

ASSESSING THE LEADERSHIP POTENTIAL OF CHORAL CONDUCTORS

BY

CHRIS LUDWA

Submitted to the faculty of the
Jacobs School of Music in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree,
Doctor of Music,
Indiana University
December, 2012

Accepted by the faculty of the Jacobs School of Music,
Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Doctor of Music.

Peter Miksza, Research Director

Carmen Tellez, Chairperson

William Jon Gray

Katherine Strand

Copyright © 2012
Chris Ludwa

Acknowledgments

My greatest debt of gratitude goes to Dr. Peter Miksza, who has been incomparably knowledgeable, accessible, and inspirational in his own leadership of this process. I also want to thank Estelle Jorgensen, for rekindling my passion for music education, and Tim Baldwin from the Kelley School of Business, for embracing the idea of something different and supporting it in spirit, consultation, and good humor.

I'd also like to thank the mentors in my conducting career, each of whom have left an indelible mark on my own leadership in orchestral, choral, and theatrical works. My sincere thanks to Robert Stoll, Michael Schwartzkopf, Carmen Tellez, William Gray, Robert Porco, David Bowden, Stephen Pratt, Don Neuen, Dan Prior, and Robert Shaw for their influence on my leadership, both on and off the podium.

I offer thanks to my wife Melissa and my parents Ray and Nancy, who continue to be an unending source of joy, perspective, and support for my quest toward self-actualization and for their constant reminders of what is important to me.

Finally, I offer deepest gratitude to Bob Docking, who has embodied leadership and friendship in a way that only a genuinely transformational person can.

Assessing the Leadership Potential of Choral Conductors

When it comes to assessing the leadership aspects of conducting a music ensemble, the traditional focus is musical skills and knowledge, past experience, and observation, with little true understanding of leadership skills. In contrast, organizational science and psychology offer numerous methods of assessing leadership potential. A tool informed by these research disciplines would be helpful to choral organizations that are seeking a new director or those leaders wishing to assess their own leadership skills. In this study, I discuss the dynamics of leadership in the context of choral ensembles, examine several leadership aptitude assessments developed in fields other than music, and design a unique assessment approach specifically tailored to choral organizations. The study involved a sample of choral conductors ($N=20$) at liberal arts and state colleges in the United States who are leading successful choral programs. Participating conductors completed an anonymous survey, as did students in one of their ensembles ($N=437$) and colleagues from the school at which they worked ($N=19$). The answers on the three related survey respondent groups were compared in order to determine the correlations between perceived leadership style from the point of view of the conductor, student, and colleague. The validity of the assessment was tested by administering it to a sample of choral conductors in liberal arts colleges and comparing their results with questionnaire data gathered from other stakeholders (singers and colleagues). The study was designed to inform an effective approach for beginning to assess leadership attributes in a conductor and how self-perception relates to perception of leadership by singers and colleagues.

Using Cronbach's Alpha, analyses showed strong reliability on the measures of magnitude, better than average reliability for certain subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) of Avolio and Bass which were used in the study, and strong reliability

for the composite scales of the MLQ, specifically those determining transformational and transactional leadership capabilities. Results show strong correlations between a conductor's ratings on magnitude and certain communication skills with their own ratings of skills in transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and inspirational motivation. When student assessments of various leadership attributes were compared with those from other students, strong correlation existed, but when student assessments of the conductor were compared with similar self-assessments performed by the conductor, either a smaller, zero, or negative correlation occurred between the transformational, transactional, and inspirational motivation scores. When compared with conductor scores on the same measures as well as others believed to be related to good leadership, colleague assessments of the conductor showed either a small or nonexistent correlation within the conductors' own ratings of themselves.

