, 2001). Due to the involvement of these different players, a much higher level of accountability exists now more so than 30 years ago.

Contemporary knowledge production is a dynamic process that is defined by the various groups or constructs in which it is situated (Bloland, 1995; Tierney, 2001). If knowledge in the
postmodern period is subject to differing perspectives from social and political constructs, all of which examine subject matter through separate lenses, then a departmental micro-focus on college recruitment makes sense. If one applies this logic to college recruitment, members of the same construct can communicate more easily with one another due to their shared ideology. Therefore, a member of the music field, i.e. a music professor, is theoretically more likely to be able to accurately explain to a young musician why he or she should attend a particular institution than a member of another discipline or an administrator from the admissions department of university X.

In addition, the postmodern role of the faculty member is quite different than its modern predecessor. Tierney (2001) and Bloland (1995) explained that a postmodern faculty member is less about existing as a disengaged theorist and more about acting on local, national and international arenas. In contemporary college recruitment, faculty members should be directly involved in the process and in direct contact with potential students.

Gildersleeve (2003) suggested that the ivory tower of the academy erected during the modern era has collapsed and that we are now living within in the postmodern world. According to Gildersleeve contemporary institutions of higher education must react to the needs of society rather than expect society to meet the needs of higher education. Institutions must have a mechanism to communicate to the individual. This mechanism includes a customized approach to delivering the college product rather than expecting individuals to arrive ready to make a purchase. Without knowing the qualities and characteristics of potential art students, or aspects of their college choice process, art department administrators will not communicate effectively and operate at a distinct disadvantage to those that have access to such information.

Kotler (1989) called for a mass customization of markets in the 21st century. In an economy of micro markets, specialization is a key to success on the individual level (Kotler, 1989). In addition, Broekemier and Seshadri (1999) found that significant differences in college choice influences exist between academic majors. Therefore, higher education administrators must find a way to mass customize their approach to marketing the college product to be competitive in the postmodern world. A departmental micro-focus on recruitment may be a step in this direction. Department faculty may be better purveyors of information to potential students to make college choice decisions than representatives from the admissions department. By studying the characteristics and college choice process of potential fine arts students
Department administrators and faculty can become effective communicators and successful recruiters of the best and brightest.

The philosophical issues faced by college administrators in this new era offer another reason for individual departments to improve their student body. Departmentalized recruitment efforts based on postmodern perspectives illuminate student’s unique characteristics that may influence their success in one field versus another. Further, the one-size-fits-all approach commonly offered through general university recruitment efforts may not satisfy the needs of potential students interested in specific academic programs. The first step toward mastering this new market is to study potential students interested in particular fields, learn about their characteristics, and college choice process.

Despite an extensive search for literature on this topic using sources such as Jstor, First Source, Web Luis, Amazon.com, and Google, little to no published research was found that revealed the unique characteristics of art students and the factors influencing their college choice. An absence of literature on undergraduate fine art student characteristics and the college choice process of such students has been exposed. Research needs to be conducted to reveal the unique characteristics of these students. Studies on the student’s college interests and college choice process are also needed. Understanding these factors is critical if departments are to recruit individuals who possess the qualities associated with success at their school and in their field.

The literature that does exist on academic marketing contains a great deal of information on general recruitment and retention that may meet the needs of academic institutions in the aggregate. Individual departments at universities benefit from organization wide, macro recruitment efforts. It is likely, however, that those same departments might benefit to a greater extent if specific efforts were made in conjunction with the larger effort made by the university to attract students who are better prepared to succeed in their field versus another.

The summer camp method can deliver a customized approach to recruitment due to the extended level of contact between faculty and potential students while they are on campus. Participants of these programs have selected additional academic study and are engaged in an investigation of the institution sponsoring the camp. Studying the participants enrolled in camp programs may offer insight into their college choice process. By learning more about the impact of the camp on participant’s, researchers may learn more about influences on college choice that may be specific to potential music students of the hosting university.
Research Questions

The study focused on one overriding question, “How does participant characteristics and participation in the summer camp affect prospective student perceptions about the hosting university and their college choice?” Four related questions were developed to frame data gathering and analysis. The first is “What is the typical profile of a summer camp participant?” Results from this question can be beneficial to answering the overriding question because studies suggest that an individual’s characteristics influence college choice (Litten, 1982; Kealy & Rockel, 1987).

The second question is “How do music campers perceive the institution before attendance in terms of four factors from the literature?” These factors include perceptions of faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere (Kealy & Rockel, 1987). The third is “What changes in perception of the institution in terms of the four factors occur after participation in the camp?” Data was collected through the pre and post camp surveys to answer these questions to illustrate how and to what extent participation in the camp influences perceptions of the institution.

The fourth question was “How do participants view their overall experience in the camp as framed by the four factors: faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere?” Data for this question was collected through focus groups to examine the camp experience and illustrate how participation in the program relates to college choice and perceptions of the institution.

Definitions

Academic Marketing: The methodology that permits college administrators in any institution to consider the mission, the college product, recruitment and retention and how well the university characteristics relate to the current target market.

College Product: The results of combined student learning and social participation within the physical characteristics of the university and the capabilities of the faculty over an extended period of time.

College Recruitment: Any activity that promotes the attraction of qualified, prepared students often involving the exposure of prospective students to information provided by the university or college pertaining to enrollment in the specific institution of higher learning.

Retention: Retention is the reduction of student drop out or transfer through administrative efforts and services provided by the university.
College Choice Predictors: The qualities of universities that influence perceptions of college choice.

College Choice: A decision made by a potential student that results in choosing one particular institution versus another.

Target Market: The type of student who will most likely persist, become academically successful, and graduate from an individual college or university.

Student Typology: The demographic and biographic characteristics of any particular group of students.

Persistent Student: The persistent student has all of the desired characteristics important to academic success and graduation at a particular university.

Summer Camp: The summer camp is an organization operated for the purpose of marketing the institution to the desired target market.

Campers: The high school students who participate in the music camp.

Overview of the Study

The study is intended to increase the knowledgebase regarding potential students within the fine arts so that more of the best, brightest and most prepared can be matched with institutions of higher education. An intention of this research was to study characteristics of students participating in a summer camp operated through a large public university, observe the way they perceive the institution and illuminate some of the influences and important factors within their college choice process.

The study began with an observation of the demographic and biographic characteristics within a sample of music campers enrolled in a summer program for high school students at the hosting university. The analysis of this data was used to uncover the type of students interested in pursuing further education in the fine arts. In addition, the study examined student perceptions of the institution before and after participation in the program as related to four selected college choice factors identified in the literature on academic marketing. Furthermore, an aim of the research was to observe the importance of college choice factors for these individuals.

The study involved quantitative and qualitative analysis including a comparison of independent samples from a pre and post camp surveys and focus group data analyzed using the Constant Comparative method. First, analysis of demographic and biographic data from the Pre-
Camp Survey was conducted to identify student characteristics in the music camps at the hosting university. Second, a comparison of the Pre and Post-Camp Survey data containing participant’s opinions from independent samples was conducted to determine if perceptions of the hosting university changed after participation in the camp. These surveys asked questions pertaining to programmatic components of the institution: faculty, facilities, social atmosphere and academics. The surveys involved a Likert Scale to gauge the range of positive, negative and neutral “unsure” responses. A statistician was employed to create frequency tables for each question and operate \( t \) test procedures. Means were calculated for the appropriate response groups and tested for statistically significant differences using this procedure.

Third, four focus groups were conducted with campers to augment the Pre and Post-Camp Survey data. Questions asked in the groups mirrored the survey’s focus on perceptions of the four college choice factors: faculty, facilities, social atmosphere and academics. Similar to the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys, the focus group results were intended to offer insight into perceptions of hosting university’s qualities, but delve much deeper into the camper’s experience, their feelings, thoughts, and priorities regarding the four college choice factors. A descriptive narrative was created from the transcriptions of the focus groups and 2 composite profiles were also created to further understanding of the college choice dynamic among fine arts students in the hosting university’s music camp.

In order to frame the summer camp experience, camper’s perceptions, and the result of their characteristics on the college choice process, it was necessary to understand the background of academic marketing. A review of some of the competing philosophies regarding college choice and the models of the college choice process was conducted. In the next chapter, these philosophies and models are discussed. A brief introduction to postmodern marketing philosophies and how they relate to academic marketing on the departmental level will be presented.
CHAPTER TWO
Review of the Related Literature

The review of the literature presents research, studies, theories, and other thoughts pertinent to academic marketing and with a specific focus on college choice in higher education. More specifically, the importance of understanding academic marketing and college choice within the spectrum of higher education will be discussed. Three prominent models of college choice will be explained with the addition of one newer model that has been designed within a postmodern philosophical framework. In addition, this chapter explores factors that affect college choice, including those that can be influenced from the departmental level. Issues related to the recruitment efforts employed by colleges to attract the best new students will also be discussed as well as the information sources commonly used by students to gain information about universities. Finally, this chapter discusses the benefits of employing academic marketing strategies within individual departments and focuses on what is absent within the existing knowledgebase regarding college choice of potential fine art students at the hosting university on this level.

Importance of College Choice

The study of college choice is important to college faculty and administrators for several reasons. These reasons range from the desire to increase enrollment and retain students, to the academic preparedness of applicants and to the impact of federal and state public policy issues on financial aid and access to post secondary education. Enrollment of students is as vital for a university as oxygen is to the survival of the body. Hossler, Schmit, and Vesper (1999) found that in public and private universities, the enrollment of students can account for 30 to 90 percent of total revenue. Moreover, the personal characteristics of enrolled students are thought to define many important attributes of individual campuses and heighten an institution’s reputation (Litten, 1980; Hossler et al, 1999; Kinzie et al, 2004).

In addition, the understanding and employment of quality marketing strategies in higher education is linked to student persistence, a key factor in maintaining graduation rates. Hossler, Braxton, and Coopersmith (1989) suggested that students who possess a greater understanding of the qualities intrinsic to the colleges to which they apply are more likely to attend an institution that meets their needs and desires. By becoming better informed consumers, students are more
likely to choose an institution where they fit in, thus increasing the chances they will persist and graduate.

Finally, many public institutions raise tuition to counteract the decline in state support. The result is an increase in institution-based, no-need scholarships or financial aid to maintain enrollment of the most talented or less privileged students. By expanding their knowledge of college choice, administrators are able to make better decisions regarding targeting the most qualified applicants or those who have the greatest need and employ scarce financial resources more effectively (Hossler et al., 1999). Clearly, a deeper understanding of student’s college choice decisions is essential to successful recruitment and enrollment at contemporary universities. The management of these critical functions can only fuel the strength of an academic institution. Leaders within such organizations naturally wish to improve their standings among others and possessing a greater understanding of the college choice process can deliver the desired results.

*Models of College Choice*

The study of influences on college choice was initially conducted in the 1970s and 1980s by researchers such as Miller (1976), Peters (1977), Hanson and Litten (1982), Chapman (1984), Kotler and Fox (1985), Hossler and Gallagher (1987) and numerous others; however a recent addition to the knowledge base has been offered by Gildersleeve (2003). Gildersleeve’s contribution is of particular interest due to an insertion of postmodern implications on previous models of college choice. This study utilizes Gildersleeve’s new model that incorporates contemporary philosophy in a description of the college choice process.

Most models of college choice fall into one of two categories. The first category is the econometric model, which deals with the influences of financial matters on the college choice process (Hossler et al., 1989). The second category is the sociological model, which focuses on influences pertaining to student characteristics such as socio-economic status (SES), parental involvement and educational aspirations (Hossler et al., 1989). Both types of college choice models contain separate stages that students theoretically advance through in order to arrive at a decision to attend one particular institution over all others.

The decision making process described in econometric models is based on information related to the price of tuition, parental income and the availability of scholarships and financial aid. One such example is the Kotler and Fox model. Kotler and Fox (1985), determined a four
stage process. First, the student makes the decision to investigate certain universities, gathers information in an orderly fashion and then evaluates and eliminates particular institutions to develop a final set of choices finally choosing from those options. In order to move from one stage to the next the student weighs the cost and benefit of each decision according to monetary impact. Hossler et al. (1999) refer to it as a discrete process of evaluation and decision, typical of other econometric models because it focuses on the fiscal results of each decision. Proponents of these models assume that students’ decision making is an entirely rational process and that they have all of the information required to make such decisions. Considering the complexity of the teenage experience, the bombardment of conflicting information sources intrinsic to college choice and the countless postsecondary institutional characteristics to contemplate, the econometric model offers too simplistic of an explanation to satisfy the needs of those interested in understanding college decision making.

The sociological models include those created by Chapman, Hanson, and Litten as well as Hossler and Gallagher. Chapman’s (1984) model of college choice centers on two primary factors including student characteristics and external influences. Please see the Hossler et al, (1999) adaptation of the Chapman model in Figure 1.
Chapman suggested a five-stage process: presearch, search, application, choice and finally enrollment. The model implies that student characteristics such as socio-economic status (SES), aptitude, aspiration, academic performance and external influences (significant persons, college characteristics and recruitment efforts from particular institutions) all frame the choice process. Chapman’s (1984) model incorporated some of the econometric criteria, but suggests that the choice process is far more dynamic than the Kotler and Fox model.

Hanson and Litten (1982) proposed another five-stage process. The primary difference from Chapman (1984) is that Hanson and Litten consider college aspiration as the first stage in college choice followed by searching, gathering information, sending applications and, eventually, enrolling (Hossler et al, 1999). In addition, Hanson and Litten developed a far more
complex model than did Chapman, which considers a multitude of influences such as student characteristics, high school characteristics, personal attributes, environment and the possibility of financial aid all within the Aspiration Stage. Furthermore, Hanson and Litten indicate that financial matters interact with other stimuli rather than dominate college choice. Please see an adaptation of Hossler, Schmit, and Vesper’s (1999) adaptation of the Hanson and Litten (1982) model in

*Figure 2.*

![Figure 2. Adaptation of Hanson and Litten’s college choice model.](image)

In 1987, Hossler and Gallagher produced a more refined model of college choice that is becoming widely accepted as the best explanation of the process. In fact, Gildersleeve (2003) indicated that more than 120 subsequent studies have sited the article placing it at the pinnacle of research on this topic. Hossler and Gallagher simplify the process by framing it with three stages. The stages start with Predisposition, move to Search and finish with Choice.
Predisposition is similar to College Aspiration and Presearch from the previous models but emphasis is placed on the decision, not the intention, of going to college. The Search stage is characterized by efforts from the student to gain information regarding specific institutions although there is more of a focus on interaction between students and institutions than in previous models. Hossler et al. (1999) suggested that Hossler and Gallagher assumed this was the most important stage to those interested in recruiting because once in the Search Stage the student is more receptive to recruitment efforts from universities. The Choice Stage is marked by application decisions and assumes that students will only apply to schools they have previously selected via their Search Stage. According to Hossler and Gallagher (1987) students compare academic and social qualities of each institution and base their decision on the best match with their individual needs and desires. Please see the Hossler et al. (1999) adaptation of the Hossler and Gallagher (1987) model in Figure 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Dimensions</th>
<th>Influential Factors</th>
<th>Student Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Factors</td>
<td>College and University Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Predisposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td>College Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant Others</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Activities</td>
<td>Other Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Preliminary College Values</td>
<td>School Search Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Search Activities</td>
<td>Choice Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choice Group</td>
<td>School Recruitment Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3.* Adaptation of Hossler & Gallagher Three-phase model, 1987

In a more resent study, Gildersleeve (2003) created a new model of college choice which considers the influence the postmodern world may have on the college choice process as
conceptualized during the 1980s. Primarily, Gildersleeve’s model suggested that Hossler and Gallagher’s three stage process is limited by a linear framework suggesting all students move from one part to the next never to return, a design that does not sit well with postmodernist’s cyclic view of the world. Gildersleeve (2003) suggested that the college choice decision process is different for different demographic groups and is a more socially and organizationally dynamic experience. Gildersleeve (2003) redesigned the Hossler and Gallagher (1987) model to represent a choice process that is highly interactive, overlapping and acknowledges how renegotiation and reorganization of the stages must occur for members of different cultural groups and institutions. Gildersleeve (2003) explained that the stages can move in multiple directions simultaneously and outcomes can appear differently for different students, populations and the types of colleges and universities within the spectrum of contemporary higher education. See below for an adaptation of Gildersleeve’s (2003) model in Figure 4.

![Figure 4. Adaptation of the Gildersleeve college choice model.](image-url)

A particularly interesting aspect of Gildersleeve’s model is that due to its cyclic perspective it offers faculty and administrators a flexible framework which can be tailored to
specific inquiries regarding college choice in a localized context. This approach seems to be more akin to the market specialization that Kotler (1989) called for to be effective on the individual level. As Gildersleeve (2003) explained “It does not ask for inquiry to fit into the framework,” rather, the framework flexes to fit the inquiry (p.18). This conceptualization of the college choice process is useful for understanding departmental recruitment efforts because it recognizes that potential students interested in specific academic fields may possess characteristics unique to members of those fields, which as a result make them unique within the general applicant pool. A departmental recruitment effort, such as a summer camp, that specialized in a specific discipline could speak to those unique student characteristics. Therefore, a study of participants in such a program may yield new information regarding the uniqueness of those characteristics within the specific field.

**Student Characteristics and College Choice**

At the same time researchers were creating models that described the components of college choice, others were studying how the personal characteristics of students impacted the way they moved through the decision process. According to Miller (1976); and Peters (1977) socio-economic status (SES) is one of the characteristics with the greatest impact on the college choice process. These authors found that SES has a cumulative influence on college planning that starts as early as preschool and continues through the end of high school. In addition, Litten (1982) found that student ability also plays a dominant role in the process of college choice decisions. His research suggests that the greater student’s academic ability, the earlier the student engages in a formal choice process. Furthermore, Manski and Wise (1983) indicate that though SES is a dominate factor influencing college choice, a student’s academic ability has a larger impact on the process than SES. Based on this information, it is possible that high achieving students in the fine arts plan for college at an earlier age. They are acting within what Hossler and Gallagher (1987) refer to as the Predisposition phase well before even entering high school.

Another aspect of the college choice process for high ability students is sophistication. According to Ihlanfeldt (1980) and Litten (1982), higher achieving students organize more complex searches for the best institution. Moreover, students not possessing this characteristic conduct more narrow, less geographically wide college searches. If it was found that many of the students participating in this study possess high academic abilities and that they traveled
great distances to attend the music camp at the hosting university, then it is likely the camper’s
college choice process is highly sophisticated. According to Litten (1982), another aspect of
high ability students is that they primarily consider the qualities of academic programs when
selecting one university over another, adding to the sophistication of their college choice process.

In addition, students that possess a higher SES and academic achievement move through
the choice process more proficiently than others. Litten (1982) found that students from lower
SES backgrounds and students from lesser educated families move through the college choice
process less efficiently than their higher achieving, higher SES counterparts. Litten (1982) also
found that Black students are more thorough in their decision process than others. Because they
consider more information sources, they progress through the process more slowly. In the same
study, Litten (1982) also examined the impact of gender on the college choice process and found
that some differences exist. Litten (1982) suggested that women move through the process more
quickly than men, although he found men to be more thorough than women. Based on this
information, one may suggest that high achieving, non-Black, female students, possessing higher
SES move through the college choice process more efficiently and with the greatest level of
sophistication than any other group.

Additional Issues Important to College Choice

Beyond the impact of personal characteristics on movement through popular models of
college choice, several other issues within the literature are helpful to this study. One such issue
is the timing of institutional recruitment efforts within the choice process. Chapman (1984)
explained that the Search Stage is the best time for colleges to begin courting potential students
because it is at this time that they are most active in conducting their own inquiries and would
theoretically be more amiable to receiving unsolicited information. Hossler et al. (1999)
suggested that high school sophomores start developing consideration sets of schools and can
name specific characteristics regarding those institutions. However, they also suggest that many
sophomores are not yet interested in highly specific information about those same schools and
students in their sophomore year were more likely to frequently add or remove schools from
their choice set (Hossler et al, 1999). Kinzie et al. (2004) indicated that students generally
consider the largest number of schools during their junior year while seniors narrow their
searches and become more certain of institutional characteristics that are important to them.
Taking these facts into consideration, researchers interested in studying departmental recruitment
programs such as summer camps may want to focus on participants during the summers between their sophomore and junior years as well as during the summers between their junior and senior years if possible. Observing potential students who are too young and are not ready to make serious college choice decisions may not be the best use of limited resources.

Another important issue in college choice that is a topic for consideration in this study is the information sources used by students to develop their decisions and the influences on those decisions. The literature listed numerous information sources including opinions of friends and parents, university publications, conversations with faculty and campus visits, and advice from teachers and guidance councilors (Chapman, 1981; Hanson and Litten, 1982; Hossler et al, 1989). Departmental recruitment efforts such as summer camps can offer some types of information used in the total decision process. More importantly, the summer camp process can offer the most exact information because it not only comes straight from the source but involves the opportunity for students to form their own perceptions of the institution while on campus in realistic situations that mirror college life. All of the other information sources involve the opinions of others in one way or another. The beauty of the summer camp process is that it allows the students to make the decision by themselves based on their own needs and desires with little interference from others. Therefore, a study of participants enrolled in one of these programs should theoretically offer outstanding insight within the choice process as it is ongoing and heightened during the camp experience.

The research in academic marketing indicates that college choice is also influenced by numerous other factors. The literature indicates that quality marketing and recruitment efforts are the product of honesty and facilitating the ability of the individual to make their own decisions free of salesmanship (Miller and Eddy, 1983; Losher and Miller, 1983; Wojtas, 1991; Mackey, 1994; Hoffman, 1997). The research conducted by Hanson and Litten (1982), Kealy and Rockel (1987) and Hossler et al, (1989) focused on the topic and delivers evidence in support of variables that affect perceptions of college quality. These qualities refer to a multitude of aspects such as academic quality, social atmosphere, campus location, and athletic competitiveness (Kealy and Rockel, 1987; Hossler et al, 1989). Although authors, especially Hanson and Litten (1982), suggested that there are many other factors that influence college choice, the variables of perceptions of academic quality and perceptions of social atmosphere are more controllable by universities especially efforts on the departmental level and therefore will
be a focus of this study. Other influences on college choice such as those mentioned in the econometric models like price, financial aid and family income are not controllable by faculty or administrators in academic departments. Although those factors may play significant roles in the overall choice process, they are not stimulated by the camp experience and consequently will not be a focus of this study. Furthermore, some aspects of the sociological models such as the SES of the student’s family and parent’s opinions of the institution are less controllable on the departmental level and therefore will also play a subdued role in this research.

Summer Programs

The department can influence perceptions of academic quality and social atmosphere through a summer camp since stimulation of these two factors is a result of spending time on campus (Kealy and Rockel, 1987). A study conducted on determining college choice by Hesel (2004), found that visiting campus was the single most influential source of information student’s used to determine college choice. Therefore, a study of a recruitment effort that primarily focused on the campus visit may be the most effective in eliciting data regarding the choice process. According to Kealy and Rockel (1987), the two most influential factors while on campus are meeting and conversing with university faculty and current students. Other influential factors include conversing with alumni, the overall appearance of campus and seeing the university facilities but the authors communicate that these are only marginally influential in comparison to time spent with the current faculty and around current students (Hesel, 2004; Kealy and Rockel, 1987). Neither Hesel (2004) nor Kealy and Rockel (1987) attempted to estimate or provide evidence of the amount of time that would be necessary to for a recruit to develop a substantial perception of academic quality. However, Hesel, (2004) briefly referenced an overnight stay and Anderson (1981) stated that the amount time needed to form perceptions of academic quality would take no longer than one or two days on campus. Although Anderson’s research does not focus as deeply on these particular factors of college choice, his research on minority student’s perception of college quality provides additional support to the argument. For these reasons, a study of campers should occur after they have been on campus for at least a few days.

The importance of a college’s social atmosphere to a recruiting effort according to Kealy and Rockel (1987) is the development of a prospective student’s feeling of belonging at the institution or “fit.” Fit or “student fit” is essentially a match up between student and institution,
congruence between the student’s values, attitude and aspirations and those of the college or university. According to Seidman (1989), the greater the fit, the more likely the student is going to persist at the institution and graduate. Kealy and Rockel (1987) found multiple variables influence perceptions of social atmosphere and institutions can encourage these perceptions in a number of ways. The modernization of campus dormitories to include larger common areas on each floor and active student life organizations can increase student enjoyment while at school and promote “fit” (Kealy and Rockel, 1987; Seidman, 1989; Lydon, 1997). Therefore, a study should include participants that have exposure to campus living. Fortunately, this prospect is easily achievable due to the fact that the summer camp administration houses students in campus dormitories during the program.

The research also communicates that universities with developed food service programs also promote improved student happiness suggesting that social bonding occurs during meal times (Lydon, 1997). It is also suggested that prospective students should take part in campus activities while they are at the university, further emphasizing the necessity of longer campus visits and the incorporation of such activities into recruitment efforts (Kealy and Rockel, 1987). Both of these factors are present in the summer camp program at the hosting university. The dorm the campers stay in offers food service and campers are made to eat together during meal times. In addition, campers participate in campus activities during evenings. Camp administrators have built in a few social activities on campus such as ice cream socials, bowling and movie nights as such facilities exist on campus. Finally, Kealy and Rockel (1987) state that perceptions of social atmosphere are influenced to a greater extent when recruits stay overnight on campus with a current student. This may be an important facet in the development of social precepts however spending the night with a college student may be outside the scope of a summer camp due to risk management issues. Fortunately, for the study, the camp offers participants the opportunity to participate socially in a number of ways. Observations of these campers should offer insight into the influences of these activities on college choice.

Anderson’s research focuses less on the development of social perceptions but more on the results of not properly forming a sense on belonging or fitting in at a university. According to Anderson (1981), college students that don’t feel welcome or never develop a sense of belonging on campus tend to move off campus where they run a higher risk of not graduating. This information provides some illumination to the benefits of studying college choice within
summer programs that may be stimulating perceptions of campus social atmosphere before the student applies. If more was known about this process, administrators may have the ability to create activities for potential students that address feelings of belonging within the university and as a result promote the eventual enrollment of better prepared students and in turn improve the institutions retention rate.

Location and College Choice

An additional influential variable in developing a recruit’s perceptions of an academic institution is the physical location of the campus. Until the advent of distance learning, this was a fixed and uncontrollable attribute of a university. Regardless of the fact that an institution cannot completely manipulate the situation with a campus’s geographic parameters, the influence it has on college choice is vast. According to Kealy and Rockel’s findings (1987) and Kinzie et al (2004), the rural or urban setting of the campus was a significant factor in college choice. Furthermore, they found that distance from home was another significant factor in a student’s choice of which college to attend, especially for students from low SES backgrounds (Kealy and Rockel, 1987).

The results of Anderson’s research are also similar to Kealy and Rockel in regard to distance from home, although, he makes no reference to the influential qualities of whether the campus is rural or urban. Anderson’s research does offer an enlightening suggestion regarding the reasoning for a student’s preference to attending a college close to home. Anderson mentions that less privileged students might prefer a school that is close to home because of the financial benefits of living with their parents while others might enjoy staying close to their friends from high school or the possibility of going to college with them as well. Since location is not addressed by the summer camp at the hosting university it will not play a dominant role in this study.

Athletics and College Choice

Another influential variable of college choice is an institution’s athletic quality. Kealy and Rockel (1987) described this attribute to be most influential for colleges with well known athletic traditions. Furthermore, their research indicates that this characteristic has a greater impact on students with athletic abilities. These abilities are individual to the characteristics of the prospective student but have differing results with institutions maintaining strong athletic competitiveness. Athletic quality influences perception on a higher level for students with
average to exceptional athletic skills (Kealy and Rockel, 1987). Moreover, Kealy and Rockel’s research (1987) indicated less of a perception forming impact for students with lower athletic skills and specifically students that had higher artistic interests. Due to these findings, perceptions of athletic quality and campus location will not be a primary focus of this research. Rather, this study focuses on factors that can be influenced by departmental recruitment efforts such as perceptions of faculty, facilities, academics and social atmosphere.

The value of determining influences of college choice to improving retention in academia is critical to developing “fit” (Kealy and Rockel, 1987). College administrators can adjust marketing techniques to focus on the specific factors that influence their particular target audience such as athletic programs for some or specific academic programs for students with greater scholarly or artistic interests. The research conducted by Chapman (1981) and Kealy and Rockel (1987) does not address market segmentation or micro-markets, but knowledge of the influential factors explained in those studies can still help researchers understand perceptions of “fit” among potential new fine art students by serving as a theoretical basis in the design of future studies.

Marketing

Academic marketing involves not only a specialized approach but also a great deal of market research. Market research involves a significant amount of effort on the part of the college administrator prior to the first contact with the public and results in a unique approach to marketing each institution. It requires an introspective examination of the institution by the administration through image identification and development, student typology and target market development, and the effective delivery of the institutional image to the targeted market as well as evaluation of the development and delivery processes (Topor, 1986; Absher and Crawford, 1996; Hossler, 1999; Sevier, 2000). The combination of these practices has been shown by the literature to create more effective marketing results in recruitment and retention and has been used successfully throughout the last 15 to 20 years in higher education (Topor, 1986; Seidman, 1989; Hossler, 1999). As the literature illustrates, from the mid 1980s to the recent past there has been a dominant emphasis in higher education to promote quality in the recruitment process to the extent that the associated practices such as retention have also been influenced by a drive to practice academic marketing responsibly. Part of this process is accurately representing the institution’s image to potential students.
The process of image identification includes “the aggregate, or sum, of the feelings, beliefs, attitudes, impressions, thoughts, perceptions, ideas, recollections, conclusions, and mindsets people have of an institution” (Topor, 1986, p.1). The research necessary to discover and positively influence the institutional image involves additional examination. The first stage might include an “image audit” which is the collection of as many different pieces of literature produced by the admissions department or other departments that frequently deal with the public. By physically placing the documents together administrators are able to get a collective idea of what people outside of the organization might think when they hear the institution’s name (Topor, 1986).

Topor (1986) pointed out that there are two dominant theories relevant to image generation. The first theory is rational and suggests that characteristics of the object (i.e. the physical condition of the facilities and campus) determine the image. The second theory is empirical and suggests that image is subjective to the personal judgments made by the individual viewing the object (Topor, 1986). As the literature indicates, both the rational and empirical philosophies of image generation are believed to be correct (Topor, 1986). Administrators must not only identify their college’s image, but also adjust it to the needs and desires of the target market if they are to be successful in the contemporary collegiate marketplace (Topor, 1986; Hossler, 1999).

