Developing Successful Conductors: A Survey of Feedback Methods for Undergraduate Instrumental Conducting Courses

by

LaToya Alexandra Webb

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
August 8, 2020

Keywords: conducting, undergraduate, quantitative,
verbal feedback, nonverbal feedback

Approved by

Nancy Barry, Chair, Professor of Music Education
Richard Good, Professor of Music
Jane Kuehne, Associate Professor of Music Education
Chih-hsuan Wang, Associate Professor of Educational Research Methodology and Analysis

Abstract

Few studies have explored feedback methods in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses. The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate the various methods of verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback and to compare and contrast instructors' perceptions of feedback based on their attributes, school, and course characteristics. Undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors from the College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA), "Conducting Pedagogy" listserve, and the Historically Black Colleges and Universities National Band Directors Consortium (HBCU-NBDC) professional members' email list ($N = 109$), completed a web-based Qualtrics survey titled "Undergraduate Conducting Feedback" developed from previous studies (Boardman, 2000; Marrs, 2016; Rowe & Wood, 2008). The survey addressed five constructs: School Characteristics, Course Characteristics, Methods of Feedback, Perceptions of Feedback, and Demographic Profile.

The following research questions were devised to gain further understanding of undergraduate instrumental conducting courses and the various types of verbal and nonverbal feedback.

1. What is the relationship between the types of feedback and class time?
2. What is the relationship between the demographic information and the perceptions of feedback?
3. Does class size, allotted class time, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting predict perceptions of feedback?
4. Based on the different methods of provided feedback, what are the most frequently used course activities in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses?

Both descriptive statistics and various parametric inferential statistical analysis tests were used to describe and generalize about undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors. Pearson correlation results indicated no significant relationships between verbal and nonverbal feedback and allotted class time. A series of one-way MANOVA analyses revealed instructors' perceptions of feedback. No significant differences were found for gender, academic title, primary instrument, highest degree earned, institution type, or U.S. region. However, a significant difference was found among instructors' perceptions of nonverbal feedback based on race. Multiple regression analyses determined if class size, allotted class time, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting predicted instructors' perceptions of feedback. Allotted class time was a significant predictor of instructors' perceptions of written feedback. Instructors indicated using "conducting peers" as a course activity more frequently in combination with verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback.

Recommendations for future research include studying undergraduates' perceptions of their conducting instructor's verbal and nonverbal feedback concerning frequency and effectiveness. Another recommendation includes providing conducting workshops and symposiums offering guidance on useful and meaningful verbal and nonverbal feedback. The last recommendation includes encouragement for instructors to seek additional opportunities to learn and become more comfortable with various tools for providing feedback.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I have to thank God for my many blessings and guidance, which led me to Auburn University, where so many supportive people surround me. I want to thank my advisor, Dr. Nancy Barry, for her expertise, genuine guidance, and enthusiastic encouragement during my tenure. Thank you also to Dr. Chih-hsuan Wang for serving on my committee and being a source of knowledge. You were available to answer any questions, and I am forever grateful. Thank you to Dr. Jane Kuehne for serving on my committee, sharing your expertise, and personal experiences. I especially want to thank my committee member and mentor, Dr. Richard Good. You shared your well-rounded knowledge, allowed me to collaborate on various projects, and provided me with both meaningful and worthwhile opportunities to grow, learn, teach, lead, and conduct.

I am very thankful and blessed to have such supportive family and friends. What I love most is that many of you see my determination, goals, and successes as inspiration to fuel your desires—continue to follow your dreams and never settle for less. Thank you to my parents, Alexander and Dorothy Webb, for your undying love and patience over the years—you always made a way to support me, whether near or far. Thank you to my sister, Keonya Webb, for allowing me to be me and live out my dreams—you never once questioned my love for music. I want to say a special thank you to my friends and extended family, you all have supported and inspired me to do what I love. Lastly, thank you to all of my former music teachers, professors, and mentors from church, elementary/middle/high school, and college—I am forever indebted to you for sharing your passion and love for music with me. I will continue to be an inspiration for others as you were to me.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter I

Introduction

Conducting is an essential skill for all undergraduate music majors, especially in instrumental and choral music. While we know that effective feedback is a critical element of quality teaching and learning (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Marrs, 2016; Rowe & Wood, 2008), few studies have focused on conducting instructors' feedback approaches. Conducting instructors use different forms of verbal and nonverbal feedback widely as a learning and developmental tool for undergraduate instrumental conducting students (Boardman, 2000; Orman, Price, & Russell, 2017; Silvey & Major, 2014; Worthy, 2005). Due to varying reasons such as large class size (Boardman, 2000), and lack of time (Baker; 1992; Boardman, 2000; Cooper, 1994; Getchell, 1957; Romines, 2003; Runnels, 1992), opportunities for conducting instructors to provide feedback are sometimes limited (Baker, 1992; Cooper, 1994; Gretchell, 1987; Runnels, 1992; Silvey & Baumgartner, 2016; Silvey & Major, 2014). Moreover, the chance to offer certain curricular activities is also compromised (Romines, 2003).

According to the Conducting and Musical Leadership section of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) Handbook:

> The prospective music teacher must be a competent conductor, able to create accurate and musically expressive performances with various types of performing groups and in general classroom situations. Instruction in conducting includes score reading and the integration of analysis, style, performance practices, instrumentation, and conducting techniques. Laboratory experiences that give the student opportunities to apply rehearsal techniques and procedures are essential. Prospective teachers in programs with less focus on the preparation of ensemble conductors must acquire conducting and musical

leadership skills sufficient to teach effectively in their area(s) of specialization (NASM, 2018-2019, p. 119).

Undergraduate instrumental conducting students must experience and explore the opportunities stated above in their music education conducting courses to fulfill the desired attributes, competencies, and procedures. Conducting instructors must also provide adequate feedback for students to develop as successful conductors.

Gaining the necessary skills and teacher feedback to learn and develop is crucial for all music majors, no matter the concentration. Both practicing musicians and conductors should have opportunities to develop their communication and leadership skills. Even though many performance majors do not wish to teach or conduct, they may never know their direct career path. Often, musicians find themselves in pressing situations where conducting skills are needed. Therefore, specific feedback related to all aspects of progress is necessary for all undergraduate conducting students' growth and development.

Need for the Study

While there is a plethora of research on undergraduate conducting courses, curricula, practices, techniques, and perceptions of instructors and students, there is little research on feedback methods (verbal [spoken/written] and nonverbal) provided in these courses. A few studies have shown the need for feedback research in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses (Boardman, 2000; Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Keller, 1979; Silvey & Major, 2014).

Over 40 years, scholars have addressed the need for feedback in conducting courses. Keller (1979) provided future research recommendations, including measuring feedback frequency, measuring videotape effectiveness through feedback from the instructor, peers or self, and measuring the effectiveness of various feedback forms. More recent recommendations

included studying evaluation types and what is most effective in conducting courses (Boardman, 2000), and "types of feedback and guided reflection that have the greatest impact on altering preservice teacher behavior" (Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010, p. 70). My study includes an investigation of both verbal and nonverbal feedback methods in hopes of addressing the literature gap.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate the various methods of verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses and to compare and contrast instructors' perceptions of feedback based on their attributes, school, and course characteristics. The majority of the literature focuses on the general topic of conducting, which offers minimum consideration to the instructor's approach to providing feedback.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made for this study:

- All survey responses are anonymous.
- Instructors will read carefully and accurately respond to the survey items.
- Instructors are currently teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting.
- Instructors will belong to the College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA) or the Historically Black Colleges and Universities National Band Directors Consortium, Inc. (HBCU-NBDC).
- Snowball sampling will allow for additional instructors outside of the CBDNA and the HBCU-NBDC.
- Both verbal and nonverbal feedback is essential to all conductors.

- The methods and perceptions of feedback (verbal/nonverbal) vary among institutions, instructors, and settings.

Positionality

I had no prior knowledge of the College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA) until attending a predominately white institution (PWI). Unfortunately, I did not learn of this organization during my tenure at a Historically Black College and University (HBCU). Perhaps it is due to the underrepresentation of HBCU directors within the CBDNA population (https://www.cbdna.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Report2012su.pdf), and the lack of mentorship. The Historically Black Colleges and Universities National Band Director Consortium (HBCU-NBDC) was formed to better meet the needs of HBCU directors. Regardless of any gender and ethnicity issues within CBDNA, my undergraduate student membership and attendance at the HBCU-NBDC annual conventions provided opportunities to develop my musical and leadership skills, network, and celebrate music education.

I am not sure if my decision to attend an HBCU hindered my awareness of various music organizations. Still, I will make it my responsibility to inform other musicians of these numerous opportunities regardless of their cultural background, gender, or differences. Since holding membership in CBDNA, I have not noticed a great deal of diversity at both regional and national conferences. The organization nowhere resembles the population of the United States for it to be a national organization. Maybe this is due to the lack of awareness and mentorship among student musicians and directors who attend HBCUs, Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs), and other Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs). Sadly, the lack of change within CBDNA may also result from the underlined history of HBCU directors

and the sense of “not belonging.” Though the CBDNA community is aware of the issues, change is shifting rather slowly into a direction of inclusivity within the organization.

Awareness of this sensitive topic and culture shock I once experienced prompted me to include a more culturally diverse pool of respondents. Given my varied background, I know that music educators and band directors at HBCUs are also instructors of undergraduate instrumental conducting and have experiences with providing verbal and nonverbal feedback. Therefore, each of their views is vital in supporting this important endeavor. I believe in creating a positive, impactful, and inclusive learning environment for increasingly diverse populations.

Overview of the Study

The quantitative design examined undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors from the CBDNA "Conducting Pedagogy" listserve and the HBCU-NBDC professional members' email list. Additionally, I recruited participants outside of these two organizations through snowball sampling. There were one hundred and nine ($N = 109$) valid survey responses for the current study (useable rate = 55.61%).

Review of Literature

I reviewed music education, conducting, and language literature in this study. This body of literature was used as a guide to explore various research on both verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal methods of feedback used in conducting courses and education in general. The literature covered five topics (a) addressing the gap in conducting feedback, (b) importance of feedback in education, (c) feedback in conducting, (d) the role of the conductor, and (e) overview of conducting courses. I gathered data from research studies, dissertations, scholarly peer-reviewed journal articles, and textbooks.

Methods and Procedures

This section outlines the methodology used in the current study. Participants were encouraged (via email invitation and reminders) to complete a 38-item web-based Qualtrics survey titled "Undergraduate Conducting Feedback," which was adapted and developed from previous studies (Boardman, 2000; Marrs, 2016; Rowe & Wood, 2008). The current survey addressed five constructs (School Characteristics, Course Characteristics, Methods of Feedback, Perceptions of Feedback, and Demographic Profile). It included some items (from previous studies) and modified content that was better aligned with the current research base. The survey contained two types of five-point Likert scales 1 (*always*) to 5 (*never*) and 1 (*strongly agree*) to 5 (*strongly disagree*), multiple-choice, and a few open-ended questions.

Results

The results section highlights answers to the research questions guiding my investigation. Since the purpose of this dissertation was to learn about methods of verbal and nonverbal feedback and to compare and contrast instructors' perceptions of feedback based on their attributes, school, and course characteristics, it was essential to organize the results according to the utilized descriptive and parametric inferential statistical data analysis.

Discussion and Conclusion

Based on the research design, I sought to determine (a) the relationship between the types of feedback and class time, (b) the relationship between the demographic information and the perceptions of feedback, (c) if class size, allotted class time, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting predicted perceptions of feedback, and (d) the most frequently used course activities in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses based on the

different methods of provided feedback. Research results are discussed and interpreted according to the four research questions and parametric inferential statistical data analysis.

Appendices

The appendices include pertinent documents used for this study, such as the institutional review board (IRB) approval, the information letter, the invitation email, two reminder emails, and the Qualtrics survey content.

Delimitations

Sampling was delimited to undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors currently teaching in undergraduate music education programs. Identifiable information was not collected because survey responses were completely anonymous. I recruited participants via the "Conducting Pedagogy" listserve of CBDNA and the email list of HBCU-NBDC. These two organizations were chosen as focus groups because I desired a more diverse population, and both organizations are nationally recognized. Additional participants were recruited through snowball sampling via invitation and reminder emails, and social media announcements on both the CBDNA and HBCU-NBDC Facebook pages.

Limitations

Survey email invitations were sent through the CBDNA "Conducting Pedagogy" listserve and HBCU-NBDC email list. A total of 1072 CBDNA members were subscribed to the listserve. There were 58 HBCU-NBDC members on the email list. Given the nature of the study, there was not enough information to produce a valid estimate of the target population among the CBDNA listserve or HBCU-NBCU email list members. It is unlikely that all members were current undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors.

Furthermore, members outside of these two organizations had an opportunity to complete the survey through snowball sampling. Due to these known limitations in identifying the target population, an accurate estimate of the sample ratio to the target population is unknown. Therefore, an exact confidence interval is not possible to calculate.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

My research goal was to examine the verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback methods among undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors and compare and contrast their perceptions of feedback based on attributes, school, and course characteristics. I collected all data through a web-based Qualtrics survey. I sought to determine how instructors' perceptions of feedback differed by instructor attributes (gender, race, academic title, primary instrument type, highest degree earned), school (institutional type, U.S. region), and course characteristics (class size, allotted class time). Based on my research goals and literature review, I developed the following research questions to guide my investigation and to gain further understanding of the various types of feedback provided by undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors. The research questions (RQ) are:

1. RQ1: What is the relationship between the types of feedback and class time?

    1.1 Is there a relationship between the instructor's use of verbal (spoken) feedback and allotted class time?

    Alternative Hypothesis: There will be a relationship between the instructor's use of verbal (spoken) feedback and allotted class time.

    1.2 Is there a relationship between the instructor's use of verbal (written) feedback and allotted class time?

Alternative Hypothesis: There will be a relationship between the instructor's use of verbal (written) feedback and allotted class time.

1.3 Is there a relationship between the instructor's use of nonverbal feedback and allotted class time?

Alternative Hypothesis: There will be a relationship between the instructor's use of nonverbal feedback and allotted class time.

2. RQ 2: What is the relationship between the demographic information and the perceptions of feedback?

2.1 Is there a significant difference between gender and race based on the perceptions of feedback?

Alternative Hypothesis: There is a significant difference between gender and race based on the perceptions of feedback.

2.2 Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of feedback based on academic title?

Alternative Hypothesis: There is a significant difference between the perceptions of feedback based on academic title.

2.3 Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of feedback based on primary instrument type?

Alternative Hypothesis: There is a significant difference between the perceptions of feedback based on primary instrument type.

2.4 Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of feedback based on the highest degree earned?

Alternative Hypothesis: There is a significant difference between the perceptions of feedback based on the highest degree earned.

2.5 Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of feedback based on institutional type?

Alternative Hypothesis: There is a significant difference between the perceptions of feedback based on institutional type.

2.6 Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of feedback based on the U.S. region?

Alternative Hypothesis: There is a significant difference between the perceptions of feedback based on the U.S. Region.

3. RQ3: Will class size, allotted class time, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting predict perceptions of feedback?

   Alternative Hypothesis: Class size, allotted class time, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting will predict perceptions of feedback.

4. RQ4: Based on the different methods of provided feedback, what are the most frequently used course activities in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses?

   Alternative Hypothesis: N/A

Definition of Terms

- CBDNA: College Band Directors National Association "is an inclusive organization whose members are engaged in continuous dialogue encompassing myriad philosophies and professional practices" (https://www.cbdna.org/about/statement-of-purpose/).
- Conducting: "A non-verbal language of communication, utilized in both rehearsal and performance, allowing the body to vividly respond to the detailed expectation of the

music, inviting the ensemble to follow unequivocally" (Haithcock, Geraldi, & Doyle, 2017, p. 11).

- Feedback: "Information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding…a "consequence" of performance" (Hattie & Timperley, 2007, p. 81).
- HBCU-NBDC, Inc.: Historically Black Colleges and Universities National Band Directors Consortium, Inc. is an organization whose purpose is to "provide an opportunity for Band Directors and students to collaborate and develop strategic plans for success in instrumental music programs" (www.hbcu-nbdc.org).
- Instrumental Conducting Course: An introductory level college course that focuses on teaching students the fundamentals of conducting a wind or band ensemble.
- Non-verbal communication: "Behavior and elements of speech aside from the words themselves that transmit meaning. Non-verbal communication includes pitch, speed, tone and volume of voice, gestures and facial expressions, body posture, stance, and proximity to the listener, eye movements and contact, and dress and appearance" (http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/non-verbal-communication.html). In this study, nonverbal feedback is showing facial expression (emotions), modeling (showing examples, gestures, style/pattern), human sounds (laugh, grunt, groan, sigh), and body language (posture, presence).
- Verbal communication: "The use of words to share information with other people. It can therefore include both spoken and written communication" (https://www.skillsyouneed.com/ips/verbal-communication.html).

Chapter II

Review of Literature

There is a substantial amount of research on the activities in conducting classes but very little research on the verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal methods of feedback, particularly the relationship between feedback, feedback styles, perceptions toward feedback, and class time allotted for feedback. I sought to gain further understanding of five topics: (a) addressing the gap in conducting feedback, (b) the importance of feedback in education, (c) feedback in conducting, (d) the role of the conductor, and (e) overview of conducting courses. This literature review examined the most common topics identified in the context of research studies, dissertations, scholarly peer-reviewed journal articles, and textbooks. The next section will outline previous research studies that have highlighted feedback methods in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses.

Addressing the Gap in Conducting Feedback

Over 40 years, scholars have addressed the need for feedback research in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses (Boardman, 2000; Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Keller, 1979; Silvey & Major, 2014). With the expansion of modern technology, some scholars have examined videotape feedback in undergraduate conducting courses (Boardman, 2000; Keller, 1979; Romines, 2003; Yarbrough, 1987; Yarbrough, Wapnick, & Kelly; 1979). Omar, Price, and Russell (2017) examined the use of augmented immersive virtual reality learning environments (VRLE) to enhance undergraduate conducting students' musical skills. Outside of videotape feedback, there is little research into how undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors provide verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback. More research is needed to address this gap in the literature.

Importance of Feedback in Education

Longitudinal student achievement should be the desired goal for both the student and the teacher. One way to track and measure teacher effectiveness and student progress is through data collection, which appears in different forms, such as assignments and assessments (Wesolowski, 2015). Black and Wiliam (1998) defined assessment as "all those activities undertaken by teachers—and by their students in assessing themselves—that provide information to be used as feedback to modify teaching and learning activities" (p. 2).

Feedback is an essential measure needed to aid students in their progress in performing specific tasks. According to Hattie and Timperley (2007), feedback is "information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding…a "consequence" of performance" (p. 102). Researchers have examined various forms of feedback and have found that it is valuable for student's progress. Over the years, scholars have investigated the delivery of positive and negative feedback, and approval versus disapproval (MacLeod & Napoles, 2012; Murray, 1975; Yarbrough & Hendel, 1993). MacLeod and Napoles (2012) examined preservice teachers' perceptions of teaching effectiveness when viewing teaching episodes that included high positive (four-to-one approval ratio) and high negative (one-to-four approval ratio) feedback statements. Teachers who used positive feedback were rated higher than teachers who used negative feedback.

Formative assessment is essential for class instruction and the development of higher standards of achievement (Black & Wiliam, 1998). Therefore, all students need guided opportunities to develop the necessary skills to achieve specific objectives and goals. According to Black and Wiliam (1998), feedback should present the qualities of a students' work, and highlight ways the student can improve while avoiding comparisons to their peers. Black and

Wiliam (1998) also suggested that feedback should “give pupils specific guidance on strengths and weaknesses” (p. 8). There are three elements about feedback effort: "recognition of the desired goal, evidence about present position, and some understanding of a way to close the gap between the two" (Black & Wiliam, 1998, p. 6).