The study explores how the MLQ, magnitude, and communication assessments used within might be applied to conductors to determine leadership potential and to compare the conductor's results with students' or colleagues' assessments of them. The findings suggests that the elusive nature of leadership is hard to describe for ensemble conductors, and that overall success of the organization may or may not be connected to the conductor's leadership ratings using one of the measures within the present study. Finally, conductors, just as any other leader, should be aware that one's own perception may not reflect the experience of followers. Both self-awareness and awareness of the type of leadership modality needed in a situation might create a more closely correlated assessment of the leader's ability to lead from the perspective of the conductor, singers, and colleagues.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | Page |
|---------|---|
| 1 | INTRODUCTION 1 |
| | Statement of the Problem. 2 |
| | Purpose of the Study. 3 |
| | Current Research 3 |
| | Music education studies 3 |
| | Conducting studies 4 |
| | Leadership studies 7 |
| | Research Questions 9 |
| | Definitions 10 |
| | Delimitations 12 |
| 2 | REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 14 |
| | Introduction 14 |
| | A Working Definition of Leadership 15 |
| | Dynamics of a Musical Organization 15 |
| | Research on Effective Conducting and Music Education . . 19 |
| | Leadership Theories and Their Connection to Conducting . 28 |
| 3 | METHODOLOGY 36 |
| | Sample 36 |
| | Reliability & Validity 40 |
| | Procedure 42 |
| 4 | RESULTS 44 |

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| 5 | CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER STUDY | 55 |
| | APPENDICES | 69 |
| | REFERENCES | 83 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE | Page |
|-------|---|
| 1 | Descriptive statistics for all variables and participant groups 45 |
| 2 | Relationship between magnitude, music-related MLQ and non-music related MLQ scores 47 |
| 3 | Relationship between conductor communication and music- related MLQ scores 48 |
| 4 | Relationship between conductor clarity and music-related MLQ scores 48 |
| 5 | Relationship between conductor and student responses regarding conductor’s feedback 49 |
| 6 | Relationship of conductor and colleague responses of non- music related MLQ scores 50 |
| 7 | Relationship between student and conductor responses regarding magnitude and music-related MLQ scores 51 |
| 8 | Relationship between conductor music-related MLQ scores and student communication responses 52 |
| 9 | Relationship between conductor music-related MLQ scores and conductor overall success responses 53 |
| 10 | Relationship between conductor music-related MLQ score and student overall success responses 53 |
| 11 | Relationship between conductor music-related MLQ scores and colleague overall success responses 53 |
| 12 | Relationship between conductor, student, and colleague overall success scores 54 |

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Organizations are experiencing an unprecedented rate of change due to globalization, technological advances, and movement toward market-driven decision-making (Schneider, 2002). This includes organizations such as orchestras and choirs for which a hierarchical model of leadership is typically followed (Das & Teng, 1998; Von Wrochem, 1971).

Academic freedom has historically protected the definition of success in a collegiate musical ensemble from being tied to concert attendance or monetary gain such as donations.

However, as funding sources for non-profits and universities become more closely tied to the political landscape, research-based justifications for academic programs and ensemble success are critical to their survival. As a result of these dynamics, it is increasingly important for performing ensembles of all types to hire leaders with a broad range of leadership skills beyond musical understanding. In today's society, conductors must have the ability to navigate higher education administration, seek funding for programs, justify the organization's importance and so on, each of which requires leadership attributes that go beyond the nuance in the score.

Many types of leadership styles can be effective in an organization. For example, leaders can be labeled as transactional or transformative depending on their style (Podsakoff, 1991). Leadership styles can also be measured with regard to abilities to inspire, create intellectual stimulation, and take consideration for individual followers (Avolio & Bass, 2004). In the realm of music education, teaching effectiveness has been studied, showing behavioral differences based on teaching style (Forsythe, 1975; Kuhn, 1975; Price, 1983; Yarbrough & Price, 1981). Magnitude and communication skills have also been assessed, each having an impact on teacher effectiveness in music education (Yarbrough, 1975;

Skadsem, 1997). Finally, studies of conducting have shown that both effects of intensity in conducting gesture and of the hierarchical structure of the leader/subordinate relationship in musical ensembles have had a bearing on the success of a leader (Byo, 1990; Tjosvold, 1984). The combination of research from these disciplines could be used to create an approach for assessing leadership potential of conductors.