Image generation is an important component to academic marketing because of the result of the potential student’s conceptualization of the institutional image combined with individual concepts of educational needs and desires may promote perceptions of fit within the university. Based on Topor, (1986) and Hossler, (1999) exposure to image promoting documents most likely does influence college choice in the long run; however, the process of image generation is outside the scope of this study. What is associated with this study is the observation of the result of image generation, i.e. the camp participant’s impressions, perceptions, and ideas related to the College of Music and the hosting university. Gaining a deeper understanding of camper’s perception of the College of Music and the hosting university’s image is salient because college choice is based within the criteria that comprise the overall image.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the postmodern world has set new standards for institutions of higher education. These new standards require accountability on more levels, the use of fewer
resources to communicate to diverse, specialized audiences, and demand self-sustainability (Bloland, 1995; Tierney, 2001). If administrators in fine art departments at colleges and universities are interested in improving their status on campus and increasing their competitiveness among similar institutions worldwide then efforts to efficiently recruit the most prepared students becomes a priority. Fine art departments may want to attract students who possess higher levels of artistic talent beyond the basic university requirements as these students have a higher likely hood of academic success within the specific major versus the university in general. Higher levels of academic success can result in higher student retention and graduation rates as well as fewer transfers and dropouts. If colleges and universities recruited some students specifically for one major or another instead of through general admission they might increase retention and, ultimately, graduation rates.

The review of literature pertaining to college choice seems to be primarily focused on efforts initiated from the admissions office. This perspective does not take into consideration the distributive impact of the postmodern experience on college choice or higher education. Recruitment efforts initiated on the departmental level can serve the potential student in a superior manor to mass marketing efforts from the university macro-level. If the general market place finds success though customization, segmentation and micro-markets, universities should apply these concepts to recruitment in higher education. By tailoring marketing efforts to meet the specialized demands of the consumer, contemporary universities can improve their standing among competitors, the perceived quality the of their products and attract, recruit and enroll more of the most prepared students. Marketing efforts initiated through academic departments can offer universities a customized approach that speaks directly to student’s interests through the very same voice that will potentially speak to them as a professor.

The literature lacks studies to illuminate the characteristics of participants enrolled in these programs and offers insight into their college choice process. Programs such as these have been around for quite some time; however, no examination has been made of the participants, what they think of the sponsoring institution, or how they move through the college choice process. Studies may be augmented if researchers looked at programs used by fine arts institutions to attract the best and brightest students. One outstanding example of student recruitment in the fine arts, that has been in operation for over 60 years, is the music camp at the hosting university. Since organizations such as these are designed to attract outstanding art
students, the camp serves as a reservoir of potential participants. This study addresses these issues by observing participant’s enrolled in the camp and their perceptions of faculty, facilities, academics and social atmosphere of the hosting university.

In addition, the study observes demographic and biographic characteristics of participants in the camp in an attempt to offer descriptive data in order to see which college choice model, if any, represents the camper’s college choice experience. By observing participants within programs like this music camp, researchers can increase the knowledge base regarding the college choice process among artistically high achieving students. Department administrators can then apply this information to potentially bring more of these students into their areas. Consequently, this study uses a combination of research methods including surveys adapted from the Ingersoll Group (1988) and focus groups adapted from Durst and Schaeffer (1987) and Eisner (1998); the triangulation of which is suggested by Stage and Russell (1992) and the analysis of which is guided by Strauss and Corbin (1998).
CHAPTER THREE
The Design of the Study

The purpose of this study is to increase the knowledgebase regarding potential students within the fine arts so that more of the best and brightest will be recruited. The study examined characteristics of students participating in a summer camp operated through a music department located on a large public university’s campus, observed the way they perceived the institution and illuminated some of the influences and important factors within their college choice process. To this end, a case study was conducted.

This chapter presents an outline of the research design, sample and instrumentation used in the study. This explanation includes a discussion of the framework for the case study, a table showing the relationship of the research questions to data collection and analysis procedures (see Table 1). The chapter includes a description of the sample and the creation of the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys used to collect demographic and biographic data from the participants in the music camp. The chapter also includes an explanation of the design and implementation of the focus groups, the results of which were a descriptive narrative highlighting participant’s perceptions of the institution with implications regarding college choice and two composite profiles of typical campers.

Moreover, the chapter contains an explanation of the procedures employed to collect the data for the study including survey administration and methods used to attract participants to the focus groups. A discussion of internal validity is included along with potential threats to the study such as instrumentation and social desirability. Details of the components comprising the statistical analysis of the survey instruments are also involved. Finally, this chapter includes the process by which the focus group data was transcribed and coded.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to expand the knowledgebase regarding students interested in the fine arts so that more of the best and brightest will be recruited. To help accomplish this goal, demographic and biographic characteristics of high school students in university music camps were gathered. A particular focus was placed on illustrating how participation influenced opinions of the hosting institution as framed by four factors: perceptions of faculty, facilities,
academics, and social atmosphere. By learning more about the impact of the camp on participants, researchers may learn more about influences on college choice that may be specific to potential university music students.

To this end the study focused on one overriding question, “How does participation in the summer camp affect prospective student perceptions of the hosting university and their college choice?” Four related questions were developed to frame data gathering and analysis. The first is “What is the typical profile of a summer camp participant?” Results from this question can be beneficial to answering the overriding question because studies suggest that an individual’s characteristics influence college choice (Litten, 1982; Kealy & Rockel, 1987).

The second question is “How do music campers perceive the institution before camp attendance in terms of the four factors from the literature?” These factors include perceptions of faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere (Kealy & Rockel, 1987). The third is “What changes in perception of the institution in terms of the four factors occur after participation in the camp?” Data was collected through the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys to answer these questions. These questions inform the overriding question by offering data to illustrate how and to what extent participation in the camp influences perceptions of the institution.

The fourth question was “How do campers view their experience of the camp as framed by the four factors: faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere?” Data for this question was collected through focus groups to examine the camp experience and illustrate how participation in the program relates to college choice and perceptions of the institution. See Table 1 for the relationship of the research questions to data collection and analysis procedures.
Table 1.
**Relationship of Research Questions to Data and Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Analysis Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1: What is the typical profile of a music camp participant?</td>
<td>Demographic and biographic data from the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys and the transcriptions of focus groups data</td>
<td>A statistician used SPSS to tally survey results calculate frequencies. The Strauss and Corbin Constant Comparative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2: How do music campers perceive the institution before camp attendance in terms of the four factors from the literature?</td>
<td>Sample containing means of perceptions of the College of Music and the hosting university before camp participation</td>
<td>A statistician used SPSS to calculate means and standard deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3: What changes in perception of the institution in terms of the four factors occur after participation in the camp?</td>
<td>Sample containing means of perceptions of the College of Music and the hosting university after camp participation</td>
<td>A statistician used SPSS to conduct a $t$ test for independent means and calculated statistically significant differences between pre and post camp samples. Q2 data was compared to Q3 data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: How do campers view their experience of the camp as framed by the four factors: faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere?</td>
<td>Transcription data from the four focus groups</td>
<td>The Strauss and Corbin Constant Comparative Method</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Design

In order to answer the questions posed for the study an exploratory, a case study with mixed methods was constructed. As defined by Stake (2000) a case study is a concentrated investigation of a single case or unit. It is an intensive, bounded examination of the particular qualities of a unit studied in hopes of informing the generalities of a population, a larger class of similar units, or a phenomenon (Stake, 2000; Gerring, 2004). For this research, the single case was the music camp.

Furthermore, this was an exploratory case study. Exploratory studies are “path breaking” and conducted to satisfy the researcher’s curiosity (Babbie, 1998; Gerring, 2004). This study is path breaking because little is known about how the music students use the camp in their college choice process. Due to a lack of previous data on this unit, and the scope of the study, nothing can be confirmed or disconfirmed regarding this research and consequently no comparisons can be made across units. Secondly, the study was conducted to satisfy the researcher’s interest regarding the experience of the music campers and to collect initial, revelatory data pertaining to their college choice.

A mixed method case study is a study that incorporates more than one approach to data collection and analysis (Krathwohl, 1998). This type of case study was selected for several reasons. First, a mixed method approach adds depth to any study and improves internal validity (Krathwohl, 1998). According to Krathwohl (1998), a question that is approached from different, independent angles can reduce method bias and strengthen validity. Since there are no perfect methods of inquiry, each possessing some level of error, the combination of data collection and analysis procedures adds credibility to observations and results. Different research methods offer different levels of insight even when error is not a consideration. A combination of approaches can compensate for errors but also strengthen results by obtaining different perspectives of units to ultimately add depth to the understanding of a phenomenon (Krathwohl, 1998).

A case study was selected for the design of this study for the following reasons. First, a case study is appropriate because of the lack of previously published data on this topic and the resulting exploratory strategy of this research. Gerring, (2004) indicated that case studies function well to elicit insight when little previous information is available. Second, one of the primary qualities of case studies is the ability to further depth of study (Gerring, 2004). Since
little is known about the topic, greater depth is desired so that the study is as informative as possible.

The environment of the camp lends itself to study the phenomenon in context versus in a laboratory. Although a laboratory setting might be more appropriate for an experimental study, a case study is a better match for this research due to the focus on exploring participant’s perceptions and access to the natural situation (i.e. the camp environment) in which the perceptions occur (Krathwohl, 1998). Therefore, a case study conducted in the context of the phenomenon is the more appropriate choice for this research.

Case study designs using mixed methods can offer the deepest and most convincing observations and results (Stake, 2000; Krathwohl, 1998). The qualitative element, (focus groups) deepened understanding of how campers view their experience within the camp. The quantitative element, (Pre and Post-Camp Surveys) gathered demographic and biographic data from independent samples of campers and observed their initial perceptions of the College of Music and then observed any trend changes that may have occurred during the experience of the camp.

Research Procedures

The data collection began with gaining access to the camp’s check in process. This involved contacting the camp director who then informed security of the researcher’s identity and intentions. Upon arrival at the university, the campers and their parents reported to check-in. Due to the large number of campers, this method yielded a large number of potential participants. The researcher randomly asked every other camper and their families to read the consent forms and complete the Pre-Camp Survey while they stood in line. Before filling out the surveys, participants and their parents were asked to read and sign a letter of informed consent that included the explanation that they would be asked to complete a survey momentarily and then be invited to focus groups later in the camp. Participants and their parents were asked to sign and print their names on the letters of informed consent completed during Pre-Camp Survey administration. (A copy of the letter of informed consent is available in Appendix A). As the campers finished the surveys, the researcher collected the completed instruments. This process was repeated until 105 Pre-Camp Surveys were handed out and 102 were collected.

The next morning, the participants began a number of activities including receiving instruction in music theory, to learning new music to practicing their instruments for the duration
of the camp, which lasted one week. In some cases, campers attended more than camp such as Honors Jazz Camp and then took Marching Band Camp, which lasted another week. All totaled the music camps at the hosting university offered eleven different camps in 2004.

In classes, they met and interacted with the faculty and current students who acted as assistants to the faculty. In many cases, the music camp administrators matched camp programming with the academic quality factors as indicated by the literature. For example, camp participants spent roughly 6 hours per day in the company of university faculty members. Kealy and Rockel (1987) indicated that experiencing university facilities can impact perceptions of academic quality. Therefore, while participants were on campus they were given access to the facilities at the College of Music. Campers used these facilities to practice their instruments and prepare for a musical performance conducted near the end of the camp session. At the end of their session campers performed what they learned in the College of Music practice rooms at a university concert hall. As the camp came to a close, the campers were required to check-out before they left with their parents. During this time, the Post-Camp Surveys were administered to campers.

The programming employed by music camp administration also matched researcher’s suggestions to stimulate perceptions of social atmosphere. As suggested by Lydon (1997), the program offered opportunity for social bonding at mealtime and exposure to food service in order to influence perceptions of social atmosphere. Each morning, mid-day, and end of each day the campers shared mealtime in the dorm cafeteria to further develop a perception of campus social life at the university. In the evenings after dinner, the campers either continued practicing their instruments at the music building or participated in a planned social activity.

The activities planned for the evenings gave the campers a break from practicing or performing and extended the camper’s time interacting with university campus facilities. As suggested by Kealy and Rockel (1987), continued contact with entertainment facilities in a relaxed setting will augment the development of perceptions of campus social life at the university. Participants interacted with the graduate students who served as camp counselors in the dorms. These camp counselors oversaw the camper’s day-to-day activities and provided guidance throughout the camp. Social activities, which involved participation of graduate students functioning in their counselor role, included movie night, a trip to the I-Max theatre, dances, and catching a show produced by the Theater Department. The activities organized by
the music camp administration promoted the types of social interaction mentioned by Anderson (1981), Kealy & Rockel (1987), and Lydon (1997).

Campers were required to participate in a check-out session prior to leaving the university. The Post-Camp Surveys and consent forms were administered randomly to every other camper during check-out. Participants received the documents in a preaddressed stamped envelope. A letter from the researcher was included asking the campers to read and sign the consent forms with their parents, complete the survey independently, and return both forms in the supplied envelope. 200 envelopes were handed out and 56 were returned with a response rate of 28% that represented 4.6% of the population, N=56. Although Post-Camp Survey participants came from the same population of music campers from 2004 this sample was independent from the sample that participated in the Pre-Camp Survey.

The focus groups occurred at the end of the camper’s session so that they had the most time to experience the university and the College of Music. Participants were invited from a list of campers that filled out the Pre-Camp Survey. From this group, 90 names were taken from the letters of informed consent and an excel spreadsheet was created. From the spreadsheet, every second person was selected (n=45) and invited to attend the focus groups. Each of these campers received a written invitation to participate in the focus groups via their daily camp mail.

Campers were enticed to attend the focus groups with free candy, gift certificates to popular stores and small monetary prizes for participation. The candy was available to all who participated in the focus groups and the prizes were given away at the end of each group session. Focus group participants were those campers who showed up on time at the scheduled location. This process resulted in four groups with sizes ranging between 6 and 10 participants.

The focus groups consisted of informal interviews conducted by the researcher. The focus groups lasted roughly 45 minutes to 1 hour and contained a battery of open-ended questions that were related to the basic criteria of the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys. (A copy of the initial focus group questions is available in Appendix B.) For example, the major topics for discussion were student opinions of the College of Music and university at large as they related to perceptions of academic quality, social atmosphere, facilities and faculty, or some particular perception of the university that stood out on the Pre-Camp Survey or previous focus group.
The Sample

The participants that completed the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys came from over 1,200 campers attending the music camp during the summer of 2004. The Pre-Camp Surveys were administered randomly to 105 campers during check-in. Of the original 105 surveys, 102 were collected by the end of administration and 95 were included in the study (7 surveys were considered unusable as they were incomplete). Overall, the sample used in this study was randomly selected from all camp participants and represented 7.9% of all of those attending the camp. In 2004 participants came from 25 states and 3 foreign countries to attend the music camp at the hosting university (University statistics, 2004). The age group of the Pre-Camp Survey participants ranged from 12 through 18. The sample was 41.1% male and 58.9% female. The races and ethnicities represented in the sample were White 78.9%, Black 7.4%, Hispanic 5.3%, Asian/Pacific Islander 4.2%, Other 4.2% and Native American 0%.

The sample of participants that completed the Post-Camp Survey also came from the same group of campers attending the music camp during the summer of 2004. Due to this relationship, it is likely that these participants possessed similar characteristics to the campers that filled out the Pre-Camp Survey, although it is unknown since no demographics questions were asked on the Post-Camp Survey.

Furthermore, the sample of students that participated in the focus groups were invited from members of the same sample of music campers that filled out the Pre-Camp Survey during check-in. There were four focus groups total. The sample size for the focus groups ranged from 6 for the first group, to 10 in the second, 7 in the third, and 9 in the fourth.

The Instruments

The Pre and Post-camp Surveys were used to provide a picture of participants in the music camp at the hosting university and observe changes to perceptions of the College of Music and university as related to college choice factors (See Appendices C and D). Questions were adapted from sections on the Ingersoll (1988) survey and included questions that were originally designed to reveal information on perceptions of the “ideal” college. The criteria for the questions originally created by the Ingersoll Group came from findings from their own 1986 National Student Database. This document included questioning that covered basic findings on expectations and perceptions of the “ideal” institution as well as what participants felt would be attractive qualities of their “ideal” institution (Ingersoll, 1988). In their study, the survey was
administered specifically to college bound high school students including those interested in
music and it was thought that questions from this document were the best available match for
this study due to their particular relevance to the research questions.

The Pre-Camp Survey was created from the existing Ingersoll Group (1988) survey by
eliminating sections unrelated to the study and reorganizing useful sections to record data
regarding simple demographics and biographic characteristics. Questions that dealt with
perceptions of known influences on college choice such as academic quality, social atmosphere,
location, athletics, financial aid availability and quality of campus housing were included.

Questions in section I “Background” were written with the intention of gathering the
biographic and demographic characteristics of persons interested in studying music on the
college level such as gender, race, and grade point average as well as questions about ownership
of musical instruments, taking private lessons, and importance of financial aid in college choice
(see Appendix C). In sections II and III, questions were included from the Ingersoll Group
(1988) instrument that focused on evaluating influences on perceptions of the university.
Questions on the Pre-Camp Survey were identical to the questions on the Post-Camp Survey so
that a comparison of responses could be made indicating potential influence of camp
participation on perceptions regarding qualities of the university (See Appendices C and D).

The focus groups added depth to this research. Since no available standardized survey
exists for measuring the influences of college choice among such students, focus groups have
been included to add greater depth to the study and for the additional purpose of increasing
reliability through Complementary Multiplism (Krathwohl, 1998). According to Krathwohl,
(1998) when involving Complementary Multiplism “the strength of the combined evidence is
markedly enhanced” and consequently the research procedures were selected and organized with
this in mind. Specifically, the focus groups were used to observe and record participant’s
perceptions of four college choice factors selected from the literature (perceptions of faculty,
facilities, academics, and social atmosphere; Chapman, 1981; Kealy & Rockel, 1987; Hanson &
Litten, 1982; Kinzie et al. 2004).

The design of the focus groups was adapted from Durst and Schaeffer (1987) who
conducted research on the culture of college students and used a multi-method technique
involving surveys with focus groups. Durst and Schaeffer used surveys to obtain “life histories”
of the students and then used focus groups to collect data on various aspects of student culture.
The questions asked in the focus groups elicited comments related to the four college choice factors selected from the literature for this study.

Questions were open-ended and centered primarily on characteristics of the College of Music and university as related to the four college choice factors taken from the literature (See Appendix B). Initial questions related to the College of Music included “What do you think about the faculty in the College of Music?”, “What do you think about the facilities in the College of Music?”, “What do you think about academics in the College of Music?” and “What do you think about the social atmosphere in the College of Music?” The questions regarding the university contained the same phrasing; however, “College of Music” was replaced with “the University.” All subsequent questions that arose during the focus groups were related to topics stemming from responses to the original aforementioned questions. Four focus groups were conducted over two evenings. Each group lasted 45 minutes to one hour. The number of participants differed in each group, but ranged from 6 to 10 participants. All conversations were recorded on mini cassette tape to accurately preserve the content and voice inflection of responses.

Validity

Since the samples taken for the study were small the results are limited to characteristics of individuals interested in pursuing a degree at the hosting university. The issue of internal validity as it relates to this case study deals with three topics. These threats are location, instrumentation, and social desirability.

Administering the surveys at the dormitory was problematic. Another location was not possible due to camp programming and the hectic environment of check-in and check-out may not have been idea for administration. In addition, the researcher could not restrict the location of the focus groups to participants and two of the groups were interrupted by other campers and staff.

Instrumentation may not have been ideal because the Ingersoll Group (1988) instrument was originally designed for general population college bound students not specifically fine arts students. The survey was selected from the Ingersoll Group (1988) because of the close relationship of the questions to the research questions. Specifically, the Ingersoll Group (1988) instrument contained sections including questioning designed to reveal potential college student demographics and biographics as well as sections addressing perceptions of university faculty,
academics, facilities and social atmosphere. These topics are central to the research questions and it was thought that the Ingersoll Group (1988) instrument was a good tool for collecting data for this study even though it was not specifically designed for college bound music students.

The threat of social desirability may exist due to the possibility that campers might have been interested in trying to impress university representatives, such as the survey administer or interviewer and purposefully answered positively to the survey or interview questions. The researcher did however explain that he came from a different college within the university and was not involved with the College of Music or Admissions in any way at the beginning of survey administration and again at the start of each focus group. Therefore, the threat of social desirability is believed to have been minimized by creating a perception of disassociation of the participant’s opinions or participation in the study with admission to the hosting university.

The use of focus groups also influences validity. According to Durst and Schaeffer (1987) the use of focus groups in conjunction with surveys improves the credibility of the research. “Qualitative techniques can personalize research and tie it more closely to values and attitudes as actually lived by students rather then to those professes on surveys, tests, and other scales” (Durst and Schaeffer, 1987, p. 22). However, an influence of social desirability still exists because students in the focus groups were just as likely to try to impress the observer as those who took the survey. The demographic and biographic data collected from the Pre-Camp Survey was probably not influenced by social desirability because of the straightforward nature of the questions. The questions are not open to various interpretations by the researcher or participant as the instrument was designed to reveal factual data only, not opinions of the university or College of Music. The back side of the Pre-Camp Survey and all of the questions are possibly influenced by social desirability because the questions contained in this document reference opinions of the College of Music and the university and participants may have thought it would be to their advantage to respond positively on purpose.

Description of Data Analysis

The Pre and Post-Camp Surveys were designed using a Likert Scale. Each response category was assigned a number ranging 1 through 5 with “Strongly Agree” as 1 and “Strongly Disagree” as 5. In the analysis, the responses “not sure” and “don’t know” were grouped and assigned a score of 3. Data from the survey responses was used to create a matrix in Microsoft Excel. Once in Excel, the data was imported into SPSS a common program for statistical
A statistician was employed to create frequency tables for each question and operate $t$ test procedures. Means were calculated for the appropriate response groups and tested for statistically significant differences.

The focus groups were intended to augment the results of the survey and add an additional dimension to the study that revealed camper’s perceptions of four influential college choice factors. Durst and Schaeffer (1987) indicated that the combination of focus groups with surveys provides more reliable data. According to Stage and Russell (1992), three possible analyses from a study that employs multiple methods exist: “convergence, inconsistency, and contradiction.” Stage and Russell (1992) suggested that inconsistency is the most common; however some contradiction is also frequent. The authors (1992) pointed out that though these outcomes may sound foreboding, the result is helpful in understanding the “richness” of the subject matter. Stage and Russell (1992) wrote, “They (contradictory results among multiple methodologies) may even provide more and better explanations” (p.489). Therefore, the responses to the focus group topics that do not reflect the results of the survey are not considered a failure, but rather deeper insight into the dynamic of music student characteristics and college choice.

In reference to the Durst and Schaeffer (1987) focus group model, the date and “the situation being observed” was recorded on cassette tape. The topics for discussion centered on what Eliot Eisner (1998) called “prefigured foci”. In this study those “foci” included the four influential factors of college choice from the literature, perceptions of faculty, perceptions of facilities, perceptions of academics, and perceptions of social atmosphere. Additional questions asked by the researcher were related to participant responses from the initial line of questioning listed above. Conversations in each focus group were recorded in narrative form on separate tapes and labeled group 1-4 accordingly to avoid confusion.

The content of the tapes was then transcribed sentence by sentence into Microsoft Word. Once transcription was complete, a coding methodology was employed using Constant Comparative Methods (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). Specifically, an adaptation of the open coding technique was used to organize the transcription data. At the start of data analysis, categories were created and framed by the four prefigured foci such as “Category 1 – Perceptions of Faculty”. Using sentence by sentence analysis, the transcription data was broken down into separate parts and then examined for similarities, differences, and thematic links while keeping
the prefigured foci in mind. Comments and statements that were observed to be conceptually related to the prefigured foci were placed into one of the four categories. Within the each of the four categories sub categories were created based on emergent themes such as “Sub Category A – College of Music Faculty.” A color code for each sub category was then created by the researcher. Different colors were assigned to each sub category and then all text associated with that sub category was highlighted with the related color. For example, comments associated with “Sub Category A – College of Music Faculty” were assigned light blue while all statements regarding “Sub Category B – Camp Teaching Staff (non-faculty)” were given the color green. Once the all associated text was appropriately color coded, those portions of the transcription were broken down and further analyzed.

Within each Sub Category, a number of related properties and dimensions were also observed and recorded. Names of these properties were taken from the words of the participants recorded during the focus groups. They reflect campers’ opinions related to the theme of the sub category. For example, “Great teachers” is a property of “Sub Category A - College of Music Faculty.” Dimensions were then added to increase the precision of the analysis and offer insight into the location of a property within a range of qualities. For example, a dimension of the property “Great teachers” is “Many years of teaching music” reflecting the perception that the faculty in the College of Music are so good because they are experienced educators and therefore “Great teachers.” From this analysis, all themes and patterns within camp participant perceptions in relation to the prefigured foci were observed. Please see the coding classifications in Appendix E.

Profiles of the campers were created based on results from the surveys and comments recorded during the focus groups. Specifically, a descriptive narrative was created using the focus group transcriptions, personal observations made by the researcher and chronicles the experiences of two camper profiles as they participate in the camp activities from start to finish. The narrative offers deeper insight into the impact of the camp programming on perceptions of the hosting university, and the four college choice factors selected from the literature as well as participatory impact on movement through the stages of the post modern college choice process. As an additional step, demographic and biographic data from the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys was put together to create 2 composite profiles of the campers, one male named Julian and one female named Brittany. Content collected from the focus groups was also used to develop
Brittany and Julian’s “Likes” and “Dislikes” regarding the camp and the hosting university. Attention was placed on Brittany and Julian as they experienced the camp and how it influenced the movement within their college choice process. The Narrative and the Profiles can be found in Chapter four.

**Brief Summary of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to expand the knowledgebase regarding students interested in the fine arts so that more of the best and brightest will be recruited. To help accomplish this goal, demographic and biographic characteristics of high school students attending the hosting university’s music camp were gathered. A particular focus was placed on illustrating how participation influenced opinions of the hosting institution as framed by four factors: perceptions of faculty, facilities, academics, and social atmosphere. By learning more about the impact of the camp on participants, researchers may learn more about influences on college choice that may be specific to potential music students for the hosting university.

The Pre and Post-Camp Survey batteries and focus groups of music campers were employed during the summer of 2004. The Pre-Camp Survey collected biographic and demographic data as well as opinions of the hosting university from independent samples. The Post-Camp Survey collected opinions of the hosting university after participation in the camp. Results of the “Opinions” sections from both surveys were analyzed by a statistician using SPSS. Data analysis included calculation of Means and Standard Deviations and a t test was performed. Frequency tables were created to illustrate data. Focus groups of music campers were held to add greater depth to the findings of the “Opinions” sections of the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys.

Focus groups were conducted using pre-figured foci. These foci were perceptions of four college choice factors selected from the literature. They were: *perceptions of faculty, facility, academics, and social atmosphere*. Coding was organized by foci to create categories, a color code was created to organize data, and sub categories were created along with properties and dimensions to strengthen analysis and stimulate observations. In addition, a descriptive narrative was written to further illuminate the camp’s influence on participants’ college choice process and decisions two camper profiles were created based on the analysis of the focus groups, survey results and personal observations made by the researcher.
Chapter four contains the results of all analysis, the narrative and some explanation of the findings. Examples of the surveys, transcriptions and coding classifications are available in the appendices.
CHAPTER FOUR

Findings

This chapter presents the results for the study. The results are divided into three sections and explained within the context of the research questions. The first section is intended to offer evidence for question one (What is a typical profile of a summer camp participant?) and includes the demographic and biographic results from the Pre-Camp Surveys.

The second section is divided into two parts and offers evidence for question two (How do music campers perceive the College of Music in terms of the four factors from the literature: faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere?) and question three (What changes in perception of the College of Music occurred due to participation in the music camp?). The first part of the second section contains data from the Pre-Camp Survey that is related to perceptions of the College of Music before participation. The second part reviews data from the Post-Camp Surveys related to perception of the College of Music after participation and highlights changes that occurred while in the camp.

In the third section, comments from the focus groups will be discussed as related to perceptions of the College of Music and the four factors. Composite profiles of two campers, Brittany and Julian, will be presented followed by a descriptive narrative highlighting their camp experience. It is intended that this section offers evidence for question four (How do campers view their experience of the camp as framed by the four factors: faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere?).

Biographic and Demographic Analysis

In this section, the results of the demographics survey will be explained with a particular focus on providing evidence to answer sub-question one (What is a typical profile of a summer camp participant?). 12 survey questions pertaining to camper demographics and biographics were asked on the instrument. Of the 105 surveys were administered, 95 were included in the study for a response rate of 90.5%. Tables will be employed to offer a visual aid in the discussion of survey data. Frequencies and percentages of the responses to each question on this battery of surveys were calculated. A frequency table is included for each question. MCS is used as an abbreviation for Music Camp Sample.
**Gender**

Analysis of question one “Gender” resulted in the following information. Out of a total of 95 responses the frequencies were 39 male and 56 female. Males represented 41.1% and females represented 58.9% of the group (see Table 2).

**Table 2.**

**Gender Frequency of Participants in the Music Camp**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#1</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Race and Ethnicity**

Analysis of question 2 “Race/Ethnicity” resulted in frequencies from the sample indicating 75 White at 78.9% and minority campers comprised 21.1% of participants (see Table 3).

**Table 3.**

**Race and Ethnicity Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#2</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/PI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age**

The frequencies from the sample on age levels indicated few campers were under age 13 or over age 17. Analysis indicated that most of the campers were either age 15 or 16 with 31 campers at age 15 representing the majority at 32.6% and 22 campers at age 16 or 23.2% (see Table 4).
Table 4.

Age of Music Camp Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#3</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Under 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socio-economic Status

The fourth question titled “Parental Involvement” was posed as a means to gauge the level of camper’s socio-economic status. Since many high school students are unaware of their parents’ income, directly asking the question might not have revealed accurate results. The use of parental involvement as an indication of socio-economic status does not imply members of lower status all suffer from limited contact or support from their parents. What it references is the financial reality of studying music. Items such as musical instruments and private lessons are expensive, in many cases the price of instruments ranges between $1,000 and $3,000, and thus most likely exclusive to upper levels of income or at least upper middle class income levels (www.music123.com, 2007).

Due to the complex nature of question four it was broken down into parts A, B, C and D in order to conduct analysis. Part A asked participants if they owned their own musical instrument. The results indicated a frequency of 87 or 91.6% of campers own their own instrument, while 8 or 8.4% indicated they did not, suggesting a high number of music campers may come from semi-affluent to affluent households.

Part B asked participants if they paid for their music instruments. The results indicate a frequency of 45 or 47.4% paid, while 50 or 52.6% indicated they did not, suggesting a relatively high level of parental involvement in this respect. Part C asked participants if they took private music lessons. The results indicated a frequency of 81 or 85.3% did, while 14 or 14.7%
indicated they did not. Additionally, the survey asked the participants if they paid for the private lessons. Similar to part B of question four, part D was intended to reveal those students who took private lessons but did so without the financial assistance of their parents. Possibly, these participants might be serious music students from less affluent households. The results indicated a frequency of 43 or 45.3% paid, while 52 or 54.7% indicated they did not, suggesting a moderately high level of parental involvement in this respect as well (See Table 5).

Table 5.

Frequency of Own Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#4A</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5, part B.

Frequencies for Paid for Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#4B</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5, part C.

Frequency of Taking Private Music Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#4C</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The comparison of instrument ownership and taking private lessons revealed that a higher percentage of the MCS owned their instrument than took private lessons. When Paid for Instrument and Paid for Music Lessons are compared, results are quite similar with only a 2% difference between responses. Results indicate a majority in both cases did not personally pay for either privilege suggesting that most students in the music camp benefit from a reasonably high level of parental involvement. Based on the results, one could easily speculate that the participants in this sample were from a middle or upper-middle class socio-economic background.

