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High school bands have typically only performed for halftime shows at local high school football games. However, today’s trends in marching band performance require that a halftime show consist of continuous, advanced movement. This trend is largely a result of the impact that the Drum Corps has had on high school marching band performance expectations.

In order for an audience to appreciate a marching band’s performance and for an adjudicator to observe and reward performance achievement, marching band formations must be performed accurately. Teaching marching band formations is a primary component of the high school band director’s job, and the method of formation instruction is of great importance to the band’s success on the field. The purpose of this study was to compare two methods of teaching marching band formations - the Dot Book method and the Drill Chart method - to determine which provides better accuracy in marching band formations.

The sampling frame for this study was a large high school in a suburban school district in the southeastern United States. Within this frame, convenience-cluster
samples were chosen from the marching band participants. Eleven students volunteered and participated in this study. These participants were randomly assigned to the Dot Book group \((n = 5)\) and the Drill Chart group \((n = 6)\). Students in the Dot Book group were given a copy of the drill charts and a Dot Book form. They then located and marked the coordinates of their position for each set on the Dot Book form.

The researcher then gave the Drill Chart participants the individual coordinates for each formation. Students were instructed to move to their locations three times. At the end of the each attempt, students were asked to remain standing where they stopped at the end of the marching phrase. At the end of each attempt the students’ location accuracy was recorded and scored.

Scores were obtained by counting the number of times the participants accurately moved to their location. T-test results on the two groups’ scores were not significant \((t(97) = 1.28, p = .203)\). However, because the Dot Book group reached their accurate location more often than the Drill Chart group, the researcher determined that the Dot Book method was more practically significant than the Drill Chart method.
Marching band is a very visible high school ensemble. The community sees this group perform during halftime at football games on a regular basis during the fall. Dunnigan (1998) believes that because of this visibility, the group needs to perform at consistently high quality (p. 1). Because of the current financial crisis in Florida, the music teacher is almost always defending the band program’s existence. Quality public performances can help rally support for music education. When it comes time for the school board to make tough decisions about the budget, the music program may have a chance at survival when the marching band program is strong.

The Problem of the Study

High school bands have typically only performed for halftime shows at local high school football games. However, today’s trends in marching band require that a halftime show consist of continuous, advanced movement. Also, the incorporation of increased tempi and highly skilled kinesthetic techniques, such as dance and ballet, are on the rise. This trend is largely a result of the impact that the Drum Corps has had on high school marching band performance expectations. A greater importance is being placed on competition, as the complexity of musical and marching skills become more advanced (Reaser, 2000, p. 29).

The need for complexity has caused an increase in the number of drill charts a high school marching band performs. In a traditional Drill Chart instructional method, the band director is the only person with a copy of the marching band formations. It is the director’s job to place all band members in the correct spot. Since this instructional method is entirely teacher-oriented, accuracy in the marching formation might be
hindered because the student has no responsibility for any part of the learning process. Students are simply told where to go, how many counts they have to get there, and what music is to be performed while getting there.

**Significance of the Study**

For an audience to appreciate a marching band’s performance and for an adjudicator to observe and reward performance achievement, marching band formations must be performed accurately. Since teaching marching band formations is a primary component of the high school band director’s job, the method of formation instruction is of great importance to the band’s success on the field.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to compare two methods of teaching marching band formations - the Dot Book instructional method and the Drill Chart instructional method - to determine which provides better accuracy in marching band formations.

**Null Hypothesis**

There will be no statistically significant difference of accuracy in a marching band formation between students who have had the Dot Book instructional method and those who have had the Drill Chart instructional method.

**Research Hypothesis**

The Dot Book instructional method will result in better accuracy in a marching band formation than with the students that received the Drill Chart instructional method.

**Research Question**

Which instructional method will provide better accuracy in marching band formations?
Delimitations

Students’ previous marching experience and instructional time were not topics addressed by the researcher. As this is a classroom environment, it was difficult to assess the varying degrees of marching experience and ability of individual students.