There are various feedback tools to aid the instruction of teachers and the continued development of students (Pellegrino et al., 2015). Although providing constructive feedback is essential for student learning and development, teachers can become overwhelmed because providing sufficient and focused feedback is also time-consuming (Andrade, 2005). A rubric is a great tool to help teachers manage their time while also serving as a guide to help support students in their academic achievements (Andrade, 2005). Rubrics are great assessment tools if created and explicitly tailored to the assignment criteria. Rubrics can help teachers clarify learning goals, tailor instruction to fit goals, communicate goals to students, guide students through feedback, and assess whether goals are met (Andrade, 2005).

In addition to rubrics, rating scales, and checklists are also excellent teaching aids for providing feedback. According to Pellegrino et al. (2015) assessment tools should be valid (accurate measurement) and reliable (consistent). Rating scales provide students with “more information about the degree to which they succeed in demonstrating a list of specific skills” (Pellegrino et al., 2015, p. 49). Checklists are useful because teachers can add specific features for assessing and use them as summative reports to students (Pellegrino et al., 2015). Students can also use assessment tools for peer and self-assessments (Pellegrino et al., 2015). There are many means for teachers to provide assessments to their students including “improving instruction, helping students learn what is expected as well as what teachers believe students are

doing well and what areas they need to improve, providing data that may be viewed by stakeholders, and providing documentation for grades" (Pellegrino et al., 2015, p. 54).

Feedback in Conducting

Conducting is a complex skill that future music educators will frequently use throughout their careers. Both verbal and nonverbal communication are essential to enhance musical experiences and performances. To develop these essential qualities, undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors should provide students with valuable opportunities for preparation within the field, specific feedback towards their performance, and various aspects focused on the "conductor as teacher, musical collaborator, and pedagogue**"** (Ulrich, 2009, p. 48). Labuta (2004) wrote about the competency-based approach and a competency curriculum, which

> consists of three principal components: the explicit statement of the competencies that students must demonstrate, the specification of criteria for assessing students' mastery of competencies, and the provision of alternative learning activities presented in modular format to facilitate student attainment and demonstration of the competencies. (p. 3)

Feedback should welcome opportunities focusing on interactive communication. Ulrich (2009) stated "Students and conductor must always seek a positive approach, offering constructive feedback to one another" (p. 50). These opportunities allow students to collaborate and take ownership of their actions. Students can also "recognize the desired goal, acknowledge their present position, and form some understanding of a way to close the gap between the two" (Black & Wiliam, 1998, p. 6). Battisti (2007) stressed collaboration and how conducting instructors and students should have a mentor-student approach to feedback. Similarly, Hattie and Timperley (2007) stated that the primary purpose of feedback is "to reduce discrepancies between current understandings and performance, and a goal" (p. 86).

Hattie and Timperley (2007) argued that "If feedback does not lead to reducing the discrepancy between current understandings and goals, students are likely to close the gap by overstating their current status or claiming various attributions that reduce effort and engagement" (p. 89). Feedback is known to affect students' general wellbeing, emotions, reduce anxiety, and demonstrate a sense of security and care (Marrs, 2016; Rowe, 2011; Rowe & Wood, 2008). In a study highlighting early field experience**,** Fant (1996) discovered that there was a positive relationship with early field experience students and student teaching performance. However, there was a negative relationship on student teaching performance of early field experience students with no feedback. Feedback can aid both students and teachers in reaching learning objectives and goals.

Through instructor feedback, students can improve problem areas that transpire while conducting activities and performances. However, students must know what is necessary and expected to close the gap between their present performance and the preferred goal (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Sadler, 1989; Strobart & Gipps, 1997). Feedback unrelated to a specific goal can cause a lack of clarity due to ineffective communication and understanding in reducing the necessary gap (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Weaver, 2006). Example: The instructor should not offer feedback on left-hand cues and gestures (i.e., eye contact and hand independence) if the intended goal is for the student to achieve clear and consistent baton technique (i.e., grip, use of wrist, the tip of baton centered with the body). The instructor's feedback is unrelated to the specific goal, which is ineffective in reducing the gap associated with the clear and consistent baton technique.

Many studies show that students value feedback and are cognizant of its importance in improving learning (Marrs, 2016; Rowe & Wood, 2008; Silvey & Major, 2014; Sweeney, 1999).

According to Price (1985), “telling students how to do something, having them try, and giving them feedback will result in attentive and accomplished students who have positive attitudes” (p. 13). Academically, feedback is a tool used to guide students closer to learning objectives and goals (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Rowe & Wood, 2008). Feedback is an effective way to aid students in taking steps toward learning targets (McMillan, 2007). In conducting, various tasks and activities become much more complicated as students progress through the course. Previous research findings suggest that feedback is particularly useful when provided following a performance, outlines strengths and weaknesses, address the students learning style, presents suggestions on how to improve, and motivates and encourages (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Rucker & Thomson, 2003). Instructors who provide high-quality feedback every step can raise student achievement and learning and the quality of their teaching (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Rowe & Wood, 2008).

Both positive and negative feedback is mentioned frequently in scholarly research. According to Hattie and Timperley (2007), “Feedback is one of the most powerful influences on learning and achievement, but the impact can be either negative or positive” (p. 81). Student performance does not always improve with provided feedback (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Moreover, not all feedback is sufficient or valuable. Price et al. (2010) discussed how feedback could seem more as a result than a dialogue. This type of result can leave students feeling unwilling to accept the feedback—they may never apply it towards future assignments because it seems like a result of the desired goal (Price et al., 2010). Teachers should view feedback in a formative manner to provide ongoing dialogue that allows students to improve over time rather than evaluating students using summative feedback as a result connected to a grade (Marrs, 2016).

Marrs (2016) stated, “If feedback is such a critical piece of learning and improvement, and a central part of formative assessment, it is imperative for us to understand students’ feelings toward feedback” (p. 13). Students have various reactions to feedback. Some care for it, while others ignore it (Marrs, 2016). Some students even perceive feedback as unhelpful and vague (Carless, 2006; Higgins, Hartley & Skelton, 2002), and untimely (Angius & Wilkinson, 2013; Rae & Cochrane, 2008; Rowe & Wood, 2008). Students have expressed that late teacher feedback is disrespectful (Rowe & Wood, 2008). Unhelpful feedback stems from instructors who highlight negative aspects of student work, demonstrate a lack of guidance and encouragement, and fail to provide transparent information relating to the task or performance of learning aimed to close the gap (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Marrs, 2016).

According to Marrs (2016), assigning grades for students’ performance “is not a sufficient or effective means of providing feedback” (p. 12). Unfortunately, students tend to pay more attention to grades than the provided comments (Marrs, 2016). However, some studies support students’ notion of wanting feedback to explain their grades (Holmes & Papageorgiou, 2009**;** Rae & Cochrane, 2008). Research has shown that grades alone are less effective than feedback comments (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). According to Black and Wiliam (1998),

> if pupils are given only marks or grades, they do not benefit from the feedback. The worst scenario is one in which some pupils who get low marks this time also got low marks last time and come to expect to get low marks next time. This cycle of repeated failure becomes part of a shared belief between such students and their teacher. (p. 8)

Though studies have revealed negative findings of some types of feedback, it is arguably a vital factor in the development and learning process. Some methods of feedback are more prevalent than others.

Conductors utilize two forms of communication, verbal and nonverbal. This study will explore various forms of verbal (spoken/written), and nonverbal feedback based on undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors. Verbal communication is "the use of words to share information with other people. It can, therefore, include both spoken and written communication" ("Verbal Communication Skills," n.d., para. 1). Verbal communication is an essential skill for a conductor as he or she must rehearse an ensemble and provide feedback concerning the performance. However, a conductor who uses verbal communication can also take away from rehearsal time. Colson (2012) noted, "it is a worthwhile reminder to the conductor that if he or she keeps the verbal communication to a minimum in the rehearsal process, the conductor could still communicate effectively with good conducting technique" (p. 69). Verbal feedback (communication) can help guide the critical issues of rehearsal pacing (Manfredo, 2006). Conductors must gauge their use of verbal communication because:

> the interaction between teacher and students must be effective because students rely on clear, concise, and unambiguous information…they thrive on specific feedback, rather than general comments—either positive or negative—to develop a greater appreciation and enjoyment of the music they're playing. (Manfredo, 2006, p. 44)

Many studies have shown a need for more verbal feedback (spoken/written) from instructor to student (Maltas & McCarty-Clair, 2006; Mohd, 2014; Rae & Cochrane, 2008; Runnels, 1992; Silvey & Major, 2014; Yarbrough et al., 1979). Mohd (2014) examined the relationship between the instructor feedback approach and change in the undergraduate students'

conducting efficacy enrolled in a basic conducting techniques course. His findings revealed that instructor feedback influenced the conducting effectiveness of the students. One-on-one feedback, "such as discussion, dialogue, demonstration and video playback," indicated significant relationships in students' conducting achievement (Mohd, 2014, p. 574). See Table 1 for a list of studies, and the major findings specifically related to preferences of verbal feedback.

Table 1

Studies Related to Verbal Feedback Practices

Author(s), Year	Major Findings
Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Hart, 2019; Marrs, 2016; Silvey & Major, 2014; Yarbrough, 1979	Individualized feedback
Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Hattie & Timperly, 2007; Rowe & Wood, 2008; Rae & Cochran, 2008	Written feedback
Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Marrs, 2016; Mohd, 2014; Rowe & Wood, 2008	Oral feedback (verbal/spoken)
Bautista, Wong, & Cabedo-Mas, 2018; Boardman, 2000; Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Cooper, 2015; Gillis, 2010; Hart, 2019; Keller, 1979; Manfedo, 2006; Mohd, 2014; Plondke, 1992; Runnels, 1992; Silvey & Baumgartner, 2016; Silvey & Major, 2014; Silvey & Montemayor, 2014; Ulrich, 2009; Whitaker, 2011; Worthy, 2005; Yarbrough, Wapnick, & Kelly, 1979	Videotape feedback (self-assessment/self-analysis)
Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Hart, 2018; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Keller, 1979; Runnels, 1992; Ulrich, 2009; Yarbrough, Wapnick, & Kelly, 1979	Audio recordings
Bautista, Wong, & Cabedo-Mas, 2018; Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Marrs, 2016; Mohd, 2014; Pellegrino et al., 2015; Rowe & Rowe, 2008; Silvey & Major, 2014; Silvey & Montemayor, 2014; Worthy, 2005	Peer-reviews
Pellegrino et al., 2015; Plondke, 1992; Yarbrough, Wapnick, & Kelly, 1979	Checklists
Andrade, 2005; Pellegrino et al., 2015; Silvey & Montemayor, 2014; Ulrich, 2009; Wesoloski, 2015	Rubrics
Boardman, 2000; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Keller, 1979; Manfredo, 2006; Mohd, 2014; Runnels, 1992; Silvey, 2011; Silvey & Montemayor, 2014; Whitaker, 2011	Self-assessments, self-analysis, self-observations

Numerous research studies have compared verbal and nonverbal feedback between different career level teachers and conductors (experienced, inexperienced, novice, preservice), demonstrating that experienced teachers and conductors utilized verbal feedback less often (Cavitt, 2003; Manfredo, 2006; Single, 1990). Experienced conductors use verbal feedback less often because they have developed the ability to use nonverbal communication more frequently,

allowing more time for student performance than teacher talk (i.e., lectures and discussions). Nonverbal communication is:

> Behavior and elements of speech aside from the words themselves that transmit meaning. Non-verbal communication includes pitch, speed, tone and volume of voice, gestures and facial expressions, body posture, stance, and proximity to the listener, eye movements and contact, and dress and appearance. ("non-verbal communication", n.d., para. 1)

Several scholars have recognized nonverbal communication as "nonverbal behavior" (Byo & Austin, 1994; Keller, 1979; Whitaker, 2011; Yarbrough, Wapnick, & Kelly, 1979). Yarbrough (1975) identified body movement, conducting gestures, eye contact, facial expressions, and voice characteristics as nonverbal behaviors. Nonverbal communication such as expressive gestures (Boardman, 2000; Maiello, 1996; Mohd, 2014; Whitaker, 2011), eye contact (Byo & Austin, 1994; Colson, 2012; Keller, 1979; Manfredo, 2006; Whitaker, 2011), and facial expression (Maiello, 1996; Silvey & Major, 2014; Yarbrough, 1975) are reoccurring topics throughout the literature.

Conducting students must demonstrate a high level of nonverbal communication before completing undergraduate conducting courses. Conducting instructors consider both facial expression and eye contact as essential nonverbal communication skills for conducting students (Maiello, 1996; Mathers, 2008). The face is one of the most basic and powerful means of communication (Maiello, 1996, p. 68). Conductors can eloquently express their feelings and convey emotions as part of the interpretation delivery. Using facial expression is extremely personal, and conductors must genuinely convey the music and allow their vulnerabilities to surface naturally. Students who show less expression (bland personality) usually struggle in this area of conducting due to a lack of self-confidence in owning their expression (Boardman, 2000).

Instructors use modeling to teach effectively and as a resource in both the learning and development of students. Battersby and Bolton (2013) stated "a teacher's modeling through a nonverbal example rather than a verbal one is sometimes a more effective way to be understood and a quicker way of emphasizing the point" (p. 61). Music instructors have demonstrated modeling by singing, acting, playing (an instrument), moving, and gesturing. Often, modeling is an extension of provided verbal feedback, allowing teachers and students to elaborate on concepts as a guide for reinforcement (Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010). Bandura, Ross, and Ross found that "observation and modeling are highly effective learning approaches" (as cited in Bautista, Wong, & Cabedo-Mas, 2018, p. 2). Since modeling is heavily discussed in the literature, conducting instructors should strive to mentor students through this form of feedback. Furthermore, previous scholars linked assessment preferences to learning orientation and styles (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Modeling may be an effective method of instructing all learning styles in the instrumental conducting setting.

Previous scholars have suggested that conducting students should observe master teachers and conductors (Bautista, Wong, & Cabedo-Mas, 2018; Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Colson, 2012; Manfredo, 2006, Runnels, 1992; Silvey & Major, 2014). Opportunities to observe master teachers and conductors offer students a model to follow. Since modeling is stressed as beneficial to students in the literature, conducting instructors should strive to mentor students through this form of feedback. Furthermore, there is evidence that students exhibit different learning styles. Modeling may be an effective method of instructing all learning styles in the instrumental conducting setting.

According to previous research, body language is effective in communication (Maiello, 1996). However, gestures and facial expressions can affect the learning experiences between

conducting instructors and students (Persellin, 2009). Plondke (1992) stated "psychologists have discovered that attitude and a significant amount of information is transmitted through body language" (p. 47). If conductors understand their use of body language, they can "become more consistent and effective communicators and create environments that are conducive to positive music making and enjoyment" (Persellin, 2009, p. 2).

Body language is a critical communicator between the conductor and ensemble; it is also compelling. Maiello (1996) noted "An erect posture is a much more pleasing and positive message to transmit to performers and the general public than a compromising, slouched position that might be interpreted as being unprepared or uninterested" (p. 11). The use of body language allows conductors to prepare and convey their musical intent, which is even stronger when facial expressions are involved. Battersby and Bolton (2013) stated, "the key to success with establishing nonverbal gestures is simple steps with constant eye contact and clear, encouraging, and slightly exaggerated facial expressions" (p. 60). The presence, posture, motion, and stance of a conductor should have "purpose in order to transmit a musical and technical message" (Plondke, 1992, p. 47). Elizabeth Green described expression as:

> Interpretive imagination deals with the inspirational profile of the music, its emotional content, its personalized appeal. Joy, sorrow, peace and calm, turbulence and excitement, nobility, gentleness, triumph and despair—they are all there. And it is the province of the interpreter, the conductor, to ferret out from the remarks on the page the real meaning that lies behind them. (Green & Malko, 1985, p. 77)

Conducting instructors must be sensitive to their body language when observing and providing students feedback because all body language does not depict positive behavior. Students who receive feedback sometimes experience difficult and emotional measures (Marrs,

2016; Rowe & Wood, 2008). Their feelings can range from happy to sad, frustrated to angry, and more (Marrs, 2016). Conducting instructors who recognize their emotions demonstrated through body language can strongly "influence students' future motivation and self-esteem" during the process of providing feedback (Marrs, 2016, p.17).

My literature review did not reveal any research specifically related to human sounds (laugh, grunt, groan, sigh) within a band or instrumental conducting. However, a few resources in the conducting literature discussed the modulation of voice (Silvey & Baumgartner, 2016), voice characteristics (Yarbrough, 1975), voice volume and pitch (Keller, 1979; Whitaker, 2011; Yarbrough, 1975), and voice topography (Whitaker, 2011). Battersby and Bolton (2013) described three areas of communication:

> *Paralanguage* (which refers to the extraverbal elements such as tone, volume, and hesitations, that are associated with speech); *proxemics* (the study of the ways that individuals use space in their environment), a term coined by cultural anthropologist Edward T. Hall; and *kinesics* (the study of the pattern of body movement in human interaction), coined by anthropologist Ray L. Birdwhitsell. (p. 58)

According to Frank et al. (2015), paralanguage is inclusive "for any information derived from the voice that is not the actual spoken word" (p. 92). They assert that humans speak with three different voice subchannels. One of the subchannels is verbal speech, which includes spoken words. The other two subchannels are nonverbal and include speech style and speech tone—both fall under the term prosody, which is also thought of as paralanguage. Speech style "consists of the patterns of pausing and other irregularities of speech that accompany the words spoken," and speech tone "consists of the acoustic properties of speech such as loudness and pitch" (Frank et al. 2015, p. 92). Nonverbal communication subchannels are quite different from

verbal communication subchannels. An individual can make eye contact or a facial expression, present a specific body language, or a gesture without articulating a sound. However, a tone and a style will accompany a sound once presented (Frank et al. 2015).

Human sounds such as laughter, sighs, or groans present an individual's attitude and emotion, which could demonstrate both positive and negative behavior. Frank et al. (2015) described nonverbal subchannels and how they can "reveal information about transient states, such as emotions, attitudes, as well as cognitive load" (p. 93). Tolins (2013) focused on the role that nonlexical vocalizations play in music instruction. He stated, "The requirements of the structured activity of music instruction motivate the musicians to make frequent use of "nonsense" syllables during interaction" (p. 47). I did not find any studies specifically related to human sounds in the band or conducting literature. However, my study may inform future studies on human sounds, paralanguage, or nonlexical vocalizations in conducting.

All conducting instructors do not provide adequate and meaningful feedback. Keller (1979) stated "feedback is one of the most important factors in shaping behaviors of inexperienced conductors" (p. 5). Verbal and nonverbal feedback offers conducting instructors and students opportunities to improve the learning and development of conducting skills.

The Role of the Conductor

Conductors play vital roles for ensembles and audiences. Not only are they the leaders, but they are visionaries between the performers and the composers who recreate music through performance. Maiello (1996) noted, "The conductor is the communicator, inspiration and overseer of the musical message; the conveyer of the composer's intent, and the courier of the music being sent to the listener via the performance" (p. 7). Individuals seeking to become a conductor must not be afraid to illustrate their interpretation and relationship to music or

personal connections. It is quite selfish not to share all of oneself to reach the ultimate goal of art-making. Nadia Boulanger stated, "You must give each note life, your life. You must sacrifice, you must learn to give yourself to music. Then you will make it live. Then you will be able to make other people understand music" (as cited in Lisk, 1996, p. 5).