**Academic Achievement**

The fifth question “Grade Point Average” was posed for the purpose of observing the level of academic achievement in the MCS. The results indicate a frequency of 31 or 32.6% at the 4.0 GPA category, 32 or 33.7% in the 3.6-3.9 GPA range, and 22 or 23.2% at the 3.1-3.5 GPA range, suggesting an extremely high level of academic success among campers. In fact, when the two largest percentages are combined (33.7% and 32.6%) a resulting 66.3% of music campers achieving high school GPA’s of 3.6 or higher can be observed. Furthermore, nearly a third of the sample (32.6%) have perfect 4.0 GPA’s (see Table 6).
Table 6.

*Academic Achievement Frequency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#5</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6-3.9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1-3.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6-2.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sixth question “Highest Degree you will Eventually Seek” was posed to help support the fifth question on academic achievement. This question may reveal how serious the student is about pursuing academics, possibly music or another area within the fine arts. The frequencies for Masters are 40 or 42.1%, 21 or 22.1% for Doctorate, and 20 or 21.1% for Professional degrees with 3 responses omitted due to error (see Table 7).

Table 7.

*Academic Aspiration Frequency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#6</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 6 and 7 show students in the MCS are not only high academic achievers; many of them aspire to higher levels of education. In fact, a combined 85.3% aspire to graduate level study. If Doctoral and Professional are grouped, there is only a 1% difference of educational
aspiration above the Masters level within the MCS, indicating a combined 43.2% aspire to the very highest level of education possible.

**Religious Affiliation**

The next question on the survey centers on religious affiliation. This question was intended to reveal any grouping of participation in faith based organizations that might exist among music students. This topic is of particular interest due to the frequency in which music or song is involved in a church or at other religious services. Students interested in playing instruments or singing in a choir might do so in a religious activity.

Question seven involved eleven different categories including “Other” and “None.” Of the faith affiliations used in the analysis, the combined frequencies indicated “Catholic” with 20 or 21.1%. All other categories represented less than 10% with “Baptist” at 14 or 14.7%. “Other” and “None” also registered slightly higher with 13.7% and 10.5% respectively. Interestingly, the Catholic faith had the highest frequency by far (see Table 8).

Table 8.  
*Religious Affiliation Frequency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#7</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mormon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next question dealt with the “Importance of Financial Aid in Choice of University.” Question eight was intended to reveal more about the participant’s socio-economic status. The question is based on the assumption that the most affluent students would be less interested or uninterested in choosing a university based on financial aid. The results indicated frequencies of 15 or 15.8% in the Essential category, 39 or 41.1% in the Very Important category, 34 or 35.8% in the Somewhat Important category, suggesting that financial aid may be important to this unit. (see Table 9).

Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#8</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Unimportant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Essential</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the MCS, the Very Important and Somewhat Important categories have the largest percentage of responses. If combined, 76.9% of all responses to question #8 fall into these two categories. One might speculate that if this is true then the socio-economic status of the participants is not so affluent, rather the participant’s may come from middle class families but have the benefit of high levels of parental involvement, as evidenced by the results of the Pre-Camp Survey question four.
Type of High School

Question nine deals with the type of high school the participants attended. This question is another socio-economic descriptor intended to reveal a level of affluency. The question assumes that since private schools charge tuition and thus cost more than public schools, those participants attending private schools would most likely come from more affluent families. Additionally, some private schools might have outstanding music programs that would attract students interested in seriously pursuing music, possibly as a career or at least in college.

The results revealed a frequency of 8 for the Private School category or 8.4%. The frequency for Public School was 85 or about 89.5%, Parochial School was 2 or about 2.1% (see Table 10).

Table 10. Type of High School Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#9</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Private</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of “Type of High School,” the majority of participants did not go to private high schools rather they were mostly public school students. Results from question nine seem to suggest lower levels of socio-economic status as so few participants attended private schools. Based on the results from asking about instrument ownership, private lessons, one might speculate that the participants came from upper-middle to upper-income families. However, question eight revealed that some level of financial aid will play a role in the college choice of most participants and this question revealed that most participants went to public high school. Perhaps these students don’t come from mostly upper middle to upper class homes. Maybe they are more associated with the middle and upper-middle classes. If their parents were particularly devoted to developing their children’s talents, they might pay for a used instrument and find affordable private lessons. To this end, it is very possible that the participants in the MCS are from a socio-economic status that is more middle class than previously thought.
Emphasis on Technology

Question ten dealt with the subject of an emphasis on technology in college choice. Many universities place an importance on being perceived as high-tech or having Internet wired campuses and dorms to attract students due to the perception that this is what students want in a college experience (Lydon, 1997). This perception seems to be wide spread and the question was intended to reveal the importance of technology to music campers at the hosting university. Therefore, the participants were asked if an emphasis on technology would increase, decrease or not make a difference in their choice to attend the university.

The results indicated technology would increase interest for the majority of students with a frequency of 51 or 53.7%. However, the “Not make a Difference” response had a frequency of 42 or 44.2% suggesting many student would be unaffected (see Table 11).

Table 11. Emphasis on Technology Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#10</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Omission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Interest</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease Interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Make a Difference</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results for this question indicate the presence of technology in campus programs would not be as great of a recruitment tool as the literature suggests, at least with students in the music camp. Most of the MCS are interested in technology but 44.2% indicated that it would not make a difference. This result is somewhat of a departure from what Lydon (1997) indicated in regard to technology and college choice, suggesting that choice factors among music students might not represent the norm. Perhaps technology is important to most high school students, but not as important to those interested in studying music.
Emphasis on Fine Arts

Question eleven dealt with the subject of an emphasis on fine arts in college choice. This question is somewhat similar in design to question ten. For this question “Increase, Decrease and Not Make a Difference” were utilized with the intention of revealing participants particular interest in fine arts as a factor for determining college choice. The assumption with this question is that students choosing to attend a university that does emphasize the fine arts might be planning to major in a fine art or related field in college.

The results indicated a frequency of 82 or 86.3% for Increase Interest. Decrease Interest had a frequency of 0 and was omitted from analysis. As anticipated, the majority of participants in the sample indicated that an emphasis on fine arts would increase their interest in attending (see Table 12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#11</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Increase Interest</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Make a Difference</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distance from the University

The final question on this survey attempts to assess the distance the participants traveled to come to the hosting university. It was intended that this question reveal how determined the participants were to study at the university. Question twelve makes the assumption that students traveling greater distances are more interested in some aspect of the institution (most likely music) and are seeking it out above and beyond what is locally available to them. Furthermore, students who travel great distances might be more dedicated to their academic pursuits given that there are plenty of colleges and universities that offer music throughout the nation.

The results indicated the majority of responses fell between 101 to 250 Miles with a frequency of 26 or 27.4%, and 46 or 48.4% within 251 and 500 Miles (see Table 13).
Table 13.  
*Distance from the University Frequency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#12</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Within 20 Miles from Home</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 20 and 100 Miles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 101 and 250 Miles</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 251 and 500 Miles</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 501 and 1,000 Miles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 1,000 Miles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, a large percentage of the sample traveled hundreds of miles to attend the hosting university. The majority of participants in the sample traveled within 251 and 500 miles to attend this institution. Surprisingly, there were relatively low numbers of students from closer locations, with 44.3% of campers traveling under 250 miles; however 55.8% still came from locations over 250 miles to attend the university suggesting a high level of academic dedication among the MCS.

*Summary*

In review, data analysis for the biographic and demographic surveys included calculation of frequencies and percentages of responses to all questions from the MCS. The results suggested students attending the music camp at the hosting university are mostly white, female, age 15 or 16, middle class or upper-middle class and benefit from supportive families. There are
also large numbers of males attending both programs and minorities are present; they just don’t represent characteristics of the statistical majority.

Furthermore, these students are also high academic achievers and aspire to the highest levels of education possible. This is a highly informative characteristic and offers insight to the phenomenon because as Ihlanfeldt (1980) and Litten, Sullivan and Brodigan (1983) indicated, higher ability students tend to conduct more sophisticated college searches, do so more efficiently, and also tend to come from homes where higher levels of parental education are present.

Moreover, Zemsky and Oedel (1983) found that as ability and SES fall, students tend to conduct geographically narrower searches. If the reverse of this finding is also true then a high ability student might conduct a wider college search, which not only complements the fact that many of these campers were willing to travel enormous distances to attend the university, but adds support to the description of the profile of typical music camper as an individual from a moderately high SES background.

Opinions of the College of Music

Section two is divided into two parts and intended to provide data analysis and discussion for the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys as they relate to question two, “How do music campers perceive the institution in terms of the four factors: faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere?” and question three “What changes in perception of the institution in terms of the four factors occur after participation in the camp?” (see Appendix C and D for examples of the surveys). The Pre and Post-Camp Surveys were divided into two parts. The first part focused on opinions of the College of Music and the second focused on opinions of the university as a whole. Analysis indicated that opinions of the university as separate from opinions of the College of Music were not significantly influenced by participation in the camp and therefore those findings have been omitted from the study.

The first part of this section is centered on presenting the findings of the Pre-Camp Survey. The surveys contained a Likert Scale with the number 1 assigned for the Strongly Agree response, 2 assigned for Agree, 3 assigned for Not Sure and Don’t Know, 4 assigned to Disagree, and 5 assigned to Strongly Disagree. Survey responses ranged between 1 through 5 and means indicate placement on this scale. A comparison with means of Post-Camp Survey findings will indicate any movement on the scale of 1 through 5, which represents change in
opinion. A discussion of the Post-Camp Survey findings will be presented in part two of this section.

The survey results have been organized around the four factors: faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere that were addressed by the questions. For example, findings of survey statements pertaining to faculty will be discussed together.

**Pre-Camp Opinions Regarding Faculty**

**Concern.** In the “Opinion of the College of Music” (OCM) section of the Pre-Camp Survey, the first statement deals with perceptions of the faculty. The statement reads “Has a faculty which is concerned with helping students reach their maximum potential as artists.” Means and standard deviations were calculated. The results can be seen on Table 14.

Table 14.  
*Concern for Students: Mean and Standard Deviation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#1</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q#1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accessibility.** The next statement from the OCM section dealing with faculty was number five, “Has faculty members who are accessible.” Means and standard deviations results can be seen in Table 15.

Table 15.  
*Faculty Accessibility: Mean and Standard Deviation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#5</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q#5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Acumen.** The next statement from the OCM section dealing with faculty was number seven, “Has faculty members who are up to date in the field of music.” Means and standard deviations results can be seen in Table 16.

Table 16.  
*Professional Acumen: Mean and Standard Deviation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#7</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q#7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching Ability. The last statement from the OCM section dealing with faculty was number eight, “Has faculty members who are excellent teachers.” Means and standard deviations results can be seen in Table 17.

Table 17.
Teaching Ability: Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#8</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-Camp Opinions Regarding Academic Programming

Professional Values. The next focal point of the surveys was opinions of academic programming. Statement three under the “Opinion of the College of Music” section on the Pre-Camp Surveys reads “Has an emphasis on professional values in Music.” Means and standard deviations results can be seen in Table 18.

Table 18.
Emphasis on Professional Values: Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#3</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Practical Learning. The next statement from the OCM section dealing with academics was number four, “Provides practical learning opportunities (internships, apprenticeships, education to work programs).” Means and standard deviations results can be seen in Table 19.

Table 19.
Practical Learning Opportunities: Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#4</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job Placement. The last statement from the OCM section dealing with academics was number six, “Has an excellent job placement program.” Means and standard deviations results can be seen in Table 20.
Table 20.
Job Placement Program: Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#6</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-Camp Opinions Regarding Facilities in the College of Music

Library. The last focal point of the surveys was opinions of facilities in the College of Music. Statement ten on the OCM Survey reads “Has a library that meets student needs.” Means and standard deviations results can be seen in Table 21.

Table 21.
Library that Meets Student Needs: Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#10</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technological Facilities. The other statement dealing with facilities on the OCM Section was question twelve. This statement reads “Has excellent technological facilities.” Means and standard deviations results can be seen in Table 22.

Table 22.
Excellent Technological Facilities: Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#12</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-Camp Opinions Regarding Social Atmosphere

Social Interaction. The next focal point of the Pre-Camp Surveys was opinions of social atmosphere. Statement two of the OCM Survey reads “Has Students who socially interact out of class.” Means and standard deviations results can be seen in Table 23.

Table 23.
Student Social Interaction: Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#2</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Staffing.** The next statement from the OCM section dealing with social atmosphere was number nine, “Has staff members who are accessible and caring.” Means and standard deviations results can be seen in Table 24.

Table 24.
*Caring and Accessible Staff: Mean and Standard Deviation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q#9</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**International Dimension.** The last statement from the OCM section dealing with social atmosphere was number eleven, “Has a strong international dimension.” Means and standard deviations results can be seen in Table 25.

Table 25.
*International Dimension: Mean and Standard Deviation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q#11</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second part of this section is centered on presenting the findings of the Post-Camp Survey. Once again, the results have been organized around the four factors: faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere that were addressed in the questions. Means and standard deviations were also calculated and a comparison with the Pre-Camp Survey data was conducted. A *t* test was also conducted to identify changes between pre and post-responses as well as an independent samples test. A discussion of the focus group findings and the descriptive narrative will be presented in the third section.

**Post-Camp Opinions Regarding Faculty**

*Concern.* In the “Opinion of the College of Music” (OCM) section of the Post-Camp Survey, the first statement is concerned with perceptions of the faculty. The statement reads “Has a faculty which is concerned with helping students reach their maximum potential as artists” (see Table 26). Based on the mean results, responses moved a little closer to 1 or Strongly Agree suggesting that the opinions formed were also highly positive in regard to faculty in the College of Music. The results of the *t* test for statement one show equal variances.
assumed and obtained a $t$ value of 2.590 with significance at $p < .011$ suggesting a significant difference between the pre and post responses (see Table 27).

Table 26. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern for Students: Mean and Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q#1 time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern for Students: t test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q#1 Equal variances assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error Difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accessibility. The next statement from the OCM section dealing with faculty was number five, “Has faculty members who are accessible” (see Table 28). Based on the mean results, responses moved from above 2 or Agree and into 1 inside the range for Agree suggesting that the opinions that were formed were more positive after participation. The results of the $t$ test for statement five show equal variances assumed and obtained a $t$ value of 2.944 with significance at $p < .004$ suggesting a significant difference between the pre and post responses (see Table 29).

Table 28. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Accessibility: Mean and Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q#5 time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 29.  
**Faculty Accessibility: t test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q#5</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Acumen.** The next statement from the OCM section dealing with faculty was number seven, “Has faculty members who are up to date in the field of music” (see Table 30). Based on the mean results, responses moved from 2 or Agree and into the 1 or Strongly Agree category suggesting that the opinions that were formed were highly positive after participation. The results of the $t$ test for statement seven show equal variances not assumed and obtained a $t$ value of 3.717 with significance at $p < .001$ suggesting a significant difference between the pre and post responses (see Table 31).

Table 30.  
**Professional Acumen: Mean and Standard Deviation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q#7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31.  
**Professional Acumen: t test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q#7</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>7.134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching Ability. The last statement from the OCM section dealing with faculty was number eight, “Has faculty members who are excellent teachers” (see Table 32). Based on the mean results, responses moved from 2 or Agree to well into the 1 or Strongly Agree category suggesting that the opinions that were formed were highly positive after participation. The results of the $t$ test for statement 8 show equal variances assumed and obtained a $t$ value of 2.471 with significance at $p < .015$ suggesting a significant difference between the pre and post responses (see Table 33).

Table 32.
*Teaching Ability: Mean and Standard Deviation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33.
*Teaching Ability: $t$ test*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q#8</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-Camp Opinions Regarding Social Atmosphere

Social Interaction. The next focal point of the surveys was opinions of social atmosphere. Statement two of the “Opinion of the College of Music” Survey reads “Has Students who socially interact out of class” (see Table 34). Based on the mean results, responses moved from within the 2 or Agree category into the 1 or Strongly Agree category. Results suggest that the opinions formed were highly positive in regard to social atmosphere in the College of Music. The results of the $t$ test for statement 2 show equal variances assumed and obtained a $t$ value of 2.583 with significance at $p < .011$ suggesting a significant difference between the pre and post responses (see Table 35).
Table 34.

**Student Social Interaction: Mean and Standard Deviation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q#2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35.

**Student Social Interaction: t test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q#2</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staffing.** The next statement from the OCM section dealing with social atmosphere was number nine, “Has staff members who are accessible and caring” (see Table 36). Responses moved from the agree category (2.14) into the 1 or Strongly Agree category suggesting that the opinions that were formed were highly positive after participation. The results of the $t$ test for statement nine show equal variances assumed and obtained a $t$ value of 2.400 with significance at $p < .018$ suggesting a significant difference between the pre and post responses (see Table 37).

Table 36.

**Caring and Accessible Staff: Mean and Standard Deviation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q#9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
International Dimension. The last statement from the OCM section dealing with social atmosphere was number eleven, “Has a strong international dimension” (see Table 38). Based on the mean results, responses moved within the Agree category 2.34 to 2.13 suggesting that the opinions that formed were still positive after participation. The results of the $t$ test for statement eleven show equal variances not assumed and obtained a $t$ value of 1.628 without significance at $p < .106$ suggesting no difference between the pre and post responses (see Table 39).

Table 38.  
**International Dimension: Mean and Standard Deviation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#11</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39.  
**International Dimension: t test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#11</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>4.445</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>1.628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post-Camp Opinions Regarding Academic Programming

Professional Values. The next focal point of the surveys was opinions of academic programming. Statement three under “Opinion of the College of Music” Section on the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys reads “Has an emphasis on professional values in music” (see Table 40). Based on the mean results, responses moved from the edge of 2 or the Agree category into the Strongly Agree category. Results suggest that perceptions of academics in the College of Music were highly positive after participation. The results of the \( t \) test for statement three show equal variances not assumed and obtained a \( t \) value of 3.275 with significance at \( p < .001 \) suggesting a significant difference between the pre and post responses (see Table 41).

Table 40.
Emphasis on Professional Values: Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q#3</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41.
Emphasis on Professional Values: \( t \) test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>( t ) Test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( F )</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q#3</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>5.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Practical Learning. The next statement from the OCM section dealing with academics was number four, “Provides practical learning opportunities (internships, apprenticeships, education to work programs)” (see Table 42). Responses moved slightly negatively within the Agree category 2.07 to 2.16 suggesting that the opinions were more positive before participation. It is very possible that the participants had little to no exposure to information regarding internships and the like during the camp. Therefore, when they took the post survey, campers chose unsure or don’t know more frequently than they did before participation. The results of
the \( t \) test for statement four support the previous findings. Equal variances were assumed and obtained a \( t \) value of \(-.621\) with significance at \( p < .536\) suggesting no significant difference between the pre and post responses (see Table 43).

Table 42.

**Practical Learning Opportunities: Mean and Standard Deviation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#4</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43.

**Practical Learning Opportunities: \( t \) test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q#4: Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job Placement.* The last statement from the OCM section dealing with academics was number six, “Has an excellent job placement program” (see Table 44). Responses moved slightly negatively within the Agree category 2.46 to 2.55 suggesting that the opinions were mostly positive after participation. The results of the \( t \) test for statement six also support the previous findings. Equal variances were assumed and obtained a \( t \) value of \(-.758\) with significance at \( p < .449\) suggesting no significant difference between the pre and post responses. As with responses to the previous statement, it is again possible that the participants were not exposed to information about job placement of music school graduates. Therefore, when campers took the post survey they chose Unsure or don’t know more frequently than they did before participation. It is also possible that some of the participants simply guessed on the survey and most of the ones that did not circled the “Not Sure” response (see Table 45).
Table 44.
**Job Placement Program: Mean and Standard Deviation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#6 time</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45.
**Job Placement Program: t test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#6</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q#6</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Post-Camp Opinions Regarding Facilities*

*Library.* The last focal point of the surveys was opinions of facilities in the College of Music. Statement ten on the “Opinion of College of Music” Survey reads “Has a library that meets student needs.” The statement was intended to reveal opinions related to the quality of the College of Music’s Center for Music Research (CMR). According to the hosting university’s website, the CMR provides a duel service to music students, combining a facility for scholarly research with computer technology. This statement was utilized to reveal perceptions of scholarly quality associated with the CMR facility. It was thought that the term “library” best represents a facility for scholarly research on a college campus. Therefore, “library” was kept in order to compose a more succinct survey statement.

Responses started within the 2 or Agree category and moved more towards the middle of the same category (see Table 46). Results suggested that perceptions of facilities in the College of Music were still positive after participation, however some participants must have been unsure or had negative experiences with facilities in the College of Music. The results of the *t* test for statement ten support the previous findings. Equal variances were assumed and obtained a *t* value of -.472 with significance at *p* < .638 suggesting no significant difference between the pre and post responses (see Table 47).
Table 46.
Library that Meets Student Needs: Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#10</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 47.
Library that Meets Student Needs: t test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#10</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variances assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quality of the library or CMR program within the College of Music was not a topic that surfaced during focus group discussion or the interview. Due to its absence as a topic during the statements centering on facilities in the College of Music, it seems unlikely that the music camp addressed this topic directly in their curriculum. The subject of library quality was included in the Ingersoll Group (1988) survey for higher education program evaluation, which was utilized for this case study. Therefore, library quality was considered an aspect of overall programmatic quality and the survey was intended to collect data to this end. Since there was no reference to library or CMR during the focus groups, the survey results stand as the only reference to this subject.

Technological Facilities. The other statement dealing with facilities on the “Opinion of College of Music” Section was statement twelve. This statement reads “Has excellent technological facilities” (see Table 48). Responses started just before the middle of the 2 or Agree category and moved beyond it to 2.54. Results suggested that perceptions of facilities in the College of Music were still positive after participation, however some participants must have been unsure or had negative experiences with facilities in the College of Music. The results of the $t$ test for statement twelve support the previous findings. Equal variances were assumed and
obtained a $t$ value of $-.488$ with significance at $p < .626$ suggesting no significant difference between the pre and post responses (see Table 49).

Table 48.  
**Excellent Technological Facilities: Mean and Standard Deviation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 49.  
**Excellent Technological Facilities: $t$ test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#12</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>$t$-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

In review, section two was intended to present findings and provide data analysis for the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys as they relate to research question two (How do music campers perceive the College of Music in terms of the four factors: faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere?) and research question three (What changes in perception occurred due to the participation in the music camp?). The section was divided into two parts. The first part focused on opinions of the College of Music collected on the Pre-Camp Survey and the second focused on changes to those opinions collected on the Post-Camp Survey. Means and standard deviations were calculated and the researcher conducted a $t$ test to observe statistically significant changes between pre and post-camp responses.

Overall, results indicated that perceptions of faculty were highly positive. Opinions of concern for students, accessibility, professional acumen, and teaching ability were all positive or highly positive and $t$ tests for questions pertaining to each of these qualities resulted in significant differences after participation in the camp. Specifically, opinions of concern for students became more positive with a Mean score moving from 2 or Agree .32 closer to 1 or
Strongly Agree. Accessibility also became more positive with a Mean score moving .44 closer to 1 or Strongly Agree. Professional Acumen became more positive as well with a Mean score moving from 2 or Agree .50 closer to 1 or Strongly Agree. Opinions of teaching ability also became more positive with a Mean score moving from 2 or Agree .36 closer to 1 or Strongly Agree after participation in the camp.

Survey results indicated that perceptions of social atmosphere were also high. In particular, opinions related to out of class social interaction, the caring and accessible nature of camp staff members and a strong international dimension were positive or highly positive after participation. Specifically, opinions of out of class social interaction became more positive with a Mean score moving from 2.05 or Agree .35 closer to 1 or Strongly Agree. Opinions of caring and accessible staff also became more positive as well with a Mean score moving from 2.14 or Agree .35 closer to 1 or Strongly Agree. One point of interest is that t tests for opinions related to the international dimension were not found to be significantly different after the camp.

Survey results suggest that perceptions of academics were mixed. Specifically, opinions related to emphasis of professional values in music were highly positive and the t test for opinions of this quality suggested a significant difference after participation. Opinions became more positive with a Mean score moving from 1.83 to 1.43 with the Strongly Agree category. Opinions related to practical learning opportunities were slightly negative although t tests indicated no significant difference after participation. Furthermore, opinions related to excellent job placement program were mostly positive even though t tests indicated no significant difference after participation.

Results pertaining to perceptions of facilities in the College of Music were also mixed. In particular, opinions related to the library or CMR were positive although t tests indicated that no significant differences were found after participation in the camp. Furthermore, opinions related to technological facilities were mostly positive even though t tests indicated no significant difference after participation.

*Focus Group Findings*

In the focus groups, campers were asked questions on the same basic topics as in the surveys. All additional questioning and commentary resulted from these initial topics. Through personal examples and commentary, the focus groups provided more in-depth information on the experience of participating in the camp as framed by the four college choice factors. Following
the design of the pre and post surveys, the focus groups were divided into two sections, the first centering on perceptions of the College of Music and the second centering on perceptions of the university as a whole. It is intended that this section offer evidence for question four (How do campers view their experience of the camp as framed by the four factors: faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere). A complete transcription of the focus groups can be found in Appendix F.

Opinions of the College of Music

Faculty. The focus group responses that dealt with faculty related issues communicated a belief among participants that the College of Music had excellent faculty that were concerned with helping students reach their full potential. In focus group 1, a participant stated, “The professors here make the difference, especially in music.” Another participant in the same focus group explained, “The music we play at my school is really easy and when I was in sixth grade I was playing in the high school band.” The participant went on to explain that academics in the camp were far superior to what he was used to at home. An additional participant communicated, “In school I am not really challenged too much and coming here (the music camp) does improve my ability.” In general, participants in the focus groups communicated that they had a great deal of respect for the faculty in the College of Music and how challenged they were by the camp curriculum. For many, the quality of the faculty and academics seemed to emerge as a dominate perception associated with the College of Music.

The focus group responses that dealt with issues related to faculty accessibility revealed a fair amount on this subject. A participant in group two referenced being particularly prepared for their recital because of the faculty and stated, “There’s about 5 people per teacher (in class)” while explaining how helpful the faculty have been in the camp. It is unknown if the teacher/student ratio is similar in classes throughout the camp, however, a 1:5 ratio would surely augment instructor accessibility. In the same group, another participant offered a supporting testimony stating, “It (the camp) doesn’t even compare to high school…When you come here they kind of treat you like a college student, there’s more one on one with you.” This particular statement confirms high levels of faculty accessibility within the camp. The statement also suggests that the campers form perceptions of what it would be like to attend the hosting university as a college student based on their experience in the camp. Finally, many of the participants communicated that they thought the faculty were “Top Notch” or “Really, really
personal and nice.” Opinions of this nature might not have been formed if there was not quality contact between students and faculty.

The focus group responses that dealt with issues related to College of Music faculty revealed some feelings pertaining to professional acumen. In group one, a participant exuberantly stated, “The professors here make the difference,” suggesting a great deal of respect for the faculty. Another participant in the same focus group supported the previous assertion with, “The professors here are world renowned.” In the second focus group, a student indicated that her professor had “…played at Carnegie Hall on at least two times” referencing the professionalism of the College of Music faculty. Finally, in the fourth focus group the participants supported the previous statements regarding faculty quality with comments such as, “They all seem to know what they’re doing,” “They’re impressive” and “Definitely good.” Based on these comments, the students in the music camp certainly had the opportunity to form opinions of faculty quality. It should be said that no participant in the focus groups directly stated the faculty are “up to date” in the College of Music. The participants did however communicate positive opinions related to faculty professionalism, which most likely would not have happened if the campers thought they were not current or up to date in their respective areas.

The sections in the focus group dealing with College of Music faculty revealed some opinions pertaining to quality teaching. In focus group two a participant explained what it was like attending his theory class. He indicated that the professor gave a lecture to begin the class and then, “She’ll come around and work with everyone,” communicated individually with each student. A second student in the same focus group told the researcher that when she came to camp she was not ready for her recital. She then stated, “Now our recital is on Friday and I feel really ready especially because of my teacher.” In group three a participant spoke about her band director and said, “I’ve been with ones that bring out the best musician in me and taught me so much. I think the university does a really good job in choosing people (to teach). I’ve learned so much these past two weeks and I’m going to go home and show everyone what I’ve learned.” Evidently, the participants in the music camp not only have excellent opportunities to form perceptions of the College of Music, the perceptions seem positive.

**Academic Programming.** The focus groups revealed a few opinions on this topic, although professional values in music were not discussed as a main theme. Responses for this
question were especially difficult to interpret due to the participants’ lack of experience in the music profession. Furthermore, the researcher is not a member of the music profession and is not absolutely familiar with values in music. To this end, a few instances of activities repeatedly mentioned by participants are presented in the next paragraph. It is assumed that this activity might be a professional value in music and can serve as an example of an emphasis within the College of Music.

In group two a camper mentioned, “we have four hours of practice time,” in which it was acceptable to practice with other students. Also in group two, a student new to music camps in general stated, “when I first came to camp here I thought it was going to be impossible to do but after two days I had it down because of the practice time.” Additionally, in group four a participant indicated the inclusion of a music theory class in the curriculum as well as mentioning practice time. The camper stated, “We have a theory class. Out of all of them it’s the most academic class. Otherwise, it’s just practicing and playing your instrument, but in this class you actually sit down and learn things.” Since practicing one’s instrument seems to be a reoccurring theme in the experience of the campers, it is likely that this is a professional value in the music field that is getting communicated to the participants.

The quality of practical learning experiences within the College of Music curriculum was not one of the topics specifically discussed in the focus groups or the interview. Furthermore, it is not known whether the music camp addressed this topic directly in their curriculum. The question was part of another survey used to evaluate programs in higher education and was created by The Ingersoll Group (1988). Since no published instrument could be located for the evaluation of summer music programs within the literature, the Ingersoll Group instrument was utilized for this case study. This question was not eliminated because the Ingersoll Group asked the question in their survey and thus it was considered an aspect of programmatic quality. The survey results stand as the only reference to this subject.

The quality of job placement programs within the College of Music curriculum was also not a topic specifically discussed in the focus groups and no reference was made to it by the participants. It is unlikely that the music camp addressed this topic directly in their curriculum as it pertains little to playing music. Furthermore, at the time of the study it is unknown if any such program actually exists in the College of Music. Question six was included in the Ingersoll Group (1988) survey for higher education program evaluation, which was utilized for this case
study. This question was not eliminated because the Ingersoll Group asked the question in their survey. Therefore, job placement was considered an aspect of programmatic quality and the survey was intended to collect data to this end. Similar to question three, the survey results stand as the only reference to this subject.

**Facilities.** One of the main goals of the focus groups was to reveal opinions related to facilities in the College of Music and the university at large. Question twelve was included on this survey to support question ten since in the College of Music the research and technological facilities are combined in the CMR. In every group, questions pertaining to facilities in the College of Music were asked. The resulting discussions focused on quality of practice rooms, concert halls and the dormitory in which the campers stayed. In no communication with any participant did the topic of technological facilities or the CMR come into the dialogue. The absence of any mention seems to indicate an absence of exposure to these facilities within the camp curriculum. This is particularly perplexing due to the presence and outstanding nature of such facilities in the College of Music.