Definition of Terms

As provided by Previc (2006) with author’s permission:

Counts: the number of beats in a set (p. 208)

Dot: the location a marcher occupies at a certain point of time on the field (p. 208)

Dot Book: a series of reference charts that holds the most important information of the marching show (p. 208)

Drill: the series of pictures that represent the movements of the marchers (p. 208)

Drill Chart: a gridded picture representing the marching stage (p. 208)

Marching: a dance of unified steps (p. 210)

Set: the motion between two points; one page of drill (p. 211)
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The researcher completed a review of previous literature to determine if the Dot Book method would provide better accuracy in marching band formations. The Dot Book method is a learning process that is largely student centered: students are responsible for most of the learning process. The band director will facilitate the lesson by providing training on the use of the Dot Book forms and drill charts. Moving from a teacher centered approach (such as the Drill Chart method) to a student-centered approach (the Dot Book method) may provide more accuracy in marching band formations.

Philosophical Rationale

The learning process is more important than the actual performance. However, if the process is successful, then the performance will be a positive experience for the learner. Students can also meet high expectations as long as proper modeling and instruction are provided. A learning environment that is student-centered should be developed (Abeles et al., 1995 p. 57). In addition, students will also build knowledge based on their experience in the rehearsal (Elliott, 1995, p. 72).

Theoretical Rationale

The researcher firmly believes the process of knowledge acquisition is at the fundamental core of student learning. Through exploration and discovery a student becomes invested in the responsibility of acquiring knowledge. When information is learned in this manner, the student should have greater retention because of the investment made in the learning process (Duckworth, 1968, p. 54).
Implications of constructivist learning theory also help increase the accuracy of marching band formations. The fundamental role of the teacher is facilitation (Blair, 2009, p. 44). An educator must be able to guide the student through the learning process and know when it is time to back away and let the student take over. According to Elliott (1995), the role of the student is to figure what information is important and then decide what to do with it (p.73). Also, teacher assessment of student learning can be done through evaluation of how well a student can teach the material to others.

The researcher believes that the Dot Book method will show an increase in the accuracy of marching band formations. As active participants in the learning environment, students will be more engaged during the learning process.

Research

Comparing the effects of a teacher-centered instructional method to one that is primarily student-centered was the purpose of Marchand’s (1975) study (p. 15). Marchand (1975) found that college students with little background in music seemed to benefit more from a student-centered learning environment. Results from Marchand’s study raise a level of intrigue because many high school marching band members possess a limited background in music.

In a study based on student-centered methodology, Garofalo and Whaley (1979) compared traditional rehearsal and unit study as they pertain to performance of instrumental music (p. 137). In the unit study, students completed assigned tasks outside the classroom, instead of the band director giving instruction on concepts from the podium. This combination of teacher instruction and the use of a unit study adds an extra layer of learning to a typical band rehearsal. In this study, two bands of the same level of musicianship were chosen and studied in a parallel group design. Each band
was taught the same piece of music; however, one band was taught using unit study instructional method while the other used traditional rehearsal. Results showed that unit study led to significantly greater student achievement (Garofalo & Whaley, 1979, p. 142).

Woody (2006) evaluated three instructional methods’ performance effectiveness among collegiate level piano students. The three instructional methods used were aural modeling, verbally describing actual musical concepts, and verbally depicting mental imagery (p. 23). These instructional methods are primarily teacher-based because they all consist of an instructor relaying information to a student. Woody’s study indicated that no single method of instruction significantly increased or decreased the students’ musicality in performance in comparison with another (p. 32).

Canelos, Murphy, Blombach and Heck (1980) evaluated three types of instructional methods and their effect on student achievement of music intervals. The three methods evaluated were a computer-assisted method, a programmed-instruction method, and a self-practice method (p. 243). Results indicated that the self-practice method participants achieved less in comparison to the other method groups. This is because those students in the self-practice group had to decide what information was important from only a textbook and previous learning experience, whereas the other two groups were taught with methods that had a pre-determined sequence of materials (p. 247). What can be taken from their research is that an entirely student-centered approach may not be effective and that the teacher should provide some facilitation in the learning process.
A higher level of engagement can occur when students feel they are a part of the learning process. Hopkins (2002) investigated the effects of expository and discovery methods of computer-based learning on the aural recognition of concepts in music (p. 131). Results from the discovery method group indicated one instructional advantage: higher level of interest in the learning process (Hopkins, 2002, p. 141). This higher level of interest led to the discovery group making higher scores in the practice exercises.