Previous scholars and conductors (Boardman, 2000; Colson, 2012; Green, 1997; Maiello, 1996) suggested that conductors should exhibit required skills such as technique (beat pattern, tempo, baton grip, and use, plane awareness), gestures and cues (clarity, preparation, eye contact, hand independence), expression (pattern size, dynamics, pulse, style, mood, body movement, facial expression), and posture (presence, carriage, confidence, the vulnerability of expression). Although all of these skills are important, a successful conductor should first demonstrate musicianship levels on a musical instrument or by voice (Colson, 2012; Green, 1997). Green (1997) stated, "Fine conductors are, first of all, fine musicians…They have integrity where the music is concerned" (p. 8). In a similar vein, Colson (2012) stated:

> Musicianship development is contingent on the training and industry of the developing conductor as well as the continued exposure to quality musical performances. Serious study on a musical instrument with a competent teacher is the initial step in this musicianship development. Musicianship is an all-encompassing term and must be pursued diligently throughout the conductor's career. Private study with a conductor would provide insights into musicianship development as well. It is important to realize that when there is an "artistic" performance presented by an ensemble, it is usually because the conductor possess this higher level of musicality. (p. ix – x)

Green (1997) also revealed, "The best conductors are innately endowed with musicality—a term that need not be defined because those who have it know what it means and

those who do not will never understand it through definition" (p. 9). What Green has described gives insight to the many conductors who have a natural gift or talent; individuals who may not have to work as hard as some others because they possess this gift. However, that does not mean that these gifted conductors do not have to work hard. According to Maiello (1996), "Not everyone possesses the same degree or amount of ability to achieve this demanding responsibility. This talent is a special one that openly displays an infinite affection and love of music" (p. 9). Conducting is an intricate art, and those dedicated must have ongoing training and experience in many disciplines of music. Because of the diversity of knowledge and skills required in being a conductor, the task is continuous (Colson, 2012, p. x). Claudio Abbado noted that "There is never a moment when one has arrived. You have to study all your life" (as cited in Lisk, 1992, p. 3).

Leadership is an essential component of a successful conductor (Colson, 2012; Maiello, 1996). It affects an organization or ensemble's culture if modeled behaviors are present, and everyone has established a purpose set on the mission and vision. If a conductor has issues with leadership, the organization and its culture may suffer (Garvin et al., 2008). Manfredo (2006) noted, "The director's podium personality must be energetic and focused so that there is a sense of strong leadership for students to follow" (p. 46). As a conductor, leadership involves more than the waving of arms; it also requires conductors to be organized and administrators. Leadership duties include selecting personnel, programming literature, managing budgets, planning travel, overseeing public relations, organizing rehearsals, and conducting (Colson, 2012; Cooper, 2015; Labuta, 1965).

Various composers and conductors have highlighted leadership in their books. Green (1997) believed that conductors "are sincere and inspiring leaders" (p. 8). Haithcock et al.

(2017) discussed Erich Leinsdorf's concept of "musical navigation" and how some conductors, especially young conductors, get stuck on a comfort level of objectively policing the mechanics of music, rather than exploring the subjective communication of creating a musical experience. The objective manner of conducting is thinking as "Was that the correct note?" "Is the rhythm, right?" "Did the ensemble breathe together?" "Was that the right articulation?". An effort to create meaning and expression by only responding to accents, dynamics, and articulation markings leaves little room for an individual's imagination or interpretation of the composer's intent (Lisk, 1996, p. 6). According to Haithcock et al. (2017):

> a conductor who engages the musicians by leading with a physical presentation of that is to be heard, beyond what is commonly seen in the musical notation, adds a subjective dimension of compelling leadership beyond navigation and enlightens the ensemble to musical possibilities beyond the limitations of the printed notation. (p. 6)

Maiello (1996) described the role of a leader as "one who directs and models by example what is expected of the group…aspects of leading are to inform, enlighten and teach" (p. 10). Personality, sensitivity, and musicianship are essential factors of leadership (Colson, 2012). Leading is a way for conductors to purposefully recreate a musical experience for an ensemble or audience (Cramer, 1967), or "to communicate and convey musical intent to the players through various verbal and nonverbal means" (Berz, 1983, p. 13). Another responsibility of the conductor besides leading is teaching. Many conductors believe that teaching is the primary focus of conducting (Berz, 1983; Green, 1997; Maiello, 1996). To achieve specific goals and objectives with an ensemble, conductors must provide feedback during their teaching process (Manfredo, 2006). Teaching while leading an ensemble allows the conductor to model the expected, solve

problems, demonstrate a high level of passion for the music, utilize various rehearsal techniques, describe the context, style, and history of the music, lecture about the composer, and much more.

Another role of the conductor is to have a vast array of musical discipline knowledge (Battisti & Garofalo, 1990; Colson, 2012; Green, 1997; Runnels, 1992). A knowledgeable conductor can study the score in-depth, provide an analysis of the music, rehearse an ensemble with an intended plan, and teach and lead the ensemble. According to Maiello (1996), "Musical skills must be maintained, improved and expanded upon daily in an effort to remain fresh and current" (p. 7). Battisti and Garofalo (1990) believed that wind band conductors should have solid training and experience in music history, literature and style, music theory and analysis, composition, ear training and sight-singing, orchestration, transpositions and clefs, secondary instruments, piano/keyboard skills, and instrumental performance. Colson (2012) also highlighted many of the same musical disciplines stating, "they are all important ingredients in the education of the developing conductor" (p. Xi). He also believed that "languages, acoustics, visual arts, theater, dance, literature, poetry, architecture, and travel" are essential to expanding a conductor's education (p. xi). Green (1997) also discussed knowledge of musical disciplines and how excellent musicians have a

> developed sense of pitch…they know theory, harmony, counterpoint, musical history, form, and analysis…they have reached a professional performance level on their instrument…they are interested in learning more about the problems of each instrument…they have taken a thorough course in orchestration and all transpositions have become second nature. (p. 8)

A wealth of musical discipline is essential to the conductor's score study process. Maiello (1996) noted, "Studying the score should be a daily ritual, a routine as disciplined as music

making itself" (p. 191). Studying a score is the initial first step in preparing the music as a conductor. It is also "crucial for well-paced and sequenced instruction (Manfredo, 2006, p. 43). Score study involves long hours of dedicated work and isolation (Colson, 2012); it is a mental and methodical process that requires much discipline (Maiello, 1996). One of the most important reasons to study a score is to "develop an interpretation of how the music should be performed" (Silvey, 2016, p. 86). Conductors should study scores daily as a routine to discover a composer's musical ideas. Through score study, conductors can transfer their musical knowledge and create music based on their interpretations. Manfredo (2006) noted:

> proper score preparation allows the ensemble director to hear more accurately on the podium, to rehearse more effectively and efficiently, to demonstrate more self-confidence and the ability to handle any deviation from expectations, and to be more expressive, thereby making the composition come to life for the students. (p. 44)

Overview of Undergraduate Conducting Courses

Conducting is an essential skill for music educators on various levels, mainly elementary and secondary teachers. Therefore, undergraduate conducting courses are a crucial component in the music education curriculum. Labuta (1965) recommended that graduates should "possess a wide range of musical and pedagogical competencies: with conducting being among the most important" (p. 1). The instruction, activities, and opportunities provided to students enrolled in conducting courses should present practical experiences for them to learn, teach, receive feedback, reflect, and develop as conductors. Hart (2019) outlined the relatively small body of research on undergraduate music education conducting coursework. Many of the studies are from the 1960s, 70s, 80s, and 90s, and do not highlight the specifics of undergraduate instrumental conducting courses.

Historically, conductors' training evolved from apprenticeship to formal conducting instruction in higher education degree programs (Boardman, 2000). Formal conducting training in undergraduate music education programs is essential for future music educators who wish to enter the field. According to Manfredo (2008):

> present-day band literature has increasingly become more difficult to conduct due to the common use of mixed meters, asymmetrical patterns, and other challenging conducting competencies; thus, creating a greater need for the conducting course within the undergraduate curriculum. (p. 43)

Typically, undergraduate music education programs require two conducting courses (Boardman, 2000; Hart, 2019; Silvey, 2011). The first course in the conducting sequence usually begins in the fall semester and focuses on basic technique. The second course generally begins in the spring semester and is more advanced. Band, choral, and orchestral directors with various titles (i.e., Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, Director of Bands, Conducting Coordinator, Director of Instrumental Studies) usually teach conducting courses (Boardman, 2000; Hart, 2019). Graduate assistants or teaching assistants may also teach or assist with the courses. Thus, individuals with varying years of teaching experience may teach undergraduate conducting courses.

Over two semesters, conducting courses typically consist of a wide variety of activities. Many instructors choose to use conducting textbooks as an aid to facilitate students through activities in the course sequence. Studies have indicated that 50% or more undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors use a conducting textbook (Boardman, 2000; Hart, 2018; Runnels, 1992). Moreover, studies have revealed that a little over half or more instructors use supplemental materials and sources (Hart, 2018; Runnels, 1992). Conducting course activities

involve primary baton fundamental techniques, score reading and score analysis, rehearsal techniques, conducting live and lab ensembles, observation of conductors, rehearsals, performances, interpretive aspects, and error detection (Boardman, 2000; Manfredo, 2008; Runnels, 1992). Movement theories such as Laban Movement Analysis, Dalcroze Eurhythmics, and Alexander Technique are other activities that instructors may use depending on their experience and expertise (Hart, 2019; Running, 2009).

Throughout the literature, some authors have examined the curricular content of undergraduate instrumental conducting courses (Boardman, 2000; Cooper, 1994; Getchell, 1957; Hart, 2019; Hunsberger & Ernst, 1991; Labuta, 1965; Manfredo, 2008; Romines, 2003; Runnels, 1992). Conducting instructors often rely on their previous training, pedagogical knowledge, experience, and musical backgrounds to teach. Much of the material is commonly adapted and revamped from prior mentors and teachers (Runnels, 1992). A concern throughout the literature regarding course content is more consistency in the undergraduate instrumental conducting curriculum. Manfredo (2008) examined the curricular content of both introductory and advanced undergraduate instrumental courses. He wanted to determine if conducting and the instrumental methods course content was organized systematically as a progression from one class to the other. The results from the study indicated a lack of alignment in the curricular content of both courses. He recommended the development of more innovation and organization within the undergraduate conducting curriculum, stating that "The underlying issue is the determination of an appropriate and unified focus for the conducting course and how it impacts teacher preparation within the music education curriculum" (Manfredo, 2008, p. 56).

Previous studies have explored integration, and practical experiences among both instrumental conducting and instrumental methods courses (Boardman, 2000; Funk, 1977; Hart,

2019; Manfredo, 2008; Romines, 2003; Runnels, 1992; Zirkman, 1984). Various studies indicate that undergraduate music education majors receive the performance and technical aspects of conducting but limited music education pedagogical practices (i.e., instrumental methods) such as parallel field and student teaching experiences within the conducting course (Fant, 1996; Hart, 2019). Furthermore, undergraduate music education majors are receiving pedagogical practices in methods courses but limited practical conducting opportunities (Hart, 2019; Romines, 2003). Groulx (2015) examined the value of undergraduate music education curricula to accommodate the profession better. Participants rated the value of "student teaching, ensembles, applied lessons, conducting, early field experiences, aural theory, and music theory" high (Groulx, 2015, p. 13). Also, results indicated that ensemble directors rated specific specializations (ensembles and conducting) much higher than elementary music teachers due to the level of relevancy in their classes. The value of ensembles and conducting is typically less in elementary music classrooms and activities than the secondary levels.

Integrating both conducting performances and pedagogical aspects will allow students to transfer their knowledge between each course (Hart, 2019). The transfer of knowledge will also aid students in their confidence in rehearsing various ensembles in practical music teaching settings such as elementary, middle, and high school band or live and lab band (Hart, 2019; Silvey, 2011; Worthy, 2005). Developing as a skilled conductor is no different from developing as a skilled instrumental performer. A conductor must have an ensemble and practical experiences to develop their skills, and an instrumental performer must have an instrument and the essentials needed to accomplish the same. Asmus (2000) believed that "As a profession, we have not done an adequate job of studying our own professional realm—the training of future music educators" (p. 5). Undergraduate music education programs are essential to the longevity

of the profession—it is vital to further examine all aspects of music education to set future educators up for ultimate success.

The lack of consistency in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses has become a significant theme of the literature. Due to the lack of consistency, Labuta (1965) developed a textbook to aid students and instructors with structured content for the course (Boardman, 2000). In his study, Labuta (1965) found that all aspects of the instrumental conducting course demonstrated organizational issues. He examined issues with "live laboratory groups, appropriate music, sequence of experience, semester requirement and course credit" (p. 14). Several studies have supported the belief that more time is needed to allow undergraduate conductors multiple opportunities to develop their skills as musicians, leaders, and conductors (Boardman, 2000; Runnels, 1992; Silvey & Baumgartner, 2014; Silvey & Major, 2014). Research studies have revealed that both students and instructors desire more podium time with live ensembles or lab bands. Unfortunately, due to large class sizes, all students are not provided an opportunity to conduct ensembles, let alone receive individualized feedback from the instructor during class (Silvey, 2011; Silvey & Major, 2014).

Another study by Silvey (2011) highlights concerns regarding issues within the undergraduate conducting curriculum. He administered an Internet-based survey to examine undergraduate conductors' perceptions of instrumental conducting curricular. The survey aimed to question participants "about their perceived level of conducting and rehearsal preparedness and the extent to which instructional time was devoted to specific topics by their conducting teachers" (p. 27). Results indicated that the mean ratings for participants were lower in rehearsal preparedness and higher for conducting skill preparedness. Also, mean ratings revealed significant differences based on gender. Mean ratings for conducting skills, rehearsal skills, and

instructional time was higher for males than their female counterparts. Silvey believed that more time spent on conducting and rehearsing would help to aid the skills of undergraduate conductors. He also suggested that "class enrollment, ensemble size, and instructor" are possible factors affecting students' "confidence and skill development" (p. 36).

Similar to the gender differences mentioned in Silvey's findings, other research studies have demonstrated gender differences in education, music education, and conducting (Marrs, 2016; McLeod & Napoles, 2012; Rowe & Wood, 2008; Silvey, 2011). Compared to males, females are usually reluctant to pursue their dreams and aspirations because of the stereotypical behaviors that society has created, leading females to believe that certain avenues of interest are not for them or that they are not good enough. Women musicians face many obstacles due to longstanding historical/cultural biases and unequal opportunities based on stereotyping, gender-exclusion, and the lack of mentors and role models (Atterbury, 1992; Brown, 1972; Duchen, 2014; Pucciana, 1983). Robert Spano stated, "There's still a lot of sexism in this field (conducting), though it seems to be changing, albeit slowly" (as cited in Tsioulcas, 2009, p. A28). More recently, Hart (2019) revealed that conducting instructors were "mostly well-educated males at the assistant or full professor rank, with extensive college teaching experience but comparatively little experience in K-12 music teaching" (p. 13).

Moreover, persistent race differences are identified in the literature. Historically, Caucasian males have dominated the conducting field, and that dominance is still prominent in the 21st century. According to Tsicoulcas (2009):

> Decades ago, all male (and all-white) orchestras were the norm in America, but particularly in the wake of the civil rights struggles of the 1960s U.S. ensembles gradually changed their auditioning norm to so-called "blind" tryouts: having the players

> perform from behind screens, and giving them carpeted surfaces to disguise the clicking of heels against hard floors. (p. A28)

Sheldon and Hartley (2012) examined trends in instrumental music education leadership among women and minorities from 1996 until 2008. Band conductor gender was tabulated by year (1947-2008), and by ensemble level (elementary, junior high/middle school, high school, university, adult, military, and other) through the Midwest Band and Orchestra Clinic. Gender and ethnicity of graduate wind band conducting students were examined from 1999 until 2008, along with the gender and ethnicity of conducting workshop participants from 1996 until 2008. Results indicated that men dominated the Midwest Band and Orchestra Clinic's primary conductor roles from 1947 until 2008. During these same years, women significantly represented the population at the junior high/middle school level. Gender and ethnicity of graduate wind band conducting students and conducting workshop participants were predominately Caucasian and male.

Summary

Much research in the field of instrumental conducting discussed in the literature review acknowledged the gap in conducting feedback, the importance of feedback in education, feedback in conducting, the role of the conductor, and an overview of conducting courses. Investigating these topics can aid conducting instructors understanding. Though there is considerable literature on instrumental conducting, gaps exist in areas examining the various types of feedback, the effectiveness of feedback, frequency of feedback, and the perceptions of feedback from both instructors and students.

While a goal of instruction is student achievement, instructors should measure student progress at all times. The conducting instructor must provide future music educators and

conductors with ample opportunities to experience and learn the complexities of conducting. Along with worthwhile instruction and opportunities, conducting instructors should offer adequate feedback. If instructors do not provide appropriate feedback, students may never recognize desired goals, acknowledge their present position, or understand how to improve.

Chapter III

Methods and Procedures

The purpose of this study was to gain further understanding of various methods of verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback provided in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses and compare and contrast instructors' perceptions of feedback based on attributes, school, and course characteristics.

Research Design

Though research studies about conducting are numerous, few have examined verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback methods among undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors. I used quantitative research to measure, analyze, evaluate, and describe data collected from a web-based survey to make generalizations. As per Mertler (2019), the goal of quantitative research is to describe the current data, determine relationships among variables, and justify or explain relationships between variables. This study is based solely on indices, and the consistency of statistical tests used to observe and make generalizations about undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors.

Population

The target population for this study was current undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors from the College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA) “Conducting Pedagogy” listserve and the Historically Black Colleges and Universities National Band Directors Consortium (HBCU-NBDC) email list. This population was selected to obtain a sample of participants representing a wide range of diverse demographics, school and course characteristics, usage of feedback, and personal perceptions of feedback.

Sampling

Given my diverse educational and musical backgrounds, I targeted potential participants from two different professional music organizations (the CBDNA listserve and the HBCU-NBDC email list) to obtain a more culturally diverse sample. The CBDNA listserve is an electronic mailing list allowing communication between active members subscribed to this group. Within the "Conducting Pedagogy" listserve, CBDNA offers nine additional listserve categories: Athletic Bands, Band Music Education, Contemplating Our Future (New Ideas), Gender/Ethnicity Issues, Performance Material and Concerns, Research, Small College Issues, State Chairs, and Two Year/Community College Issues. Although some undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors may fall under other categories, the Conducting Pedagogy listserve was most appropriate for the current study.

I employed convenience sampling through a web-based Qualtrics survey to recruit current undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors from the CBDNA "Conducting Pedagogy" listserve and the HBCU-NBDC email list. Since I am an active member of CBDNA, I have access to the CBDNA listserve categories, free and open to all active CBDNA members. I contacted the organization's current president to inquire about the procedures to retrieve the current HBCU-NBDC database. The current HBCU-NBDC president provided the membership email list.

Additionally, I recruited potential instructors outside of both organizations through snowball sampling via invitation and reminder emails. I also recruited participants through the social media platform, Facebook, Inc. Organizations such as the Women Band Directors International (WBDI), the Minority Band Directors National Association (MBDNA), CBDNA, and the HBCU-NBDC Facebook groups allowed me to post an invitation to participate in the

current study. Both CBDNA and HBCU-NBDC are targeted organizations for band directors. However, some undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors are choral and orchestral directors who also have relevant experiences to share.

A total of 1072 subscribed CBDNA "Conducting Pedagogy" listserve and 58 HBCU-NBDC email list members were invited to participate in the current study. I also recruited additional participants through snowball sampling. Due to this study's nature, it is unlikely that all members of both organizations fit the description of being a *current undergraduate instrumental conducting instructor*. Therefore, it is impossible to report the exact number of targeted participants. Potential biases to consider from the use of convenience sampling are: Participants may not always answer survey questions truthfully or may leave question responses blank (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014).

Furthermore, survey results depend on the characteristics and attitudes of the population (McMillan, 2016). If the sample population of undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors is small, then much sampling error could occur. In the current study, I allowed participants more time to complete the survey to gain a larger sample of responses by utilizing an online survey, providing a seven-week time frame, and sending reminder emails. These procedures helped me eliminate potential biases produced by the use of convenience sampling.