Moreover, several of the focus groups participants communicated less than affirming opinions related to College of Music facilities. One participant in the second focus group stated, “The practice rooms are in really bad shape, the air is not working well. I play strings and it constantly goes out of tune because it is so humid and hot. They really need to put better air in those areas. I went into one room and it was leaking from the ceiling onto the piano.” Another participant in the same group supported these statements with, “Well the pianos on the fourth floor are not bad, but the rooms are all vandalized and have not very nice things written all over them, the pianos in the basement are really, really bad.” In addition to these statements, another participant said, “Yeah, disrepair is like a design theme here” offering similar sentiments as with the previous comments. Since some of the campers did not seem to think highly of these facilities it is possible that if they did associate these facilities with “technological facilities” then some would have disagreed with the affirmative statement on the survey.

**Social Atmosphere.** The focus group responses that dealt with issues related to social interaction suggest that a great deal of peer bonding took place during the camp. One participant in the first focus group stated, “The people here, not only are they interested in music, but we get to know them and kind of break the ice a little bit. We all have a common interest. We all just kind of relate. I have met one of my best friends here, actually.” The camp structure also
included on campus planned social activities that increased contact among campers. A participant in the same focus group stated, “They have activities for us. They have movie night tonight and there was a bowling thing the other night. We also have a place were we can just hang out and chill. We can come in here and talk to people and get to know each other.” When asked “Do you feel like you are making friends for the long term,” one participant in the second focus group responded, “Yeah, I have about five friends that I met here, that live an hour and fifteen minutes away from home.” A few of the other participants responded to the same question with, “When I came last year I met a couple of people that I’m still in touch with this year,” demonstrating that campers do have the opportunity to make lasting friendships within the program.

Campers also commented on their observation of university students socially interacting while on campus. These remarks suggested that the time they spent traveling to classes and back to their dorm was also beneficial in forming perceptions of the university’s social atmosphere. One participant stated, “The school itself just has a great atmosphere, you just walk back and forth from the dorm to the College of Music, you can tell people like it here.” Another participant in the same group stated, “You walk by the fields and there’s always people playing football or just playing out there or reading something,” supporting the previous participant’s account.

In this case, the focus groups revealed that the campers more closely associated “Staff” with camp staff than with staff in the College of Music (i.e. secretaries and advisors). Therefore, it should be understood that this question did not reveal the intended information. It is beneficial to this study to know how well the music camp operates and that camp staff do play a role to that end. Consequently, the results for this question were relevant and should be considered a reflection of the music camp staff and not the staff in the College of Music.

In general, the focus groups revealed mixed results on the topic of staff accessibility and caring. A participant in focus group three explained that some coordination issues exist among the staff in the camp. He told the interviewer that he got stuck at the dorm on the night in which campers attended the local amusement park. He said, “the counselors were like, whatever” and suggested that “communication improvements would help.” Once this participant told the story another camper indicated that the same thing happened to her. She said, “People didn’t tell me what was going on,” supporting the possibility of communication problems among staff. In
another section of the same focus group a participant stated in reference to counselors, “Sometimes they’re hard to find. I got hurt yesterday and I had to hunt around for the counselor,” further reinforcing accessibility problems. Just after the “hurt camper” told their story another spoke up about his trouble. He said, “Sometimes you go in search of your counselor in their room and you bang on the door for like ten minutes and somebody says, ‘they’re not in there.’” “Then you go and have to search the whole entire dorm for them and they end up not being there yet.” It seems that this statement is a bit of an exaggeration, but the frustration of the campers is evident. A more stirring description of frustration with the counselors was voiced in focus group four. In reference to her treatment by the counselors one participant described feeling like a cow. She emphatically stated, “We’re down here (in the large common area at the dorm) at 9:55 pm and they send everybody up to their rooms no matter what’s going on. I feel like cattle. I’m a person, not a cow. I hate that. I don’t like to be mass herded. I like to be treated as a human being and a person.” The point this camper reported is not the applicability of a 10 pm curfew on high school students rather the tactless way in which it was enforced. Unmistakably, the counselor’s actions indicated an absence of friendliness or the personal touch, which commonly communicates that one cares.

In contrast to the previous statements, participants did have some good things to say about the staff in the music camp. One of the older campers in group three stated in reference to counselor’s behavior, “You have to understand that they’re put in charge of 15 or 20 girls or guys, plus they have their own job, while at camp. You have to be kind of lenient there.” Additionally, a participant in the fourth focus group told a different story. He said, “I talked to some of the counselors and they told me about the program I could pursue here and now I’m pretty sure this is the place I want to go to college. Everyone was helpful and told me what I wanted to know about the school.” This individual’s experience with the counselors is certainly different than the previous accounts, suggesting the possibility that some of the counselors were accessible.

Revealing perceptions of social atmosphere in the College of Music was one of the goals of the focus groups. The participants in the groups did mention the presence of diversity within the music camp. Furthermore, the survey results augmented this observation and suggested that campers extended the perception of an international element from the music camp to be included within their perception of the College of Music’s student body as well. In group three, a
participant stated, “I think they do a really good job with getting diversity,” which directly affirms participants either had contact with or observed different demographics within the camp. Finally, one participant in the first focus group stated, “there are people here from Spain,” which confirms an international dimension in the music camp.

Opinions of the University

In this part of section three, focus group responses related to perceptions of the university are discussed. These responses are discussed separately from the tables and statistical data pertaining to this topic because findings of the Post-Camp Survey questions dealing with perceptions of the university did not result in significance and were omitted. Focus group discussion also included questioning centered on perceptions of the University. These discussion topics included perceptions of academics, facilities, and social atmosphere as well as additional University related topics such as athletics, staffing, prestige, and reputation. Discussion related to each of these topics is explained in the following paragraphs.

Academic Programming. In the case of specialized or diverse academics, it’s important to say that camper’s perceptions of academics at the university are entirely based in experiences within the College of Music as there were not curricular aspects in the camp that exposed campers to other schools or colleges at the university. Further, focus group participants in group one directly supported this claim by stating, “We don’t get any other contact, it’s just music. So I really couldn’t tell you, I don’t know the professors, I don’t know anything, but as far as music is concerned, if it follows the same trend, then yeah, it (the university) seems like it would be a worthwhile school to come to.” Based on these statements, it seems that although the camp participants don’t “get any other contact,” they do associate a perception of academics in the College of Music with academics in the university at large, establishing their decision to attend college at the university on experiences within the College of Music.

Since specialized or diverse academics are neither positive nor negative in relation to a university characteristic, from a recruitment standpoint it is less important to reveal what the participants thought about the university. Depending on the particular institution, academics might be diverse or specialized; each characteristic has its benefits and drawbacks. It is more important to point out that if the students only took classes in music then it would make sense that some of them might think the university had specialized academics since no other academic experience occurred. Analysis suggested extremely limited opinion forming opportunities were
available to participants in relation to experiencing diverse academics during the camp. The participants in the music camp were not exposed to any other academics while on campus, which most likely resulted in “Unsure” perceptions regarding the university.

**Facilities.** The focus groups were designed to reveal opinions related to facilities in the College of Music and the university. The topic of campus housing came up quite frequently during the discussions. In most cases, opinions of the dorm in which campers stayed were negative, providing a great deal of contrast to the survey findings for the “Poor Housing/Good Housing” question. In the first focus group a participant stated, “The dorms leave a little something to be desired.” When the interviewer asked for an elaboration another participant said, “There’s no lights in the dorms.” Other members of the same focus group supported this statement with, “There is one little light over the doorway and the rest of the room is kind of far back so it doesn’t illuminate anything, like at night it’s just enough to see where you’re going.” Participants in the second focus groups added more to the “Poor Housing” question.

When the interviewer asked if the participants would they live in a dorm if they came to the university for college the responses were immediate and negative. One participant shouted out, “No!” and others agreed stating various reasons such as, “They’re way too small” and “everything is a little bit crusty.” The food was also an issue with the participants. One girl stated, “I would not want to eat that food, imagine every night and waking up to that stuff every morning.” Additional comments on this topic can be found in each focus group. It should be said that the dorm the music camp participants stay in is not owned by the university. The university has other dorms, but the camp chooses to house their students at this particular facility. It is not known why the camp administration chooses this dorm over the others, only that participants have been staying there for a number of years.

Additional commentary recorded during the focus groups related to facilities pertained to perceptions of campus. The attractive or unattractive nature of campus is not a facility, rather the overall visual impact of all facilities and grounds combined. Many of the participants offered comments on the nature of campus. One participant in the second focus group stated, “As far as the building itself, it doesn’t look as good as the rest (of campus). It looks older than the rest, but I’d rather put up with a little bit of not as niceness. I guess what I’m trying to say is that I would give up a little beauty for the better program.”
Later, in the same group, another participant communicated his opinion of campus stating, “It looks older than like some of the other colleges I’ve been to for band camp, but it’s still really nice.” Moreover, participants followed with this statement, “I don’t mind the old look because it shows you how long they have been here and how experienced they really are,” suggesting a perceptual relationship between campus nature and academic quality.

In focus group four participants made similar comments, but added a different interpretation to the state of campus. One participant stated, “I love the brick buildings, I’ve lived up north most of my entire life and the bricks remind me of so much of it. The campus makes me feel like I’m at home again.” This sense of home is particularly important due to the influence on college choice. As the hosting university’s Director of Undergraduate Admissions says, “We are all in the business for having the students find the right fit, where they can feel like it’s home, because if it’s home and you feel it’s going to be a good fit, your going to be a successful student.” Interestingly enough, when the interviewer asked this particular focus group participant if the camp had an impact on her decision to attend the university for college she replied, “It was always in the back of my mind, but when I got to come here and walk around on campus and everything I saw that this is what I want.” It seems that in this case the Admissions Director is right about the relationship between perceptions of home and fit. It also seems that, for this participant, the music camp served as a vehicle for her to make a decision regarding college choice.

**Social Atmosphere.** The focus groups were designed to reveal opinions related to social opportunities at the university. The discussions contained comments regarding social events that were planned into the music camp curriculum and observations made by participants while on campus. In the first focus group a participant stated, “They have activities for us. They have movie night tonight. There was a bowling ally thing the other night. We also have a place where we can just hang out and chill. We come in here and talk to people and get to know each other.” These activities not only offer opportunities to socialize, they simultaneously showcase the university’s recreational facilities. When asked about their observation of social interaction among the university’s students participants stated, “It’s pretty obvious, you just walk around campus and there’s tons of stuff to do. You walk by the fields and stuff and there’s always people playing football or playing out there or reading something.” In the fourth focus group the interviewer asked the participants to consider going to school here and describe what they
thought it might be like socially. The participants responded with, “It would be okay. They have some good stuff to do (on campus) and there are things around in the area.” Clearly, the camp administration incorporated numerous social events into their curriculum in which the participants seemed to form related opinions. What is perplexing is that the survey responses did not reflect the reactions of the focus groups participants, which seem to suggest campers thought social opportunities abound at the university.

Additional University Related Focus Group Topics

Athletics. The focus groups were not organized to include a focus on athletics, although some comments were made to that end. In support of the previous findings, one of the participants in group one did mention athletics. While responding to the question, “What do you think about the university on the whole?” a participant stated, “It’s great, you hear a lot about the sports programs here, football, marching band and all kinds of stuff.” In the same group, another participant mentioned athletics at the university. At the end of each focus group, the participants were asked individually if participation in the camp influenced their choice to attend the university for college. While explaining his answer to this question a participant said, “I’ve seen a pretty good number of universities for music and this is probably one of the better ones I’ve gone to. I’m not a big sports fan to begin with, but I guess I could deal with that, to come here for the music program, yeah, I’ll deal with the jocks.” These comments don’t necessarily support that all participants are highly aware of the university’s athletic programs; they do, however, serve as excellent examples of opinions dealing with athletics that were formed in the music camp.

Staffing. Discussions that occurred in the focus groups touched upon the subject of staff. A participant in group two was complaining about problems in the scheduling of the planned social activities the researcher asked the group if they felt like the program was “impersonal” or “corporate,” the participants disagreed stating, “No, personal.” Furthermore, the participant went on to explain how his teacher will “come around and work with everyone” during class as an example of how personal the camp was. In contrast, a participant described her displeasure for the treatment she was receiving by the camp staff in the dorm. She explained how the counselors “herded” everyone up to their rooms at 10 pm and by doing this she was made to feel “like cattle.” Therefore, the focus group responses make it difficult to gauge whether most participants received personal or impersonal treatment by the university. There seems to be a
difference between the treatment in class and the treatment in the dorm. However, experiences in both places may lead to one total experience, ultimately determining the participant’s perception of the university. In this case, the focus groups served as a superior indication of the participant’s experience in the music camp. Analysis of transcriptions suggested that some participants in the music camp were able to form opinions related to the way in which the university treats its students. It is unknown how other students perceived the 10 pm “herding” or if other impersonal actions occurred in the camp and went unspoken during the focus groups. It is more important for this study to simply point out that regardless of perspective, the participants were able to form opinions related to the university’s treatment while attending the music camp.

*Prestige.* The discussions in the focus groups briefly addressed the topic of prestige. In focus group four a participant explained how “All of these kids (campers) want to be here. They will work for this, because they want to be here, they chose this,” implying that some level of importance was associated with attending the music camp. When the researcher asked about prestige the participant’s response was mixed stating, “Not really, but it is a little bit,” suggesting some level of prestige does exist at the university, but it is not a defining factor.

*Reputation.* The focus groups were not designed specifically to collect opinions pertaining to the university’s reputation. This topic did, however, come up during the discussions. In the opening statement from the first focus group, the participants commented on the School’s reputation. One participant stated, “I heard a lot of good things and I came here last year and that’s why I came here this year.” Later, in the same group the interviewer asked about the university as a whole and responses included, “You hear a lot about it, I live in Miami and I hear a lot about this school” as well as “People don’t just come here because they can afford it, or something, you know, it’s a great school.” Certainly, these statements add more evidence to support the results of the pre and post surveys and offer some insight into the influence of a good reputation on college choice.

**Summary**

In review, focus groups revealed that campers held the College of Music faculty in very high regard, noting their experience, professionalism, and teaching ability as outstanding. Experience with faculty outside the College of Music was extremely limited or was nonexistent altogether. The perceptions they formed related to academics were most likely founded on the
experiences they had with College of Music faculty. If the campers formed perceptions of other faculty at the university those thoughts were the result of transferring opinions of College of Music faculty onto those in other colleges and departments.

Focus groups also revealed perceptions of campus housing. In most cases these opinions were negative centering on insufficient lighting, disrepair, and poor food quality. Additional commentary related to campus especially the overall visual impact of the buildings. Perceptions related to this subject were markedly different than those associated with the dorms. Participants communicated an appreciation of the architectural aesthetic prevalent throughout campus. Specifically, comments focused on a comforting association with the aged brick buildings on campus and how they suggested experience and longevity as an institution.

Focus group discussion also revealed numerous perceptions of social atmosphere beyond the College of Music. Participants indicated that they had opportunities to socialize at different locations on campus such as the student union bowling alley and other recreational facilities. Many focus group participants explained that they thought there was a great deal to do on campus and in the surrounding town. One point of interest is that these perceptions are in contrast to the survey results, which did not reflect the idea that social opportunities abound.

In addition to the subjects of faculty, facilities, and social atmosphere the focus group discussions revealed perceptions of several other qualities loosely related to the music camp and the university. These qualities included perceptions of athletics, camp staffing, prestige, and reputation of the university. Specifically, perceptions of athletics arose as a topic when the participants were asked what they thought of the university, communicating awareness of the athletic tradition at the university. Perceptions of staffing included personal experiences with College of Music faculty and impersonal experiences with camp counselors in the dorm. It is associated with perceptions of the university because based on these experiences participants form perceptions of how the institution treats its students. Perceptions of prestige and reputation also became a discussion topic during the focus groups. Participants indicated that they were aware of the university as a somewhat prestigious institution, but that it was not a defining factor. The reputation of the university was also briefly described as a reason that participants come to the institution to study music and that it’s known throughout the state as an outstanding school.
A Summer on Campus – Brittany and Julian go to Music Camp

The following is a composite of many of the students described in the study and will serve as case study vignettes to illustrate the average music camp participant and their experience in the music camp at the hosting university. The narrative is comprised of a description of settings, activities, and demographics related to the music camp including an introduction to Brittany and Julian as well as a description of their experiences within the camp context. Content for the narrative comes from information available on the hosting university’s website and handbook as well as a combination of data from the focus groups and surveys along with personal observations made by the researcher.

The Music Camp at the Hosting University

At the time this research was conducted, the music camp at the hosting university was entering the 62nd year of operation. The camp is located at and functions within the College of Music at the hosting university during the months of June and July. The College of Music is a nationally renowned public music school with an enrollment of 712 undergraduates in 2004. In the same year, the camp enrollment reached over 1,200 students hailing from 27 states and 3 countries.

The curriculum includes 11 camps ranging from Honors Jazz to String Orchestra to Marching Band Leadership to Honors Choral each lasting approximately 1 week. In addition to the various camps offered by the program, 16 electives are also included. These electives are related to a specific instrument or musical genre such as Salsa and World Music or Saxophone and Percussion. Besides the regular camps and electives, a number of private lessons with particular professors, shuttle services to and from the airport, optional dorm activities and camp merchandise are also made available to participants during the camp. In some cases, campers stayed for only one week, but in others, participants attended more than one camp and stayed on campus for several weeks.

All daily camp classes are taught by members of the College of Music, many of which are professors, although some are graduate students serving in the capacity of teaching assistants. The day to day activities of the campers are supervised by camp counselors, which are undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in the College of Music. The camp is operated by the College of Music the administration of which is led by one of the College’s professors.
In addition to the music curriculum, the campers are also involved in numerous social activities designed by the camp administration. These activities take place after classes are over for the day and include dance night, bowling night, an ice cream social, trips the local I-Max theatre, and local amusement park. Participation in these activities is required by the camp administration although campers can choose which social activity they participate in on any given night.

The campers are housed in a dormitory, a private multi-level college living facility located across the street from the university’s southern entrance. At the dorm, the campers eat, sleep, and socialize all under the supervision of the counselors. Male and female campers are separated by different floors, discipline is maintained through cleaning duty punishments and a strict 10 pm curfew is enforced nightly. Campers are expected to be present at all meals, which begin at 7 am for breakfast, 12 noon for lunch, and 5 pm for dinner. Campers are also expected to attend all classes, walk though campus on a predetermined path to and from the dorm and the music school, cross the street in groups and never talk to college students even if they already know them.

The demographics of the music campers were collected via the Pre-Camp Survey at the beginning of camp and the following is a summary of the results. The participants of the music camp were comprised of a multi-gender group that contained representatives of most races, although the majority of campers were White. The ages of the campers ranged between 12 and 17, but most were either 15 or 16.

In addition, some information pertaining to economic status was included on the survey. Of those surveyed, the majority of campers owed their own instrument and most did not pay for it without help from their parents. Many campers also took private music lessons and results indicated that most did not personally pay for them suggesting a moderate or high level of family income. Furthermore, the majority of participants traveled great distances to attend the music camp. Survey results indicated that most participants traveled between 101 and 500 miles to attend also suggesting higher levels of SES given that less affluent students might not be able to afford the cost of camp tuition and travel.

The need of financial aid was also included in the survey and most of the campers indicated that it would be very important or essential for them to attend college. In addition to perception of need related to financial aid, data pertaining to type of high school was also
collected. Type of high school responses among campers indicated 91.6% attended public schools. These results are somewhat contradictory to the previous findings suggesting many campers may come from families with more moderate income levels and not from families with such high SES.

The music campers surveyed also possessed high levels of academic achievement. The majority of the sample had cumulative GPA’s at or above 3.1 and 23.4% had a 4.0 GPA. Academic aspiration was also determined to be high among music campers with the majority of participants indicating they intended to pursue graduate study after college.

Religious affiliation was also included on the survey. Ten religions were referenced and the most frequent affiliation of music campers in the sample was Catholic. Another large distribution was Baptist and the “None” and “Other” categories were also larger, while all others included in the survey represented less than 10%.

The topic of technology was also included in the study with a question related to a prominence of it on a given campus. As a result, most of campers indicated that an emphasis on technology would make a university more interesting to them, but many indicated that it would not make a difference. An emphasis of fine arts was also included as well and the majority of campers indicated that the fine arts would increase their interest.

**Brittany, Julian, and College Choice**

Brittany and Julian are both developing young musicians and are interested in pursuing some aspect of a career in the fine arts. Based on their middle class upbringing they are both economically predisposed to go to college. Furthermore, both Brittany and Julian’s parents are college graduates and they are also socially predisposed to go to college.

The difference between the two of them is that before attending the music camp at the hosting university, Brittany is moving within the Search and Choice phases of what R. Evely Gildersleeve might call a postmodern model of student college choice, while Julian is moving through Predisposition and Search phases. Since Julian is a serious musician, he is considering playing his saxophone as a primary career aspiration, and a college degree is not absolutely required for success. Although, based on his socio-economic background, Julian is predisposed to attend college he may choose otherwise. He is, however, still searching for a potential college that suits his musical academic interests and would attend if he finds what he is looking for in an institution. Brittany, though also a very serious musician, aspires to become a music teacher and
that field requires higher levels of formal education. Based on her socio-economic status she is also predisposed to attend college. She has already made the choice to attend college after high school, and is currently searching for the institution that best fits her academic needs and desires with one particular university in mind as a first choice.

*The First Day of Camp*

At check-in Brittany and Julian have both made their way to the hosting university and now they are required to wait in line for camp check-in. Although the building is air conditioned, the number of people standing in line, which reaches from the far end of a hallway to all the way down and out the door, has left the main entrance open for a few hours making it “so humid and hot.” Everyone is hot and their faces reflect the discomfort of their environment. Julian waits through the heat thinking about the week ahead of him. He has come to the university for the Honors Jazz Camp. Back at school “they talked about all the areas they have (at the university) for music and the faculty they have for the jazz area are really good” and Julian can’t wait to get started. One by one each camper has their moment at the front desk where they state their name, inform the camp staff that they have arrived and that they are ready to move on to the next step in the orientation process.

*The Audition.* With check-in completed, the next step involves an audition in front of a Music School Professor acting as a talent judge. The result of this part of the process will place Julian and Brittany in one band or another based on their performance. Julian knew that “once you get here they expect a lot” and he hopes all of his practicing has paid off. Other campers “fake their audition” and play easy music, but not Julian. Those kids spend the rest of camp “struggling to keep up” and that’s not what Julian came to the university to do. Julian confidently takes the stage with his sax, stands proudly, and plays a piece of music. “Four Mountain Solo” is not an easy piece to play, and Julian’s ambitiousness is rewarded with a place in “Top Band.” Julian leaves the stage satisfied with his performance as he knows he played well and has the week ahead to get even better.

Brittany is auditioning for percussion and the difference between their two experiences is that the “first judge” who “apparently judged quite a bit easier” is finished. A new “second judge” has taken her place and “the people that auditioned in the after noon had it quite a bit harder.” Brittany plays the snare drum and has selected “Snare Drum Superstar” as the piece she is going to perform. The piece of music is designed to be a drum solo, which fits the conditions
of the audition perfectly, and is relatively easy to play. In a turn of events she is unaccustomed to back in high school, the judge does not think as highly of her performance or choice of music as she had hoped. Brittany is not placed in “Top Band” rather “Gold Band” which is considered to be of slightly lower quality. At her “community orchestra back at home, it’s just not that difficult of stuff (music).” Brittany blames herself because her “audition piece was really easy.” Never the less, she knows she has a week to study at the university and she will make the best of it.

Moving in. Now that check-in and the auditions are over, it’s time to move into the dorm. After the short drive to the dormitory, each family begins to unload a week’s worth of clothes and other belongings while they mingle with the crowds of other campers and the ever present summer heat. Brittany is excited to “meet so many people when I moved in.” For her moving in is “a chance to get to know new people that are just like her or completely opposite, but still play music.”

The brick building is wedged between two streets traveling parallel to each other. The facility has a portico area located on the west side of the building, which is used for loading and unloading. From the portico area there are steps leading up to the main entrance. Once inside, the lobby a front desk is found to the left with elevators as well as a set of double doors marked “Stairs” behind it. Knowing where to find the stairs is a critical skill for new campers as the administration does not allow campers “to use the elevators because they’ll break down.” Although “dragging all that stuff up and down the stairs gets really tiring” Brittany is unaffected by this arrangement. In contrast, Julian’s “instrument weighs 10 pounds and the case weights about 20” and “on top of that” he has “to carry a music stand too.” Julian has “bad knees” and wears a knee brace and going up stairs with all my stuff really hurts.” As a result, neither Brittany nor Julian “like how we can’t use the elevators” and don’t appreciate “being treated like a small child.”

As they move into their rooms they meet their new roommates and say their goodbyes to parents. Brittany and Julian’s first perception of what daily life will be like at the university is formed as the two enter their rooms, which “leave a little to be desired.” To begin with, “they’re (the rooms) way too small.” The bed frame is wood and damaged from wear. The “mattresses on the beds are really thin and you can feel the bed frame right through the foam.” Furthermore,
“There is one little light over the doorway” and “it doesn’t illuminate anything.” Brittany finds out that “most people bring lamps”, but she only has a “flashlight” for reading.

The second thing that strikes them about the environment at the university is far more impressive. The amount and diverse nature of other young musicians they have become immersed within is truly inspirational. Brittany thinks, “they (the camp administration) do a really good job of getting diversity.” Brittany knows that the “(campers) all have a common interest” and she will make friends easily because “she and the others “all just kind of relate.” There are violinists and pianists, flautists and cellists, trombone players, drummers, guitarists and even kids that play the tuba. As Brittany and Julian explore the different dorm facilities they easily find “places to just hang out and chill” and begin to make friends throughout the remainder of the day. At home in high school band the groups are much smaller, there are definitely not as many other students that play similar instruments and Julian is pleased to learn that he “can have someone else in the room with him to play a duet.”

The first day of classes begins in the morning and they have both had a tremendous day. A 10 pm curfew extinguishes all social activities. In a coordinated effort counselors “herd” campers out of the various common areas “no matter what’s going on,” form them into a rumbling and grumbling mass of humanity in the lobby and finally “send everybody up to their rooms” for lights out. Julian does not like this treatment and exclaims, “I feel like cattle, I’m a person, not a cow!” He says, “I feel like I am being treated like a small child and I’m 17 years old.” “Not something that has to go up to their room because they have to be in bed by 10 pm.”

First Day of Classes

The day begins with “counselors beating like a drum on dorm room doors at 6 am.” Julian is first down to breakfast. It lasts until 7:30 am when everyone must leave for their classes in the Music School. Brittany makes it to breakfast around 7 am and picks at some “really nasty looking fruit” next to one of her new friends from the night before. Julian doesn’t like the food situation either and settles for “cereal,” which he will “eat for 4 days.”

At 7:30 am breakfast ends and the counselors once again round up the campers, move them into the lobby and out the main entrance. Brittany and Julian, along with “600 kids” are made to “hold hands” and “cross the street at the same time.” Once onto campus they walk on the designated path to the College of Music. Anyone that deviates from the path “gets a cleaning duty punishment.” The group passes though parking lots; walks by brick buildings and under
live oaks with spanish moss hanging from the limbs. In a few minutes they arrive at the College of Music ascend the steps, file through two open doors, and then the group breaks into individuals that must find their class rooms.

Julian’s first class is Music Theory. “At first in class when the teacher is talking” he is not thrilled because the instruction seems “impersonal,” but once the lecture is complete the professor “comes around and works with everyone one on one.” Julian gets to meet a professional musician who has “played at Carnegie Hall two times” and he is thrilled to be at the university. These are people who are doing what Julian aspires to do with his life and “are world renowned.” His next class is Conducting and again Julian finds another professor that is “so good, really personal, and nice and really helps a lot.” Julian begins learning things about music that were never addressed at home “because it (camp) doesn’t even compare to high school.” As an elective, Julian is “put in World Music.” This is a type of expression that he is aware of, but not familiar with. He finds it “really interesting” and Julian’s creative processes expand to include this influence.

Brittany is a drummer in marching band and her experience is a little different. Her first class is Leadership, which takes place out on a field. Her professor was “in the marching band” and “came back to the university to teach.” Similar to Julian’s experience, Brittany finds that the professors are “well qualified, and have a lot of experience;” soon she realizes that “coming here (the university) does improve my ability.” Later, Brittany takes her elective class, which is Steel Drums. The metallic surface of instrument is different from her snare and, like Julian, she finds that the camp “curriculum is definitely above” what she’s “used to at school.”

Between classes Brittany and Julian as well as the other campers “walk back to and forth from the dorm to the College of Music.” Throughout the day, they have a total of “4 hours of practice time” and also eat lunch. For both Brittany and Julian, the food takes some getting used to. “The buffet has only two choices,” “pasta with beef” and some “Chinese stuff,” neither of which seemed appealing. The old standbys are present, hot dogs and hamburgers, fries and tater tots. “The fruit is really nasty looking” and “you can’t pick anything that’s healthy except salad.” Both think “the food is horrible.”

Afternoon classes continue intermittently for 5 hours with additional practice time spaced between. Brittany and Julian realize that by the end of the day they have gone up the hill to the Music School three times and “carried instruments up 4 flights of stairs 6 times.” Brittany is
unaffected, but Julian thinks that “after a while even an alto sax heavy” and since he plays tenor, which is larger and due to “bad knees, it’s really hard” for him.

Evening of the First Day. The next episode in Brittany and Julian’s first day of camp is dinner time at the dormitory. Around 7 pm they both finish up with practice time and Brittany and Julian find their way down stairs and get in line for “mandatory” dining. Dinner has been in service since 5 pm and the line is massive and stretches out into the Lobby. Everyone in line has a name tag and an I.D. ready to be checked at the entrance; again, due to the crush of people in a relatively confined space, the temperature is uncomfortably high. In the Lobby, a light smell of sweat mixes with the rather generic food smell emanating from buffet tables, which are located around the corner and out of sight of those in line. Like many industrial food service facilities, the floor is lined with faux marble Linoleum tile, and cafeteria style plastic seating is dispersed in and around tables filling a large open dinning hall with a staircase that leads up to a second level, a metal railing wraps around the edge. The din of conversation and commotion from scores of campers can be heard as soon as one enters the building.

Brittany and Julian navigate the line, move around the corner and see what’s for dinner. More fried food, suspicious looking vegetables, an unrecognizable casserole and Brittany does “not want to eat that food” and decides to order out. The camp administration allows campers to order from a few local restaurants to complement the food from the dinning hall, “but only from the menus they have.” Curfew is set at “10 pm” sharp and all deliveries must be in before this time. Julian decides that tonight he will settle for hotdogs and fries and maybe eat out tomorrow. In contrast, Brittany can’t “imagine (eating at the dorm) every night and waking up to that stuff every morning” and heads straight to phone to place her order.