Within a choral ensemble, effective leadership methods can vary as a function of age of singers, professional versus amateur singers, experience level of the singers, history of the organization, cultural differences in conductors and singers, and size of the ensemble. Given this diversity, it is important to identify best practices in leadership to empower the ensemble to achieve not just musical, but organizational strength that can lead to better quality performances, a more enjoyable experience for the participants, and long-term sustainability of the ensemble. It is important that researchers work to identify these best practices or common leadership attributes with a goal of strengthening choral organizations in the future.

Statement of the Problem

Research on the topic of leadership within the fields of conducting and music education exists, but the design and implementation of an assessment tool of leadership skills in conductors seems to be limited. One research area that might prove helpful is studies of musical organizations that are conductorless (Benzecry, 2006; Faulkner, 1973; Kodyakov, 2007). It may also be helpful to turn to research on choral music that is focused on the conductor as teacher (Gumm, 1983; White, 1982) or studies on effective conducting gestures and choral methods instruction that could better inform leadership of choral ensembles as to how to teach (Byo, 1990; Persson, 2000). An intentional, well-organized combination of the findings of these studies along with general leadership research could

improve the strength and focus of choral organizations in a way that transcends their performances.

Purpose of the Study

My study created and pilot-tested a measurement approach for assessing choral leadership ability. This approach drew from research in conducting, music education, and business in order to address leadership issues and improve college music ensembles. The measurement approach may also have secondary benefits including: providing feedback to conductors about their own leadership skills, improving conductor training programs at colleges and universities, and strengthening the potential connection and communication between conducting and music education disciplines.

Current Research

Music education studies

A comparison of the fields of music education and conducting shows music education leading the way in the systematic collection of data and experiments designed to increase effectiveness of its practitioners. For the purposes of this study, the line between music education and conducting is one that could be intentionally blurred for the intention of informing training for future singers, instrumentalists, and leaders of music ensembles.

One attribute of effectiveness studied in music leadership is the *magnitude* that the conductor displays. This term refers to the synthesis of eight different behaviors that they termed ‘magnitude’ which included body movement, pitch, voice volume, speed, activity, eye contact, gestures and facial expressions (e.g., Yarbrough, 1975). Students typically remain more attentive during high magnitude conditions (Yarbrough, 1975). Similar to magnitude, *enthusiasm* is an important tool for a conductor, but functions independently (Collins, 1978). Thus, while enthusiasm may be obvious in the conductor’s personality (i.e. Leonard

Bernstein), research also shows that magnitude can be independently exhibited in the conducting gesture even if it is not reflected in the conductor's personality (Byo, 1990). Magnitude can save time in rehearsal by letting conductors communicate nuance in the music in a way other than by explanation. Further, magnitude is an attribute that could allow a conductor to communicate *during* a performance when explanations would be inappropriate.

Researchers have also found that *communication style* affects music teacher effectiveness. A powerful example of communication is eye contact, a quality with unrealized potential for conducting success (VanWeelden, 2002). This is corroborated with literature outside the conducting field which notes that eye contact can aid in the giving, receiving, and interpreting of verbal and non-verbal messages (Skadsem, 1997). It is also a powerful tool for connecting with an individual on a personal level, establishing a sense of trust and communication that may create more long-term commitment to an organization.

A combination of positive and negative *feedback* may also affect achievement of musicians, and some studies show that ensembles will tolerate negative feedback when it is aimed at the music itself and not the individual (Duke, 1999). This phenomenon may explain how a conductor like Arturo Toscanini or Fritz Reiner could generally be negative in their feedback, but able to achieve high results. Of similar explanation, some authors suggest that the reinforcing nature of music-making itself may counteract the affects of positive or negative feedback (Forsythe, 1977; Madsen & Alley, 1979; Madsen & Duke, 1985b).