Data Collection Instrument

The survey for this study was adapted and developed from previous studies (Boardman, 2000; Marrs, 2016; Rowe & Wood, 2008). I included some question items from these three instruments and modified others to align with the focus of the current research topic and questions. I also revised question types (i.e., changed opened ended questions to closed-ended questions) to minimize data entry errors. The resulting 38-item survey (administered through

Qualtrics) is titled “Undergraduate Conducting Feedback.” Dillman et al. (2014) revealed a variety of diverse reasons for using an online survey including minimizing data entry errors to provide more accurate results, boosting response rates, and promoting the convenience of both the participants and researcher. Based on these reasons, I thought the use of an online survey would be best for collecting data due to the relatively large population of undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors.

While some content in the current survey was adapted and developed from three previous studies, it did not mimic the exact item content and format (Boardman, 2000; Mars, 2016; Rowe & Wood, 2008). The prior surveys were used to guide the development of the current research topics. I used Qualtrics to construct and distribute the current survey, which contained 15 five-point Likert scales 1 (*always*) to 5 (*never*) and nine five-point Likert scales 1 (*strongly agree*) to 5 (*strongly disagree*), 10 multiple-choice, and four open-ended questions. Each of these question types supports quantitative design. The survey outlined five constructs: School Characteristics, Course Characteristics, Methods of Feedback, Perceptions of Feedback, and Demographic Profile. The “School Characteristics” section focused on the institutional type and U.S. Region. Items in the “Course Characteristics” section included topics on class activities and the frequency of verbal and nonverbal feedback used for each, and course scheduling. In the “Methods of Feedback” section, questions outlined the frequency of both verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal methods of provided feedback. Items in the “Perceptions on the Feedback” section highlighted the level of agreement based on specific statements of verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback. The “Demographic Profile” section focused on the participants’ educational and musical background, teaching experience, gender, race, and age. See Appendix F for a copy of the survey.

Reliability and Validity of Instrument

I conducted a thorough literature review to understand both verbal and nonverbal feedback in instrumental conducting courses. Validity was achieved through the Delphi method to ensure face and content validity with a small uninvolved population of music educators familiar with instrumental conducting (Eggers & Jones, 1998). Based on the Delphi method's feedback, I corrected misspelled words, revised the wording of some questions for clarity, changed a few question types to improve the data results, and deleted items that did not align with the research questions. As per McMillan (2016), I piloted the survey with former and retired instructors of undergraduate instrumental conducting ($N = 19$) to ensure reliability. Administering the pilot test helped to eliminate any biases and gave the participants "the opportunity to test the entire survey process from start to finish" (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014, p. 343). The pilot study served as a useful method to examine respondents' submitted comments and inquiries about the survey items (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014).

An advantage of conducting a pilot study was that participants (former and retired undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors) similar to the intended population would complete the revised survey content for the current study. This advantage helped foster consistency for the use of results, which helped me remove any potential flaws before conducting my study. I used evidence-based content to measure the validity of the piloted survey responses (McMillan, 2016). I also used internal consistency to measure the reliability of the four perceptions of feedback category (general, spoken, written, nonverbal) Likert statements by using coefficient alpha estimates (McMillan, 2016). Based on the pilot study, I reorganized some survey content to offer participants a logical flow to responding and eliminated a few Likert items due to low reliability.

I conducted internal reliability tests using Cronbach's alpha coefficient on each of the four perceptions of feedback scale items (categories) for the pilot study. According to Cronk (2017), item-total correlations greater than 0.7 are considered desirable, and those less than 0.3 are considered weak. Pilot study results from the Cronbach's alpha produced reasonable ranges of alpha coefficients for the perceptions of feedback scale items, suggesting reliable to strong internal consistency for each of the four categories. The perceptions of general feedback scale included six items (α = .83), the perceptions of spoken feedback scale consisted of 13 items (α = .81), the perceptions of written feedback scale contained 15 items (α = .90), and the perceptions of nonverbal feedback scale consisted of 13 items (α = .92).

Some threats to internal and external validity should be acknowledged. Instrumentation could pose a threat to internal validity due to the use of three adapted surveys (Boardman, 2000; Mars, 2016; Rowe & Wood, 2008) from both previous conducting and feedback studies. The selected sample could also pose an external threat to population validity. The population from the sample, and the target population, include results from both CBDNA and HBCU-NDBC members, and other instructors who chose to participate in the study through snowball sampling (Mertler, 2019). All instructors of undergraduate instrumental conducting courses are not included in the current study. Additionally, participants' attitudes, motivation, values, and allotted time could also influence survey results.

Data Collection Administration

The survey was included in three emails (administered over seven-weeks) to increase the response rate of potential respondents (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014). I sent an invitation email (See Appendix C) that included the information letter (See Appendix B), estimated survey completion time, survey link, and the institutional review board (IRB) approval (See Appendix

A) to begin the survey administration process. Participants completed the survey because they chose to volunteer their time in submitting data with no compensation. Because I had no way of knowing who completed the online survey (responses were anonymous), reminder emails to all were necessary to reach potential participants. I sent the first reminder email (See Appendix D) two weeks after the invitation email. The second reminder email (See Appendix E) was sent two weeks after the first reminder. While survey responses were completely anonymous, there was a slight risk of breach of confidentiality regarding the email list from the HBCU-NBDC. I deleted this list after the study was complete to protect confidentiality.

Statistical Analysis

All data collected were downloaded from Qualtrics into a Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) data file. I used the IBM SPSS software 26 to analyze the data. I used descriptive statistics to describe the results of the sample (Nolan & Heinzen, 2008). Considering that the sample population was normally distributed and statistical assumptions were met, I employed parametric inferential statistical analysis tests (Nolan & Heinzen, 2008).

I used the Pearson correlation coefficient for RQ1 (What is the relationship between the types of feedback and class time?) to determine if a linear relationship existed between allotted class time and method of feedback (verbal [written and spoken] nonverbal). Both variables were measured on interval scales to describe and measure the degree and strength of the relationship (Cronk, 2017). To analyze RQ2 (What is the relationship between the demographic information with the perceptions of feedback?), I used one-way MANOVAs (Cronk, 2017) to determine if there were differences in the perceptions of feedback based on professor demographic attributes (gender, race, academic title, primary instrument type, highest degree earned), and school characteristics (institutional type, U.S. region). Multiple linear regressions were used for RQ3

(Does class size, allotted class time, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting predict perceptions of feedback?) to determine if course characteristics (class size, allotted class time, and years of teaching) predicted instructors' perceptions of feedback. Frequencies and percentages were used to analyze RQ4 (Based on the different methods of provided feedback, what are the most frequently used course activities in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses?). See Table 2 for a summary of the research questions, survey items, and data analysis procedures.

Table 2

Summary of the Research Questions, Survey Items, and Data Analysis Procedures

Research Question	Survey items to address the research question	Data Analysis Procedure
1.1 Is there a relationship between the instructor's use of verbal (spoken) feedback and allotted class time?	Methods of Feedback (questions 4-5) and Course Characteristics (question 19)	Pearson correlation (scale scores)
1.2 Is there a relationship the between instructor's use of verbal (written) feedback and allotted class time?	Methods of Feedback (questions 6 7) and Course Characteristics (question 19)	Pearson correlation (scale scores)
1.3 Is there a relationship between the instructor's use of nonverbal feedback and allotted class time?	Methods of Feedback (questions 8-9) and Course Characteristics (question 19)	Pearson correlation (scale scores)
2.1 Is there a significant difference between gender and race based on the perceptions of feedback?	Demographic Profile (questions 36-37 and Perceptions of Feedback (questions 10-18)	One-way MANOVA
2.2 Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of feedback based on academic title?	Perceptions of Feedback (questions 10-18) and Demographic Profile (question 33)	One-way MANOVA
2.3 Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of feedback based on primary instrument type?	Perceptions of Feedback (questions 10-18) and Demographic Profile (question 30)	One-way MANOVA
2.4 Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of feedback based on the highest degree earned?	Perceptions of Feedback (questions 10-18) and Demographic Profile (question 31)	One-way MANOVA
2.5 Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of feedback based on institutional type?	Perceptions of Feedback (questions 10-18) and School Characteristics (question 2)	One-way MANOVA
2.6 Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of feedback based on the U.S. Region?	Perceptions of Feedback (questions 10-18) and School Characteristics (question 3)	One-way MANOVA
3. Does class size, allotted class time, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting predict perceptions of feedback?	Course Characteristics (questions 19-20), Demographic Profile (question 35), and Perceptions of Feedback (questions 10-18)	Multiple linear regression
4. Based on the different methods of provided feedback, what are the most frequently used course activities in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses?	Course Characteristics (questions 21-29)	Frequency and Percentage

Chapter IV

Results

The purpose of this dissertation was to learn about the various verbal and nonverbal feedback methods in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses and compare and contrast instructors' perceptions of feedback based on their attributes, school, and course characteristics. I sent the "Undergraduate Conducting Feedback" survey through email as an invitation to "Conducting Pedagogy" listserve members of the College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA) and Historically Black Colleges and Universities National Band Directors Consortium (HBCU-NBDC) email list members. Through snowball sampling, I invited members of both organizations to forward the invitation email to other potential participants. A total of 196 responses were received. One hundred and nine (N = 109) survey responses were usable for the current study (usable rate = 55.61%).

Participant Response Rates and Reliability

Current undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors from both the CBDNA and the HBCU-NBDC were targeted to complete a researcher-developed web-based survey through Qualtrics. Additional instructors were sought by snowball sampling. One hundred and ninety-six (N = 196) respondents answered "Yes or 'No' to the initial filtered survey question (Are you currently teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting?). After deleting all "No" responses (40 cases deleted), 156 survey responses remained of current undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors. Among the remaining survey responses (N = 156), 47 participants did not complete 50% or more of the entire survey. All 47 incomplete cases were deleted, yielding one hundred and nine (N = 109) survey responses used for the current study (useable rate = 55.61%). See Table 3 for a summary of survey completion.

Table 3

Summary of Completed Surveys

Survey Completion	*n*	%
Completed more than 50%	13	11.93
Completed 100%	96	88.07

I also conducted internal reliability tests using Cronbach's alpha coefficient on each of the four perceptions of feedback scale items/categories for the current study. All item-total correlations were greater than 0.7. Results from the Cronbach's alpha produced for the current study demonstrated reasonable ranges of alpha coefficients. Consistency among the four perceptions of feedback categories revealed reliable to strong internal consistency. The general perceptions scale consisted of 11 items (α = .80), the spoken perceptions scale contained 17 items (α = .76), the written perceptions scale included 16 items (α = .90), and the nonverbal perceptions scale consisted of 17 items (α = .91). See Table 4 for a summary of alpha coefficients for the perceptions of feedback scale scores based on the four categories.

Table 4

Alpha Coefficients of Perceptions of Feedback Scale Scores

Perception	Scale Items	Cronbach's α	*M*	*SD*
General	11	.80	16.28	4.74
Spoken	17	.76	33.06	7.27
Written	16	.90	51.61	12.02
Nonverbal	17	.91	38.74	11.89

Conducting Instructor Demographics

Current undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors completed the "Undergraduate Conducting Feedback" survey. Of the 109 usable survey responses, 15 participants (16.00%) identified as female, 76 (80.90%) identified as male, and three (*n*= 3, 3.20%) identified in the

‘Other’ category: prefer not to answer (*n* = 2), identify differently (*n* = 1). In relation to race, 17 (18.10%) African Americans, 69 (73.40%) Caucasians, and eight (*n* = 8, 8.50%) others completed the survey: Asian (*n* = 1), Native Hawaiian (*n* = 1), Cajun-American (*n* = 1), Other (*n* = 1), Prefer not to answer (*n* = 4). Instructors held a wide range of academic titles. Thirty-three (35.10%) of the conducting instructors were Assistant Professors. In addition, there were 20 (21.30%) Associate Professors, and 28 (29.80%) Professors. Thirteen (13.80%) participants were identified in the ‘Other’ category: Instructor/Lecturer (*n* = 9), Graduate Teaching Assistant (*n* = 3), Artist in Residence (*n* = 1).

Forty-five (47.90%) instructors held a tenure track position. Twenty-two (23.40%) were in a pre-tenure position, and 27 (28.70%) were not in a tenure-track position. Of the survey participants, 24 (25.50%) earned a Master's degree, 25 (26.60%) earned a Ph.D., and 45 (47.90%) earned a DMA. Fifty-two (55.90%) instructors played a brass instrument, 29 (31.20%) played a woodwind instrument, and 12 (12.90%) were placed into the ‘Other’ category: Keyboard (*n* = 2), Percussion (*n* = 9), String (*n* = 1).

Responses from the current study represented conducting instructors from three music organizations (band, choral, orchestral). Eighty-five (78.70%) instructors were members of the College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA), 11 (10.20%) were members of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities National Band Director Consortium (HBCU-NBDC), and 12 (11.10%) were members combined into the ‘Other’ category: Orchestra organization (*n* = 11) and Choral organization (*n* = 1). Table 5 describes the demographics of participants.

Table 5

Participant Demographics

Characteristic	*n*	%
Gender		
Female	15	16.00
Male	76	80.90
Other	3	3.20
Race		
African American	17	18.10
Caucasian	69	73.40
Other	8	8.50
Academic Title		
Assistant Professor	33	35.10
Associate Professor	20	21.30
Professor	28	29.80
Other	13	13.80
Position Track		
Tenured	45	47.90
Pre-tenured	22	23.40
Not Tenured	27	28.70
Highest Degree		
Masters	24	25.50
PhD	25	26.60
DMA	45	47.90
Primary Instrument		
Brass	52	55.90
Woodwind	29	31.20
Other	12	12.90
Organization		
CBDNA	85	78.70
HBCU-NBDC	11	10.20
Other	12	11.10

The age of conducting instructors ranged from 30 to 76 years (M = 49.22, SD = 11.46). Twenty-four (27.40 %) participants reported being 30 to 39 years old. Twenty (22.80%) respondents were between the ages of 40 and 49. There were 25 (28.40%) participants between

the ages of 50 and 59, and 16 (18.10%) reported being between ages 60 and 69. Only two (2.30%) participants reported being in their 70s; both were 76 years old. I also examined the years that instructors taught undergraduate instrumental conducting. Results indicated a wide range of teaching experience in years. Conducting instructors had taught from 1 to 54 years (M = 12.27, SD = 11.05). Forty-eight (52.80%) instructors had taught undergraduate instrumental conducting for 10 years or less. Eighteen (19.80%) had taught from 11 to 15 years, and 25 (27.50%) had taught for 16 years or more.

School Characteristics

Thirty (28.00%) conducting instructors taught at a 4-year Private institution, while 77 (72.00%) instructors taught at a 4-year public institution. One instructor from a 2-year private institution completed the survey. However, I treated this response as an outlier and removed it from the data set. One hundred and eight (N = 108) instructors completed the U.S. Region question. Thirty-seven (34.30%) instructors taught in the Midwest, 16 (14.80%) taught in the Northeast, and 35 (32.40%) taught in the Southeast. The Southwest and West regions were combined (n = 20, 18.50%) due to the small cell size of West participants (n = 5). See Table 6 for a summary of the school characteristics.

Table 6

Descriptive Summary of School Characteristics

Variable	*n*	%
Institution Type		
4 Year Private	30	28.00
4 Year Public	77	72.00
U.S. Region		
Midwest	37	34.30
Northeast	16	14.80
Southeast	35	32.40
Southwest/West	20	18.50

Course Characteristics

The majority of undergraduate instrumental conducting courses (71.90%) met between 100 (37.90%) and 150 (34.00%) minutes per week (M = 126.65, SD = 37.96). Fourteen courses met more than 150 minutes a week, and nine courses met less than 100 minutes a week. Four courses met for 110 minutes per week, while two courses met for 120 minutes per week. Instructors were asked to provide the maximum enrollment seat capacity available for their undergraduate instrumental conducting course. The majority of the conducting courses (37.30%) seat capacity (M = 20.69, SD = 8.11) was between 15 (16.70%) and 20 (20.60%). Results indicated that ten courses (9.80%) allowed 30 seats for student enrollment, while another 10 (9.80%) courses allowed 25 seats. Additionally, 10 (9.80%) other courses allowed 12 seats. Nine (8.80%) conducting courses allowed 16 seats.

Research Question 1 (1.1 – 1.3)-Pearson Correlation

What is the relationship between the types of feedback (spoken, written, nonverbal) and class time?

In the 'Methods of Feedback' section of the survey, participants rated a series of statements on how often they provided verbal (spoken and written), and nonverbal feedback to their undergraduate instrumental conducting students. The rating scale consisted of a five-point Likert scale 1 (*always*) to 5 (*never*). Regarding class time, participants specified how often their conducting course met per week by minutes in the 'Course Characteristics' section of the survey.

Based on the rating scale for spoken feedback items, results showed that the majority of instructors used "in-class/in-person instructional time" always or most of the time with spoken feedback. Most of the instructors indicated using "self-assessments," "peer-reviews," and

"videos" always, most of the time, or about half the time combined with spoken feedback. Spoken feedback provided with "audio recordings" was used less than half the time or never. One participant indicated using spoken feedback for "school visits." See Table 7 for a summary of the frequency and percentage distribution for instructors' level of usage with spoken feedback.

Table 7

Descriptive Summary for Spoken Feedback Usage

Method of Feedback	Always		Most of the time		About half the time		Less than half the time		Never	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Spoken										
In-class	77	71.20	27	25.00	4	3.70	—	—	—	—
One-on-one	18	16.70	14	13.00	12	11.10	58	53.70	6	5.60
Video	23	21.30	20	18.50	13	12.00	24	22.20	28	25.90
Peer-review	24	22.40	24	22.40	17	15.90	31	29.00	11	10.30
Checklist	19	17.60	9	8.30	12	11.10	24	22.20	44	40.70
Audio	6	5.60	3	2.80	7	6.50	21	19.60	70	65.40
Self-assessment	26	24.10	17	15.70	11	10.20	25	23.10	29	26.90
Other										
School visits	—	—	—	—	1	100.00	—	—	—	—

According to the rating scale for written feedback items, most instructors used "self-assessments" and "rubrics," always or most of the time, with written feedback. Only 23 (21.50%) instructors reported always delivering written feedback through a course management system such as Canvas by Instructure or Blackboard. Written feedback provided with "peer-reviews," and "checklists" were used less than half the time or never. One participant revealed using written feedback for "score markings." See Table 8 for a summary of the frequency and percentage distribution for instructors' level of usage with written feedback.

Table 8

Descriptive Summary for Written Feedback Usage

Method of Feedback	Always		Most of the time		About half the time		Less than half the time		Never	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Written										
Course System	23	21.50	15	14.00	14	13.10	21	19.60	34	31.80
Rubric	40	37.40	29	27.10	11	10.30	11	10.30	16	15.00
Peer-review	8	7.50	10	9.30	6	5.60	27	25.20	56	52.30
Checklist	13	12.10	14	13.10	12	11.20	23	21.50	45	42.10
Self-assessment	44	41.10	17	15.70	15	14.00	17	15.90	14	13.10
Other										
School visits	—	—	—	—	1	100.00	—	—	—	—

Rating scale results for nonverbal feedback items indicated that most instructors used "modeling," and "body language" always or most of the time combined with nonverbal feedback. Most instructors reported using "facial expressions" always, most of the time, or about half the time. Many instructors specified using "human sounds with nonverbal feedback;" however, results revealed that 25 (23.40%) participants did not. One participant reported using nonverbal feedback for "encouragement." See Table 9 for a summary of the frequency and percentage distribution for instructors' level of usage with nonverbal feedback.