With dinner behind them, Brittany and Julian are required to participate in the evening’s planned social activities. Tonight is “the ice cream social.” It’s the traditional opening night icebreaker where everyone meets in the Ballroom and campers get to “talk to people and get to know each other.” The event is enjoyable, the ice cream was a relief from the daylong affect of summer heat and humidity and the two mingle with the other campers as they are intended to do by the administration. Brittany meets other drummers, “a couple of people I met last year that live about an hour and 15 minutes away from home” and a several other members of her leadership marching band camp. Julian, on the other hand, spends the entire night talking to another sax player “from Alabama.”
The ice cream social ends with an hour remaining before curfew and the counselors let the campers socialize in the ballroom after the remnants of the previous activities are cleaned up. The ballroom is located between the cafeteria and the lobby. It’s not directly between, rather separated from the lobby by a wall, and the first thing one sees upon entering the building through the main entrance. When one is inside the ballroom and facing the lobby the kitchen is to the right and the dining hall is just forward beyond. The Ballroom has a large movable wall that divides in two and a few campers stand around in groups talking while others sit on the floor in front of a big screen TV. The ceiling of the ballroom is under repair and has several missing tiles. Wires hang loosely through the openings where lights used to be. A few water stains mark some of the remaining tiles with brown amorphous forms that complete the “design theme” of “disrepair.” Julian asks himself, “Why is it that everything here is a little bit crusty?” At 10 pm the counselors representing the long arm of the administration round up campers and move them into the lobby. The group is moved up the stairs repeating the previous night’s “herding.” The campers are put into their rooms and “10:30 pm lights out” is enforced with the threat of a “clean up duty punishment” for defiant campers.

**Throughout the Camp**

As the first day passes Brittany and Julian adjust to the new routine of waking up via “someone banging on the door at 6:15 am,” dealing with the food, and attending classes at the Music School. In their classes they both get to work with and learn from “professors that are world renowned” and interact with peers that possess a similar devotion to music at “one of the top schools in the South.” Brittany meets lots of new young musicians, and begins “4 hours of practice every day” in hopes of perfecting her technique for the end of the week performance. In her opinion, the music being played at camp “is much harder than what she usually gets to play in high school” and to her that means a great opportunity to perform because “it’s not as competitive in high school.”

Julian enjoys classes too and like the fact that “they kind of treat you like a college student.” He spends most of his free time hanging out with one of his friends he “met from Alabama,” who he considers one of his “best friends.” They both play the sax, but his friend plays alto and the two usually collaborate for of “a duet” almost every day during practice time. Julian is not used to having access to such devoted and talented musicians his own age and he takes every opportunity to improve his abilities. This may be Julian’s first time at this music
camp and he “came here to learn how to play (his instrument) better,” but he’s already thinking that he “wouldn’t mind coming back.”

Over the course of the camp, a few other issues and activities came to the surface as aspects of the camp experience. One evening, Julian was hanging out in his friend’s room. His friend’s parents had just dropped off a care package filled with chips, cookies, and Chex-Mix. Being boys, they were horsing around and accidentally “spilled Chex-Mix over on the floor.” Most of the box had spilled out and the two went in search of “a counselor” to get “a vacuum cleaner.” They “kept asking” their “counselor,” but after a considerable time passed and “she never got it” the boys went down to the front desk to get it themselves. Unfortunately, the front desk staff told them “they weren’t allowed to go and get it (the vacuum)” without a counselor so they went back upstairs to find one. As luck would have it, another counselor finds the room a mess with Chex-Mix. This type of behavior results in a punishment. The two get “clean up duty” for their irresponsible actions. This does not sit well with Julian and he begins to develop a bad attitude in regard to the camp staff and thinks “the dorm needs to be a little more prepared when the music camp comes.”

Brittany has different issues with the camp experience. She is sharing a room with three other girls and there is “a huge toilet paper shortage” at the Dorm. She has asked the attendant at the front desk for more, but with limited success. They’re all out and “it took three days to restock.” Fortunately, one of her roommates is the local town and she “gets one of the parents to go buy some more toilet paper.” In addition, the dorm “ran out of laundry carts.” Brittany as well as many others is forced to wear dirty clothes and reuse old towels, which “gets really gross.” As the week progresses, she too develops a dislike of the dormitory and the camp staff.

As the 2nd week progresses the end of the camp performance at the university’s music hall draws near. Both Brittany and Julian must focus on their music and worry less about superficial issues related to the dorm. It’s only a few days away and everyone will be watching and listening. The best place to go to get ready is one of the “hundreds” of “practice rooms” at the College of Music. There are many to choose from and depending on the instrument you play, they have “all kinds of equipment to use.” There is a down side, however. Some of “the practice rooms are in really bad shape” and “are all vandalized and have not very nice things written all over them.” In other rooms “the ceiling was leaking onto the piano,” “the air is not working well” and since it is summertime “the rooms are extremely hot.” This creates problems
with the sound from some instruments as they “constantly go out of tune” because of the heat. Brittany is used to the heat from marching around outside and is aware of the higher temperatures in the practice rooms. She is also aware of the passage of time and the importance of performing at her best in only a day or so.

In the days leading up to the performance at the music hall, the two begin to spend more and more time playing music and listening to music. Due to the structure of the camp, Brittany and Julian end up practicing more frequently than back at home and with less time between sessions. To Julian’s surprise he is awarded “1st Chair” for the sax in his Jazz ensemble class. Brittany is making progress too. She was a little overwhelmed with the difficulty of the piece she selected for her performance, but the instruction she is receiving is “top notch” and her “band director” can “bring out the best musician (in her)” and she has “learned so much.” Additional pressure to continue such focus is administered via the faculty concerts. The professors working in the camp put on 3 performances of their own during evenings of each week. The campers are “forced” to attend each time, which was considered “way too much” by the campers, but they were “great” and “a couple of acts caught my (Julian’s) eye.”

At night, after practice time and dinner, there are planned activities to let the campers blow off some steam and get a feel for the social atmosphere of the hosting university and surrounding town. The Ice Cream Social from the first night was only the beginning. The campers also get their choice of visiting the I-Max theatre, go bowling, and/or go to a small local amusement park. On the second night, Brittany chooses to go to the I-Max theatre because the counselors “told me they have a movie about Dolphins.”

When the bus pulls up to the dormitory, campers are waiting in the lobby. Counselors arrange the campers into rows and they file onto the bus. In contrast to the hot, humid air outside “it was actually cold on the busses.” When she gets into the theatre to see the film the camp staff tells her that “it was about NASCAR,” a topic “she wasn’t interested in.” Brittany thinks “there should have been more of a variety of things to do.”

Julian’s knees hurt from climbing the stairs and by the middle of the week he has his knee brace on. This being the situation, he decides bowling might not be the best choice for him right now and he thinks the amusement park place would probably be fun. He too boards a bus and rides to the amusement park. Julian arrives at “7:30 pm” and since the group was not scheduled to leave until “8:45 pm” he was looking forward to over an hour of fun.
Unfortunately, a few hundred of his fellow campers also had the same idea and he “waited over an hour in line” and didn’t have much time for anything. The counselors said that they would be able “to do three things” including “go cart racing,” “mini golf,” and “laser tag.” He had to pay “$10” for a ticket to get into the park and due to limited activities offered by the camp and their “mandatory” nature Julian was “only in there (the Park) for 4 minutes and they came and told me we had to leave.” Julian’s perception of the camp dropped another notch as he indicated “the amusement park really wasn’t that fun.” He says, “There were so many people there that we had to wait in huge lines and if they scheduled more things to do there would have been for time to do stuff.”

Although Brittany and Julian have not been enjoying the planned social activities as much as the Camp administration might have hoped, the two have been able to meet lots of new young musicians, work with “world renowned” faculty, and had the opportunity to see the campus as they “walked back and forth from the dorm to the College of Music.” The area that Julian grew up in was covered in brick homes and other buildings “and the bricks remind me so much of it.” The architecture at the university mirrors this familiar aesthetic and “campus makes” Julian “feel like I’m home again.” As he walked through campus on his daily routine he also noticed “there’s tons of stuff to do.” “You just walk by the fields and stuff and always people playing football or playing something out there or reading” and “it kinds of gives it a college feel.” He could tell that “people liked being here” and in general, Julian felt like “this (the camp) showed me that I definitely fit in” at the university. Although Julian is “not really familiar with other colleges” he thinks, “I would apply here.” This is a critical moment for Julian because he had made the transition from the “Predisposition Phase” and is now moving within the “Search” and “Choice Phases” of Gildersleeve’s postmodern model of college choice.

Brittany’s opinion of campus was similarly positive, but a little different in comparison. For Brittany, the primary feature of campus that appealed to her sensibility was the historic nature of the campus architecture. To her, the university’s campus “looks old.” Not old in a decrepit sort of way, rather in a sense that added character. To Brittany, the aged buildings at the university communicated “how long they have been here and how experienced they really are.” In the College of Music “they have the pictures in there so you get the history of it all.” “They have the one with the University on a dirt road and how it was a women’s school and everything and that’s pretty cool.” Although the campus is “enormous” and somewhat larger than her tastes
desire, Brittany thinks that the “buildings” are “better” and that “the bricks and the trees kind of give it a college feel” and that was attractive.

As the last days of the music camp approach, Brittany and Julian have had the opportunity to work with and receive instruction from outstanding faculty musicians, met numerous young musicians from all over the country, and observed and, in some ways, participated in college life at the university. For both of them, the experiences garnered from the camp have influenced their opinions of the university, increased their awareness of institutional characteristics unique to the university and helped them come to some sort of conclusion regarding where to attend college.

When Julian first arrived on campus, he was not sure if he even wanted to go to college. His focus was primarily on playing the saxophone professionally. Because of his previous perspective on going to college he is “not really familiar with other colleges.” He is “not a big sports fan to begin with” but he guesses he “could deal with that to come here for the Music Program;” evidence that he is now within Gildersleeve’s “Search” and “Choice Phase” and leaning heavily toward the university. Over the weeks at camp he has met people that “want to be here (at camp)” and “will work for this, because they chose this (the camp).” He has met passionate young people that will “practice the music if they need to, they’ll get it where it needs to be to perform they’re individual part.” Julian has become aware of the academic dedication of his peers and thinks that “if it (academics) follows the same trend, then it seems like it (the university) would be a worthwhile school to come to.” His less than agreeable experiences with the camp staff, the hassles of camp rules and lackluster organization pale in comparison to the qualities and characteristics of the students and faculty in the College of Music. Finally, the campus “feels like home” to Julian and this, although unexpected, has pushed him to his decision to “apply here.” He is completely impressed.

When Brittany arrived on campus she had been to three other music camps in search of the best university for her. Since she possessed this experience she was making comparisons between universities as well as “to learn how to play my instrument better.” She too is impressed with the talent and professionalism of the faculty in the College of Music and wants to be a “music ed major” when she does go to college. While at camp, Brittany “talked to some of the counselors and they told (her) about the program.” She found everyone helpful and they “told her what (she) wanted to know about the school.”
For Brittany, a few other factors played a significant role in her decision to make the university “one of my top two choices.” Brittany is very social and at camp she was able to meet lots of other campers and make numerous friends. Similar to Julian she also observed college students while walking around on campus and Brittany believes she will “fit in.” Brittany says, “The music camp really did change my opinion about coming to school here. Before I thought the university was just here and I kind of thought I wanted to go out of state for college, but now that I’ve been here I have noticed it is a really good college and I would actually like to go here. It has made me like it and I’m really interested in it now.”

Another factor for Brittany was her dislike of the dorm, specifically the food situation as well as the curfew issue. This took some getting used to for her, but she knows that if she did attend the university she “wouldn’t stay in a dorm.” There are plenty of college apartments scattered throughout this town and she could “get a roommate, and pay half price on food” especially since “there’s lots of good microwavable stuff out there.” In an apartment living situation Brittany is convinced she would thrive, “you wouldn’t have to say, ‘I’ll be back at 10 pm’ or have a curfew and everything.” Furthermore, “you could make everything a little more you own instead of having white walls everywhere.” Ultimately, the quality of the faculty in the College of Music, the appearance and feel of campus, and the knowledge of a solid music education program made the difference for Brittany.

The following part of this section contains two composite profiles of campers that participated in the music camp during summer 2004. The profiles were created from a combination of Pre and Post-Camp Survey results, data from the focus groups and personal observations of the campers and the camp environment made by the researcher during data collection. Focus group data was used to create the profile’s personalities and their physical appearance was based on the researcher’s personal observations of the campers and demographic survey data pertaining to gender, race/ethnicity and age. The profile’s background and academic characteristics such as what kind of high school they attended or what degree they aspired to receive came from the survey data. Profile’s opinions related to institutional qualities came from a combination of Post-Camp Survey results and comments from the focus group data. All quotations are taken directly from the transcription of the focus groups and the descriptions of the camp environment are from the personal observations of the researcher and information provided via the camp’s hand book available on hosting university’s website. It is intended that
the camper profiles augment the description of the participants and their experiences at the music camp as additional evidence to answer research questions 1 and 4.

*Music Camper Profiles*

*Brittany*

Brittany is a girl from a middle class background, age 16. She is White with blonde hair and from Tampa, Florida. Brittany plays the drums in marching band, which she has been doing since she started high school three years ago. She’s been involved with music for a lot longer than just a few years. Brittany is Catholic and was first exposed to music in church where she played several other instruments. Her interest in percussion began later when she started high school. She is very talkative and the type of person that speaks directly and looks you right in the eye. She seems to have an opinion about most everything and has a plan for herself. Even at such a young age, Brittany is a leader.

Brittany considers herself to be a serious student of percussion instruments. She attends public school and plays school instruments, but takes lessons after school. The lessons are arranged through her music teacher and consist of meeting with the teacher for an hour of additional instruction in a smaller group than during the regular school day. She likes this setting because of the increased attention from her teacher, the higher talent level, and more serious attitudes of the kids in the after school group. Once the lessons are finished, she goes home and practices for another hour after she does her homework. Brittany is a good student who works hard academically as well as with her music. Brittany is predisposed to go to college. She isn’t merely “planning” to go to college, Brittany expects to go, and to the institution of her choice. She has a back up school in mind, but it’s only there as a formality.

Brittany is seriously considering the hosting university as her first choice for college. She has done some research and found that the College of Music offers an excellent music education program. She plans to be a music teacher in high school and a degree in music education from the hosting university would help her accomplish that goal. Part of Brittany’s search for the right college has landed her at the hosting university’s music camp each summer for the past two years. This year is her third summer camp in music at the university and her experiences have resulted in a lot of opinions regarding the institution. Since Brittany has not yet been admitted to the university, she is partially in the Search phase of college choice, but is predominantly in the Choice phase.
What Brittany Likes

The most important aspect to the music camp for Brittany is the contact with faculty and instruction received through the College of Music. She emphatically believes that the faculty are simply top notch. Brittany also appreciates the level of academic rigor. Back in high school, she has to take after school lessons to be around other serious music students, but at the hosting university’s music camp, she is surrounded by them in every waking moment. Brittany believes that the instrument she plays requires more technical precision than most others and seems to enjoy the challenge. Furthermore, she enjoys the weekly competition provided through the camp curriculum.

The camp is arranged in three groups, based on the results of try-out auditions that happen on the first day of the program. One group (Top Band) is perceived to be the best by the students and she’s in it. This ranking is brought back into question in the opinions of the campers after each weekly performance. Since Brittany is in the highest ranking group she must perform better than the others or be ridiculed by members of the lower ranking groups. This situation is not a threat to her, rather motivation to practice and out perform her peers.

The final aspect of the camp experience that stands out for Brittany is the fact that the program is thought to be prestigious by other music students. She can go home after a few weeks and keep practicing what she has learned from the professors. This is important so she can tell her friends in high school where she went and what she did last summer. An added benefit is that she can prove it by out playing them in music class and on the field during sporting events. Attending the music camp at the hosting university for three years straight really means something to Brittany’s self image. She believes she’s a better musician because of it.

What Brittany Doesn’t Like

Brittany has been to the music camp for three years and during that time she has had the opportunity to experience the camp under two different administrations. She believes that recently the camp has become more controlling of its camper’s actions. This is a negative for Brittany as she does not like the new rules such as holding hands when crossing the street and having to walk on one path to and from the music building or face a punishment of cleaning duty back at the dorm. She says that she will be a college student soon, hopefully at the university, and doesn’t like being controlled and restricted in these and other ways.
Specifically, Brittany complains about not being allowed to have access to other buildings on campus or even being able to walk around and see more of the campus. Since she attended the program in previous years and was allowed to travel around on campus she is aware of the other buildings and facilities. She feels stifled and wishes she could revisit the places she has seen in the past. Brittany wishes she could have a tour of campus.

Another control related issue for Brittany is the fact that she is not allowed to interact with college students at the hosting university. A few of her friends from high school now attend the university and she knows that they are on campus. She wants to be able to associate with them, but is not allowed by the camp administration. She says she understands why the administration wants to keep minors away from the student body, but believes she is missing out on important first hand opportunities to talk to students about going to school at the university.

The final control related issue for Brittany is the 10 pm curfew. At home, Brittany is allowed to stay up as late as she wants to. She says her parents give her this freedom so she can learn the value of making responsible choices. She also complains about the way she is treated by the counselors at 10 pm. She describes a mass herding of campers from the common areas of the dorm to the rooms upstairs. She feels that this treatment is very impersonal and does not understand why the camp or the counselors act in such a boorish manner.

Another problem Brittany fervently points out is the quality of the dormitory. All three summers, she has stayed in the dorm offered through the camp. Significant problems with this facility include general disrepair, the mildew smell in her room, the absence of appropriate quantities of toilet paper in the bathrooms, the sighting of a roach in the dining hall and poor food quality. When asked if she would live in a dorm if she attended the university for college she responded with an adamant no. In this case, she clearly associates her negative experiences in this dorm with living on campus at the university in general, although they do not seem to have influenced her decision to choose the university for college.

Overall, Brittany is positive about her time in the music camp. She firmly believes she is a better musician because of the instruction received through the camp via the professors. Despite the possibility of a negative association of control issues from the camp administration and her dorm related dislikes with her concept of the university at large, she adamantly leans heavily towards college at the university with a major in music education. It seems positive
perceptions of quality among faculty win out over any perception that might have been formed of a poor collegiate experience at the university based on the problems with the dorm and camp.

Julian

Julian is also from a middle class background. He is from Baltimore, Maryland, an African American, and has just turned 17. He is physically a very large young man and plays the tenor saxophone. Julian has also been playing his instrument for quite some time, originally gaining exposure to the possibilities of music in a similar fashion to Brittany. Julian is not Catholic, rather from a Baptist family, but also began his study of music through the church as a younger child. Julian is not in a marching band, but he is just as serious about his music, perhaps even to a higher degree. In fact, Julian seems to only care about playing the sax. He doesn’t have the same academic or planned career aspirations as Brittany; however, he is just as devoted. Julian is moving within the Predisposition and Search phases of college choice. His is aware that college is an option and probably a good choice for him but what he really wants is to play the saxophone in New York, New Orleans, and maybe even in Europe, these are his goals.

Julian also shares another similarity with Brittany. He attends a public high school and attends private lessons. The difference here is that Julian owns his saxophone, no longer plays school instruments and takes his private lessons with a professional musician away from school. For Julian, the lessons are a way to continually improve and be taken seriously as a young musician. Similar to Brittany, Julian also feels that the other kids in his high school music classes are not as talented or serious in their pursuit of music. He says the music isn’t challenging enough for him and he wants more. When he is at his lessons Julian can focus, be immersed in the culture of other musicians and really play. When Julian is done with his lessons he also returns home and continues to practice.

Julian is thinking about attending college. He, like Brittany is also a good student academically, but seems more focused music than any adjacent career. Julian might to go to the university, but is keeping his options open. More recently than Brittany, he has begun his search for the right college. For Julian, however, the search is more about finding the best music school rather than fitting in at a university or what his friends think. Julian has also been attending music camps in the summer. He has been to two others and the university is his third. Out of all of the possible summer programs he chose the university’s because of the reputation for being the best. Julian’s experiences with other music camps as well as the one at the hosting university
have provided him with a relatively broad knowledge base from which to form his opinions, a
multitude, in regard to the camp and College of Music.

What Julian Likes

Julian is highly impressed with the professionalism among the College of Music faculty
he has met and heard play during the camp experience, noting having met professors that have
performed at Carnegie Hall as a particular highlight. He also appreciates the level of contact and
the frequency in which he gets to interact personally with the faculty during class. In addition,
Julian enjoys the weekly performances because he gets to play in front of a large critical
audience, something he rarely experiences in high school. His opinion of the faculty he has met
at other universities is not as exceedingly positive. Julian believes faculty in the College of
Music at the hosting university are better musicians than the others he has met at the different
music camps he attended in previous years.

Another point of interest for Julian is his perception of campus. Julian has taken notice
of the other buildings on the way to and from the music school. He mentions how the aged brick
buildings make him feel like he is home in Maryland. Furthermore, Julian points out how the
brick adds a sense of history to the university that the other campuses he’s seen are lacking. He
believes that the appearance communicates a level of establishment that the newer colleges and
universities can’t match.

What Julian Doesn’t Like

Julian also complains about the quality of the dorm. He has stayed in dorms at the other
universities and in his experience this one was quite poor. Julian describes large common areas
with new couches and nice bathrooms that were more like hotel suites than the dimly lit and
inadequately maintained rooms occupied by music campers at the hosting university. Another
problem Julian has with the dorm is the elevator situation. It seems that in an attempt to keep the
campers from interacting with the college students the camp administration has outlawed the use
of the elevators and made the campers take the stairs. Julian is a big kid and happens to have
been given a room on a higher floor, which means he has to carry his instrument up and down
quite frequently. He has a bad knee and says the use of the stairs is painful. Finally, Julian has
to share a locker, which he does not like. He says his instrument takes up most of the space and,
since he owns it, is worried about theft since he doesn’t know the other person. A further
frustration is the fact that he is aware of the existence of numerous other unused lockers and doesn’t know why the counselors won’t let him have his own locker.

Julian also has problems with the behavior of the counselors. He says that the punishments handed out by the counselors are not consistent. He mentions ordering food from a local restaurant, which arrived just at the 10 pm curfew. The counselors took the food away and he had to eat some snacks his roommate’s parents had dropped off. Earlier in the camp, he saw other kids ordering food close to curfew and their food was not confiscated. He seems very upset about this issue and may have taken it personally. An additional complaint regarding the counselors was a lack of availability. On one occasion Julian fell and hurt his knee. He went looking for his counselor, but could not find him and eventually found out he wasn’t even in the dorm. The injury was minor and he did not seek medical treatment against the wishes of his parents.

Julian also did not like the planned evening entertainment. Attendance was required at one of each of the activities, which included seeing a movie at the local I-Max theatre and going to a small amusement park. These activities infringed on Julian’s practice time, which was not appreciated. He understood the benefit of socializing with the other music campers, but was more introverted and wanted more time with his saxophone. What was particularly frustrating for Julian was the miscommunication about the subject of the movie and the long lines at the park. Julian was told the movie was about the ocean and it ended up being about NASCAR, a topic of little interest. The trip to the park was also bungled by the camp. When Julian arrived he had to stand in line to get in and pay for an admission ticket. The line was so long that just after he got into the park the time allotted for the activity ended and he had to leave without a refund.

Finally, and most importantly to Julian, the facilities in the College of Music were not as nice as others he had experienced at other university camps. He references the practice rooms for example. Julian indicated that the rooms were too hot, had water damage and some instruments easily became out of tune due to the humidity. He seemed shocked that a university with such an outstanding reputation for music would keep their facilities in such disrepair.

A particularly interesting facet of Julian’s experience has to do with his admiration of the professionalism and musicianship of the faculty. Regardless of Julian’s dislike of the dorms, some of the camp rules and the practice rooms in the College of Music he is still seriously
considering going to the university and majoring in music. The positive perceptions of academic quality and the professionalism of the faculty seem to dominate numerous negative perceptions formed in relation to the dorm, music camp and music facilities. For Julian, perceptions of faculty and academics seem to be more important to his college choice decision than the other characteristics of the universities he is considering.

Overall, the similarities between Brittany and Julian are an intense devotion to music that spans beyond the opportunities offered through their regular public high school curriculum and both are planning to pursue an aspect of music as a profession after their formal education is complete. The two campers come from middle class backgrounds and both sets of parents are highly educated. In addition, Brittany and Julian have been attending college sponsored music camps for the last few summers. Both Brittany and Julian appreciate the frequent contact with faculty as well as the high level of their professionalism. Both enjoy the level of musical competition.

Differences between Brittany and Julian are that Brittany is in the Choice phase while Julian is moving through the Predisposition and Search phases of college choice. Brittany plans to become a music teacher and Julian in leaning towards becoming a professional musician. Brittany does not like the controlling nature of the camp administration or the quality of the dorm, while Julian has problems with the quality of the College of Music Facilities and behavior of the counselors.

Ultimately, the camp experience has exposed both Brittany and Julian to the qualities and characteristics of the university. The two hold the faculty of the College of Music in very high esteem and this perception outweighs any of the negative perceptions they formed about the dorm and practice rooms or counselors and camp administration.

Summary

In review, the study included an overriding question and four research questions. The overriding question was “How does participation in the summer camp affect prospective student perceptions about the hosting university and their college choice?” Four related research questions were formed to frame data gathering and analysis. The first was “What is the typical profile of a summer camp participant?” The second was “How do music campers perceive the institution before attendance in terms of four factors from the literature?” These factors include perceptions of faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere (Kealy & Rockel, 1987). The
third was “What changes in perception of the institution in terms of the four factors occur after participation in the camp?” The fourth question was “How do participants view their overall experience in the camp as framed by the four factors: faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere?”

Question one was answered by collecting and analyzing descriptive data on the demographic and biographic characteristics of camp participants. Results from this question can be beneficial because little is known about participants of the music camp at the hosting university, only that many of them eventually enroll at the university and major in Music. If more was discovered about the qualities of the camp participants and if one of the existing models reflects their choice process it may be possible to understand why the program has become an effective recruitment tool for the College of Music at the hosting university.

Analysis of the Pre-Camp Survey resulted in the following data. Participants in the music camp at the hosting university are mostly white, female, middle class or upper middle class, from supportive families, high academic achievers and aspire to the highest levels of education. These students were somewhat unique in that they are more interested in fine arts than technology and are willing to travel enormous distances to attend the university. There are also large numbers of males attending both programs and minorities are present; however, they do not represent characteristics of the statistical majority.

In reference to research questions two and three, analysis of the Pre-Camp Survey as compared to the Post-Camp Surveys and the focus groups does reveal participant’s opinions pertaining to the College of Music and the university. It seems that the programming in the camp allows participants to experience the College of Music and the university in such a way that campers develop more informed perceptions of what it might be like to attend the university. Results from analysis of the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys pertaining to the College of Music were the most revealing with significance observed for 7 of 12 questions, illuminating participant’s opinions. The results of the pre and Post-Camp Surveys pertaining to opinions of the university at large were not significant and were omitted from the study.

The focus groups revealed that the campers had very little contact with the university outside of the College of Music due to the design of the program, which offers an explanation as to why opinions of the university as separate from the College of Music did not change after Participation. In reference to question four, the focus groups revealed that the camp experience
informed several perceptions of the College of Music and the university. Specifically, campers
greatly respected the faculty of the College of Music, did not like the dorm facilities at the
university, and thought the practice facilities in the College of Music had room for improvement.
The focus groups also revealed many participants thought highly of academics in the College of
Music and projected those beliefs onto the university. Finally, focus group participants voiced
their awareness of social opportunities at the university and many seemed to be satisfied with the
level of availability activities on campus.

In addition to the use of the focus groups to augment the statistical data from the surveys,
a descriptive narrative was also created from profiles derived from the transcriptions. Data was
organized by pre-figured foci to create categories, a color code was created to organize data, and
sub categories were created along with properties and dimensions to strengthen analysis and
stimulate observations. In addition, two camper profiles were created based on the analysis of
the focus groups and a descriptive narrative was written further illuminate the camp’s influence
on participants’ college choice process and decisions.

In reference to the overriding question the analysis of the surveys and focus groups
offered some evidence that participation in the music camp at the hosting university is
influencing perceptions of the College of Music and the university. In addition, analysis
illuminated the extent in which participants placed importance on opinions of the College of
Music and the university. Specifically, analysis of the focus groups revealed that among the
participants perceptions of faculty are more important than those related to facilities. Perceptions
of academics are linked to perceptions of faculty and also outweigh perceptions of associated
with facility. Perceptions of social atmosphere are more important than facilities, but not as
important as perceptions of faculty and academics. These results and implications for further
practice and study are discussed in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER FIVE
Discussion

The questions investigated by this study were related to a case study of a music camp at a large public university. A central theme of the study was to inform an overriding question of how participation in the music camp relates to perceptions of the College of Music, the university, and college choice. Gaining a deeper understand of how these students might choose a university and how they perceive important factors in their decision process would most likely be useful to those interested in the recruitment of fine art students and may serve as an initial step to further studies.

The study was designed with four research questions intended to frame data gathering and analysis to inform the overriding question. The first research question was “What is the typical profile of a summer camp participant?” The second and third were “How do music campers perceive the institution before attendance in terms of four factors from the literature?” and “What changes in perception of the institution occur after participation in the camp?” The fourth question was “How do campers view their experience of the camp as framed by the four factors: faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere?” The implications of findings from these questions are outlined in this chapter and presented in respect to each research question. Information from these questions was then considered as evidence for an answer to the overriding question, which is also discussed.

Summary of Results for Research Question One

Results of data analysis for research question one were intended to identify a typical profile of students attending the music camp at the hosting university. An existing survey from the literature was utilized to collect data to answer this question (Ingersoll Group, 1988). This data was collected to broaden the understanding of students in the fine arts with the intention that learning more about their characteristics may help to identify their college choice process among the popular models from the literature.

Data analysis included calculation of frequencies and percents of responses to all questions on the “Pre-Camp Survey” instrument. 12 survey questions pertaining to camper demographics and biographics were asked on the instrument. 105 surveys were administered and 95 were included in the study for a response rate of 90.5%.
In reference to question one, analysis indicates a larger population of females than males with 58.9% female and 41.1% male. The racial and ethnic break down was predominantly White with 78.9%. The question on age resulted in 55.8% either 15 or 16 years old. The fourth question asked participants about instrument ownership, taking private lessons, and if they paid for these privileges themselves. Analysis indicated 91.6% owned their own instrument and 47.4% paid for it. Analysis also indicated 85.3% took private music lessons and 45.3% paid for them.

High school grade point averages for the MCS were very high with 66.3% above 3.5 GPA. Academic aspiration results were similarly high with 85.3% at or above the Masters level. Analysis of religious affiliation resulted in were dominantly Catholic at 21.1% with all other affiliations between 14.7% and 1.1%. Importance of financial aid results indicated 76.9% said aid would be very important or somewhat important in choice of college. Analysis of type of high school resulted in 89.5% enrolled in public schools, with the remainder split between private and parochial schools. Results for the emphasis on technology question indicated 53.7% of the sample would have increased interest and 44.2% would not make a difference. Results for the emphasis on fine arts question indicated 86.3% would have increased interest and 13.7% would not make a difference. Analysis of the final question distance from the university indicated 75.8% came from within 101 to 500 miles to attend the music camp.