Kendall (1988) compared the effect of two instructional methods for teaching beginning instrumental students at the fifth-grade level. The two methods studied were a modeling instructional method and a comprehensive instructional method (Kendall, 1988, p. 208). The modeling group required a student to learn a song by ear and then perform it for the class. The comprehensive group learned to read music notation from a methods book. The comprehensive group was largely a teacher-centered form of instruction because the instructor delivered information to the students through a predetermined sequence of materials. Kendall’s results indicated that the comprehensive group scored higher and that music reading skills do not hinder aural musicianship and instrumental skills (p. 218).

Bernhard (2006) compared instructional method and its effect on the development of melodic ear training (p. 70). There were two groups in this study. The experimental group learned melodies based on the repetition of solfege syllables the teacher sang. The control group learned melodies from interpreting music notation from a band method book. The experimental group scored higher than the control group (Bernhard, 2006, p. 75).
Steven Kelly (1997) examined the effects of teaching beginning band students basic conducting techniques (p. 296). Experimental groups received ten minutes of instruction in conducting while control groups used their traditional method of instruction. Conducting instruction was primarily teacher-centered because it involved teacher modeling and lecture. Overall performance was not enhanced by the addition of the conducting instruction (Kelly, 1997, p. 302).

The literature reviewed does not imply that instructional method will have an effect on location accuracy in a marching band formation. However, the method of learning, student-centered or teacher-centered, may affect student learning and achievement. In addition, research examining the effect of instructional method on student learning shows that many factors that affect the learning process.
CHAPTER 3
METHOD

Introduction

The methodology employed in this research study is described in this chapter. A definition of the research participants and sampling techniques employed is given. This is followed by a discussion of the apparatus, tools, and equipment necessary to conduct this experiment. The procedures of the experiment are then defined and explained.

Subjects

The sampling frame for this study was a large high school in a suburban school district in the southeastern United States. Within this frame, convenience-cluster samples were chosen from marching band participants.

Eleven students volunteered and participated in this study. These participants were randomly assigned to the Dot Book group \( n = 5 \) and the Drill Chart group \( n = 6 \). Only students that turned in parent permission forms and student assent forms were allowed to participate.

Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was requested and this study was exempted. Approval was also requested and given by Kathleen F. Thomas, Ph.D., the Director of Planning, Evaluation, and Accountability in the Lake County School District of Florida.

Procedures

First the research team was created. This team had two members, the researcher and an assistant staff member. The researcher selected the music for the halftime show. The visual design for the show was created by Crane and Hodges (2010) using the marching band drill-writing software called Field Artist 3 (Miller, 2009). Since the
visual design is representative of the music, the number of counts from one formation to another was derived from the phrasing of the music. Once the designs were created, the researcher printed out the drill charts and made copies for all research participants.

A form was created to record the results of the experiment. The Correct Spot or Not form (Appendix B) was used to record whether the participant marched to the correct spot or not. The Correct Spot or Not form showed the selected marching band formation. Also included on the form were dots showing the correct positioning of the participants. No identifying information about the dots was included on the form. This was done to protect research participant anonymity. These Correct Spot or Not forms were created from three randomly selected marching sets in the last song of the halftime show.

Quantitative observations were to be done on sets chosen at random from the last song of the halftime show. Each set was given a number. Those numbers were written down on small pieces of paper and placed in a hat. The researcher then randomly selected one piece of paper from the hat. This was done two more times. Those three numbers became the formations from which data was collected. Chris Previc (2006) created and provided the template for the Dot Book form (Appendix A) used by participants (p. 171).

Field dots were used to help students know the correct position at the end of the set. Research participants each provided a 3-ring binder/folder to store their Dot Book forms and drill charts. Pencils were also needed to mark indications and directions in their Dot Books.
Preparation of a practice area was necessary for the experiment. Tools needed were 500 feet of rope, 3 cases of white line-marking paint, a football field line-marking paint-sprayer, and a 300-foot tape measure. A practice field was marked off and painted using the measurements of a regulation-size football field minus the end zones: 100 yards long and 53 yards wide. Lines were marked and painted every five yards. Hash marks were also painted.

Research participants were randomly assigned to either the Dot Book group or the Drill Chart group by selecting a piece of paper out of a hat. On these papers were either the letters DB (Dot Book group) or DC (Drill Chart group). More pieces of paper were created and placed in the hat than there were participants.