Table 9

Descriptive Summary for Nonverbal Feedback Usage

Method of Feedback	Always		Most of the time		About half the time		Less than half the time		Never	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Nonverbal										
Facials	37	34.60	26	24.30	15	14.00	21	19.60	8	7.50
Modeling	63	58.90	31	29.00	12	11.20	1	.90	—	—
Human sounds	22	20.60	18	16.80	14	13.10	28	26.20	25	23.40
Body Language	60	56.10	26	24.30	4	3.70	16	15.00	1	.90
Other										
Encouragement	—	—	1	100.00	—	—	—	—	—	—

A Pearson correlation was calculated, examining the relationships between instructors' use of spoken, written, and nonverbal feedback and allotted class time. Results indicated weak negative correlations that were not significant for spoken (r (104) = -.07, p = .50), written (r (105) = -.03, p = .77), or nonverbal (r (105) = -.11, p = .28) feedback. There were no significant relationships between the three types of feedback and allotted class time. Class time is not related to spoken, written, or nonverbal feedback in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses. See Table 10 for a summary of the Pearson correlation analysis for feedback method (spoken, written, nonverbal) and allotted class time.

Table 10

Pearson Correlations of Feedback Method and Class Time

Variable	*n*	*M*	*SD*	Class Time	*p*
Spoken	106	21.69	5.69	-.07	.50
Written	107	15.85	4.69	-.03	.77
Nonverbal	107	40.93	3.59	-.11	.28

Research Question 2 (2.1–2.6)-One-Way MANOVA

What is the relationship between the demographic information and the perceptions of feedback?

A series of one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) tests were used to examine the effects of undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors' perceptions of feedback (written, spoken, general, nonverbal) on demographic information (gender, race, academic title, primary instrument, highest degree earned, institution type, and U.S. region). See Table 11 for a summary of the Multivariate test analysis for perceptions of feedback based on demographic information.

The Box's M Test used for the equal covariance assumption between race and the perceptions of feedback showed the assumption was violated (p= .02), hence, Pillai's Trace correction was used to interpret the MANOVA results. A significant difference was found in the perceptions of feedback based on race (Pillai's $V_{8,162.00} = .22$, $F_{8,162.00} = 2.51$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .11$). The effect size for race was moderate (.06~.13). About 11.00% of variance in participant perceptions of feedback was explained by the race ($\eta^2 = .11$). Follow-up univariate ANOVAs indicated that instructors' perceptions of nonverbal feedback were significantly influenced by race ($F_{2,83} = 3.27$, $p = .04$, $\eta 2 = .07$). Caucasians' perceptions of nonverbal feedback were rated higher ($M = 39.83$, $SD = 11.25$) than African Americans ($M = 32.50$, $SD = 9.44$), and 'Others' ($M = 33.25$, $SD = 13.36$). Table 12 displays the tests of between-subjects effects analysis for perceptions of feedback based on race.

No significant differences were found for gender (Wilks' $\Lambda_{8,160.00} = .88$, $F_{8,160.00} = 1.28$, $p = .26$), academic title (Wilks' $\Lambda_{12,209.31} = .88$, $F_{12,209.31} = .85$, $p = .60$), primary instrument (Wilks' $\Lambda_{8,158.00} = .90$, $F_{8,158.00} = 1.11$, $p = .36$), highest degree earned (Wilks' $\Lambda_{8,160.00} = .89$, $F_{8,160.00} = 1.24$, $p = .28$), institution type (Wilks' $\Lambda_{4,91.00} = .93$, $F_{4,91.00} = 1.80$, $p = .14$), or U.S. region (Wilks' $\Lambda_{12,238.41} = .94$, $F_{12,238.41} = .51$, $p = .91$). Perceptions of feedback (written, spoken, general, nonverbal) were not significantly influenced by these demographic traits.

Table 11

Summary of Multivariate Test for Perceptions of Feedback

Effect	Wilks' Lambda	*F*	*df*	*p*	η2
Gender	.88	1.28	8, 160.00	.26	.06
Academic Title	.88	.85	12, 209.31	.60	.04
Instrument	.90	1.11	8, 158.00	.36	.05
Highest Degree	.89	1.24	8,160.00	.28	.06
Institution Type	.93	1.80	4, 91.00	.14	.07
U.S. Region	.94	.51	12, 238.41	.91	.02
	Pillai's Trace	*F*	*df*	*p*	η*2*
Race	.22	2.51	8, 162.00	.01*	.11

*$p < .05$.

Table 12

Test of Between-Subjects Effects for Perceptions of Feedback Based on Race

Perception	Caucasian		African American		Other		*F*(2,83)	η2
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*		
General	16.08	4.70	15.58	4.09	19.63	5.95	2.21	.05
Spoken	33.72	6.50	29.86	6.44	29.13	9.73	3.02	.07
Written	52.20	11.03	48.00	17.30	47.75	4.17	1.07	.03
Nonverbal	39.83	11.25	32.50	9.44	33.25	13.36	3.27*	.07

*$p < .05$.

Research Question 3-Multiple Regression Analysis

Will class size, allotted class time, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting predict perceptions of feedback?

I used four separate multiple regression analyses to determine if undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors' perceptions of feedback (general, spoken, written, nonverbal) was explained by class size, allotted class time, and the years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting. Participants rated a series of five-point Likert statements

1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) based on their level of agreement towards the four perceptions of feedback categories.

General Feedback. The overall regression model for using class size, allotted class time, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting to predict the general perceptions of feedback was not statistically significant ($F_{3,79} = 1.64$, $p = .19$). The linear combination of class size, allotted class time, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting explained about 6.00% of the total variance in the perceptions of general feedback ($R^2 = .06$). Class size ($B = -0.07$, $\beta = -0.13$, $t = -1.16$, $p = .25$), allotted class time ($B = -0.01$, $\beta = -0.09$, $t = -0.80$, $p = .43$), and years teaching ($B = -0.06$, $\beta = -.015$, $t = -1.33$, $p = .19$) were not significant predictors of undergraduate conducting instructors' perceptions of general feedback. See Table 13 for a summary of the multiple regression analysis for the prediction of general feedback based on class time, class size, and years of teaching experience undergraduate instrumental conducting.

Table 13

Multiple Regression of Class Time, Class Size, and Years of Teaching Predicting Perceptions of General Feedback

Course Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	*t*	*p*
Intercept	19.95	2.17			
Class time	-0.01	0.02	-0.09	-0.80	.43
Class size	-0.07	0.06	-0.13	-1.16	.25
Years teaching	-0.06	0.05	-0.15	-1.33	.19

Spoken Feedback. The overall regression model for using class size, allotted class time, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting to predict the spoken perceptions of feedback was statistically significant ($F_{3,79} = 2.83$, $p = .04$). About 10.00% of the

total variance in perceptions of spoken feedback was explained by the linear combination of class size, allotted class time, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting (R^2 = .10). Class size (B = -0.19, β = -0.21, t = -1.97, p = .052), allocated class time (B = -0.03, β = -0.16, t = -1.42, p = .16), and years of teaching (B = -0.06, β = -0.10, t = -0.90, p = .37) were not significant predictors of undergraduate conducting instructors' perceptions of spoken feedback. See Table 14 for a summary of the multiple regression analysis for the prediction of spoken feedback based on class time, class size, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting.

Table 14

Multiple Regression of Class Time, Class Size, and Years of Teaching Predicting Perceptions of Spoken Feedback

Course Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	*t*	*p*
Intercept	41.39	3.31			
Class time	-0.03	0.02	-0.16	-1.42	.16
Class size	-0.19	0.09	-0.21	-1.97	.052
Years teaching	-0.06	0.07	-0.10	-0.90	.37

Written Feedback. The overall regression equation for written perceptions of feedback was not statistically significant ($F_{3,78}$ = 1.60, p = .20). The combination of class size, allotted class time, and years teaching explained about 6.00% of the variance in the perceptions of written feedback (R2 = .06). Neither class size (B = -0.02, β = -0.02, t = -0.14, p = .89), nor years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting (B = -0.09, β = -0.09, t = -.074, p = .46) significantly predicted undergraduate conducting instructors' perceptions of written feedback. Even though the overall regression equation was not significant, allotted class time (B = 0.08, β = 0.25, t = 2.18, p = .03) was a significant predictor of instructors' perceptions of

written feedback. The regression equation of the Perceptions of Written Feedback = 42.88 + 0.25(Class Time). As allotted class time increased, instructors' level of agreement (1 [strongly agree] to 5 [strongly disagree]) to the perceptions of written feedback also increased. See Table 15 for a summary of the stepwise linear regression analysis for the prediction of written feedback based on class time, class size, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting.

Table 15

Multiple Regression of Class Time, Class Size, and Years of Teaching Predicting Perceptions of Written Feedback

Course Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	*t*	*p*
Intercept	42.88	4.79			
Class time	0.08	0.04	0.25	2.18	.03
Class size	-0.02	0.17	-0.02	-0.14	.89
Years Teaching	-0.09	0.13	-0.09	-0.74	.46

Nonverbal Feedback. The overall regression model for using class size, allotted class time, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting to predict the nonverbal perceptions of feedback was not statistically significant ($F_{3,78}$ = .48, p = .70). About 2.00% of the total variance in the perceptions of nonverbal feedback was explained by the linear combination of class size, allotted class time, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting (R^2 = .02). Class size (B = -0.09, β = -0.06, t = -0.55, p = .58) was not a significant predictor of undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors' perceptions of nonverbal feedback, neither was allocated class time (B = 0.01, β = 0.02, t = 0.20, p = .84), nor years of teaching (B = -0.14, β = -0.12, t = -1.00, p = .32). See Table 16 for a summary of the

multiple regression analysis for the prediction of nonverbal feedback based on class time, class size, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting.

Table 16

Multiple Regression of Class Time, Class Size, and Years of Teaching Predicting Perceptions of Nonverbal Feedback

Course Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	*t*	*p*
Intercept	40.94	6.05			
Class time	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.20	.84
Class size	-0.09	0.17	-0.06	-0.55	.58
Year teaching	-0.14	0.13	-0.12	-1.00	.32

Research Question 4-Frequencies and Percentages

Based on the different methods of provided feedback, what are the most frequently used course activities in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses?

Under the 'Course Characteristics' section of the survey, participants indicated whether they used specific activities in their courses (yes, no) and rated how often 1 (always) to 5 (never) they provided verbal (spoken/written), and nonverbal feedback to undergraduate instrumental conducting students. Course activities used more frequently according to all "yes" responses combined with spoken feedback included "conducting peers" (97.00%), "observations" (87.00%), "conducting while singing parts of the score individually" (83.80%), and "singing parts of the score with peers" (80.80%). There were some noticeable trends among the undergraduate instrumental conducting course activities based on the feedback methods using the five-point Likert scale 1 (always) to 5 (never).

The majority of participants revealed using "conducting peers" always or most of the time combined with spoken feedback. Most participants indicated using "student conductors conducting while singing parts of the score," "singing parts of the score with peers," "conducting

a lab band," and "transposing scores and instrumental parts" always, most of the time, or about half the time. Some course activities combined with spoken feedback were not popular. Participants specified using "conducting to audio recordings for practice," "conducting to audio recordings for exams," "using the piano to perform score reductions," "Alexander Technique," and "Dalcroze" less than half the time or never as course activities combined with spoken feedback. A few participants expressed offering spoken feedback for "conducting excerpts/exercises," "reflections", and "video self-assessments." Table 17 displays frequencies and percentages of utilized course activities based on spoken feedback.

Table 17

Summary of Course Activities Provided with Spoken Feedback

Course Activity	Yes Responses		Always		Most of the time		About half the time		Less than half the time		Never	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Spoken Feedback												
Conduct peers	97	97.00	66	69.50	18	18.90	5	5.30	4	4.20	2	2.10
Observations	87	87.00	16	18.40	11	12.60	17	19.50	29	33.30	14	16.10
Conduct/Sing	83	83.80	34	35.80	20	21.10	15	15.80	14	14.70	12	12.60
Sing Score/Peers	80	80.80	32	35.60	20	22.20	11	12.20	16	17.80	11	12.20
Transposition	79	79.80	28	30.10	16	17.20	12	12.90	18	19.40	19	20.40
Conduct Inst. Ens.	67	67.70	24	27.90	6	7.00	3	3.50	30	34.90	23	26.70
Student Journal	65	66.30	14	17.50	9	11.30	14	17.50	18	22.50	25	31.30
Error Detection	59	59.00	25	29.10	16	18.60	14	16.30	7	8.10	24	27.90
Conduct Lab Band	57	57.60	29	32.30	11	12.20	7	7.80	8	8.90	35	38.90
Conduct Audio	42	42.90	9	11.00	14	17.10	7	8.50	10	12.20	42	51.20
Laban	40	40.40	18	22.80	6	7.60	6	7.60	11	13.90	38	48.10
Piano Score Reduc.	28	28.00	7	10.10	6	8.70	2	2.90	12	17.40	42	60.90
Conduct Audio Exam	21	19.30	8	10.80	11	14.90	1	1.40	4	5.40	50	67.60
Alexander Technique	16	16.00	7	10.10	4	5.80	2	2.90	4	5.80	52	75.40
Dalcroze	13	13.10	3	4.30	3	4.30	1	1.40	4	5.80	58	84.10
Others												
Excerpts/Exercises	2	1.80	2	50.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Reflections	1	0.90	—	—	1	25.00	—	—	—	—	—	—
Video Self-Assess.	1	0.90	—	—	—	—	1	25.00	—	—	—	—

Course activities used more frequently based on all "yes" responses combined with written feedback included "conducting peers" (93.90%) and "observations" (85.60%). According to the five-point Likert scale 1 (always) to 5 (never), most participants specified using "conducting peers," "conducting an institution ensemble," and "observing professional conductors in rehearsal or performance," always, most of the time, or about half the time combined with written feedback. Some of the same course activities combined with spoken feedback remained less popular for written feedback. Results revealed that participants used more than half of the course activities less than half the time or never with written feedback. None of the movement theories (i.e., Laban, Alexander Technique, Dalcroze) were popular with written feedback, neither was "using the piano to perform score reductions." Table 18 displays frequencies and percentages of utilized course activities based on written feedback.

Table 18

Summary of Course Activities Provided with Written Feedback

Course Activity	Yes Responses		Always		Most of the time		About half the time		Less than half the time		Never	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Written Feedback												
Conduct peers	92	93.90	27	28.70	15	16.00	15	16.00	24	25.50	13	13.80
Observations	83	85.60	18	20.50	13	14.80	14	15.90	23	26.10	20	22.70
Conduct/Sing	73	74.50	9	10.50	9	10.50	17	19.80	19	22.10	32	37.20
Sing Score/Peers	73	74.50	9	10.50	10	11.60	8	9.30	23	26.70	36	41.90
Transposition	71	72.40	16	18.40	11	12.60	15	17.20	17	19.50	28	32.20
Conduct Inst. Ens.	63	64.30	20	24.10	12	14.50	8	9.60	17	20.50	26	31.30
Student Journal	61	63.50	16	19.50	16	19.50	10	12.20	17	20.70	23	28.00
Error Detection	55	56.70	12	14.50	7	8.40	12	14.50	16	19.30	36	43.40
Conduct Lab Band	53	54.10	14	17.30	11	13.60	8	9.90	15	18.50	33	40.70
Conduct Audio	40	41.70	6	7.60	4	5.10	9	11.40	13	16.50	47	59.50
Laban	34	35.10	4	5.20	6	7.80	4	5.20	11	14.30	52	67.50
Piano Score Reduc.	23	23.70	2	2.90	5	7.20	5	7.20	9	13.00	48	60.90
Conduct Audio Exam	22	22.70	11	15.70	2	2.90	3	4.30	3	4.30	51	72.90
Alexander Technique	16	16.50	2	3.10	1	1.50	3	4.60	4	6.20	55	84.60
Dalcroze	11	11.50	1	1.50	2	2.90	1	1.50	4	5.90	60	88.20

Course activities used more frequently according to all "yes" responses combined with nonverbal feedback also included "conducting peers" (94.30%) and "observations" (80.70%). Differences were observed considering the five-point Likert scale 1 (always) to 5 (never) results for undergraduate instrumental conducting course activities combined with nonverbal feedback. The majority of participants indicated using "conducting peers," and "student conductors conducting while singing parts of the score" always, most of the time, or about half the time as course activities aligned with nonverbal feedback. Many of the course activities observed were not popular. Over half of the participants revealed using specific course activities less than half the time or never with nonverbal feedback. Table 19 displays frequencies and percentages of utilized course activities based on nonverbal feedback.

Table 19

Summary of Course Activities Provided with Nonverbal Feedback

Course Activity	Yes Responses		Always		Most of the time		About half the time		Less than half the time		Never	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Nonverbal Feedback												
Conduct peers	83	94.30	22	25.00	20	22.70	13	14.80	25	28.40	8	9.10
Observations	71	80.70	10	12.20	5	6.10	7	8.50	17	20.70	43	52.40
Conduct/Sing	68	78.20	13	16.30	16	20.00	13	16.30	20	25.00	18	22.50
Sing Score/Peers	69	79.30	16	20.50	17	21.80	7	9.00	18	23.10	20	25.60
Transposition	61	69.30	10	12.30	9	11.10	9	11.10	21	25.90	32	39.50
Conduct Inst. Ens.	56	63.60	13	16.70	12	15.40	9	11.50	23	29.50	21	26.90
Student Journal	49	55.70	5	6.90	6	8.30	7	9.70	11	15.30	43	59.70
Error Detection	48	55.80	11	14.10	10	12.80	6	7.70	15	19.20	36	46.20
Conduct Lab Band	48	55.20	13	17.10	9	11.80	10	13.20	17	22.40	27	35.50
Conduct Audio	36	41.40	7	9.50	5	6.80	8	10.80	13	17.60	41	55.40
Laban	30	34.90	10	13.90	7	9.70	3	4.20	8	11.10	44	61.10
Piano Score Reduc.	21	23.90	2	3.10	4	6.20	—	—	11	16.90	48	73.80
Conduct Audio Exam	19	21.80	5	7.70	—	—	3	4.60	6	9.20	51	78.50
Alexander Technique	15	17.00	5	7.70	1	1.50	3	4.60	5	7.70	51	78.50
Dalcroze	9	10.60	2	3.20	4	6.50	—	—	3	4.80	53	85.50

Summary

There was a significant difference between the demographic information and the perceptions of feedback. Results of a one-way multivariate analysis of variance test indicated significant differences between mean ratings based on race. Ratings for Caucasians' perceptions of nonverbal feedback were higher than African Americans and "Others." Allotted class time was a significant predictor of instructors' perceptions of written feedback. An increase in allotted class time revealed an increase in instructors' level of agreement to the perceptions of written feedback. Results also showed that conducting instructors specified "yes" for "conducting peers" more frequently as a course activity combined with spoken, written, and nonverbal feedback. Based on a five-point Likert scale 1 (always) to 5 (never), instructors also indicated using "conducting peers" and "observations" always, most of the time, or about half the time as a course activity for both verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback.

Chapter V

Discussion and Conclusion

The ability to communicate and lead as a conductor is acknowledged as an essential skill by scholars, conducting instructors, and students. Unfortunately, many undergraduate conductors feel unprepared by varying aspects of their undergraduate curriculum and conducting courses (Manfredo, 2008; Silvey & Major, 2014). Some lack opportunities to learn and develop due to time constraints and large class sizes (Romines, 2003; Silvey, 2011; Silvey & Major, 2014), lack alignment in curricular content (Labuta,1965; Manfredo, 2008; Romines, 2003), lack integration and practical experiences (Boardman, 2000; Funk, 1977; Hart, 2019; Manfredo, 2008; Romines, 2003; Runnels, 1992; Zirkman, 1984), and lack conducting and rehearsal preparedness (Silvey, 2011). Others do not receive adequate feedback that can help them recognize their strengths and weaknesses (Silvey, 2011; Silvey & Major, 2014). Providing conducting students with sufficient and meaningful feedback to learn and thrive should be a pertinent role of all conducting instructors.