Overall, analysis suggested students in the music camp at the hosting university are mostly White, female, age 15 or 16, middle class to upper middle class, from supportive families, high academic achievers and aspire to the highest levels of education. These students were somewhat unique in that they are more interested in fine arts than technology and are willing to travel to attend the university.

Summary of Results for Research Questions Two and Three

Research questions two and three specifically dealt with revealing the camper’s perceptions of the College of Music before and after participation in the camp in an attempt to observe changes in perception of important factors in participant’s college choice. The Pre-Camp Survey was administered containing questions related to factors mentioned in the literature as highly influential of college choice. These factors include perceptions of faculty, academics, social atmosphere, and facilities Chapman (1981); Kealy and Rockel (1987); Hanson and Litten (1982) and Kinzie et al (2004). Data analysis included calculation of means and standard
deviations. Results of question two serve as initial perceptions of the College of Music in relation to the four factors and were compared to the results from research question three to see if changes occurred after participation in the music camp.

After participation, the majority of students in the camp were able to form opinions related to the College of Music. It is important to reiterate that these opinions may be positively or negatively related to the College. The goal was to study all of the perceptions that were formed during the camp experience, not just the positive ones. The results of the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys pertaining to perceptions of the College of Music indicated the majority of participants held high opinions of the faculty before participation and even higher opinions after attending the program. Questions one, five, seven and eight all dealt with perceptions of faculty and in each case analysis indicated pre and post-responses contained significance differences and that opinions moved from the Agree category into the Strongly Agree response category.

The surveys also revealed a few important points directly related to academics in the College of Music. Perceptions of this particular factor may have been difficult for participants to discern from perceptions of faculty as the two are directly linked. Survey questions three, four and six asked about academics as separate from the faculty. Analysis of question three revealed a significant difference between pre and post-responses and that opinions moved in a positive direction within the Strongly Agree response category. Analysis of questions four and six did not contain significance but stayed in the agree response category after participation.

Pre and Post-Camp Survey results also communicated camper’s perceptions of social atmosphere. Questions two, nine and eleven dealt with this topic and revealed participants had frequent opportunities to either directly participate in or observe the social atmosphere on campus. For questions two and nine, analysis indicated a significant difference between pre and post-responses and that opinions moved from the Agree category into Strongly Agree. Analysis of question eleven did not result in significant differences between pre and post-responses, but opinions stayed well within the agree category after participation.

Lydon (1997) suggested the quality of facilities on campus is an additional factor that determines a perception of social atmosphere. Questions ten and twelve in the Opinion of the College of Music Section in the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys offered results related to facilities. Question ten referenced the quality of the library, which in this case was the Center for Music Research (CMR). The CMR is a facility that combines computer technology and opportunities
for scholarly research in music. Question twelve centered on perceptions of technological facilities, which in the context of the College of Music could also include experiences in the CMR. Analysis of survey questions ten and twelve did not indicate a significant difference between pre and post-responses although opinions stayed within the agree category suggesting positive perceptions of facilities in the College of Music.

Opinions related to the university were collected in the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys. Factors from the literature thought to influence college choice framed the survey questions. In stark contrast to the results of the “Opinion of the College of Music” section of the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys, analysis indicated the “Opinion of University” sections did not contain results that possessed significant differences between pre and post-camp responses and were omitted from the study.

**Summary of Results for Research Question Four**

Question four dealt with examining the camper’s experience as framed by perceptions of four influential college choice factors: faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere. Data was collected from four focus groups held near the end of the camp. Focus groups revealed that campers thought very highly of the College of Music faculty, expressing that their professionalism, experience, and teaching ability was “top notch.”

Focus groups revealed perceptions of campus housing. In most cases these opinions were negative centering on insufficient lighting, disrepair, and poor food quality. Additional commentary was recorded related to campus, especially the overall visual impact of the buildings. Perceptions were markedly different than those associated with the dorms. An appreciation of the architectural aesthetic prevalent throughout campus was communicated. Specifically, comments focused on the how the aged brick buildings suggested experience and longevity as an institution.

Focus groups also revealed perceptions of social atmosphere outside the College of Music. Participants indicated that there were opportunities to socialize at the student union bowling alley and other recreational facilities. Focus group participants explained that they thought there were many things for students to do on campus. One point of interest is that these perceptions are in contrast to the survey results, which did not reflect the idea that social opportunities abound.
The focus groups also revealed campers had very little contact with any faculty members or facilities outside the College of Music and the dorm. The perceptions of academics and social atmosphere were formed solely on experiences within the College of Music, traveling back and forth to the dorm and participating in planned campus activities in and around the student union. The focus groups also revealed that participants may have projected opinions of the College of Music onto the university at large. Therefore, it is highly probable that students who thought highly of faculty, academics and social atmosphere in the College of Music also thought highly of these criteria within the whole university.

In addition to the subjects of faculty, academics, facilities, and social atmosphere the focus group discussions revealed perceptions of several other qualities loosely related to the music camp and the university. These qualities included perceptions of athletics, camp staffing, prestige, and reputation of the university. Specifically, perceptions of the university athletic tradition arose as a topic when the participants were asked what they thought of the university. Perceptions of staffing included personal experiences with College of Music faculty and impersonal experiences with camp counselors in the dorm. Perceptions of prestige and reputation also arose as a topic during the focus groups. Participants indicated that they were aware of the university as a somewhat prestigious institution, but that it was not a defining factor. The reputation of the University was also briefly described as a reason that participants came to the institution to study music and that it is known throughout the state as an outstanding school.

Implications of the Findings

Participant’s Profile

The results of the biographic and demographic surveys revealed the typical profile of participants in the 2004 music camp at the hosting university. This data can now be reviewed with the overriding question in mind: how does participation in the music camp at the hosting university relate to perceptions of the College of Music and college choice? Pertinent information can be used to offer support for possible influences of attending the camp on the college choice of these students. Since qualities of market segments tend to differ and micro markets do so even more dramatically the relationship between the typical participant’s profile and participation in the camp most likely only relates to college choice of campers attending the music camp at the hosting university.
Since evidence of a typical music camper’s profile is now available for review particular aspects stand out as directly related to extant college choice models. Personal demographics such as race, gender, age, and SES are all known to influence college choice and describe activities within (Predisposition, Search, and Choice) components of Hossler and Gallagher’s 1987 three-phase model as well as Gildersleeve’s 2003 postmodern reinterpretation of the same model (Hossler et al, 1999; Kinzie et al, 2004). Furthermore, additional characteristics of these campers such as high academic achievement and a wider college search that includes greater geographic ranges have also been explained to impact the process of the search phase in college choice (Litten, 1982; Manski and Wise, 1983; Zemsky and Oedel, 1983).

More specifically, the typical profile of participants such as White, female, age 15 or 16, and higher SES and academic achievement suggests a college choice process that is the most efficient of all possible demographic combinations. Furthermore, this demographic combination would most likely place them beyond what Hossler and Gallagher (1987) have refereed to as the Predisposition phase of college choice, as studies have shown that high academic achievers enter the search phase as early as elementary or middle school (Litten, 1982; Hossler et al, 1999; Kinzie et al, 2004).

In addition, results indicated that the majority of participants were high academic achievers that also traveled between 101 and 500 miles to attend the camp. Based on this data and studies conducted by Manski and Wise (1983) and Zemsky and Oedel (1983) there is evidence to suggest these participants are most likely in the process of conducting highly sophisticated college searches as they collect information to expand their choice set.

This position is further supported by participation in the camp. Participants in the camp are directly exposed to numerous college choice information gathering experiences, such as prolonged contact with faculty, staying overnight in a college dormitory, and attending social functions on campus (Kealy and Rockel, 1987). The efficiency and sophistication of this level of information gathering would be difficult to match from less direct sources such as viewbooks, websites, and brochures. By participating in the camp, participants are actively becoming more efficient and sophisticated college choice makers.

Analysis of the focus group data pertaining to the Search and Choice phases suggests a slightly different type of action that is more akin to Gildersleeve’s (2003) interpretation of Hossler and Gallagher’s (1987) three phase model. In Gildersleeve’s (2003) model, students
move around and within the three phases cyclically. These students do this because of a lack of “cultural capitol” and are essentially choosing whether or not to invest in the possible benefits of a White education (Gildersleeve, 2003). Most of participants in this study are White and come from higher SES backgrounds so it is highly unlikely that their college choice process involves this consideration.

What the students in this study might be doing that in action resembles Gildersleeve (2003) is moving cyclically within phases. When asked “Do you think your experience here at the camp has influenced your decision to come to school here?” participants in each of the focus groups indicated that they either would or would not like to attend the university. Several focus group participants indicated the camp “changed my opinion because I know the music school is really good,” “I plan on majoring in pre-med so if I did come here maybe I’d do a double major” and “I think I’d like to come here for college, but there are other things I like too and I know there is more than just music here” as well as “I wasn’t planning to go to a state school for music, it’s always better to go to a conservatory than a university” suggesting some students have made the decision not to come to the university. The focus groups statements also suggest that some students have possibly completed their investigation of the College of Music, while others are considering multiple alternative academic options which may include a different major or a non-traditional college education at a conservatory.

These students are using participation in the camp to collect significant information and experiences related to attending the university and their experiences are influencing their college choice decision. At some point, these students may reach a stopping point on one path, make a decision, and start collecting more information about other options. It is possible that, due to their demographic and biographic characteristics, these participants have so many potential academic paths to choose from they may move back and forth between the phases. These students might simultaneously collect information on multiple options, or possibly one at a time, weighing the potential benefits against each other, then decide to go back and collect more information on other paths, essentially stopping and starting over again with another option. Further research on this process is needed to clarify this position.

This research indicates that many participants in the music camp at the hosting university possess characteristics of high achieving traditional college students and they may have arrived on campus beyond the Predisposition Phase. Due to these characteristics, the literature on
college choice suggests that they should fit into linear models such as the Hossler and Gallagher (1987) three-phase model. Based on the focus group findings of this research, it may be possible that camp participants are involved in a more dynamic college choice process than the linear model permits.

It is plausible that the college choice process employed by music campers participating in this study may have more in common with the Gildersleeve’s (2003) postmodern model than with its linear predecessors. The Hossler and Gallagher (1987) model provides an excellent framework for the stages of college choice among persons within the traditional college going community. It may be necessary, however, to readdress the components of this model within the context of the postmodern view. According to Gildersleeve (2003), one may revise Hossler and Gallagher’s (1987) model by reorganizing the components of three phases of college choice to possess a beginning, but no longer rigidly moves from one stage to another resulting in an absolute end. A more contemporary view of the model includes a fluid process that possesses interacting influences, which can change and alter direction throughout the course of action and impact results. By adopting this understanding, one may be able to view college choice through a more contemporary, postmodern lense.

Participants in the music camp at the hosting university might not fit the linear three-phase model because they are more specialized in their academic pursuits at a younger age than their modern era predecessors, more technologically astute and thus able to access greater levels of information regarding traditional college and non-traditional educational choices. In addition, participants in this study might not fit the linear model because these students are seeking out highly specific knowledge from specific programs that meet their individual needs and desires within institutions. They may not progress from one stage to the next, rather they move between and within the phases as they carefully consider and reconsider the multitude of factors, opportunities, and particular paths that lay before them.

These students are most likely more savvy college consumers who seek out and assess the characteristics and offerings of particular departments within institutions. Self selecting in and out of potential programs based on perceptions of those qualities, these students may move dynamically through the decision process rather than progress linearly through a three-step routine. For example, the focus group data indicates that the participants are considering topics such as staying in state or going out of state for college, attending a private conservatory or a
traditional four year university and attending the hosting university or another, etc. In Hossler and Gallagher’s (1987) model, choosing between a private conservatory or a four year university would fall under Predisposition. Furthermore, considering an in-state institution versus an out-of-state institution would be a Search phase activity, while choosing the hosting university versus another university would be part of the Choice phase. Therefore, participants may be moving throughout and between the three phases as the Gildersleeve (2003) model suggests.

Statements collected during the focus groups offer some evidence to support this claim and might be beneficial to other researchers conducting future, more in-depth studies of fine art student college choice. What the study does offer is evidence that the campers use their experiences in the camp to aid their college choice process.

Factors Influencing Perceptions of the College of Music

In reference to important factors influencing the college choice of fine arts students at the university, the findings from the analysis of the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys imply a couple of important points regarding perceptions formed in the music camp at the hosting university. The results indicated that large amounts of contact between campers and faculty heightened campers’ opinion of the faculty. High opinions of faculty are extremely important to college choice. As Kealy and Rockel (1987) indicated, meeting and conversing with faculty are some of the primary stimulants of perceptions of academics. Due to extensive contact with faculty, the campers developed perceptions regarding these educators, which they related to their possible future study of music at the university. In addition, focus group findings such as “the professors here make the difference, especially in music” and “the faculty they have for the Jazz area are really good and I think that would be why I’d like to come here” encouraged campers to select the university over another university due to the positive nature of the opinions of College of Music faculty they formed during the camp.

Results of the analysis of the questions pertaining to social atmosphere also suggested campers experienced numerous opportunities to form perceptions related to this institutional quality. Moreover, survey results suggested participants arrived on campus with some preconception regarding social atmosphere at the university and that additional or new, mostly positive, viewpoints were developed during the camp. This is particularly important as Kealy and Rockel (1987) found a close relationship between perceptions of social atmosphere and potential student’s concept of fit at the university. Furthermore, those perceptions formed by
participants tended to be positive, even when opinions shifted negatively they stayed in the agree response category. Focus groups findings also support this perspective with comments such as “We all have a common interest. We all just kind of relate. I have met one of my best friends here actually” and “We also have a place where we can just hang out and chill. We can come in here and talk to people and get to know each other” as well as “this (the camp) showed me I definitely fit in.”

The only area in which the results reflected negative perceptions had to do with opinions of facilities. The survey data did not register these opinions, but the focus groups certainly did. Participants voiced some discontent with the practice rooms in the College of Music stating “The practice rooms are in really bad shape” and “disrepair is like a design theme here.” Participants also expressed extreme dissatisfaction with the quality of the dorm stating “there’s no lights in the dorms” and “you have to have a flashlight” as well as “the food here is horrible, it’s horrible.”

As Lydon (1997) posited, perceptions of facilities are linked to social atmosphere and, ultimately, concepts of fit. The campers clearly expressed frustration with these facilities, which may have a deleterious influence on perceptions of fit on campus, at least for students in the focus groups. Due to the fact that many participants in the focus groups were upset with conditions in the dorm and the close relationship between perception of facilities and social atmosphere to the concept of fit, it is remarkable that so many these same participants seemed to remain positive in regard to attending the university for college.

Overall, analysis indicated that participation in the music camp resulted in opinion forming opportunities for the campers in regard to the College of Music. In 7 out of 12 questions asked about the College significant differences were observed between the Pre and Post-Camp Surveys. Results suggested that after participation campers’ opinions regarding the College of Music changed significantly on 58.3% of the questions. Furthermore, the opinions formed from participation in the camp tended to be positive in relation to the College of Music.

Based on analysis, several important college choice factors for these students may have emerged. First, it may be possible that participant’s perceptions were developed through structured and unstructured learning opportunities occurring during the camp experience. When those learning experiences did not occur, such as in the case of opinions of the university, new perceptions were not formed.
Based on the findings of this study, it seems that perceptions of faculty are more important than those related to facilities. Focus group findings clearly indicated the participants did not think positively about the practice rooms or the dorm. In contrast, participants thought very highly about the faculty and these perceptions seem to outweigh those associated with the facilities as many of the focus group participants were still interested in attending the university and majoring in music.

Furthermore, perceptions of faculty were linked to perceptions of academics, which outweigh perceptions associated with facilities. Participants seem to have trouble differentiating between perceptions of faculty and academics as focus group participants responded to questioning regarding either subject with similarly themed commentary. More importantly, perceptions of both, however interrelated, seem to outweigh the negative perceptions of the facilities among these participants.

In addition, perceptions of social atmosphere seem to be more important to participants than facilities, but not as important as perceptions of faculty or academics. On numerous occasions, campers explained their positive opinions regarding the social atmosphere within the camp, the College of Music, and among college students on campus and beyond. Once again, findings from the focus groups suggested that these perceptions outweigh the negative ones associated with the facilities due to sustained interest among campers in attending the university. Finally, perceptions of the faculty seem to outweigh perceptions of social atmosphere although both categories were positive. The findings from the focus groups were overwhelmingly positive in regard to the faculty and numerous campers stated the faculty as the reason they would attend the university. Many indicated that they though highly of the appearance of campus, but it was not this singular factor that made the difference in their choice.

Limitations of the Study

One of the problems with this research was that the study did not receive complete support from the camp administration or the College of Music. Since the research was not proposed from within the College of Music or within the music camp at the hosting university and the researcher was from another college within the university, the study was treated as foreign and unnecessary. This perception, which seemed to pervade every aspect of data collection, placed restrictions on access to potential participants, time with participants and a proper location to conduct undisturbed focus groups.
The impact of this situation can be seen in several aspects of the study. First, more access to participants would have resulted in larger sample sizes on the Post-Camp Surveys and the biographic and demographic surveys. Access to large numbers of potential participants was granted for the Pre-Camp Survey administration and a sample size of 95 was achieved. Since this level of access was not granted for the administration of the Post-Camp Surveys the sample size is much smaller than that of the Pre-Camp Surveys. In addition, the lack of access to potential participants resulted in the researcher collecting data from independent samples. If access was granted to the same group of participants throughout the study reliability of results could have been strengthened and a \( t \) test for correlated means could have been conducted. If more access was allowed, then larger samples and an exploration of the reasons for the changes in campers perceptions of the College of Music and hosting university could have been possible, which undoubtedly would have deepened the results. Furthermore, the focus groups had to be conducted in an environment that was not conducive to the type of research. The room could not be completely closed off to non-participants and each group was interrupted at least twice during questioning. In the event that the study was considered important to the College of Music or the music camp at the hosting university, many of the problems that occurred could have been avoided.

In addition to problems with access to participants, the survey questions utilized were not specifically designed to elicit information from music students or even fine arts students in general. The questions came from sections of a survey intended to reveal characteristics of general population college students and access their opinions of an ideal college, not necessarily a school focused on fine art or music. Therefore, it is possible that the questions asked may not have centered on topics important to a mini-market of fine art students and in turn revealed less important data. Since a survey designed for fine arts students could not be located, the instrument utilized in the study had to serve as the best available, but may possess shortcomings.

A better, more specifically designed, instrument may reveal additional characteristics of music or fine arts students. Moreover, if a survey such as this was designed it might be capable of delivering deeper insight within the particular influences a summer camp program may have on fine arts students. Data from the focus groups is also tied to the quality of the questions asked and they too may also need some refining. Since no examples of a similar study could be located, there was no available model to follow. The foci of the focus group questions were
created from suggestions in the literature on academic marketing that pertain to influences on general population college choice. The questions in this part of the study were developed with fine art students in mind however it is unknown if these questions revealed information that represents the most relevant issues to recruiting college fine arts students.

Finally, the scope of this study is too small to confidently state that the results reflect a profile of all fine art students or even music students as a discipline. This was a case study that focused on collecting biographic and demographic data on music campers in the College of Music at the hosting university and the perceptions they had of the college, the university, and revealing some of the important factors in their college choice process. It should be said that these are results from a rather small study and most likely are not reflective of music students everywhere.

Suggestions for Further Research

It should be stated that this research only scratches the surface of research on marketing higher education to music students, much less art students in general. An exhaustive search was conducted and no other published documents on this topic could be located. It is quite possible that this is one of the first attempts to understand issues related to the college choice decisions of students pursuing an education in music or the fine arts. This study may offer a starting place for future research on this topic, but lacks the scope and depth to support new theories regarding art student college choice processes, which would be beneficial to the field.

To this end, the questions and design of the surveys utilized could be a starting place for additional research. If the instruments could be somewhat more refined the responses might have greater depth and not need to be balanced by data from focus groups. In fact, conducting focus groups to form questions might be a method to start refining the survey instrument. This is not to say that the function of the focus groups should be completely changed, only that additional focus groups should be conducted to develop more specifically tailored survey questions. Questions that may be helpful to understanding more about these students might include asking what year in high school the campers are in as a component to age. Furthermore, a way to more accurately address the camper’s family income would be helpful as well.

Moreover, the focus group questions pertaining to faculty, facilities, academics and social atmosphere could benefit from additional research. At present there are no standard questions that can be used to assess summer music programs. Perhaps more research could illuminate
what types of questions need to be asked to ascertain a level of quality in summer recruitment programs for the fine arts. In addition, if there was a more established method to assess programs of this type then statistical analysis could be done with the confidence that the initial results are not skewed by unknown factors.

Furthermore, additional research needs to be done on to develop a profile of students in the fine arts. A far broader net must be cast in order to capture a more developed image of who studies the fine arts and how they select an institution. The implications of understanding the characteristics of these students and their college choice process are directly related to recruiting students who best fit with the university and stand much greater chances of academic success and graduation. With the current trend to reduce or remove remediation in higher education, identifying and recruiting students whose characteristics are similar to those students who have been successful in the past is extremely important to both the students and the university.

Further research of a similar nature should also be done in other art fields. If it is possible that music student’s college choice decisions are influenced by criteria that are different from the norm, then students in other art fields may also have certain differences or similarities. Likewise, if demographic and biographic data was collected from other types of artists then a comparison could be made and the knowledgebase could further expand. If this research was conducted with visual artists or dancers as participants it would likely have produced different results. More in-depth information in this subject would be additionally valuable to future research efforts investigating students of specific departments or areas of art schools than the present results, as they only pertain to music campers at the university.

Perhaps participants of programs similar to the individuals investigated in this study will become more important to researchers as the current focus on reducing or eliminating remediation efforts in academia places a greater responsibility on college recruiters to target more of the most prepared, competitive, and talented students. Recruitment efforts from individual departments can help enable admissions officers in the selection of those students that possess the characteristics which are most likely to promote “persistence” or success in the pursuit of a degree in the arts and thus reduce the probability of dropping out or transferring. In the postmodern world of higher education these institutional issues are at the forefront and should not be ignored by leaders within academic departments or thought of as the singular responsibility of admissions department administration. Learning more about students in
academic areas including the fine arts can only aid in the development and positive growth of such institutions in higher education.
Appendix A

Letter of Informed Consent

Dear Parent:

Ph.D. student Chris Hampton, and Professor Marcia Rosal Ph.D. will be conducting some research during the 2004 Music Camp. The data from this research will supply Mr. Hampton with statistical information for his dissertation titled “A Case Study of the Music Camp at FSU Campers Versus Seniors from the Music School”. The results will also help the administration of this program better understand the influence of University summer programs on the students who attend them. We will specifically be looking for changes in opinion related to the University at large and the School of Music. Additionally, we are interested in the demographic and biographic characteristics of students who attend college summer programs in music and we will be asking students for information related to this topic.

In order to conduct this research we would like to survey and conduct focus groups with some of the students enrolled this year’s program. The surveys are short and will only take a few minutes to complete. The focus groups are small and informal containing about 10 participants. They will be conducted with the researcher and should only take about one hour. In order to record the conversations in the focus groups for data analysis the researcher will make audiotapes of the proceedings; no names will be used. Once the focus groups are over the researcher will have possession of the tapes, which will be kept at the researcher’s private residence, and destroyed no later than July 1st, 2005 or upon the completion of the dissertation. The information obtained during the course of the study will remain confidential, to the extent allowed by law.

There are no risks associated with involvement in this research and your son or daughter will not be penalized in any way if you do not agree to the surveys or the focus groups. You have the right to not allow your child to participate or withdraw from either the surveys or the focus group or both.

For further information about this research or your rights you may contact Professor Marcia Rosal Ph.D., Florida State University, School of Visual Arts and Dance, Department of Art Education. She may be contacted at (850) 644-2926 or at mrosal@garnet.acns.fsu.edu. Chris Hampton may be contacted at hamptonari@comcast.net. The Human Subjects Committee may be reached at (850) 644-8836 or online at www.research.fsu.edu/humansubjects.

I understand that my son or daughter will be asked to fill out a paper and pencil survey at the beginning and end of this program and may be asked to participate in an informal focus group with the researcher. By participating in the focus groups your child will be entered in a drawing for cash prizes totaling $50, $20, and $10 or gift certificates to Best Buy.

I freely and voluntarily and without element of force or coercion, consent to allow my child to participate in this research. I understand that my child will be tape recorded if he or she participates in the focus groups.

I have read and understand this consent form.

[Signature]

(Child’s Name)

(Parent’s Name)

(Date)

(Parent’s Signature)
Appendix B

Initial Focus Groups Questions

1) What do you think about the (music camp) Program?
2) What do you think about the faculty in the College of Music?
3) What do you think about the facilities in the College of Music?
4) What do you think about the social atmosphere in the College of Music?
5) What do you think about the academics in the College of Music?
6) What do you think about the faculty at the hosting University?
7) What do you think about the facilities at the hosting University?
8) What do you think about the social atmosphere at the hosting University?
9) What do you think about the academics at the hosting University?
10) Do you think your experience here at the camp has influenced your decision to come to college here?
Music Camp Pre-Survey - Front Side

I. Biographical Data
Please respond to the following questions.

1. Gender
   __Male __Female

2. Race/Ethnicity
   __White __Black __Native American
   __Hispanic/Latino __Asian/Pacific Islander __Other (please specify)

3. ___Age

4. Parental involvement:
   __Do you own your own musical instrument? Did you pay for it? Yes / No
   __Do you or have you taken private music lessons? Did you pay for them? Yes / No

5. What is your current grade point average?
   __ (A) 4.0 __ (B+) 3.1 - 3.5 __ (B-) 2.6 - 2.9 __ (C) 2.0
   __ (A-) 3.6 - 3.9 __ (B) 3.0 __ (C+) 2.1 - 2.5 __ (C-) or Below

6. What is the highest degree you will eventually seek?
   __Associate __Bachelor's __Master's __Doctorate __Professional (example MD, Law)

7. What religious affiliation are you?
   __Catholic __Methodist __Presbyterian __Baptist __Episcopal
   __Jewish __Church of Christ __Lutheran __Bretheren __Nazarene
   __Mormon __Muslim __Other (Please specify)

8. How important will financial aid be in your choice of a college or university?
   __Essential __Very Important __Somewhat Important __Somewhat Unimportant __Not Essential

9. Is your high school:
   __Private __Public __Parochial

10. Would the fact that a college emphasizes technology in its programs:
   __Increase your interest in attending the school
   __Decrease your interest in attending the school
   __Not make a difference

11. Would the fact that a college emphasizes fine arts:
   __Increase your interest in attending the school
   __Decrease your interest in attending the school
   __Not make a difference

12. What is the University's distance from your home?
   __Within 20 miles from home __Within 20 and 100 miles __Within 101 and 250 miles
   __Within 251 and 500 miles __Within 501 and 1,000 miles __More than 1,000 miles Over Please
II. Opinion of the College of Music

Please circle the response that best indicates your opinion of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Has a faculty which is concerned with helping students reach their maximum potential as artists.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has students who socially interact out of class.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has an emphasis on professional values in Music.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provides practical learning opportunities (internships, apprenticeships, education to work programs).</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Has faculty members who are accessible.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Has an excellent job placement program.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Has faculty members who are up to date in the music field.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Has faculty members who are excellent teachers.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Has staff members who are accessible and caring.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Has a library that meets student needs.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Has a strong international dimension.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Has excellent technological facilities.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Opinion of the Hosting University

Please circle the number that best indicates your opinion of the following University characteristics.

(5) Very  (4) Moderately  (3) Not Sure  (2) Moderately  (1) Very

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Career Oriented</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Non-Career Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Well-Known Athletics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Not Well Known Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Specialized Academics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Diverse Academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Low Admission Standards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 High Admission Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-Innovative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conservative Environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Liberal Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Impersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Non-Prestigious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Prestigious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Academically Rigorous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Academically Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Low Pressure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 High Pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. High Cost</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Low Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Responsive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Unresponsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Poor Housing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Good Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Theoretical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teaching Oriented</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Research Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Active Student Life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Little Student Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Demanding Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Lenient Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Good Reputation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Poor Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. High Academic Quality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Low Academic Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Unattractive Campus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Attractive Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Ext. Recreational Facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Ltd. Recreational Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Ext. Social Opportunities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Ltd. Social Opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Music Camp Post-Survey - Front Side

I. Opinion of the College of Music
Please circle the response that best indicates your opinion of the following statements.

1. Has a faculty which is concerned with helping students reach their maximum potential as artists.
   - Strongly Agree (SA)
   - Agree (A)
   - Not Sure (NS)
   - Disagree (D)
   - Strongly Disagree (SD)
   - Don’t Know (DK)

2. Has students who socially interact out of class.
   - Strongly Agree (SA)
   - Agree (A)
   - Not Sure (NS)
   - Disagree (D)
   - Strongly Disagree (SD)
   - Don’t Know (DK)

3. Has an emphasis on professional values in Music.
   - Strongly Agree (SA)
   - Agree (A)
   - Not Sure (NS)
   - Disagree (D)
   - Strongly Disagree (SD)
   - Don’t Know (DK)

4. Provides practical learning opportunities (internships, apprenticeships, education to work programs).
   - Strongly Agree (SA)
   - Agree (A)
   - Not Sure (NS)
   - Disagree (D)
   - Strongly Disagree (SD)
   - Don’t Know (DK)

5. Has faculty members who are accessible.
   - Strongly Agree (SA)
   - Agree (A)
   - Not Sure (NS)
   - Disagree (D)
   - Strongly Disagree (SD)
   - Don’t Know (DK)

6. Has an excellent job placement program.
   - Strongly Agree (SA)
   - Agree (A)
   - Not Sure (NS)
   - Disagree (D)
   - Strongly Disagree (SD)
   - Don’t Know (DK)

7. Has faculty members who are up to date in the music field.
   - Strongly Agree (SA)
   - Agree (A)
   - Not Sure (NS)
   - Disagree (D)
   - Strongly Disagree (SD)
   - Don’t Know (DK)

8. Has faculty members who are excellent teachers.
   - Strongly Agree (SA)
   - Agree (A)
   - Not Sure (NS)
   - Disagree (D)
   - Strongly Disagree (SD)
   - Don’t Know (DK)

9. Has staff members who are accessible and caring.
   - Strongly Agree (SA)
   - Agree (A)
   - Not Sure (NS)
   - Disagree (D)
   - Strongly Disagree (SD)
   - Don’t Know (DK)

10. Has a library that meets student needs.
    - Strongly Agree (SA)
    - Agree (A)
    - Not Sure (NS)
    - Disagree (D)
    - Strongly Disagree (SD)
    - Don’t Know (DK)

11. Has a strong international dimension.
    - Strongly Agree (SA)
    - Agree (A)
    - Not Sure (NS)
    - Disagree (D)
    - Strongly Disagree (SD)
    - Don’t Know (DK)

12. Has excellent technological facilities.
    - Strongly Agree (SA)
    - Agree (A)
    - Not Sure (NS)
    - Disagree (D)
    - Strongly Disagree (SD)
    - Don’t Know (DK)

How many times have you been to the music camp?
   - 1st time
   - 2nd time
   - 3rd time
   - 4th time

Over Please
II. Opinion of the Hosting University
Please circle the number that best indicates your opinion of the following University characteristics.
(5) Very (4) Moderately (3) Not Sure (2) Moderately (1) Very

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Career Oriented</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Well-Known Athletics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Specialized Academics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Low Admission Standards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-Innovative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conservative Environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Non-Prestigious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Academically Rigorous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Low Pressure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. High Cost</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Responsive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Poor Housing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Theoretical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teaching Oriented</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Active Student Life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Demanding Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Good Reputation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. High Academic Quality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Unattractive Campus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Ext. Recreational Facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Ext. Social Opportunities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Coding Classifications

Phenomenon:
The phenomenon studied is the impact of participation in a summer music camp at a large public university on perceptions of the College of Music and the hosting university as related to college choice factors.