Dot Book group participants were given a copy of the drill charts. They then located and marked the coordinates of their position for each formation, in their Dot Book. In the Dot Book they also notated the musical part they were to perform while executing this maneuver.

At this time, all participants reported to their starting position. The researcher gave the vocal command “Set” to the research participants. The researcher announced that the participants were to locate their next formation. Dot Book group participants used their books to locate the correct position; but Drill Chart group participants were given their individual coordinates. Participants in both groups placed a field dot on the ground to mark their spot in the formation. When all dots were in place, the researcher again called the participants to “Set.” The researcher then instructed all participants to return to the preceding formation.
The researcher again gave the command “Set” to the participants. The researcher told participants they had a pre-determined number of counts to arrive at their next position. Once participants have used all the counts, they are to stop and remain in that position whether that position is correct or not. Once the instructions were defined, the researcher conducted and vocalized an eight-beat count-off. This gave participants a clear starting point for the experiment. At the conclusion of the last beat, the researcher vocalized the command of “Halt.” Those who did not make it to the correct place received an “X” on their spot. The spot was circled for those who did make it. When all data was collected, students were asked to relax and hydrate. This exact procedure was done two more times.

An assistant was collecting data in the same fashion. After the experiment ended, the researcher reviewed and analyzed the scores collected. An informal debriefing session was held at the end of the experiment. At the end of the debriefing session the researcher recorded and analyzed the comments made by participants. The researcher asked the participants the following questions:

1. Which method do you think was more effective?
2. Do you think we should use the Dot Book method?

**Data Collection**

Data were collected using the Correct Spot or Not form. Quantitative measurement was used. Data from these forms were assigned a numerical value. Being in the correct spot was assigned the numerical value of one, while not being in the correct spot was assigned the numerical value of zero. Scores were obtained by counting the number of times the participants accurately moved to their location. Both researchers acted independently during data collection.
The rehearsal took place on one day and lasted 2.5 hours. Participants attempted to make it to their correct location in a marching band formation three times. After each attempt the research team scored the results. This was done two more times in the exact same fashion. Since the sample size was small, repetition was used to provide consistent evidence. Also, statistical analyses were calculated from the scores recorded by the research team. A qualitative list of participant responses for the informal debriefing session was created and scored for percentages of agreement by the researcher.

Reliability Procedures

Inter-rater reliability was measured by percentage of agreement. Scores recorded by the researcher and assistant were found to be in 100% agreement.

Statistical Procedures

Null Hypothesis

There will be no statistically significant difference of accuracy in a marching band formation between students who have had the Dot Book instructional method and those who have had the Drill Chart instructional method.

The independent variable in this study was instructional method and it had two levels: the Dot Book method and the Drill Chart method. The dependent variable was the accuracy of a marching band formation. An independent samples t-test was performed using the researcher’s data from the study to determine if the difference between the mean scores of the two groups is statistically significant or not. This procedure was used because the study is quantitative and has a dependent variable and an independent variable with two groups. Also, the sample size is less than thirty participants. The .05 alpha was used for all statistical tests.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The Drill Chart group had six participants and the Dot Book group had five participants. During the study, the researchers marked whether or not a participant made it to the correct spot in the formation. Data from these forms were assigned a numerical value. Being in the correct spot was assigned the numerical value of one, while not being in the correct spot was assigned the numerical value of zero. Because the researcher’s and assistant’s scores were in 100% agreement, only the researcher’s tables and scores are provided.

Debriefing Session

At an informal debriefing session, the researcher asked participants the following questions:

1. Which method do you think was more effective?
2. Do you think we should use the Dot Book method?

There was 100% agreement among all participants that the Dot Book instructional method was more effective and that we should start using this method of instruction. One of the participants in the Dot Book group said students would need training to know how to use the Dot Book form.

Analysis

Results show that of all the attempts made, the Dot Book group made it to their spot 73% of the time while the Drill Chart group made it 61% of the time. Breaking this comparison down to a set-by-set level indicates in all the attempts for Set 1, the Dot Book group made it to their spot 80% of the time, while the Drill Chart group made it 67% of the time. In addition, in Set 3, the Dot Book group made it 80% of the time,
while the Drill Chart group made it 50% of the time. However, during Set 2, the Drill Chart group made it 67% of the time, while the Dot Book group made it 60% of the time.