Researchers have stressed the need for feedback research in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses for over 40 years (Boardman, 2000; Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Keller, 1979; Silvey & Major, 2014). Very few sources have examined feedback. Hence, we know more about conducting in general and less about how conducting instructors provide feedback. The purpose of this dissertation was to learn about the various methods of verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback provided in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses and to compare and contrast perceptions of feedback based on instructors' attributes, school, and course characteristics.

College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA) 'conducting pedagogy' listserve members, Historically Black Colleges and Universities National Band Directors Consortium, Inc. (HBCU-NBDC) email list members, and potential participants through snowball sampling received an email invitation to complete an online survey developed through Qualtrics titled "Undergraduate Conducting Feedback." This survey examined five constructs: School Characteristics, Course Characteristics, Methods of Feedback, Perceptions of Feedback, and Demographic Profile. The current study used 109 ($N = 109$) valid survey responses. Findings are discussed and interpreted about the four research questions and employed parametric inferential statistical data analysis. In this study, I sought to describe:

- the relationship between the types of feedback and class time
- the relationship between the demographic information and the perceptions of feedback
- if class size, allotted class time, and years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting predicted perceptions of feedback
- the most frequently used course activities in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses based on the different methods of provided feedback

Feedback Methods and Course Characteristics

Based on the Pearson correlations analysis, I failed to reject the null hypothesis (There will be no relationship between the instructor's use of feedback [verbal, nonverbal] and allotted class time). The alternative hypothesis stated that there would be a relationship. However, my data analysis did not support the alternative. The observed Pearson correlations revealed weak negative correlations with no significant linear relationships between the feedback method and allotted class time. It is possible that most undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors feel that more time is needed to offer specific course activities and feedback. Various studies have

emphasized a concern for conducting course time (Boardman, 2000; McCullough, 2018; Romines, 2003; Silvey, 2011). Results from this study demonstrate that class time and instructor's use of different feedback methods are not related. Conducting instructors could advocate for more course sections, more class time, or an additional lab band course strictly for conducting students. More allotted class time supports the recommendations of previous research (Baker, 1992; Boardman, 2000; Getchell, 1957; McCullough, 2018). Conducting instructors could also collaborate with instrumental music methods and instrumental techniques instructors to bridge the integration and alignment gaps outlined in the literature review between curricular content, pedagogical practices, and parallel field and practical experiences. Collaborating could allow instructors to manage time better and place emphasis on practical cross-curricular approaches to teaching and learning.

Perhaps conducting instructors should tailor (plan) specific course activities and the necessary feedback that works for them, their students, and the particular assignment with the allotted time to alleviate feeling overwhelmed and frustrated. Conducting is a complex skill that takes much time to learn and develop. The goal of conducting instructors should focus more on the students' needs to be successful teachers, leaders, and conductors as opposed to the wealth of complex material to teach over a short period—this can become overwhelming. Runnels (1992) suggested that conducting instructors should train students to achieve high proficiency and artistry congruent with the available time for instruction. Hence, all aspiring conductors should seek additional training beyond the undergraduate music curriculum. There is no way instructors can teach their students everything about conducting in the typical two semesters. If students are serious about conducting, they must find other ways to study during and beyond their undergraduate years. However, practical experiences in the conducting class with sufficient and

meaningful feedback and necessary resources could reinforce teaching and learning (Fant, 1996; Hart, 2019).

Conducting instructors must prepare students to learn from the best opportunities and experiences needed to be competent teachers, leaders, and conductors (Runnels, 1992). What skills do preservice and first year music teachers need to teach, conduct, and lead their students on an everyday basis? What types of practical experiences can you afford your students to be successful conductors? What resources (i.e., feedback tools, rehearsal plan guides, fundraising ideas, tips for collaborating, festival and adjudication documents, budgeting documents, musical repertoire, supplemental materials, books, articles, handbooks, concert program templates, websites, dissertations, workshops, clinics, mentors, professional contacts, conferences, organizations) can you share with your conducting students? What motivating and encouraging words can you offer your students to continue learning about conducting?

Above are vital questions to consider when structuring an undergraduate instrumental conducting course. Conducting instructors could teach some of the above resource topics as a discussion assignment through a course management system allowing students and teachers to engage in essential dialogue. Using the course management system as a teaching tool could alleviate some pressures of teaching and discussing particular topics during the allotted class time. Instructors could also require students to keep a conducting notebook to preserve much of this information for future use as a music educator. Findings from previous studies indicated that many instructors use supplemental materials and sources (Hart, 2018; Runnels, 1992).

The rating scales of various verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback indicated that spoken feedback during in-class/in-person instructional time was prevalent. This finding is congruent with research highlighting students' need for more verbal feedback (Maltas &

McCarty-Clair, 2006; Mohd, 2014; Rae & Cochrane, 2008; Runnels, 1992; Silvey & Major, 2014; Yarbrough et al., 1979). It also relates to students' desire for individualized feedback (Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Hart, 2019; Marrs, 2016; Mohd, 2014; Silvey & Major, 2014; Yarbrough, 1979). Self-assessments and rubrics were popular with written feedback, which is consistent with past research (Boardman, 2000; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Keller, 1979; Manfredo, 2006; Silvey & Montemayor, 2014; Ulrich, 2009; Wesoloski, 2015). Instructors also indicated the use of modeling and body language for nonverbal feedback. These types of nonverbal feedback are consonant with related scholarly literature (Bautista, Wong, & Cabedo-Mas, 2018; Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Colson, 2012; Manfredo, 2006; Persellin, 2009; Plondke, 1992; Runnels, 1992; Silvey & Major, 2014).

Results from this analysis demonstrate that conducting instructors should continue preparing, evaluating, and improving their use of instructional time, activities, and feedback provided regardless of the allotted class time. Continuous observation of how, when, and why instructors provide feedback can help to determine whether or not conducting students are learning, improving, and reaching desired goals. Furthermore, conducting instructors should strive to reevaluate their syllabi every semester while incorporating diverse perspectives to deliver feedback, thus allowing students opportunities to grow and develop as successful conductors. Instructors should also involve their students in the decision-making process for selecting specific course activities and feedback methods.

Perceptions, Demographics, and School Characteristics

Several one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) tests examined the relationship between the participant's demographic information and their perceptions of feedback (general, spoken, written, nonverbal). Demographics such as gender, academic title,

primary instrument, highest degree earned, institution type, and U.S. region did not significantly influence the perceptions of feedback. Hence, I failed to reject the null hypothesis.

On the contrary, a significant difference among perceptions of feedback was found based on race. Since the results favored the alternative hypothesis by showing a significant difference, I rejected the null hypothesis because instructors' perceptions of nonverbal feedback were influenced by race. Interestingly, Caucasians' mean ratings of nonverbal feedback perceptions were significantly higher than African Americans, and "Others." Much music education, conducting, and feedback research outlines significant differences for gender (Hart, 2018; Marrs, 2016; McLeod & Napoles, 2012; Rowe & Wood, 2008; Silvey, 2011), but not race.

Based on history and research, the music education and conducting professions are dominated by Caucasian males (Brown, 1972; Jagow, 1998; Pucciana, 1983; Sheldon & Hartley, 2012; Tsicoulcas, 2009). Research from Sheldon and Hartley (2012) revealed that males outnumbered females as primary conductors throughout the Midwest Band and Orchestra Clinic history. They also found that Caucasian males dominated graduate wind band conducting studies and conducting symposiums and workshops. Like much other music education and conducting studies, Caucasian males also outnumbered females and other races in my study. These findings mirror the population demographic for both music education and conducting professions—females and races (other than Caucasian) are significantly disproportionate (Elpus, 2015; Sheldon & Hartley, 2012). Gardner (2010) found significant differences between teachers of music and other subjects concerning sex and race. Music teachers were usually male and Caucasian. Research from other scholars also supports the uneven population within the music profession (Elpus, 2015; McKoy, 2012; Pembrook & Craig, 2002).

Perhaps the significant difference with nonverbal feedback found among race in this study is present because more Caucasians take the liberty to seek out various conducting opportunities through graduate conducting studies, conducting workshops, symposiums, and seminars. These types of opportunities significantly help conductors to build on their overall nonverbal skillsets and welcome mentorship. Engagement in these opportunities is a norm and, more so, learned behavior or culture for Caucasians because of the known history, which may support their higher level of agreement or significance for nonverbal feedback.

Unfortunately, seeking out conducting opportunities may not be a norm or perceived culture of other races, ethnicities, or minorities (gender or sexual). The value of nonverbal feedback reported in this study may be disproportionate due to historical views of unequal opportunities, stereotyping, gender-exclusion, and the lack of mentors and role models within the music education and conducting professions (Atterbury, 1992; Brown, 1972; Duchen, 2014; Pucciana, 1983). As a frequent attendee at conducting symposiums and workshops, I have been the only female and sometimes only African American in many instances. Some progress for change is in motion; however, underrepresentation is still apparent, and maybe it is because some people do not feel a sense of belonging.

I know how it feels to be in an environment where others do not look like me. I know how it feels not to belong. Many people have judged or excluded me because of my race and gender. However, that has never stopped me from being myself and present in each moment. I believe it takes much courage, empathy, passion, self-confidence, and self-love to be yourself. Joseph (2012) stated, “Having a positive and strong sense of identity may prevent feelings of not socially fitting in, which may also influence participation in social activities” (p. 130). All individuals who aspire to be successful music educators and conductors regardless of race,

ethnicity, and gender should always be themselves and find ways to engage in opportunities allowing them to be present to learn and grow, even when environments are uncomfortable.

Instructors should advocate for diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in their conducting programs, workshops, symposiums, seminars, and organizations. A simple suggestion could be diversifying promotional and recruiting materials with real-life images of underrepresented populations attending music and conducting programs, workshops, or conferences. Conducting instructors could also invite colleagues of different races, ethnicities, and genders to present, guest conduct, fellowship, clinic, or teach. Another recommendation is to purposefully recruit minority students (race, gender, sexual orientation). Often, when underrepresented populations are in an environment and do not see others who look like or identify as them, they tend to disengage or disconnect (Joseph, 2012; Shavers & Moore, 2014; Vakalahi et al., 2014). Therefore, creating diverse promotional and recruiting materials may provide a sense of belonging, allowing these potential students or conductors to engage and connect. Recruiting outside the majority population will diversify the music education and conducting professions. Inviting colleagues of various backgrounds may encourage healthy relationships, broaden knowledge and understanding, and foster respect for humanity.

How can music and conducting programs, workshops, seminars, and organizations be more welcoming to the underrepresented populations? A key to implementing an approach of DEI is acknowledging that all people are different and have biases that must surface. It is crucial to understand and empathize with others to promote healthy environments where aspiring musicians and conductors can engage in open dialogue, see and relate to people who look like them and identify differently, and feel like they belong in any setting. I hope that underrepresented populations will continue to pursue and take advantage of the many

opportunities that have been around in our profession for decades and make them a norm or culture. I also hope that the majority population will provide an environment where all feel seen, welcomed, and valued. Also, I look forward to seeing more DEI in both music education and conducting fields—representation, empathy, vulnerability, acknowledgment, transparency, awareness, collaboration, and being vocal matters.

Several authors suggested that this profession needs more mentors to help guide aspiring teachers, leaders, and conductors (Boardman, 2000; Gillis, 2010; Groulx, 2015; Hart, 2018; Lawson, 1984; Sheldon & Hartley, 2012). Mentors of all backgrounds with extensive experience and training in conducting pedagogy and music education are needed to help guide all races, ethnicities, and genders to continue the profession's growth.

Course Characteristics, Demographics, and Perceptions

Scholars have cited large class size (Boardman, 2000), and lack of class time (Baker; 1992; Boardman, 2000; Cooper, 1994; Getchell, 1957; Romines, 2003; Runnels, 1992) as contributing reasons for limited development of undergraduate conductors. Results from this study revealed that class size was not a significant predictor of instructors' perceptions of general, spoken, written, or nonverbal feedback. Other scholarly research has observed the age and experience of music and conducting teachers (Boardman, 2000; Hart, 2018; Manfredo, 2006). My study indicated that years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting was not a significant predictor of instructors' perceptions of general, spoken, written, or nonverbal feedback. Based on the alternative hypothesis, I failed to reject the null hypothesis because class size and years of experience teaching were not significant predictors.

In this study, the years of experience teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting ranged from 1-54, and class size ranged from 6-50. Perhaps, instructors' training, experiences,

and instructional delivery significantly influence their perceptions of verbal and nonverbal feedback, rather than the years of experience teaching conducting, or class sizes. Some conducting instructors never evolve their syllabi, course activities, methods of instruction, feedback methods, assessments, evaluations, experiences, or training. Therefore, instructors' years of experience teaching and class size would not influence their perceptions of verbal and nonverbal feedback. They could potentially teach the same skills, content, and concepts repeatedly with different years of experience teaching and class sizes without changing their delivery.

I also observed allotted class time in this study since numerous researchers explored time concerns in conducting courses (Boardman, 2000; McCullough, 2018; Romines, 2003; Silvey, 2011). My study revealed that allotted class time was not a significant predictor of instructors' perceptions of general, spoken, or nonverbal feedback. However, allotted class time was a significant predictor of instructors' perceptions of written feedback. I rejected the null hypothesis since the results of allotted class time and the perceptions of written feedback favored the alternative hypothesis. Results indicated an increase in instructors' level of agreement to the perceptions of written feedback as allotted class time increased. Perhaps conducting instructors feel they can provide the necessary written feedback to their students when they have more class time. Hence, written feedback may not be the most preferred method when conducting instructors have less class time.

Nonetheless, written feedback can serve as a tool for reflecting on individualized progress. Chaffin and Manfredo (2010) discussed the effectiveness of written feedback and how it reminds and reinforces actions and achievements for preservice teachers. Without specific written feedback, conducting students may forget verbal (spoken) comments provided during in-

class/in-person instruction. Written feedback (comments) allows students to reflect on desired goals, observe their present position based on strengths and weaknesses, and improve moving forward.

There is no one-size-fits-all approach to teaching, leading, and conducting. Conducting instructors of all class sizes, class times, ages, and years of experience teaching must find ways to teach all students through various mediums and learning styles. Though written feedback is ideal for more allotted class time, instructors must continue stepping out of their comfort zones and learned behaviors or habits. Instructors must find ways to incorporate both verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback methods for their course activities, allotted class time, and preparation time. The lack of preparedness, experiences, and the instructor's unwillingness to provide sufficient feedback limits students' ability to learn and grow as successful conductors and future teachers. Because teaching, leading, and conducting are essential skills of preservice music educators and conductors, the majority of their careers will involve working in settings where students are inexperienced and on varying levels as musicians (Ulrich, 2009).

The necessary feedback and practical opportunities needed to improve upon strengths and weaknesses are crucial for conducting students who will eventually teach, communicate, and collaborate with future students in the music field; this concept mirrors the African American proverb, "Each One Teach One." If we as conducting instructors cannot provide our students with the necessary feedback to improve and reach desired goals, and opportunities to become capable conductors, teachers, and leaders, who will? Students often view their teachers as role models or influencers. Runnels (1992) indicated that conducting instructors have diverse training and practical experiences, which stems from prior experiences as students in conducting. Due to these known factors, conducting instructors may reflect on and try to replicate what they

observed as a student to formulate their conducting courses. Considering this perspective, conducting instructors who do not provide multiple opportunities for authentic learning experiences in conjunction with various feedback methods, may or may not effectively contribute to the development of practicing preservice teachers and future conducting instructors.

Teaching conducting is a complex art form, and instructors should embrace different strategies to assist students in improving their conducting, teaching, and leadership skills. What works for one class or one student may not work for the other. More importantly, conducting students may reflect and replicate their instructor's observed actions and behaviors, whether effective or not.

Frequency of Course Characteristics and Feedback Methods

Before this study, I assumed that undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors provided various course activities. A review of the literature showed a substantial agreement with this assumption (Boardman, 2000; Manfredo, 2008; Romines, 2003; Runnels, 1992). Manfredo (2008) noted differences throughout the conducting profession about curricular content, teaching strategies, and course activities and materials. I surveyed participants asking if they used specific activities in their courses and to rate how often they provided verbal (spoken/written), and nonverbal feedback to undergraduate instrumental conducting students.

Based on spoken feedback, instructors indicated "yes" for using "conducting peers," "observations," "conducting while singing parts of the score individually," "singing parts of the score with peers," and "transposition" more frequently. Instructors specified "yes" for using "conducting peers," and "observations," more frequently for both written and nonverbal feedback. There were some noticeable trends among verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback methods based on the five-point Likert scale 1 (always) to 5 (never). Instructors

indicated that they always used "conducting peers" as a course activity combined with spoken, written, and nonverbal feedback. Boardman (2000), Hart (2019), Romines (2003), and Runnels (1992) also found that conducting instructors utilized this course activity (conducting peers) during class or for lab and live ensembles.

Other course activities such as "students using the piano to perform score reductions," "Alexander Techniques," and "Dalcroze," were not popular among verbal (spoken/written) or nonverbal feedback methods. Though Hart (2019) did not research movement theories in conjunction with verbal and nonverbal feedback, he discovered that Laban Movement Analysis, Dalcroze Eurhythmics, and Alexander Technique were preferred movement theories in undergraduate music education conducting classes. Conducting instructors should continue researching and attending movement workshops to incorporate activities in their classes. They should also encourage their students to do the same. I recommend speaking with the movement instructors and community to learn about providing proper verbal and nonverbal feedback to students based on these theories. Attending movement workshops may also allow both conducting and movement instructors to collaborate on course activities or welcome an invitation for an on-campus workshop or clinic. The less popular course activities observed in this study may indicate that some instructors are not comfortable with movement theories or playing the piano. Therefore, instructors may not teach them due to a lack of experience and expertise.

These results indicate that some instructors are providing specific feedback methods with course activities—though some instructors are not. Conducting instructors should try incorporating various approaches and course activities for all students while providing sufficient and meaningful verbal and nonverbal feedback. Some form of feedback is better than none. Most importantly, the feedback must be helpful for students to know the desired goal, their present

position, and how to close the gap between the two (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Sadler, 1989; Strobart & Gipps, 1997). According to previous research, feedback should explain a student's grade (Holmes & Papageorgiou, 2009**;** Rae & Cochrane, 2008). Students should not receive grades without the necessary feedback. Perhaps, some less popular activities may be beneficial for students with a particular learning style. When faced with unexpected course interruptions, instructors must be prepared, confident, flexible, supportive, unbiased, and versatile in their teaching approaches. Working to diversify instructional delivery, course activities, and feedback methods frequently will help instructors prepare for known and unknown circumstances.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Findings from this study indicate that conducting instructors should strive to provide various methods of verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback to conducting students in combination with all provided course activities. Chaffin and Manfredo (2010) recommended that individual feedback, modeling, and class seminars were most beneficial. Study results also indicate that instructors should deviate from some traditional course activities to embrace new approaches. There are various ways to foster creativity and innovation in conducting courses, especially when thinking about the many scenarios that can occur in authentic classroom environments at all levels and school settings (rural, suburban, urban, town). Change, in general, is hard for many people, but with the change, we evolve to become more durable and resilient.

I encourage conducting instructors to generate new ideas and course activities to share with students, colleagues, and others within the profession. I also encourage instructors to strive for DEI (diversity, equity, and inclusion) within their classes and music education programs. Conducting instructors should also create ways to provide both verbal (spoken/written) and

nonverbal feedback to students when incorporating these new ideas and course activities. Battisti (2007) recommended that conducting instructors and students should have a mentor-student approach to feedback. Hence, instructors could collaborate with students to form new ideas, course activities, and ways to provide adequate feedback.

Often, instructors rely on student course evaluations to gain an understanding of their instruction. However, these evaluations usually occur at the end of a course and lack alignment with specific course content, feedback, and instructional methods. Also, feedback provided during the undergraduate program may not reflect the challenges which conducting students face once they enter the profession. Conducting instructors should develop a student evaluation explicitly designed for their class to learn about their instruction, activities, feedback methods, and areas for improvement. Surveying conducting students or having open dialogue at the beginning, middle, and ending of a course cycle could help instructors identify new approaches and ways to improve their instruction and feedback delivery.