Classification of Conceptual Actions:

Category 1 - Perceptions of Faculty
   Sub Category A - College of Music Faculty
      Properties
      • Really Talented
      • World renowned
      • Personal
      • Great teachers
      • Impressive
      • Intense performers
      Dimensions
      • Numerous performances at prestigious venues
      • Many years teaching music

   Sub Category B - Camp Teaching staff (non-Faculty)
      Properties
      • Well qualified
      Dimensions
      • Students at different levels

   Sub Category C - Camp Counselors/Administration
      Properties
      • Restrictive
      • Yelling
      • Trouble
      • Controlling
      • Curfew
      • They
      Dimensions
      • Impersonal treatment
      • Not accommodating needs/desires
      • Incongruent rule enforcement
      • Poor level of activity organization
      • Low expectations from campers
Sub Category D - Other University Faculty (non-College of Music)
Properties
• No contact
• Good
• Awesome
• Nice
Dimensions
• Good if they are like the CoM Faculty

Category 2 - Perceptions of Facilities
Sub Category A - Practice rooms
Properties
• Amazing space
• Bad Shape
• Disrepair
• Hot & Humid
• Leaking
• Vandalized
Dimensions
• Environment could be more conducive to practice/learning
• Rooms arranged with different temperatures for different instruments
• Proper room availability limited

Sub Category B - Performance venues/Concert halls, Fields
Properties
• Beautiful
• Massive
• Historic
Dimensions
• Old pictures represent others that studied music in the past
• Suggestion of past success offers projection of future success
• New buildings offer opportunity to participate in future tradition

Sub Category C - Dorm rooms/food
Properties
• Dim lighting
• Small
• Crusty
• Undesirable food
• Supply shortage
Dimensions
- Poor quality in comparison to other dorms at other schools
- Rooms don’t meet needs/desires of participants
- Food quality and selection is poor
- Dorm staff not prepared

Sub Category D - Other University Buildings/Campus (non-College of Music)
Properties
- Old
- Historic
- Bricks
- Nice
- Beautiful
- Cool
Dimensions
- Offers a sense of history
- Feels like home
- Visual representation of expertise
- Buildings under construction represent something to look forward to

Category 3 - Perceptions of Academics
Sub Category A - Classroom teaching & learning
Properties
- Personal instruction
- Master classes
- Amazing
- Really good
- Informative
- Theory class
- Conducting class
Dimensions
- High level of access to professors
- Noticeable improvement of skills & learning
- Diverse course offerings
- Respect from faculty
- Harder music than in high school

Sub Category B - Practice time
Properties
- 4 hours per day
- Lots of practice
Dimensions
- Extended periods of focus in additions to classes
- Improves performances
Sub Category C - Academic interaction between peers
Properties
• Duets
• Top Band versus Blue versus Gold Bands
• Opinions of others
Dimensions
• Shared learning experiences
• Competition between groups
• Competition between individuals within groups
• Harder music better musician hierarchy

Sub Category D – Performances
Properties
• High expectations
• Struggling
• Competitive
• Pressure
Dimensions
• Auditioning is required for placement in camp curriculum
• Hard work required by educational environment
• Much higher level of play as compared to high school
• Practice pays off in performances

Sub Category E – Reputation
Properties
• Quality education
• Affordability
• Some prestige
Dimensions
• Well known and respected
• Students must work hard to make it
• Good college buy
• Strong academics improve perception of hosting university despite affordability

Category 4 - Perceptions of Social Atmosphere
Sub Category A - Planned events via the camp
Properties
• Movie night
• Bowling night
• Dance night
• Meal times
• Mandatory
• Ice cream social
• Amusement park
• Imax Theatre
Dimensions
• Imposed by camp administration
• Enforced by counselors
• Must go to all events
Sub Category C - Unstructured association with camper peers
Properties
• Common interests
• Friends
• Hang out and chill
• After dinner
• Talking
• Get to know each other
• Need more
Dimensions
• Participants meet peers with a shared love of music
• Lasting relationships are formed
• Unstructured socialization promotes peer bonding

Sub Category D - Association with camp counselors (hosting university college students)
Properties
• Authority
• No
• Unreliable
• Punishment
• Miscommunication
• Experience with the hosting university
Dimensions
• Working arm of camp administration
• Never around when you need one
• Variant behavior towards campers
• Reservoir of first hand knowledge regarding College of Music & hosting university

Sub Category E - Observed social interaction of hosting university college students
Properties
• Students at College of Music
• Students playing sports
• Students reading
• Pleasant environment
• Number 5 party school
• Students having fun
• Many activities to do

Dimensions
• Hosting university Freshmen that attended Music Camp last summer
• Students interacting outside on campus
Appendix F

Coded Focus Group Transcription

Prefix Foci: Perceptions of Faculty, Facilities, Social Atmosphere and Academics

Category 1 - Perceptions of Faculty
(CoM)
Focus Group #1
Pg. 3
Interviewer:
When you have your classes, whom do you study with? Are they professors or are they grad students?

Participants:
They are doctors and professors and stuff.

Interviewer:
Are they all?

Participants:
No, my theory teacher is just a student here. Yeah, some of them are students at like different levels, and some of them are professors of the University. It depends on who you get, but they’re all well qualified.

Pg. 6/7
Interviewer:
Have you ever heard of anybody who whet to this and then went to marching band once they got to college?

Participants:
One of the instructors in our marching band, he was in the marching band and he came back to be an instructor and he helped us with our marching techniques, with music and a lot of stuff.

Participants:
There are a few state schools, that I would consider going to, UM or here and the professors here also make the difference, especially in music, like who you study under makes a huge difference, and coming here, the professors here are world renowned, I mean, so it’s a huge deal. This school is probably one of the top schools in the south. You hear a lot of things, like you go to a school and they’ll be misleading and you’ll think that you’ll be working with some of the top professors at a school so it makes the school more attractive but when you get there, the only people that will be working with people like that are the seniors, but when you come here, they tell you that you’ll be working with these people and your really working with those people, and they’ll be doing master-classes with you and all kinds of things.
Participants:
In like, the theory classes at first in class when the teacher is talking about everything its impersonal but after you do everything and you’re just working on the worksheet she’ll (the instructor) come around and work with everyone.

Interviewer:
So you get one on one, that kind of contact?

Participants:
Yeah.

Participants:
When I came I though I wasn’t really ready for the recital, but now our recital is on Friday and I feel really ready especially because of my teacher. There’s about 5 people per teacher and he’s so experienced, he’s played at Carnegie Hall like 2 times, he’s so good. He’s really, really personal and nice and he’s really helped me a lot.

Participant:
I think I want to go to school here after coming (to the camp). Not as much because of the symphonic camp but because of the honors jazz camp. They talked about all of the areas they have here for music and the faculty the have for the jazz area is really good. And I think that would be why I’d like to come here. That changed my mine.

Participants:
They’re really good. Yeah, they’re awesome. They’re really nice too. Yeah, I agree. They’re really talented.
Interviewer:
Okay, as far as the University faculty are concerned in your opinion they’re top notch.

Participants:
Definitely, top notch. (Note: Group 1 said they had no contact with any other University faculty. The previous exchange confirms the transfer of perceptions formed in the camp onto the University as a whole.)

Faculty (CoM)
Group 3
Pg. 26
Interviewer:
Okay, how about your teachers, like the actual instructors. Some of them are grad students and some are regular faculty. It seems like it all depends on the particular class you take. How do you feel about them?

Participants:
My band director scares me. Sometimes he diagonally smiles really weird. Then he gets all serious when he is conducting. Sometimes he stops conducting but he wants you to keep playing but he doesn’t tell you that. He just walks around the room. It’s like, do you want me to keep playing it not.

Interviewer:
Is that unusual? I mean I don’t know I’m not a musician.

Participants:
Yeah. Sometimes. It’s different with each person. When you get to know a conductor you get used to their conducting style. It’s like your high school band director. You get used to their style and you learn how they work. When you go into a new environment for the first two or three rehearsals there’s a change and sometimes it’s unique and sometimes its not. I find that it just depends on the person’s preference. I’ve been stuck with some band directors that kind of scared me and I’ve been with ones that bring out the best musician in me and taught me so much. I think that this university does a really good job in choosing people (to teach). I’ve learned so much these two weeks and I’m going to go home a show everyone exactly what I’ve learned and be able to share with people.

Pg. 28
Participants:
I don’t think I’ve learned anything, yet. It’s kind of funny. I’m like the 14 chair and the first 12 are from an orchestra back at school or something and they put them all together. I just sit there and no one helps me.
Interviewer:
Is the assessment of stuff like this (musical talent) done arbitrarily? Does it have to do for the personal taste of the judge or is it completely obvious when someone doesn’t play as well as the next person?

Participants:
I would say it’s both, especially with the instrument that I play. I play percussion and it’s all about technique and the way you play. Once you learn how to read it’s all about technique and if you get really good it’s about perfecting your technique. So, if the judge likes your technique and your style everything will be fine.

Faculty (CoM)
Group 4
Pg. 36
Interviewer:
What do you think about the faculty in the College of Music?

Participants:
The faculty concerts were way too much. There was three of them and it’s not like is was different people, it was the same people all three times. Well, there were a few people that were different and a couple of acts caught my eye.

Interviewer:
Were they (the faculty concerts) good?

Participants:
Oh, yeah. The concerts were good. Yeah, yeah. Their great. It’s just that it got a little boring after a while.

Pg. 40
Interviewer:
Alright, we kind of touched on this briefly, what do you think of faculty? I’ve found out so far that some times you get grad students, sometimes you get, college students and sometimes you get real professors. How do you feel about that?

Participants:
They all seem to know what there doing. Yeah. They’re impressive. Definitely good.

Category 2 – Perceptions of Facilities
Facilities (CoM) + Dorm
Group 1
Pg. 3
Interviewer:
What do you think about the facility? How does it compare to say, high school?
Participants:
It’s amazing here, there are hundreds are practice rooms, with pianos and all kinds of equipment to use. The facility is amazing.

Interviewer:
Do you guys agree with that?

Participants:
Yeah, the dorms leave a little something to be desired, but um.

Interviewer:
Oh, really?

Participants: They’re dorms, you don’t really expect too much anyway. But um there’s no lights in the dorms. There is one little light right over the doorway. And the rest of the room is kind of far back so it doesn’t illuminate anything like at night it’s just enough to see where you’re going. Not enough to like read, if you wanted to lay down and read a book you have to sit on the floor kind of under the door or in the bathroom. You have to have a flashlight. Most of the people bring lamps. For first timers they don’t tell you that. They tell you basically (what to bring) but a lot of stuff they don’t tell you. You can’t expect them to tell you everything. But, they should mention that the lighting is kind of poor. (Laughing).

Pg. 6 (Hosting University)
The campus helps a lot, like, if it were a bad campus, it’s just kind of, I don’t know, it’s a good program, but it’s a weird campus.

Facilities (CoM)
Group 2
Pg. 14
Interviewer:
All right, that sounds pretty good. One thing I’d like to talk about is the facility. You have practice halls and concert halls, that sort of thing. What do you think? As far the College of Music goes, based off of your experience here and what you have seen elsewhere- many of you seem to have experiences elsewhere. Is this place good? Is this quality?

Participants:
As far as the building itself, it doesn’t look as good as the rest (of campus). It looks older than the rest. Like at UF they have a really nice music building and everything and there music hall is just nicer. But, I’d rather put up with a little bit of not as niceness. I guess what I’m trying to say is that I would give up a little beauty for the better program.
Participants:
The practice rooms are in really bad shape. (Group laughing) The air is not working well. I place strings and it constantly goes out of tune because it is so humid and hot. They really need to put better air in those areas. I went in one room and it was leaking from the ceiling onto the piano. Yeah, disrepair is like a design theme here. (Laughing) Well the pianos in the forth floor are not bad, but the rooms are all vandalized and have not very nice things written all over them. The pianos in the basement are really really bad.

Pg. 15
Participants:
Well, my thing is… why do we have to share lockers? They have like a hundred that aren’t being used and the other side and it would be much cooler if we could have our own lockers. Oh, you guys have to share? Yeah. Well, we have nice really big lockers to store our stuff. Yeah see, there’s really big extra lockers. Yeah there’s a whole bunch up there. They make the symphonic kids share lockers. Is anyone in vocal, because I heard that vocal kids all get their own lockers. Yeah, and I don’t even use my locker. I play the cello and I have to share a locker with another cellist. That’s ridiculous! I have a really big cello case and I still have to share with another cello and the doors are practically busting off because I can’t close it and I tried to get another locker and they told me I couldn’t.

Pg. 15
Participants:
Yeah, they have all those lockers sitting there. Well the lockers that we get aren’t big enough to hold a cello but there are big enough to hold a violin and the case or a flute and the case.

Interviewer:
Do you know that they (the lockers) are truly vacant? What if they’re used by college kids?

Participants:
(Uproar) Oh, there’s not but a hand full (college kids) ever around. Yeah, and nobody ever goes to them (the empty lockers). When they assigned them (the lockers) they said just pick a locker and put a lock on it. There is no way there’s people assigned to the other lockers. There are two-hundred some-odd lockers and only 32 no 31 piano campers.

Pg. 17
I’d like to say something about the music building. I don’t like how we can’t use the elevators. Yeah, tell me about it (says the cello player). After a while even an alto sax gets heavy. Walking up stairs, walking up 3 flights of stairs gets tiring. I think we should be able to use the elevator to carry our instruments. Anyone else can use the elevator it’s just that we can’t. It’s really hard to carry my instrument up 4 flights of stairs 6 times a day. I have bad knees and it’s really hard.
Interviewer:
Okay, we already talked about that and I’d like to focus on the campus stuff. If you were to go to school here and say live in a dorm. Do you think that would be a good idea?

Participants:
No! I wouldn’t. No, no. They’re way too small. Why is it that everything here is a little bit crusty?

Participants:
I wouldn’t stay in a dorm because you don’t have as much luxury. Plus there’s the food. Yeah, I would not want to eat that food. Imagine every night and waking up to that stuff every morning. Another thing to counter act that (the food issue) you could get a microwave. There’s a lot of good microwavable stuff out there. Get a roommate and pay half price on food. Stuff like that. I don’t think it would be that bad. Especially if you didn’t have to say, I’ll be back at 10 pm or have a curfew and everything. You don’t have somebody banging on your door at 6:15 am. I think that you just have to make everything a little more like your own. Instead of just having white walls everywhere. And if you just come here to sleep it can’t be that bad. If you go out at 6 am and come back whenever you want, it can’t that bad. My only thing about the dorms is that I went to the U of T last week and we had two bedrooms, with a living room and a bathroom. We had a couch.

Interviewer:
Yeah, you said that earlier. You didn’t like it academically but they had nice dorms.

Participants:
The bedrooms were about the size of where the bathroom door starts? That way to the end of the wall to the window was the size of one bedroom not including the walk-in closet. There were 2 walk-in closets, two bedrooms and the sinks were in the living room and there was a bathroom. I mean it was huge.

Participants:
At U of T they have a few dorms and even the bad dorms are nicer that these. But when we are walking to the music building if you look over to your left you can see the really nice dorms. I was talking to, ah, her name is Debora or something. Anyway, she came to one of our classes and was talking about college auditions and all this stuff and she said there are actually music dorms around here. What! I don’t know what they’re called, I forget the name, but it’s got some guy’s name on it. Anyway, it’s got music rooms in there so you can practice. They soundproofed the walls so you play in your room. Why is it that we can’t practice in our room in the afternoon, there’s no one who cares. That’s what you think, but if I was trying to sleep and someone was practicing next to me, I’m going to get really upset. Well, if I came here for college I don’t think that it would be that bad if you lived in the dorms.
Facilities (Hosting University)
Group 2
Pg. 20
Interviewer:
Okay, the University facility as a whole. You guys at least have to walk around somewhere. Does the University look good?
Participants:
Yes! It looks old. Yeah, it looks older than like some of the other colleges I been to for band camp, but it’s still really nice. I like it. You know what they should do for the music camp? They should add on somewhere close to the dorm so we don’t as far of a walk everyday. Well, that’s up to space on campus. The only thing I think they should do is fix the roof so it doesn’t leak. I don’t mind the old look because it shows you how long they have been here and how experienced they really are. And another thing, if you go into the new music hall it is beautiful. Yeah, it’s really cool. They have the pictures in there so you get the history of it all. They have one with the University on a dirt road and how it was a woman’s school and everything and that’s pretty cool. And there are plans to build a even newer music hall that’s going to be three times bigger than the current one. It’s something to look forward to if you’re coming to school here. At the end of the camp we always perform in one of the music halls, but I think we should perform a different one because that hall is massive. Last year there were a lot of people standing and I just think it would be better in the bigger hall.

Facility (CoM)
Group 3
Pg. 30/31
Interviewer:
What do you think about the facility in the College of Music? As compared with your experience in high school, is it better?

Participants:
Well, I go to a really nice high school and it’s not better than what I got at home. We’ve got a lot of good stuff so because of that it’s about equal. One is not better than the other.

Interviewer:
Okay, how about in your experience?

Participant:
I think it is. You play with the same people every day. The music is just better here.

Interviewer:
What about the practice rooms or the concert hall or the equipment?

Participants:
The practice rooms are extremely hot. It doesn’t seem like they trust us here. All the piano benches are nailed shut. It’s just so open that anyone can walk in and take
anything. That’s why the have to be careful with us and have the counselors watch us all the time.

Interviewer:
But the facilities. You think the facilities are good though. For the money that you paid to come here, it’s quality, there’s noting to be desired, no?

Participants:
The band rooms could be better, the practice rooms too.

Interviewer:
Yeah, you said they were hot. So you think they should have air conditioning?
Participants:
I think the facilities are more about sound. I don’t think they could re-air condition a whole building. It’s just cut in a way that it’s meant to get the best sound from the room and if they alter the temperature so much you’ll mess up instruments. Speaking from the experience of being a percussionist, some of the heads are made of calf skin and can get really messed up if you don’t watch the temperature changes.

Interviewer:
Is this true of other instruments as well? What about humidity?

Participants:
Yeah, the heat affects the wood on clarinets. Cold for a sax makes it really sharp.

Interviewer:
It sounds like there are so many differences between your instruments that if the temperature was kept constant at 72% and the humidity was controlled, ideally would that be the best for everything.

Participants:
It would probably be too cold for a wood-wind, around 75 to 80 degrees would be better. That’s why the have the temperatures in different rooms altered.

Interviewer:
Oh, okay, so it is different. They don’t just have all hot and humid rooms. It’s just different rooms for different stuff. So that’s actually pretty good don’t you think? I don’t know what I’m talking about, but I would think that you could find the right room.

Pg. 32
Interviewer:
Okay, as far as the dorm goes, I was told one time when I was the Director of the Art Camp by one of my campers that his sheets didn’t fit his bed and there were lots of problems with the rooms. So I went to the dorm to find out why there were so many problems. The front desk personnel told me that campers can just notify the front desk and they will fix what ever it is. Is that true here?
Participants:
No! We had to get a vacuum cleaner because we spilled Chex-Mix on the floor. We kept asking your counselor about it because we weren’t allowed to go and get it ourselves. So our counselor had to get it of us and she never got it. I would say in general that the dorm needs to be a little more prepared when the music camp comes. They need to be willing to help us if we have problems. They need more supplies; we had a toilet paper shortage. Oh yeah, there was a huge toilet paper shortage. I don’t know about other girls but we have three in our room and we use a lot of toilet paper. If you’ve got four girls they’re going to use even more. We had to get one of the parents to go buy us some more toilet paper. Now they restocked so it’s okay, but it took them three day and you go three days without any toilet paper and that gets really gross. Also they ran out of laundry carts. Yeah, they need more laundry cart. The mattresses on the beds are really thin. You can feel the boards in the bed frame right through foam. It’s like sleeping on boards. I had to sleep on the floor because my bed broke.

Interviewer:
Oh, I wanted to ask you guys this questioned based on one of last night’s responses. Some of you play large instruments and you have to pull them up the stairs, yes?

Participants:
Yes, my instrument weighs 10 pounds and the case weight about 20 on top of that you have to carry your stand too. Dragging all that stuff up and down the stairs everyday gets really tiring. We’re not allowed to use the elevators because they’ll break down. I don’t understand that because I see the college kids using them all the time. What if we had a bad knee for something, we’re still not allowed to use them. I have a knee brace and going up the stairs with all my stuff really hurts sometimes.

Facilities (CoM)
Group 4
Pg. 39/40
Interviewer:
The facility, the equipment, the rooms things like that. Is it quality?

Participants:
Some of it. Yeah, not all of it’s quality. Not all of it’s great. It seems a little worn down. Yeah, our mirror broke on the first day and we’re just trying to keep it in the frame. Our bathroom door handle broke off. My toilet got clogged.

Interviewer:
Okay, where talking about the dorm and we’re going to have a whole dorm section, trust me, it keeps coming up. What I mean is like at the College of Music.
Participants:
Oh, the music school is pretty good. The only thing that bothers me is that you have to lock up the music stands. That is something that is understandable it’s just aggravating.
Yes, but it makes sense to me that they would do that. It’s their property. They don’t want somebody taking that from them. Those stands are not cheap.

Interviewer:
Okay, while we are on the subject can anyone elaborate on the locker situation?

Participation:
Oh, I don’t really like my locker, they get stuck. I’m tired of turning it twice. I mean it’s alright to put your stuff in.

Interviewer:
Is there a space issue?

Participants:
A little, but the main problem for me is that I still don’t know who I’m sharing mine with. They assign you to a locker and some else gets assigned to the same locker and it’s just anyone from any of the camps. I think I’m assigned to a locker with somebody from a totally different camp.

Interviewer:
So you would never put anything valuable in your locker.

Participants:
No, never. I would think that if you were a violinist, they’d pair you up with someone who is another violinist.

Interviewer:
Okay, that issue was something that came up before and I wanted to check if you guys had a similar experience.

Interviewer:
Another thing that came up before was the practice rooms. They seem to have a variance in temperature. Is this a good thing?

Participants:
I wouldn’t know. I don’t have practice time. Every time a come from audition I end up in the same room and I end up sweating in there. It’s so hot.

Interviewer:
Okay, that’s what people in the other groups said. When we talked about this before one thing that came out is that for some instrument it’s better if the humidity is higher or the temperature is higher or lower.

Participants:
Yeah, temperature is very important. It can crack wooded instruments.
Interviewer:
Okay, so a lot of people keep saying that the practice rooms are too hot. Are there also cold rooms?

Participants:
Some of the rooms are cooler but not cold.

Interviewer:
Okay, so in theory could you find the right temperature room for your instrument?

Participants:
Not really. There are so many people practicing and you can’t sign up for a particular room because there’s too many people.

Interviewer:
Okay, I think I’ve got ya. They do have different temperature rooms for different instruments but there are so many people you can’t get into the right room for your specific instrument.

Pg. 41
Interviewer:
Alright, I’m getting a lot of the same stuff from group to group. I guess we should get on the dorm issues. Does anyone have anything to say about this place?

Participants:
Not too bad. The rooms are a little small for four people and there’s not enough time to take a shower or really do anything. Most people want to take their showers in the morning and there’s not enough time to take four showers in the morning. From 6:30 am to 7:30 am that’s when breakfast ends. We have to leave the dorm at 7:30 am. If they varied the time of the bands it would be a lot easier to get to the school of music to here. It would slow the traffic a lot less if you didn’t have 600 kids crossing the street at the same time.

Interviewer:
Yeah, I notice when I was getting out of here last night I walked into the lobby and it was packed shoulder to shoulder. Okay, does anyone have anything to say about your room specifically? I know you get stuff like bed linens.

Participants:
Well, actually no. We just get mattresses. Yeah, we had to bring our own sheets. It was in the handbook though.
Interviewer:
Oh, that must be have been an organizational change. I used to be an art camp director for a few years and my kids stayed in a dorm too. The dorm provided the linen and we had that in our brochure. No one had mentioned that yet.

Interviewer:
Okay, some things that have come up in regard to the dorm include a lighting issue. Is that a problem with you guy’s too?

Participants:
Oh, yes! There’s two lights in the entire room. Yeah, it’s dark. You have two lights? I have one in the bathroom and one over the door and that’s it. Well I have a corner room so I guess it’s different. Well, I had to ask my parents to send in a couple flashlights. I use flashlights my parents sent to light up the room.

Facilities (Hosting University)
Group 4
Pg. 48
Interviewer:
Okay. The facilities at the University not the dorm, but other facilities at the University. Lets talk about buildings, campus does it look good?

Participants:
I like it. I love the brick buildings. Down where I’m from we have lots of painted flamingo pink buildings. So it’s not very nice. I’ve lived up north most of my entire life and the bricks remind me of so much of it. The campus makes me feel like I’m at home again.

Interviewer:
Wow! Okay, some of the people in the past groups have mentioned that some of the buildings are not state-of-the-art brand new, but there is a homey feel. What do you feel about some of the older buildings?

Participants:
It doesn’t bother me at all. I would like to be in an aged building, not 200 years but something with a little past to it. It gives you a sense of history. It shows you that it has roots.

Category 3 – Perceptions of Social Atmosphere
Social Atmosphere (CoM)
Group 1
Pg. 1
Interviewer:
So, socially, you guys definitely interact a lot?
Participant:
The people here, not only are they interested in music, but we get to know them and kind of break the ice a little bit. We all have a common interest. We all just kind of relate. I have met one of my best friends here, actually.

Pg. 1
Interviewer:
So, what do you do? You have your classes, then after that you go out to maybe the student union?

Participant:
They have activities for us. They have movie night tonight. There was a bowling ally thing the other night. We also have a place were we can just hang out and chill. We can come in here and talk to people and get to know each other.

Pg. 1
Interviewer:
I noticed from just standing around out there in the lobby, there are a lot of people that have the camp nametags. They were all lining up, so I guess you all eat together too?

Participant:
Yeah, we do. We also went to the amusement park yesterday and played Laser Tag.

Pg. 1&2
Interviewer:
Okay, great. Do you ever talk to the college students?

Participants:
It’s kind of frowned upon. Like, the councilors don’t encourage you to do that. But, there’s no way you’re not going to talk to people. If you’re at the music school they’re also there for music also. There are a lot of freshmen this year that were at the camp last year.

Pg. 5
Interviewer:
I know you have already said you go out to like the bowling thing. You have an Ice cream social, was that here?

Participants:
Yeah, that was here, there was a dance over at HMU in a big room.
Interviewer:
What do you think about the University on the whole?

Participants:
It’s great you hear a lot about the sports programs here, football, Marching Band and all kinds of stuff. You hear a lot about it, I live in Miami and I hear a lot about this school. Maybe, more in my school, but if you go to a regular high school you probably won’t find as many kids going to a school out of the city, because we’ve got UM and FIU and there’s still a lot of kids that are coming here just to go to this school. The school itself just has a great atmosphere, you just walk back and forth from the dorm to the College of Music, you can tell people like to be here. People don’t just come because they can afford it, or something, you know, it’s a great school. People like being here, it’s not just a settling school, it is a first choice for a lot of people.

Interviewer:
What do you think the kids who go to school here, socially, do you hear anything about that? Is it of interest to you?

Participants:
Yeah, I mean it’s pretty obvious, you just walk down and there’s tons of stuff around the streets to do. You walk be the fields and stuff and there’s always people playing football or playing out there or reading, something. I think it is socially well enough so that you can interact with anyone you wanted but it’s also reclusive enough so that if you wanted to be alone you could also find that time. I mean, I’m super happy with it. I wasn’t planning to come back next year, but I’m thinking I might do that now.

Interviewer:
As far as your social interaction goes, do you all hang out with one another? Or, do you just go to your classes and go back to your dorm?

Participants:
Oh, this is the only time you get to do it. After dinner. After all your classes, after 5 pm is when we get to do that. And then again, like, depending 6:30 and 7:30 you eat and it’s mandatory. So you’re spending like what, and hour and one half. Yeah you sit then for around to hours around people you’re not getting to know and it’s kind of like, this is weird.
Interviewer:
Okay, I know from talking to other people that there are evening activities, like some of you mentioned bowling and there was an ice cream social and a dance and stuff. Oh, yeah you guys went to amusement park too. Did you guys participate in any of that stuff?

Participants:
Yeah, that place was so much fun. You have to participate in it you can’t just stay here. I didn’t have enough money.

Participant:
The amusement park really wasn’t that much fun. You waited an hour in line. What time did we get there? We got there at 7:30 pm and we left there at 8:45 pm. Just to get there and wait for an hour. We were in the front of the line at the go-carts and they wouldn’t even let you go for like 15 minutes on the go-carts, we were like the third people.

Pg. 10
Participants:
Yeah, we were waiting like an hour to go in line.

Interviewer:
Wow. That’s kind of interesting. It sounds like they could improve the scheduling. Maybe use some sort of rotation so you all aren’t there at once.

Interviewer:
Do you feel? (Pause) Remember the question (on the survey) about the personal/impersonal are we leaning towards impersonal? Or is it definitely, you feel like it is personal. You feel like it’s not corporate or something.

Participants:
No, personal.

Interviewer:
Do you feel like you’re making friends, like long-term, when this is over would you stay in touch?

Participants:
Yeah. I have about 5 friends that I met here, that live an hour and fifteen minutes away from me at home. When I can last year I met a couple people that I’m still in touch with this year. Yeah, same here. I met people from Alabama.
Interviewer:
Okay. Oh, one thing just popped into my head. Do you guys ever get to interact with college kids?

Participants:
No. I got in trouble. I got yelled at. Any time there are college kids in the ballroom they kick us out. The people (campers) staying at the dormitory have to use the stairs and the college kids have to use the elevators. It’s really restricted.

Interviewer:
Okay, so you have to be here all the time (when you’re not in class)?

Participants:
We eat here, but we can order out, but only from the menus that they have. It gets expensive though after a couple of days. The food here is horrible, it’s horrible! As far as being a recruitment thing for the college, that’s kind of what it is, right? I don’t think their going about it in the right way.

Interviewer:
How would you make it better?

Participants:
Well, we go from here to there, from here to there. This is where we live for over a week. They could break it up and show us the campus maybe.

Interviewer:
Okay, one thing, the food issue. I’d like to get you to elaborate on that, please. So far I’ve got, you can order stuff, right, but only from the list.