In the independent samples $t$-test, the rejection of the null hypothesis failed because $t(97) = 1.28, p > .05$ was between $+2.00$ and $-2.00$ (Johnson and Burke, 2008, p. 516). These results also indicate ($p = .203$), which also failed to reject the null hypothesis because the difference between the sample means is not statistically significant.

Table 4-1. Scores for Set 1 (S1) / Attempts 1, 2, and 3 (A1, A2, A3) (N = 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>S1/A1</th>
<th>S1/A2</th>
<th>S1/A3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drill Chart</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TU2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dot Book</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TB4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-2. Scores for Set 2 (S2) / Attempts 1, 2, and 3 (A1, A2, A3) (N = 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>S2/A1</th>
<th>S2/A2</th>
<th>S2/A3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drill Chart</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TU2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dot Book</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TB4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-3. Scores for Set 3 (S3) / Attempts 1, 2, and 3 (A1, A2, A3) (N = 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>S3/A1</th>
<th>S3/A2</th>
<th>S3/A3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drill Chart</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TU2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dot Book</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TB4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-4. Group Statistics of both the Dot Book and Drill Chart Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
<th>Std. error mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dot Book</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drill Chart</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Introduction

The sampling frame for this study was a large high school in a suburban school district in the southeastern United States. Within this frame, convenience-cluster samples were chosen from the marching band participants. Eleven students volunteered and participated in this study. These participants were randomly assigned to the Dot Book group \((n = 5)\) and the Drill Chart group \((n = 6)\). Students in the Dot Book group were given a copy of the drill charts and a Dot Book form. They then located and marked the coordinates of their position for each set on the Dot Book form.

The researcher then gave the Drill Chart participants the individual coordinates for each formation. Students were instructed to move to their locations three times. At the end of each attempt, students were asked to remain standing where they stopped at the end of the marching phrase. At the end of each attempt the students' location accuracy was recorded and scored. This was done two more times in the exact same fashion. At the end of the research study an informal debriefing session occurred.

The purpose of this study was to compare two methods of teaching marching band formations - the Dot Book method and the Drill Chart method - to determine which provides better accuracy in marching band formations. The research question that drove my study was: which instructional method will provide better accuracy in marching band formations? Based on the findings of my study, the Dot Book method provides better accuracy in marching band formations.
Comparisons

Results from Set 1 show four of five (80%) Dot Book participants made it to their spot. Only 4 of 6 (67%) Drill Chart participants made it to their spot. In Set 3, 4 of 5 (80%) Dot Book participants made it to their spot while 3 of 6 (50%) Drill Chart participants made it to their spot. However, in Set 2, 4 of 6 (67%) Drill Chart participants made it to their spot while 3 of 5 (60%) Dot Book participants made it to their spot. Overall, 4 of 5 (73%) Dot Book participants made it to the correct. In comparison, 4 of 6 (61%) Drill Chart participants made it to their spots.

Discoveries

Some rewarding discoveries were made. Using the Correct Spot or Not form allowed for the assessment of band students’ accuracy in a marching band formation. Dot Book forms create a reference tool for band members. Dot Book forms contain information for the marching band formations, the music that correlates with those formations, visual focus, and foot direction. It is sometimes difficult to provide evidence for a marked grade and these forms allow band directors to assess, evaluate, and reward student achievement. During the debriefing session with the participants, we determined that using this new instructional method would require some training to be effective.

Conclusion

Even though the same number of participants made it to their correct spots, the Drill Chart group had more participants than the Dot Book group and therefore more opportunities to be in the correct spot. Based on this, because the Dot Book group reached the correct location more often than the Drill Chart group, the researcher
determined that the Dot Book method was more practically significant than the Drill Chart method.

Results show a difference in accuracy of marching band formations between the Dot Book group (M = 73%) and the Drill Chart group (M = 61%). However, statistical results indicated a failure to reject the null hypothesis. A larger sample size should be used in future studies to bring more power to the results and increase the chance of rejecting a false null hypothesis.
APPENDIX B
CORRECT SPOT OR NOT FORMS

Reprinted with permission from Crane, R., & Hodges, C. (2010). Halftime Show
Drill-Design: Closer. Unpublished manuscript.

Reprinted with permission from Crane, R. & Hodges, C. (2010). Halftime Show
Drill-Design: Closer. Unpublished manuscript.
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