Instructors could even maintain the mentor-student relationship to guide and gain feedback from conducting students after they graduate, enter the profession, and realize what they do not know. This process would help instructors acknowledge topics, approaches, activities, content, and concepts that may be beneficial to preservice and first-year music teachers. I think this concept would provide a worthwhile experience for both parties and promote the mentor-student collaboration.

Future Research Implications

Future research recommendations include studying undergraduates' perceptions of their conducting instructors' verbal and nonverbal feedback concerning frequency and effectiveness. Do undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors have an accurate understanding of how

their students learn and process provided information or feedback? Moreover, do conducting instructors provide adequate verbal and nonverbal feedback for each course activity? Do students understand their conducting instructors' verbal and nonverbal feedback well enough to improve weak areas? Other recommendations include learning and becoming more comfortable with various feedback methods and tools.

There is a plethora of conducting workshops and symposiums at various institutions for both students and teachers to enhance their conducting, teaching, leadership, and musical skills. Many of these workshops emphasize communicating musical ideas effectively through visual gestures—using the hand, face, and body (Ulrich, 2009, p. 48). Some workshops even focus on score study, movement, interpretation of musical ideas, and rehearsal techniques. Perhaps, more conducting clinics and workshops could offer guidance on how to provide useful and meaningful verbal and nonverbal feedback to conducting students and musicians. Moreover, instructors can seek educational workshops, seminars, and webinars that discuss various tools for providing feedback. Both verbal and nonverbal feedback is essential to helping students improve and develop as successful conductors. Improving and continuing the commitment begun for this dissertation and future related studies will hopefully:

- eliminate gaps in the literature
- create avenues for improving the undergraduate conducting curricula and instruction
- create avenues for healthy and meaningful discussions about sensitive topics within the music education and conducting communities
- instill a sense of awareness and compassion for DEI within the profession
- aid conducting instructors to meet the needs of all preservice teachers and conducting students by providing sufficient and meaningful feedback

Closing

Instrumental conducting is an essential skill for all undergraduate music majors. Too often, young conductors feel unprepared or lack the necessary skills and opportunities to exercise the practical skills needed to teach, lead, and conduct. A prominent role of conducting instructors is to provide sufficient and meaningful feedback to all conducting students. Feedback in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses is crucial and helps students to learn and develop. If student conductors cannot recognize desired goals, learn of their present position, and acquire ways of understanding to improve and close the gap between the two, how can they become successful conductors? There are various methods of providing both verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback in academia. Though a wide variety of research about undergraduate conducting courses, curricula, practices, techniques, and the perceptions of instructors and students is present, there is a lack of research on verbal and nonverbal methods of feedback provided in these courses.

The purpose of this dissertation was to learn about the various methods of verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses and to compare and contrast instructors' perceptions of feedback based on their attributes, school, and course characteristics. The results of this study highlight:

- the relationships between the types of verbal and nonverbal feedback used within undergraduate instrumental conducting courses
- the relationships between the participants' demographic information and perceptions of feedback
- whether class size, class time, or years of teaching conducting experience predict perceptions of feedback

- the most frequently used course activities in undergraduate instrumental conducting courses based on the different methods of provided feedback

Although there are preferred methods of providing feedback, I hope that conducting instructors will continue reflecting on their training, experiences, and instructional delivery to provide adequate feedback for all students to develop as successful conductors. Conducting instructors must engage in various feedback practices (verbal and nonverbal) and incorporate multiple practical opportunities to accommodate all conducting students. Perhaps both conducting and methods of instrumental music instructors should collaborate more to bridge the gap in the alignment of necessary skills and opportunities needed for conducting students.

There is no one-size-fits-all model for conducting, teaching and leading. Undergraduate instrumental conducting instructors can influence many generations of aspiring future music educators and conducting instructors. Therefore, instructors need to provide feedback and reinforcement for continued development and innovation within the music field. Our profession would benefit from more discussions on verbal and nonverbal feedback at conferences and other professional events. There is room for all instructors to improve, and more research is integral to benefit our community.

References

Agius, N. M., & Wilkinson, A. (2013). Students' and teachers' views of written feedback at undergraduate level: A literature review. *Nurse Education Today, 34*(4), 552-559.

Asmus, E. (2000). The need for research in music teacher preparation. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 10*(1), 5. doi:10.1177/105708370001000102

Andrade, H. G. (2005). Teaching with rubrics: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *College Teaching, 53*(1), 27-30.

Atterbury, B. W. (1992). Old prejudices, new perceptions. *Music Educators Journal, 78*(7), 25. https://doi-org.spot.lib.auburn.edu/10.2307/3398354

Baker, A. (1992). *Creating conductors: An analysis of conducting pedagogy in American higher education* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Stanford University.

Battersby, S. L., & Bolton, J. (2013). Nonverbal communication: Implications for the global music classroom. *Music Educators Journal, 99*(4), 57-62.

Battisti, F. L. (2007). *On becoming a conductor: Lessons and meditations on the art of conducting.* Galesville, MD: Meredith Music Publication.

Battisti, F. & Garofalo, R. (1990). *Guide to score study for the wind band conductor*. Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Meredith Music Publications.

Bautista, A., Wong, J., & Cabedo-Mas, A. (2018). Music teachers' perspectives on live and video-mediated peer observation as forms of professional development. *Journal of Music Teacher Education,* 1-15. doi: 10.1177/1057083718819504

Berz, W. L. (1983). The development of an observation instrument designed to classify specific nonverbal communication techniques employed by conductors of musical ensembles. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *42,* 09(A).

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80*(2), 139–144. Retrieved from https://www.rdc.udel.edu/wpcontent/uploads/2015/04/InsideBlackBox.pdf

Boardman, S. M. (2000). *A survey of the undergraduate instrumental conducting course in region seven of the national association of schools of music* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Georgia Athens.

Brown, F. A. (1972). You won't have "lady musicians" to kick around much longer. *Music Educators Journal*, 59, 1.

Bugos, K. M. (2011). *New York state early-career teachers' selection and use of pedagogical approaches in elementary general music* [Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo]. ProQuest LLC.

Byo, J. L., & Austin, K. R. (1994). Comparison of expert and novice conductors: An approach to the analysis of nonverbal behaviors. *Journal of Band Research, 30*(1), 11–34.

Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(2), 219-233.

Cavitt, M. E. (2003). A descriptive analysis of error correction in instrumental music rehearsals. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 51*, 218-230.

Chaffin, C., & Manfredo, J. (2010). Perceptions of preservice teachers regarding feedback and guided reflection in an instrumental early field experience. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 19*(2), 57-72. doi: 10.1177/1057083709354161

Colson, J. F. (2012). *Conducting and rehearsing the instrumental music ensemble*. United Kingdom: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Cooper, E. C. (2015). *A survey of select graduate wind conducting programs in American colleges and universities: A comparative analysis of plans of study, performance requirements, and the pedagogy of wind conducting* (Order No. 3711507) [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Cooper, L. (1994). *A study of the core-curriculum for the preparation of instrumental music educators* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Kentucky.

Cramer, W. (1967). The problems of the conductor: Leading people in a musical experience. *The Instrumentalist, 22*(4), 32-33.

Cronk, B. (2017). *How to use SPSS: A step-by-step guide to analysis and interpretation* (9th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Dillman, D. A. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method* (4th ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Duchen, J. (2014). The female conductor. *Classical Music*, 997, 35.

Dunn, D. W. (1997). Effect of rehearsal hierarchy and reinforcement on attention, achievement, and attitude of selected choirs. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 45*, 547-567.

Eggers, R. E., & Jones, C. M. (1998). Practical considerations for conducting Delphi studies: The oracle enters a new age. *Educational Research Quarterly, 21*(3), 53-66.

Elpus, K. (2015). Music teacher licensure candidates in the United States: A demographic profile and analysis of licensure examination scores. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 63*(3), 314-335.

Fant, G. R. (1996). *An investigation of the relationships between undergraduate music education students' early field experience and student teaching performance* (Order No. 9713421) [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Arizona]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Frank, M.G., Griffin, D. J., Svetieva, E., & Maroulis, A. (2015). Nonverbal elements of the voice. In: A. Kostić & Chadee D. (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Nonverbal Communication* (pp. 92-113). Palgrave Macmillan: London.

Funk, R. N. (1977). *An analysis of music teacher preparatory programs in selected Texas four-year colleges and universities* (Order No. 7729030) [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Gardner, R. D. (2010). Should I stay or should I go? Factors that influence the retention, turnover, and attrition of K–12 music teachers in the United States. *Arts Education Policy Review*, *111*(3), 112–121.

Garvin, D. A., Edmondson, A. C., & Gino, F. (2008). Is yours a learning organization? *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2008/03/is-yours-a-learning-organization

Getchell, R. (1957). *An investigation of, and recommendations for, the beginning conducting class in the college curriculum* (Order No. 0023739) [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Gillis, G. (2010). Musicianship on the podium. *The Canadian Music Educator, 51*(4), 37-38.

Green, E., & Malko, N. (1985). *The conductor's score*. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Green, E. A. H. (1997). *The modern conductor* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Groulx, T. J. (2015). Perceptions of course value and issues of specialization in undergraduate music teacher education curricula. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 25*(2),13-24. doi: 10.117/1057083714564874

Haithcock, M. L., Geraldi, K. M., & Doyle, B. K. (2017). *Conducting textbook*. Unpublished manuscript.

Hart, J. T. (2019). The status of music education conducting curricula, practices, and values. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 28*(2), 13–27. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083718783464

Hattie, J. A., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*, 81-112.

Higgins, R., Hartley, P., & Skelton, A. (2002). Getting the message across: The problem of communicating assessment feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education, 6*(2), 269-274.

Holmes, K., & Papageorgiou, G. (2009). Good, bad and insufficient: Students' expectations, perceptions and uses of feedback. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education, 8*(1), 85-96.

Hunsberger, D., & Ernst, R. (1991). *The art of conducting.* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.

Jagow, S. M. (1998). Women orchestral conductors in America: The struggle for acceptance—An historical view from the nineteenth century to the present. *College Music Symposium, 38*, 126-145.

Joseph, J. (2012). From one culture to another: Years one and two of graduate school for African American women in the stem fields. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 7, 125-142. doi.org/10.28945/1571

Keller, J.C. (1979). *The effects of video tape feedback on the acquisition of selected basic conducting skills* (Order No. 8009299) [Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Labuta, J. (1965). *A theoretical basis for college instrumental conducting courses* (Order No. 6507120) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Labuta, J. A. (1992). *Basic conducting techniques* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Labuta, J. A. (2004). *Basic conducting techniques* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Lawson, K. D. (1984). A woman's place is at the podium. *Music Educators Journal, 70*, 46-49.

Lisk, E. S. (1996). *The creative director: Intangibles of musical performance*. Delray, FL: Meredith Music Publications.

MacLeod, R. B., & Napoles, J. (2012). Preservice teachers' perceptions of teaching effectiveness during teaching episodes with positive and negative feedback. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, *22*(1), 91–102. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083711429851

Maiello, A. (1996). *Conducting: A hands on approach* (2nd ed.). Van Nuys, CA: Belwin-Mills Publishing Corp.

Malta, C. J., & Clair, J. M. (2006). Once a student, now a mentor: Preparing to be a cooperating teacher. *Music Educators Journal, 93*(2), p. 48

Manfredo, J. (2006). Effective time management in ensemble rehearsals. *Music Educators Journal, 93*(2), 42-46.

Manfredo, J. (2008). Factors influencing curricular content for undergraduate instrumental conducting courses. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, (*175), 43-57.

Marrs, S. A. (2016). Development of the student perceptions of writing feedback scale. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 78*, 2-A(E).

Mathers, A. (2008). *How theories of expressive movement and non-verbal communication can enhance expressive conducting at all levels of entering behavior* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Monash University.

McKoy, C. L. (2012). Effects of selected demographic variables on music student teachers' self-reported cross-cultural competence. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 60*(4), 375–394.

McMillan, J. H. (2007). Formative classroom assessment: The key to improving student achievement. In J. McMillan, *Formative classroom assessment: Theory into practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

McMillan, J. H. (2016). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer* (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Mertler, C. A. (2019). *Introduction to educational research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Mohd, N. N. (2013). The effect of instructor feedback on technique of undergraduates studying instrumental conducting. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 141*, 571-576. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.100

Murray, K. C. (1975). The effect of teacher approval/disapproval on musical performance, attentiveness, and attitude of high school choruses. In C. K. Madsen, R. D. Greer, &

C. H. Madsen Jr. (Eds.), *Research in music behavior: Modifying music behavior in the classroom* (pp. 165-181). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

National Association of Schools of Music. (2017). Handbook 2017-18. Retrieved from https://nasm.arts-accredit.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/01/M-2018-19-Handbook-Current-09-30-2019.pdf

Nolan, S. A., & Heinzen, T. (2008). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Worth Publishers.

Non-verbal communication. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/non-verbal-communication.html

Orman, E. K., Price, H. E., & Russell, C. R. (2017). Feasibility of using an augmented immersive virtual reality learning environment to enhance music conducting skills. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 27*(1), 24-35. doi: 10.1177/1057083717697962

Pellegrino, K., Conway, C. M., & Russell, J. A. (2015). Assessment in performance-based secondary music classes. *Music Educators Journal, 102*(1), 48-55. doi: 10.1177/0027432115590183

Pembrook, R., & Craig, C. (2002). Teaching as a profession: Two variations on a theme. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (Eds.), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 786–817). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Persellin, D. (2009). Body language in general music. *General Music Today, 22*(3), 2-3.

Plondke, J. (1992). Prepare yourself for better conducting. *Music Educators Journal, 78*(6), 45–49. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2307/3398383

Price, H. E. (1985). Teaching in rehearsal: It's as easy as 1-2-3. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education, 4*, 11-13.

Price, M., Handley, K., Millar, J., & O'Donovan, B. (2010). Feedback: All that effort, but what is the effect? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(3), 277-289.

Pucciana, D. (1983). Sexism in music education: Survey of the literature, 1972 - 1982. *Music Educators Journal*, *70*, 49-51.

Rae, A. M., & Cochrane, D. K. (2008). Listening to students: How to make written assessment feedback useful. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 9*(3), 217-230.

Roberts, M. J., & Russo, R. (1999). *A student's guide to analysis of variance*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Romines, F. D. (2003). A survey of undergraduate instrumental conducting curricula. *Journal of Band Research, 38*(2), 80-90.

Rowe, A. D., & Wood, L.N. (2008). Student perceptions and preferences for feedback. *Asian Social Science 4*(3):78-88. doi: 10.5539/ass.v4n3p78

Rucker, M. L., & Thomson, S. (2003). Assessing student learning outcomes: An investigation of the relationship among feedback measures. *College Student Journal, 37*(3), 400-404.

Runnels, B. D. (1992). *Practices in the teaching of instrumental conducting at the undergraduate level among colleges and universities in the Upper Midwest* (Order No. 9224630) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Kansas City]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Running, D. J. (2009). Effects of interdisciplinary method for training conductors. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, (181), 7-19.

Sadler, R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. Instructional Science, 18, 119–144.

Shavers, M. C., & Moore, J.L. (2014). Black female voices: Self-presentation strategies in

doctoral programs at predominately white institutions. *Journal of College Student Development, 55*(4), 391-407. doi: 10.1353/csd.2014.0040

Sheldon, D. A., & Hartley, L. A. (2012). What color is your baton, girl? Gender and ethnicity in band conducting. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, *192*, 39-52. doi: 10.5406/bulcouresmusedu.192.0039

Silvey, B. A. (2011). Undergraduate music majors' perceptions of instrumental conducting curricula. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 21*(1), 27-38. doi: 10.1177/1057083710387521

Silvey, B. A., & Baumgartner, C. M. (2016). Undergraduate conductors' and conducting teachers' perceptions of basic conducting efficacy. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education, 34*(3), 24-32. doi: 10.1177/8755123314554809

Silvey, B. A., & Major, M. L. (2014). Undergraduate music education majors' perceptions of their development as conductors: Insights from a basic conducting course. *Research Studies in Music Education, 36*(1), 75-89. doi:10.1177/1321103X14523532

Silvey, B. A., & Montemayor, M. (2014). Effects of internal and external focus of attention on novices' rehearsal evaluations. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 62*(2), 161-174. doi: 10.1177/0022429414530434

Single, N. A. (1990). An exploratory study of pacing in the instrumental rehearsal. *Contributions to Music Education*, (17), 32–43.

Strobart, G., & Gipps, C. (1997). *Assessment: A teacher's guide to the issues*. London, England: Hodder and Stoughton.

Sweeny, M. R. (1999). Relating revision skills to teacher commentary. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 27*(2), 213-218.

Tollins, J. (2013). Assessment and direction through nonlexical vocalizations in music instruction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 46*(1), 47-64. doi: 10.1080/08351813.2013.753721

Ulrich, J. (2009). Preparing the conductor as teacher. *Music Educators Journal, 95*(3), 48–52. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0027432108330798

Vakalahi, H.F.O., Sermon, M., Richardson, A., Dillard, V., & Moncrief, A. (2014). Do you see me? The complex experiences of women of color MSW students. *Intercultural Education, 25*(5), 418-427. doi: 10.1080/14675986.2104.967973

Weaver, M. R. (2006). Do students value feedback? Student perceptions of tutors' written responses. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(3), 379-394.

Wesolowski, B. C. (2015). Tracking student achievement in music performance: Developing student learning objectives for growth model assessments. *Music Educators Journal, 102*(1), 39–47. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0027432115589352

Whitaker, J. A. (2011). High school band students' and directors' perceptions of verbal and nonverbal teaching behaviors. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 59*(3), 290-309.

Worthy, D. M. (2005). The effects on self—evaluation on the timing of teacher and student behaviors in lab rehearsals. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 15*(1), 8–14. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/10570837050150010103

Verbal Communication Skills. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.skillsyouneed.com/ips/verbal-communication.html

Yarbrough, C. (1975). Effect of magnitude of conductor behavior on students in selected mixed choruses. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 23*(2), 134-146. doi:10.2307/3345286

Yabrough, C. (1987). The relationship of behavioral self-assessment to the achievement of basic conducting skills. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 35*(3), 183-189. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2307/3344960

Yarbrough, C., & Hendel, C. (1993). The effect of sequential patterns on rehearsal evaluations of high school and elementary students. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 41*(3), 246-257.

Yarbrough, C., Wapnick, J., & Kelly, R. (1979). Effect of videotape feedback techniques on performance, verbalization, and attitude of being conductors. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 27*(2), 103-112. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2307/3344896

Zirkman, R. A. (1984). *Review of educational objectives for conducting classes for the undergraduate through the doctoral degree* (Order No. 8423047) [Doctoral Dissertation, Ball State University]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

APPENDIX A

IRB APPROVAL

Auburn University Human Research Protection Program

EXEMPTION REVIEW APPLICATION

For information or help completing this form, contact: **THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE,**
Location: 115 Ramsay Hall **Phone:** 334-844-5966 **Email:** IRBAdmin@auburn.edu

Submit completed application and supporting material as one attachment to IRBsubmit@auburn.edu.

1. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION **Date** July 23, 2019

a. Project Title Developing Successful Conductors: A Survey of Feedback Methods for Undergraduate Instrumental Conducting Courses

b. Principal Investigator LaToya Webb Degree(s) Doctor of Philosophy
Rank/Title Ph.D. Candidate Department/School Curriculum and Teaching/College of Ed.
Phone Number _____ AU Email law0065@auburn.edu

Faculty Principal Investigator (required if PI is a student) Dr. Nancy H. Barry
Title Professor and Coordinator, Music Ed Department/School Curriculum and Teaching/College of Ed.
Phone Number 334-844-6787 AU Email nhb0002@auburn.edu

Dept Head David Virtue Department/School Curriculum and Teaching/College of Ed.
Phone Number 334-844-4434 AU Email dcv0004@auburn.edu

c. Project Personnel (other PI) – Identify all individuals who will be involved with the conduct of the research and include their role on the project. Role may include design, recruitment, consent process, data collection, data analysis, and reporting. Attach a table if needed for additional personnel.