Participants:
Yeah, from menus that they have. What they have advertised. They say that the food shouldn’t be that bad because on the buffets you get to pick what you want. But a lot of times I don’t want any of it. The buffet has like two choices. Yeah, it’s like pasta with beef. I don’t know what happens when you’re a vegetarian. I’m a vegetarian and it’s very hard. I can only eat two things. I eat salad every day. And there’s a lot of carbs here. The fruit and stuff is really nasty looking too. The floors are not clean either. Last week I came here and they had this Chinese stuff. I ate it and I was sick for about 5 days. I ate something here and I got really sick (different camper) I threw up I couldn’t even go to my classes. I don’t know what it was but I thought it was food poisoning. Yeah, some of my friends just got sick last night. Speaking of food that we bring in. It’s cereal. Because I know the cereal is fine because I’ve had cereal the past 4 days. You can’t pick anything that’s healthy accept salad. I just order out a lot. You have to order before curfew right? I ordered Chinese food. Curfew is at ten it got here at 9:58 when I was
walking down the stairs. I got here (the lobby) exactly at 9:59. When I was walking back they made me take the food back to the guy, he had to take it back, and I still had to pay. Then my counselor told me I had cleaning duty because I missed curfew. Did you eat dinner at all that night? Yeah, I got some food from my friends.

Social Atmosphere (Hosting University)
Group 2
Pg. 18
The social interaction with college students doesn’t happen since your not allowed to talk to them. What do you think about the college kids? Do you think they have a good time here, socially? If you were going to consider going to school here do you think it would be fun?

Participants:
They look happy. They look like they’re having fun. I heard that this is the number 5 party school.

Interviewer:
Okay, as far as like, ah, you see stuff. You went to the bowling ally didn’t you?

Participants:
Yeah, and we went to the amusement park, Imax. At the amusement park I did the go-carts and the mini golf. We only got to do three things and they had laser tag. I was waiting there for an hour and a half or maybe longer. And they let me in and we were in there for only like 4 minutes and they came in and told me we had to leave.

Social Atmosphere (CoM)
Group 3
Pg. 22
Interviewer:
I would like to begin by thanking you all for coming tonight. One of the things I’d like to talk to you about is the College of Music as opposed to the hosting university and so we will talk about them in two different groups and we’ll talk about the College of Music first. The aspects are broken down into four categories. The categories are socially, academically, faculty and facility. I’d like to start with socially. What I mean by socially is your experiences and your perception of coming to the music camp, staying in the dorm, participating in the activities. What you think about it. I know from talking to the other groups that there were some things scheduled like an ice cream social, a dance and you went bowling and I imaging there were a few more other things and I’d like to know what you think about them.

Participants:
I think it was really cool that you got to meet so many people when you moved in. You have to live with them for two weeks and that could be really stressful, but it could also be a chance to get to know new people that are just like you or completely opposite from you but still play music and I think that’s really cool.
Participants:
I think they need to have a little bit more activities like the amusement park. I got stuck at the dorm that night and that wasn’t excited about that. The counselors were like, whatever, and I just think it would be better if there were more do so people don’t have to stay here (in the dorm). Communication improvements would help too.

Participants:
Yeah, the same thing happened to me. People didn’t tell my what was going on. Or they try to schedule one or two events for 500 kids, which is going to be very difficult. I think they do a really good job with getting diversity, but they need to understand that we are not 5-year-olds because there is a lot of “hold my hand when you cross the street” sort of thing. It gets kind of old. We’re teenagers and we can walk across the street by our selves.

Participants:
With the amusement park there were so many people there that they we had to wait in huge lines and if they scheduled more things to do there would have been more time to do stuff. I went to the bowling but it was over crowded too and I didn’t get to bowl until later. We also went to the Imax. There was only like 20 people that went there. The busses were nice, there was air conditioning, it was actually cold on the busses. When we got there it (the movie) turned out to be something I wasn’t interested in. They told me it was about dolphins and it wasn’t about dolphins, it was about NASCAR. I think there should be more of a variety of things to do because right now it’s like move night concert night, movie night concert night.

Pg. 32
Interviewer:
Okay, moving along, about the food, that was a big topic last night. Let's talk about that a little bit. What do you think about the food at the dorm?

Participants:
For preparing for 500 people they do a good job. It’s better than it looks, but the don’t have much choice. I think the lunches are good at least. They don’t have food for people who are on diets. There is this one girl I know who is on the Atkins diet and she can’t eat any carbs. Were all scared because she’s not eating anything. They can’t prepare meals for everyone. That’s where people like that have to bring their own food or whatever. They can’t prepare special meals for all these people on special diets like Atkins or the South beach diet. That’s a little much to ask.

Pg. 32/33
Interviewer:
Do you have access to food outside of the dorm?

Participants:
No.
Interviewer:
We can order out from a few places but that’s for kids whose parents give them money for that sort of thing. I know kids whose parents said, “okay, you’ve got food for two weeks your set”. I know a few people who are stuck here and they can’t leave and they can’t order accept from a couple of places. Yeah, we’re not allowed to go across the street (to the restaurant) and we can’t go to the book store.

Interviewer:
Why can’t you go to a bookstore?

Participants:
I know it’s crazy. We can go to the mall but we can’t go to a bookstore on campus.

Interviewer:
They took you to the mall but you can’t go to the book store?

Social Atmosphere (CoM)
Group 4
Pg. 35
Interviewer:
Well, based on first impressions, I’d like to start talking about social atmosphere. What do you think about the camp as far as your social interactions with others in the camp?

Participants:
There are a lot of personalities here it’s very diverse. Lots of very different people and we all share a common characteristic, that being we all like to play music. Even different instruments, like all music out there, some people like to play fiddles and some people are into classical and just from others opinions I have learned more about my music.

Interviewer:
I know from talking to the other groups that you have planned social activities. What do you think about those?

Participants:
To a degree it’s a little bit much. Yeah. Like, there are some times, whether you are at home or at camp you just need some time to your self no matter what. I feel that some times it’s being forced on me. At the ice cream social, I guess they were trying to get us to know each other more, that was a good idea, but not a lot of people wanted to go to that. I just think they have too many concerts. I have to agree with you. We’re playing instruments for five hours a day. Yet then we come back (to the dorm) and we want to relax and we have to go listen to other people play their instruments.
Interviewer:
One of the individuals from another group brought up the idea of having more variance in the social activities. Like get out on campus, sports, there’s all sorts of stuff to do in here in town. I know you can go to the I-Max theatre, there was the amusement park. Just real quick, the amusement park?

Participants:
I did not like it. I wasted my money on that.

Interviewer:
Did it have something to do with when you got there, there was a line and by the time you got to do anything you had to leave.

Participants:
Yeah, too many kids. Yeah pretty much. I thought it was fun but we just weren’t there long enough. You were rushed in and rushed out almost.

Interviewer:
Okay, of all of the activities, how many have you been to?

Participants:
They make us go to all of them.

Interviewer:
Oh, I thought you could choose which ones you wanted to attend.

Participants:
No, during the time when we did the amusement park, you had an option to go to the I-Max, the amusement park or bowling. If you didn’t sign up in time they just put you into one of the groups.

Interviewer:
Oh, okay. I didn’t understand exactly how that worked. I thought all of these activities happened at different times.

Participants:
What aggravated me about the amusement park was that you had to pay $10 for that ticket, but I didn’t even use the ticket. So it’s like, why did I have to pay to get in. It said that you didn’t really need any spending money, but there’s something you needed that they didn’t mention (in the camp brochure).

Interviewer:
Okay, so I sounds like they could improve their communication and organization of activities. That’s come out already.
Interviewer:
Alright, I know that you are not allowed to talk to college kids. How do you feel about that?

Participants:
Well, in a way it’s good thing and in a way it’s a bad thing. You never know who’s out there. There’s a lot of crazy people. There are a lot of nice college kids, but there are a lot of people who just don’t want to talk. Yeah, we could get drunk or on drugs or sex. There are also some kids who I know are going to this school right now (Hosting University). Yeah, who came from our high schools.

Interviewer:
Yeah, people have been saying that in the other groups.

Interviewer:
Okay, based on what other kids have said who have been here for two or three years. In the past the program was more relaxed, there were more things to do on campus. If that was the way it was now, would you prefer that over the way it is?

Participants:
Yes. I feel like I am being treated like a small child and I’m 17 years old and am about to go off to college. They say this (music camp) is supposed to be like a college experience and it’s nothing like that. They treat us like we are in middle school or something like that. It’s not all of the counselors, but some of them are treating us like their so much above us.

Interviewer:
Do you feel like there is a wide range in variance in their behavior toward you?

Participants:
Yes!

Interviewer:
Okay, that came out in one of the previous groups. I have heard that they have a good cop/bad cop thing going on here. Some of the counselors are really strict and some are laid back. It’s seems like there is not much congruency in the enforcement of rules. I asked some of the kids in the other groups who have been here for two and three years if they recognized any of the counselors from previous years and they said yes so some of the staff is not new at this. If they were all new every year then I could see how they would have problems getting the staff on the same page for every incident. I bet it would be, but the thing is that they’ve been doing it that way for years.

Interviewer:
Okay, how do you feel about the curfew? I know you have a curfew.
Participants:
Oh, I hate it. I personally it doesn’t bother me, but once again its the herd of cattle. We’re down here at 9:55 pm and they send everybody up to their rooms no matter what’s going on. I feel like cattle. I’m a person, not a cow. I hate that. I don’t like to be mass herded. I like to be treated as a human being and a person. Not something that has to go up to their room because they have to be in bed by 10:30 pm. Yeah. Usually, I’m less social than other people so I tend to be in my room on time and I haven’t been late yet. The curfew is really no issue with me, I don’t really care for staying out late, but I know with some of my room mates, they are not in favor of the curfew.

Interviewer:
What do you think about that?

Participant:
The only thing I think that’s bad about that is you have to have your lights out at 10:30 pm. Most people will be in their rooms and we don’t make that much noise. My deal is that we take showers after curfew and there’s four girls in my room. Two of us take showers at night and the other two take showers in the morning. So that way we don’t take for ever in the morning and miss breakfast. So if we don’t have that time to take it we’re kind of screwed and we’re going to be late to rehearsal, miss breakfast, everything the whole nine yards. I skip breakfast every morning, really. I don’t like to wake up when they bang on your door at 6 o’clock in the morning. They just beat like a drum on the door. I’d rather they do that than not wake us up and then we miss something and get a punishment.

Interviewer:
Oh, yeah, what do you think about the punishments? So far I’ve heard you get clean up duty, is there anything other than that?

Participants:
No. I had clean up duty already because my roommates and I had done something stupid.

Interviewer:
Okay, I think we can go over a few more issues that have come up such as elevator use, or the lack there of. Anyone want to talk about that?

Participants:
The only problem is I don’t know why they won’t let us use the elevators to go up to the second floor towards the parking garage and use the vending machines up there. It’s probably the college students.

Interviewer:
Yeah, we’ve talked about this before. They really have the separation between the two enforced. You can’t even be on the elevator with a college student. What I’ve heard is that the college students get the elevators and campers get the stairs.
Social Atmosphere (Hosting University)
Group 4
Pg. 46
Interviewer:
Okay, as far as the University, just the hosting University, what do you think, socially. If you were to go to school here what do you think it would be like?

Participants:
It would be okay. If we were really going here we would have a lot more things in our rooms than we have now. We’re just here for a two-week camp.

Interviewer:
Yeah, you would also have freedom. I’m just wondering if the camp experience has changed anything that you might think about the school socially, like activities. Do you think that the college kids here have fun stuff to do.

Participants:
They have some good stuff to do, like down at the bowling lane. There are things to do around in the area.

Category 4 – Perceptions of Academics
Academics (CoM)
Group 1
Pg. 1
Interviewer:
So, you have a lot of social stuff going on and there are a lot of academics. Would you say it’s about 50/50, social to academic?

Participant:
Yeah, exactly.

Pg. 2&3
Interviewer:
So, you think the standards are really high?

Participants:
Yeah, it’s not high to get in, but once you get here they expect a lot. Like if you fake your audition. Which, I know people who did, but they’re struggling to keep up. And it’s obvious the faked their audition.

Academics (Hosting University)
Group 1
Pg. 6
Interviewer:
One thing just came to mind, you mentioned about the marching band. You guys are musicians. Coming from the art background, there’s not some big thing we do at the
University every Saturday in the fall, like the marching band. There’s no applied attraction. You were talking about the fact that you hear about this University, as musicians, is that (the marching band) a real attractive thing, like, would it be really great if you got onto the marching band? Didn’t you say you did “leadership”, that’s marching band isn’t it?

Participants:
Yeah.

Interviewer:
Did that make you want to do it (join marching band in college)?

Participants:
Yeah, I’m in marching band back at school and we watch all types of marching bands, drum corps, and stuff. We watch a lot of stuff from this school.

Interviewer:
Do you think academically as a University student this would be challenging, its sounds like you have a pretty good opinion of the school.

Participants:
We don’t get any other contact, its just music. So I really couldn’t tell you, I don’t know the professors, I don’t know anything, but as far as music is concerned, if it (academics) follows the same trend, then yeah, then it seems like it would be a worthwhile school to come to. (Note: Perceptions of academics generated through the camp process seem to get applied to the Hosting University as a whole)

Academics (CoM)
Group 2

Pg. 7

Interviewer:
So, you’re going all the time?

Participants:
Well, like, we have four hours of practice time and during that time you don’t practice all four hours, you can have someone else in the room with you to play like a duet or something.

Pg. 9

Interviewer:
Anyway, how do you feel about the College of Music academically?

Participants:
It’s amazing. It’s really good, I think. There are a lot of people who have a lot of experience. I’ve gone to other camps. I went to the UF camp for 2 years and it’s pretty bad. I mean it’s not good at all.
Interviewer: Compared to this? What do you think?

Participants: This is my first year at any type of camp and when I first came here I thought it was going to be impossible to do but after two days I had it down because of the practice time. How much you play music is really good. Somebody I met said they came to camp for a week and when the first started that could only play scales and by the end they got first chair.

Interviewer: Wow, that's great. I know you have to audition for this.

Participants: Another thing is that this school offers a lot more programs, like I went the Honors Jazz camp before this. But, that’s only offered for band, that's not offered for stings, we are put in an elective and that's one thing I do not like. I was put in World Music and I thought that was really interesting but I had steel drums last year and that was a lot more fun. I know in Piano we get 4 hours of practice every day.

Interviewer: How would you say it compares to high school?

Participants: It doesn’t even compare to high school, my high school is, like, so inexperienced compared to this. When you come here they kind of treat you like a college student. There more like one on one with you. In high school there’s so many kids at different playing levels. It’s not as competitive in high school. You pretty much blow everybody away that’s there because they’re not as serious. I don’t know. In my high school it’s a little bit easier here than there. Last year they got, like, #1 in BOA? or something.

Participants: At my school it’s a private school and the music we play at my school is, like, really easy and like when I was in sixth grade I was playing in the high school band.

Interviewer: Oh, you were? So this, the music camp level is just way about the level of quality, competition of high school.

Participants: Yes, definitely. It depends on what high school you go to. Yeah, because like, it’s a little different for me. It’s not really at my level because I’m in the middle orchestra and I don’t feel like it’s at my level, like its not really challenging enough. I can do this, but I’m not top quality. It is a lot harder than the music I play at my school.
Interviewer:
Okay. So you’re not as challenged as you might like to be, but curriculum is definitely above what you’re used to at school.

Participants:
Yeah.

Pg. 14
Interviewer:
Do you feel like your better this year because your prior years here have gotten you where you are, or did you do a whole lot of that yourself?

Participants:
In school I am really not challenged too much and coming here does improve my ability.

Pg. 17
Participants:
It’s a really good educational experience. Especially as you get older. If you come here in like, ninth grade, you’re not as grown up and then you come here in twelfth and you’re like let me breath.

Academics (CoM)
Group 3
Pg. 24
Interviewer:
Okay, thanks. One kid in the first group said that they thought that the balance between academics, and I mean playing your instrument or practicing. The balance is about 50/50 socially versus when you are working. Do you agree or disagree?

Participants:
I disagree. Disagree. Disagree. Not with the practice time. We don’t really have that much time to practice. They’ll stress practicing, but then we don’t have much time to do it.

Interviewer:
If we change the term to work versus play. Would you say 50/50 or some other percentage?

Participants:
It all depends on your definition of “work versus play”. Some people find work to be fun.

Interviewer:
Okay. What I’m getting at is art versus not art, musically active versus not musically active.
Participants:
I think more music. Yeah, more music. They don’t really do that much activities and when they do they make you go to it, you don’t really have a choice. That or you can practice and since you’ve been playing all day you don’t really want to do that.

Pg. 27
Participants:
I’ve learned so much these two weeks and I’m going to go home a show everyone exactly what I’ve learned and be able to share with people.

Pg. 29
Participants:
I think the people who play in the gold band are better than the kids in the blue band and there supposed to be the same. One of my friends, he two different schedules and they chose which band he got to play in by the flip of a coin.
Interviewer:
I’ve not heard about that before. So there are two bands? Tell me about that, please.

Participants:
Well, there’s top band, too.

Interviewer:
There’s three bands. Do you compete with each other?

Participants:
There’s top band and it’s wind orchestra and two bands that’s below that and its Blue and Gold bands. Generally they do one two, one two, one two, sometimes one of the bands is better that the other one. Lately, the auditioning has been really weird because they two different judges for percussion. So the first judge apparently judged quit a bit easier that the second judge. The people that auditioned in the after noon had it quit a bit harder, and they would play, I played four mountain solo and I don’t know anyone who played four mountain solo in the top band. I think some people in the top band are not as good as the people in the Blue or Gold bands and it was just luck of the draw as to who got to be in the top band. I know that the percussionists in the Blue and Gold band are better than in the wind orchestra.

Interviewer:
Okay, what is the value in being in one versus the other. Do you get to say, “I was in the top band at a university music camp”?

Participants:
Yeah.

Interviewer:
It’s a prestige issue?
Participants:
Yeah! It’s like being able to say “I’m better than you people”. They play harder stuff so
I think it’s more challenging. It’s also a smaller group so its easier to work with.

Academics (CoM)
Group 4
Pg. 38
Interviewer:
Okay, do you feel like you’re learning anything?

Participants:
Yeah, definitely. I’ve learned new stuff. Yup. We have a theory class. Out of all of
them it’s the most academic class. Otherwise it’s just practicing and playing your
instrument. But in this you actually sit down and learn things. Well, I took a conducting
class and I learned quite a bit in that. Oh, really.

Interviewer:
What about you, are you learning?

Participant:
Yeah, in my theory class I’m learning a lot, plus in my section I’m learning a lot. Like in
my master classes.

Interviewer:
Okay, as far as the University, I keep getting the exact same stuff, as far as music camp.
The other groups say the music camp is good as far as quality. Educationally speaking,
everyone agrees?

Participants:
Well, I get frustrated with some of the music. I don’t know, it’s partly my fault I guess
because my audition pieces that I played were really easy.

Interviewer:
Did you get to choose those or did they just say play this piece?

Participant:
No, I chose them. I blame myself for it, but I came into this (the camp) expecting more
out of it.

Interviewer:
Like how, intellectually?

Participant:
Musically, I came into it expecting more out of it. When I came up here for Tri-State it
was amazing! I don’t know, I’m not the type of person were I have to be the best. I have
to have the first chair. I’m not that person. I just want something I can get out of it musically. I could care less whether I’m the best person in the entire ensemble or not.

Interviewer:
You’re learning something though? It’s just not much as you expected.

Participant:
It’s not what I expected.

Interviewer:
Not what you expected in a good way or in a bad way?

Participant:
Musically I expected more out of it.

Interviewer:
More rigorous?

Participant:
Yes, especially with this being one of the best music schools.

Interviewer:
Ah, yes I’m familiar with the statistics on the College of Music’s ranking.

Participants:
Well, I’m actually pleased with some of the stuff I get to play. Like at my community orchestra back at home, it’s just not that difficult of stuff (music). Some of the music is difficult, but from what I’ve heard there’s two levels of the camp I’m in, they’ve go symphony and philharmonic, and I’m in the philharmonic section. What I heard is that the symphony stuff is way harder. I don’t think all of them (those in the symphony) are that much better than us. I just think the music is unfairly balanced. They get really hard stuff and we get really easy stuff. It depends on the director and I don’t know I just feel like because it’s such a good music school why shouldn’t the music all be more difficult. The thing I thought coming into this was why do we have two concerts? Why bother with that? That’s putting more stress on us.
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Interviewer:
I’m not sure if I’m getting it all quite right, but in the last group they mentioned that there is Blue and Gold, that’s what you’re talking about?

Participant:
Blue and Gold and there’s Wind also.

Interviewer:
That’s right, there are three sections.
Participant:
I don’t have a problem with that, it’s the have one concert last Saturday and we’re having another one this Saturday. Why are we having two? Why not have something more challenging that will stretch us and have one concert that sounds amazing, rather than two okay concerts?

Participants:
It kind of challenges the person to work harder for that, so in a way it’s kind of good. But I can understand like you have this real hard piece in one week and you have to hurry up.

Interviewer:
Yeah, I can imagine that would be stressful.

Participant:
All of these kids in this camp want to be here. They will work for this, because they want to be here they chose this. So if they are going to be here, they’ll practice the music if they need to they’ll work on it if they need to. They’ll get it to where it needs to be to perform they’re individual part.

Interviewer:
Does anybody feel that there is a prestige issue with coming to this camp?

Participant:
A what?

Interviewer:
Prestige, like Mercedes-Benz or BMW. You know it’s like people would think, you went to that University’s music camp, that’s awesome.

Participants:
Not really, but it is a little bit because it’s like $700 for the camp we’re going to. It’s kind of hard to good for like three years.

Interviewer:
Okay, but I know there are auditions for this, not for all the camps but its not that easy to get in regardless of the money.

Participant:
The auditions are just to figure out what chair and the placement of the band. It’s (the camp) open to anyone who’s willing to pay for it.

Interviewer:
When I was doing the pre-surveys at check in they were doing auditions, that was what was going on in the room right next to the big hall were everybody was. I thought the auditions controlled admission to the program.
Participants:
No, the auditions are just for placement in what band you’re in.

Interviewer:
But they have nothing to do with getting into the camp.

Participants:
No matter what if you pay you’re in. You’re still going to the camp but you might be put into the lowest group.

Interviewer:
If you look at the website it says, “Audition only” on some of the camps.

Participants:
Well you have to audition but that’s just for placement no acceptance. Only the Honors camps are audition only.

Academics (Hosting University)
Group 4
Pg. 47
Interviewer:
Okay, academically what would the average University student be like. Is this a smart person, like real smart, do you feel like you could do well academically here?

Participants:
I don’t think it’s impossible, you just have to work. You have to want it. Especially if you’re a music ed major. The courses are going to be a lot more demanding and you have to know a lot more going into it. Mostly because music tends to be a more disciplined type of thing.

Interviewer:
Does anybody else have any idea as to what it might be like to go to school here? Would it be hard or easy? Is it a party school?
Participants:
I think it would be a pretty tough school to make it at.

Do you think your experience here at the camp has influenced your decision to come to school here?
Group 1

Participants:
Absolutely.

Participants:
Yeah, definitely.
Interviewer:
And your opinion of attending the University?

Participants:
Yeah, definitely, I definitely considered it, but it’s not my first choice.
Yeah, I wasn’t planning to go to any state school for music, but I mean, it’s always better to go to a conservatory than a university, that’s just how it is in this world. But as Universities go, as far as I’ve seen, I seen a pretty good number of universities for music, and this is probably one of the better ones I’ve gone to. I’m not a big Noles fan to begin with, but I guess I could deal with that, to come here for the Music program, yeah, I’ll deal with the Noles.

Interviewer:
That sounds pretty similar I guess, as far as art goes, I guess it’s the same way. There’s the state schools and they can be pretty good, but the perception out there is that the best thing is to go to and art school, in a big city, Chicago, New York, something like that, is probably the absolute top, coming of high school and going to do that.

Participant:
Not everyone can do that.

Interviewer:
Exactly, and they cost a lot! For the money, you guys are saying it’s worth it?

Participants:
Yeah, definitely.

Do you think your experience here at the camp has influenced your decision to come to school here?

Group 2
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Participant:
Well, this is kind of where I live anyway, so if I was going to college, I wouldn’t really want to stay here. I’m not sure if I’m going into music or not, but if I was, I would consider it even though I live here. It changed my opinion because I know that the music school is really good and really well known. So it might be worth the sacrifice.

Participant:
I’m not really familiar with other colleges, but I do like this campus and I would come here. I will look at other colleges also.

Participant:
Well it (Hosting University) is in my consideration because a lot of my family has gone here. It has a really great music program but I’m looking to go out of state for a music
school. I’m planning on majoring in music and I think I want to go somewhere in New York. A school somewhere else, I like change.

Participant:
I think I want to go to school here after coming (to the camp). Not as much because of the symphonic camp but because of the honors jazz camp. They talked about all of the areas they have here for music and the faculty they have for the jazz area is really good. And I think that would be why I’d like to come here. That changed my mine.

Participant:
Over the last two summers I’ve gone to a lot of college camps and I know I want to major in music. But after these last two summers there were 4 schools I went to and this (hosting university) is in the top 2 that I saw. I like the U of T because it is really close to my house. I wouldn’t necessarily have to pay for a dorm. Anyway after going here its like a tie between those two, I like it here a lot.

Participant:
I never really planned on majoring in music, but if I did then I’d probably want to come here. I plan on majoring in pre-med and they are building a new medical school here or something. So if I did come here maybe I’d do like a double major or something. I’ve thought about that.

Participant:
Well, after high school I plan to go to college and all the kids here seem like they are having fun and there are a lot of activities to do. I think I’d like to come here for college. I am planning on majoring in music, but there are other things I like too and I know there is more than just the music here.

Do you think your experience here at the camp has influenced your decision to come to school here?

Group 3
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Participant:
For me it’s more because I want to be a music major and I’ve heard really good things about this school through my counselor. So I’d definitely come here for college.

Participant:
I was sort of planning to come here to college before camp.

Interviewer:
So, your experience with the camp helped you refine your decision. Did it confirm in your mind that this (Hosting University) is a place you would send an application?

Participant:
Yeah, now that I know my way around.
Participant:
I want to come here (Hosting University). I don’t know how good the medical school is, but I was thinking about coming here. I like the way the campus looks too. I like the architecture.

Participant:
It’s a nice school you know. My dad went here, but I would never think of going to college in this state. It’s just too hot and humid and I’ve always liked Kentucky.

Participant:
I think it’s a good school and I don’t think that music is necessarily what I want to major in. I think I’d probably want to consider my options.

Interviewer:
So your experience at the camp, has it altered that opinion prior to say two weeks ago?

Participant:
Yeah, I think so. It (going to camp) shows you what the school’s like. It gives you a better idea. So yeah, I think that definitely changed.

Participant:
I kind of like it compared to UF. I like the area I like the buildings better. The brick and the tree kind of give it a college feel. But then on the other side I’d probably have to say no because I’m realizing what an enormous campus it is and I just think it would be too overwhelming and far too many people and I’d just feel totally lost.

Participant:
Well, I want to be a medical student and I know they have medical facilities here, but there are better ones in other parts of the Country. I want to go to where it’s a little more well known.

Interviewer:
Okay, did you make that decision here in the music camp or did you already know that?

Participant:
Yeah, I already knew that.

Interviewer:
Would you say it had no affect?

Participant:
It gave me positive reinforcement on music.

Participant:
I think it (music camp experience) did with me. I talked to some of the counselors and they told me about the program I pursue here and now I’m pretty sure that this is the
place I want to go to college. Everyone was helpful and told me what I wanted to know about the school.

Do you think your experience here at the camp has influenced your decision to come to school here?

Group 4

Interviewer:
Okay, I have one last question and it is: Has your experience with the music camp affected your decision to go to college here, pro or con?

Participant:
Well, I already knew I wanted to go here, but this showed me I definitely fit in. I’m from this town and I’ve seen it all my life so that didn’t change. I just came here to learn how to play my instrument better.

Participant:
No, I visited the school before for Tri-State and ever since I’ve wanted to go to school here.

Interviewer:
Oh, that’s right, you had a prior experience here and you made your decision then?

Participant:
It was always in the back of my mind but when I got to come here and walk around on campus and everything I saw that this is what I want.

Interviewer:
So did the camp confirm your first impressions from Tri-State?

Participant:
It just felt like more of the same.

Interviewer:
Okay, thanks. How about you?

Participant:
It didn’t really change that much, but I learned a little bit more about the music program here. It was pretty good and I wouldn’t mind coming back. I would apply here.

Interviewer:
Would it be your number one choice?

Participant:
It probably would be one of my top two choices.
Interviewer:
Okay, thanks. What do you think?

Participant:
The music camp really did change my opinion about coming to school here. Before I thought this place (Hosting University) was just here and I kind of thought I wanted to go out-of-state for college, but now that I’ve been here I have noticed it is a really good college and I would actually like to go here. Not necessarily for all of my education. I want to get at least a Masters, but I would get a Bachelors from here. It has made me like it and I’m really interested in it now.
Appendix G

Office of the Vice President For Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2763
(850) 644-8633 - FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 6/24/2004

To:
Chris Hampton
1917 Blackburn Avenue
Tallahassee FL 32304

Dept.: ART EDUCATION

From: John Tomkowiak, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
The influence of a college summer program on perceptions of college choice and the characteristics for success at a large public university

The forms that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Human Subjects Committee at its meeting on 6/8/2004. Your project was approved by the Committee.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals which may be required.

If the project has not been completed by 6/8/2005 you must request renewed approval for continuation of the project.

You are advised that any change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the project to the Committee for approval. Also, the principal investigator must promptly report, in writing, any unexpected problems causing risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

cc: Marcia Rosal
HSC No. 2004.385
REFERENCES


174


BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Originally born in CT. in 1973, the child of a potter and interior designer, Chris Hampton studied art with his parents until graduating from high school. His development included traveling though parts of Europe as well as Asia and Africa. Hampton attended the University of Georgia, where he studied Sculpture, earning a BFA in 1997. He then went on to The Florida State University to further his studies in sculpture, earning an MFA in 2000. Hampton decided to begin his career by teaching in college and spent 3 years as an Adjunct Professor at FSU in the Visual Arts Department. At the same time he continued his education by enrolling in the Ph.D. program at FSU. Hampton studied arts administration and received his doctoral degree in 2008.

Hampton has held several administrative positions since completing coursework in 2003. In addition to his teaching load he also served as Director of the Art Academy at FSU, a summer program for college bound high school students interested in becoming art majors from 2000 through 2003. Hampton moved into the non-profit field while still operating the Art Academy and became the Director of Education at the Gadsden Arts Center from 2002 through 2004. In 2004 he left the Gadsden Arts Center to take a position as Executive Director of the 621 Gallery, a non-profit organization dedicated to exhibiting cutting edge contemporary artwork. Hampton also owns and operates Hampton Art Studios, where he continues his work as a sculptor. He lives and works in Tallahassee, Florida with his wife Dr. Cheri Michele Hampton.