Personnel Name _____ Degree (s) _____
Rank/Title _____ Department/School _____
Role _____
AU affiliated? ☐ YES ☐ NO If no, name of home institution _____
Plan for IRB approval for non-AU affiliated personnel? _____

Personnel Name _____ Degree (s) _____
Rank/Title _____ Department/School _____
Role _____
AU affiliated? ☐ YES ☐ NO If no, name of home institution _____
Plan for IRB approval for non-AU affiliated personnel? _____

Personnel Name _____ Degree (s) _____
Rank/Title _____ Department/School _____
Role _____
AU affiliated? ☐ YES ☐ NO If no, name of home institution _____
Plan for IRB approval for non-AU affiliated personnel? _____

d. Training – Have all Key Personnel completed CITI human subjects training (including elective modules related to this research) within the last 3 years? YES ■ NO ☐

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this Document for use from 10/16/2019 to --------
Protocol # 19-420 EX 1910

APPENDIX B

INFORMATION LETTER

AUBURN UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

CURRICULUM & TEACHING

INFORMATION LETTER
for a Research Study entitled
"Developing Successful Conductors: A Survey of Feedback Methods for Undergraduate Instrumental Conducting Courses"

You are invited to participate in a research study that will survey instructors of undergraduate instrumental conducting about various methods of feedback (verbal/non-verbal) provided to students. The study is being conducted by Ms. LaToya Webb, Ph.D. in Music Education Candidate under the supervision of Dr. Nancy H. Barry, Professor of Music Education in the Auburn University Department of Curriculum and Teaching. You are invited to participate because you are an instructor of an undergraduate instrumental conducting course and are age 19 or older.

What will be involved if you participate? Your participation is completely voluntary. If you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete an anonymous online survey hosted by Qualtrics about your experience and perceptions as an instructor, your school and course characteristics, and your demographic profile. You can complete the survey on any electronic device (i.e. smartphone, desktop, laptop, tablet, etc.). Your total time commitment will be approximately 7-10 minutes.

Are there any risks or discomforts? There are no risks or discomforts associated with participating in this survey. Your participation is completely voluntary, and all responses are anonymous. While survey responses will be completely anonymous, there is a slight risk of breach of confidentiality regarding the email membership list from the HBCU-NBDC. I will delete this list as soon as the study is complete.

Are there any benefits to yourself or others? If you participate in this study, you may send Ms. Webb a request for a copy of the results, which may help you gain a better understanding of best methods for providing feedback in your conducting course. As a result of your participation, future implications for research may be made about music instruction, music education curriculum, and feedback in conducting courses.

Will you receive compensation for participating? There is no compensation for participation.

Are there any costs? Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There are no costs to you for participating.

If you change your mind about participating, you can withdraw at any time by closing your browser window. If you choose to withdraw, your data can be withdrawn as long as it is identifiable. Once you have submitted anonymous data, it cannot be withdrawn since it will be unidentifiable. Your decision about whether or not to participate or to stop participating will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University or the Department of Curriculum and Teaching.

Any data obtained in connection with this study will remain anonymous. This is an anonymous survey. We will protect your privacy and the data you provide by reporting all findings without any personal identifiers. Information collected through your participation may be used to fulfill educational requirements, published in a professional journal, and/or presented at a professional meeting.

If you have questions about this study, please contact Ms. LaToya Webb at law0065@auburn.edu or Dr. Nancy Barry at nhb0002@auburn.edu. Thank you in advance for your time in supporting this important endeavor.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Research Compliance or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334) 844-5966 or e-mail at IRBadmin@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION ABOVE, YOU MUST DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. IF YOU DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE, PLEASE PROCEED TO THE SURVEY BY CLICKING THE ORANGE ARROW BELOW IN THE LOWER RIGHT CORNER. YOU MAY PRINT A COPY OF THIS LETTER TO KEEP.

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this Document for use from October 16, 2019 to October 15, 2020. Protocol # 19-420 EX 1910

APPENDIX C

INVITATION EMAIL

Subject: Research Survey: Undergraduate Instrumental Conducting Feedback Methods

Dear Colleague,

I hope your semester is going well. My name is LaToya Webb, Ph.D. Music Education candidate and Graduate Teaching Assistant at Auburn University. I am writing to ask for your help with my research study titled "Developing Successful Conductors: A Survey of Feedback Methods for Undergraduate Instrumental Conducting Courses." Please consider participating in my brief online survey. My goal for this survey is to learn about the various methods of verbal and nonverbal feedback. I will compare and contrast perceptions of feedback by instructors' attributes, school, and course characteristics. I am recruiting current instructors of undergraduate instrumental conducting courses for this study. (More information on the topic is at the bottom of this email)

The survey should take no more than 15 minutes.

There are no risks or discomforts associated with participating in this survey. There is no compensation for participating. Your participation is completely voluntary, and all responses are anonymous.

Thank you for your consideration and time!

PLEASE FEEL FREE to forward this email and link to any colleague currently teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting who you think may have relevant experiences to share.

To begin the survey, click on this Link:

https://auburn.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8e5UDbFX4xfoX9H

All the best,

LaToya Webb
law0065@auburn.edu
Ph.D. Candidate, Music Education
Auburn University

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Providing conducting students feedback to learn and develop is one of the essential roles of conducting instructors. Many young conductors feel unprepared or need various opportunities to learn, recognize their strengths and weaknesses, and improve. The ability to communicate and lead as a conductor is one of the highly most used performance mediums in the profession.

There is a plethora of research about undergraduate conducting courses, curricula, practices, techniques, and perceptions of instructors and students. However, there is a lack of research on verbal and nonverbal methods of feedback provided in these courses. Scholars have addressed the need for feedback in conducting courses for over 40 years. We all practice various methods of feedback in our conducting courses. Our community would benefit from such a discussion. The purpose of my study is to learn about the various methods of verbal (spoken/written) and nonverbal feedback and to compare and contrast instructors' perceptions of feedback by instructor attributes, school, and course characteristics.

APPENDIX D

REMNDER EMAIL #1

Subject: Your Voice Matters: Survey for current instructors of undergraduate instrumental conducting

Dear Colleague,

I hope your winter break is winding down peacefully, and you are looking forward to the spring semester! As you reflect on your teaching from this year, please consider participating in my online survey. Two weeks ago, I sent an invitation e-mail message about my research study titled "Developing Successful Conductors: A Survey of Feedback Methods for Undergraduate Instrumental Conducting Courses." I am recruiting current instructors of undergraduate instrumental conducting courses to share their experiences with and feelings toward providing various forms of feedback.

There are no risks or discomforts associated with participating in this survey. There is no compensation for participating. Your participation is completely voluntary, and all responses are anonymous.

If you have completed the survey, thank you. Because the survey is anonymous, I have no way of knowing who has completed it. If you have not had an opportunity to take the survey, I would appreciate your time and support. This survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete.

PLEASE FEEL FREE to forward this email and link to any colleague currently teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting who you think may have relevant experiences to share.

I hope that providing you with the link to the survey makes it easy for you to respond. To begin the survey, click on this Link:

https://auburn.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8e5UDbFX4xfoX9H

Sincerely,

LaToya Webb
law0065@auburn.edu
Ph.D. Candidate, Music Education
Auburn University

APPENDIX E

REMINDER EMAIL #2

Subject: Final Survey Call: What feedback methods do you use in your undergraduate instrumental conducting course?

Dear Colleagues,

Recently I sent an e-mail message asking for your participation in my research study titled "Developing Successful Conductors: A Survey of Feedback Methods for Undergraduate Instrumental Conducting Courses." I am recruiting current instructors of undergraduate instrumental conducting courses to share their experiences with and feelings toward providing various forms of feedback.

There are no risks or discomforts associated with participating in this survey. There is no compensation for participating. Your participation is completely voluntary, and all responses are anonymous.

Thank you to those who have completed the survey. Because the survey is anonymous, I have no way of knowing who has completed it. I truly appreciate your time and support. If you have not completed the survey, I would like to ask for your consideration. It should take about 15 focused minutes to complete.

PLEASE FEEL FREE to forward this email and link to any colleague currently teaching undergraduate instrumental conducting who you think may have relevant experiences to share.

To begin the survey, click on this Link:

https://auburn.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8e5UDbFX4xfoX9H

Sincerely,

LaToya Webb
law0065@auburn.edu
Ph.D. Candidate, Music Education
Auburn University

APPENDIX F

UNDERGRADUATE CONDUCTING FEEDBACK SURVEY

Introduction

1. Do you currently teach Undergraduate Instrumental Conducting?
    - Yes
    - No

School Characteristics

2. What is your institution type?
    - 2-year Private
    - 2-year Public
    - 4-year Private
    - 4-year Public

3. In which U.S. region is your institution located?
    - Midwest
    - Northeast
    - Southeast
    - Southwest
    - West

Methods of Feedback

4. Please indicate how frequently you provide the undergraduate conducting students the following methods of spoken (oral) feedback during your course?

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - Spoken (in-class/in-person during instructional time)
    - Spoken (one-on-one feedback-office hours)
    - Spoken (video recordings)
    - Spoken peer-review
    - Spoken checklist
    - Spoken (audio recordings)
    - Spoken self-assessment

5. If not listed above, please share any other methods of spoken (oral) feedback that you use in your undergraduate conducting course and indicate how frequently you used them.

   Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
   - Other-please specify
   - Other-please specify
   - Other-please specify

6. Please indicate how frequently you provide the undergraduate conducting students the following methods of written feedback during your course?

   Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
   - Written (typed comments through a course management system [i.e., Blackboard, Canvas, etc.])
   - Written (through an objective conducting rubric)
   - Written peer-review
   - Written checklist
   - Written self-assessment

7. If not listed above, please share any other methods of written feedback that you use in your undergraduate conducting course and indicate how frequently you used them.

   Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
   - Other-please specify
   - Other-please specify
   - Other-please specify

8. Please indicate how frequently you provide the undergraduate conducting students the following methods of nonverbal feedback during your course?

   Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
   - Facial Expressions (feedback through emotions)
   - Modeling (showing examples, showing gestures, conducting style/pattern, etc.)
   - Human sounds (laugh, grunt, groan, sigh)
   - Body language (posture, presence, etc.)

9. If not listed above, please share any other methods of nonverbal feedback that you use in your undergraduate conducting course and indicate how frequently you used them.

   Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
   - Other-please specify
   - Other-please specify
   - Other-please specify

Perceptions of Feedback

10. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements on general feedback.
    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - Providing feedback makes me feel like I am a good instructor
    - I feel it is important to provide feedback regardless of students' performance in class
    - My students' performance improves from my provided feedback
    - Feedback is important if my students receive a letter grade
    - Feedback is important if my students receive a number grade
    - I look forward to providing my students with feedback

11. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements on general feedback.

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - Feedback I provide my students encourages me to give better instruction the next time
    - Feedback I provide my students is important for their learning and development as a conductor
    - Students understand the letter grade they received based on the feedback I provide
    - Students understand the number grade they receive based on the feedback I provide
    - I enjoy providing feedback to my students

12. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements on spoken (oral) feedback.

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - I prefer to use spoken (oral) video recorded feedback to help my students learn
    - I prefer to use spoken (oral) audio recorded feedback to help my students learn
    - I prefer to use spoken (oral) feedback during one-on-one sessions to help my students learn
    - I prefer to use spoken (oral) feedback during class because it helps my students learn

- Spoken (oral) feedback is better because I can clarify any issues with the student
- I am encouraging my students when I provide spoken (oral)feedback
- I prefer to use spoken (oral) checklist feedback to help my students learn
- I prefer to use spoken (oral) peer-review feedback to help my students learn
- It is easier for me to provide spoken (oral) feedback to students than written feedback in my class
- It is easier for students to understand my feedback if I orally tell them instead of writing those feedback down

13. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements on spoken (oral) feedback.

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - I enjoy providing spoken (oral) feedback during class
    - I enjoy providing spoken (oral) feedback with use of an objective conducting rubric
    - I enjoy providing spoken (oral) feedback during one-on-one sessions
    - I enjoy providing spoken (oral) feedback through a course management system (audio, video)
    - Spoken (oral) feedback is more important than a grade
    - All spoken (oral) feedback is important
    - I make better connections with my students when I use spoken (oral) feedback

14. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements on written feedback.

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - I prefer to use written feedback during one-on-one sessions to help my students learn
    - I prefer to use written feedback during class because it helps my students learn
    - I prefer to use written feedback through a course management system (Canvas, Blackboard) to help my students learn
    - Written feedback is better because I can clarify any issues with the student
    - I am encouraging my students when I provide written feedback
    - I prefer to use written checklist feedback to help my students learn
    - I prefer to use written peer review feedback to help my students learn
    - It is easier for me to provide written feedback to students than spoken (oral) feedback in my class it is easier for students to understand my feedback if I write it down for them instead of orally tell them

15. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements on written feedback.

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - I enjoy providing written feedback during class
    - I enjoy providing written feedback through an objective conducting rubric
    - I enjoy providing written feedback during one-on-one sessions
    - I enjoy providing written feedback through a course management system
    - Written feedback is more important than a grade
    - All written feedback is important
    - I make better connections with my students when I use written feedback

16. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements on nonverbal feedback.

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time,5- Never
    - I prefer to use nonverbal feedback during one-on-one sessions to help my students learn
    - I prefer to use nonverbal feedback during class because it helps my students learn
    - I prefer to use facial expressions to help my students learn
    - I prefer to use modeling (showing examples, showing gestures, conducting style/pattern) to help my students learn
    - I prefer to use body language (posture, presence) feedback to help my students learn
    - I prefer to use human sounds (laugh, grunt, groan, sigh) to help my students learn

17. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements on nonverbal feedback.

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - The use of modeling (showing examples, showing gestures, conducting style/pattern) feedback is better because I can clarify any issues with the student
    - The use of human sounds (laugh, grunt, groan, sigh) are better because I can clarify any issues with the student
    - The use of body language (presence, posture) feedback is better because I can clarify any issues with the student
    - I am encouraging my students when I provide nonverbal feedback
    - It is easier for me to provide nonverbal feedback to students than verbal (spoken/written) feedback in my class
    - It is easier for students to understand my feedback if I act/show them instead of verbally (spoken/written) tell them

18. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements on nonverbal feedback.

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - I enjoy providing nonverbal feedback during class
    - I enjoy providing nonverbal feedback during one-on-one sessions
    - Nonverbal feedback is more important than a grade
    - All nonverbal feedback is important
    - I make better connections with my students when I use nonverbal feedback

Course Characteristics

19. How many total minutes does the undergraduate conducting course meet per week?

20. What is the maximum capacity (i.e. how many seats are available for enrollment) for your conducting course?

21. Please indicate whether you use the below activities in your undergraduate conducting course and select the appropriate rating for how frequently you provide spoken (oral) feedback for each activity.

    Do you use the below activities? (Yes/No)

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - Error detection exercises
    - Singing parts of the score by class members
    - Conducting and singing parts of the score by the student conductor
    - Students conduct to audio recordings for practice
    - Students conduct to audio recordings for exams/finals

22. Please indicate whether you use the below activities in your undergraduate conducting course and select the appropriate rating for how frequently you provide spoken (oral) feedback for each activity.

    Do you use the below activities? (Yes/No)

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - Students conduct in-class peers
    - Students conduct lab band
    - Students conduct institution ensemble
    - Students transpose scores/instrumental parts
    - Laban Movement Analysis
    - Dalcroze Eurhythmics

23. Please indicate whether you use the below activities in your undergraduate conducting course and select the appropriate rating for how frequently you provide spoken (oral) feedback for each activity.

    Do you use the below activities? (Yes/No)

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - Alexander Technique
    - Using Piano to perform score reductions
    - Student observation of professional conductors in rehearsal/performance
    - Student journal on rehearsal/performance observations
    - Other- please specify
    - Other- please specify

24. Please indicate whether you use the below activities in your undergraduate conducting course and select the appropriate rating for how frequently you provide written feedback for each activity.

    Do you use the below activities? (Yes/No)

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - Error detection exercises
    - Singing parts of the score by class members
    - Conducting and singing parts of the score by the student conductor
    - Students conduct to audio recordings for practice
    - Students conduct to audio recordings for exams/finals

25. Please indicate whether you use the below activities in your undergraduate conducting course and select the appropriate rating for how frequently you provide written feedback for each activity.

    Do you use the below activities? (Yes/No)

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - Students conduct in-class peers
    - Students conduct lab band
    - Students conduct institution ensemble
    - Students transpose scores/instrumental parts
    - Laban Movement Analysis
    - Dalcroze Eurhythmics

26. Please indicate whether you use the below activities in your undergraduate conducting course and select the appropriate rating for how frequently you provide written feedback for each activity.

    Do you use the below activities? (Yes/No)

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - Alexander Technique
    - Using Piano to perform score reductions
    - Student observation of professional conductors in rehearsal/performance
    - Student journal on rehearsal/performance observations
    - Other- please specify
    - Other- please specify

27. Please indicate whether you use the below activities in your undergraduate conducting course and select the appropriate rating for how frequently you provide nonverbal feedback for each activity.
    Do you use the below activities? (Yes/No)

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - Error detection exercises
    - Singing parts of the score by class members
    - Conducting and singing parts of the score by the student conductor
    - Students conduct to audio recordings for practice
    - Students conduct to audio recordings for exams/finals

28. Please indicate whether you use the below activities in your undergraduate conducting course and select the appropriate rating for how frequently you provide nonverbal feedback for each activity.

    Do you use the below activities? (Yes/No)

    Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never
    - Students conduct in-class peers
    - Students conduct lab band
    - Students conduct institution ensemble
    - Students transpose scores/instrumental parts
    - Laban Movement Analysis
    - Dalcroze Eurhythmics

29. Please indicate whether you use the below activities in your undergraduate conducting course and select the appropriate rating for how frequently you provide nonverbal feedback for each activity.

Do you use the below activities? (Yes/No)

Scale: 1-Always, 2-Most of the time, 3-About half the time, 4-Less than half the time, 5-Never

- Alexander Technique
- Using Piano to perform score reductions
- Student observation of professional conductors in rehearsal/performance
- Student journal on rehearsal/performance observations
- Other- please specify
- Other- please specify

Demographic Profile

30. Which category reflects your primary instrument?
    - Brass
    - Keyboard
    - Percussion
    - String
    - Voice
    - Woodwind
    - Other- please specify

31. What is your highest earned degree?
    - Bachelors
    - Artist Diploma
    - Masters
    - Education Specialist
    - PhD
    - EdD
    - DMA
    - Other- please specify

32. Please indicate your organization affiliation. (Check all that apply)
    - CBDNA
    - HBCU-NBDC
    - Other- Member of a Choral Organization
    - Other- Member of an Orchestral Organization

33. Choose the best option that reflects your current title.
    - Graduate Teaching Assistant
    - Instructor/Lecturer
    - Assistant Professor
    - Associate Professor
    - Professor
    - Clinical Assistant Professor

- Clinical Associate Professor
- Clinical Professor
- Other- please specify

34. What is the track of your current position?
    - Tenured
    - Pre-tenured
    - I am not in a tenure-track position

35. How many years have you taught undergraduate instrumental conducting courses?

36. Which gender do you best identify with?
    - Male
    - Female
    - I identify differently
    - Prefer not to answer

37. Which ethnic group do you best identify with?
    - American Indian or Alaska Native
    - Asian
    - Black or African American
    - Hispanic/LatinX/Spanish
    - Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
    - White or Caucasian
    - Other- please specify
    - Prefer not to answer

38. How old are you in years?