Conducting Studies

Outside of the collegiate setting, a lack of institutional leadership is a threat to the long-term health of musical organizations. In a study by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation (Wichterman, 1997), 28 orchestras of various sizes were surveyed to identify organizational

problems. Participants generally reported that the lack of artistic leadership was their greatest problem. Some of this can be attributed to the absenteeism of music directors that hold numerous positions, but it is perhaps also rooted in a lack of leadership training for conductors. It is difficult to find studies that suggest that leadership alone can improve effectiveness of an organization. Most organizations do not teach leadership skills, so assessing leadership capacity when employees have not been given any guidance is unfair. If training for future leaders of non-musical organizations has shown an effect on these organizations, we can assume this would have the same effect on ensembles.

Directivity refers to a conductor offering explicit instructions as to how to play instead of general suggestions of the character of a piece. Just as any leader must be able to assess the type of leadership needed in a given moment, one of the challenges for a music director is an understanding of how and when to be *directive* with an ensemble. This depends on the type of musician or singer involved, including their level of experience and training. For example, if a young musician plays the wrong note in a scale, one might need to sing the scale for him or her, but this would be insulting to a professional, to whom the conductor could simply correct the note. Independent of directivity, one assumes that traits like ‘*warmth*’ (defined as approachability or accessibility by followers) have similar effects across musical organizations. In one study, when fifty-six college students took the role of a subordinate and interacted with a leader who conveyed warmth or cold in either directive or nondirective conditions, the students reported being more willing to work again with the director (Tjosvold, 1984). In this study, when warm vs. cold leadership and directive vs. nondirective styles were compared, the participants had the highest success rate at a given task for the leader that was both directive and warm. The participants under the warm leader also reported more satisfaction with their relationship (Tjosvold, 1984). Tjosvold’s findings

further suggest that the directive versus non-directive leadership style is of less importance if the leader conveys warmth in their interactions. This could be put to use whether conducting a professional choral ensemble or freshmen, non-music majors at a university. The attribute of warmth in a leader is important.

It has also been shown that process-oriented directiveness can be more effective than outcome-driven directiveness (Peterson, 1997). Results of this study showed that high degrees of process-oriented directiveness were associated with increased leader support, greater confidence, exemplary group process, and better group decision quality. In contrast, outcome-driven directiveness was associated with decreased group confidence and more defensiveness on the part of individual followers (Peterson, 1997). Unfortunately, directiveness may not take into account the opinions of the followers. Musicians in an ensemble, like workers in any other organization, have ideas of the possibilities in any piece of music. One of their major preoccupations and concerns is the authoritativeness – the controlling force – of a conductor's directives (Faulker, 1973). Similarly, if directives are ill-defined or conceived, the ensemble loses respect for the conductor as their leader. If the conductor does not have a clear sense of the vision or sound they desire for a piece of music, the ensemble will know. Generally, each member of a musical ensemble has a different way to interpret the same piece of music, even within defined performance practice standards. Learning to lead members to a common vision that may not be their own is a challenge for any leader. Like all professionals, musicians jealously guard their own prerogatives and "working prejudices" (Becker, 1963). The true test of charisma and expertise can be found not only in communicative strength and persuasiveness, but also in the responses of organizational subordinates (Weber, 1964). In these cases, it's not enough to understand the music, historical conventions, or how to move one's hands to show it. It

comes down to knowing how to handle each interaction, which is the mark of a great leader in any organization.

In essence, leadership of a musical ensemble can be as much about understanding human motivation as it is about understanding the music. Aside from the technical aspects of musical production, a conductor's task is to meld the unique voices of a choir into a unified ensemble sound. The leader's job is to marshal the talents and efforts of the singers to pursue a common goal which is higher than that of the individual. Being a good leader is far more about understanding followers than the followers understanding the leader. In Wills' (1994) opinion, this is why the great thinkers and artists often influence others with indirect means. The success of a Robert Shaw or similar pillar is equal parts genius and understanding of the human condition. If we look at the great conductors of the last two generations, there are outliers like Arturo Toscanini that exhibited overly directive, even authoritarian, leadership in their roles and had success. However, generations have evolved, and with them our knowledge of leadership has changed. Toscanini was working at a time when scientific knowledge of human motivation was less developed than today. Since then, countless studies of leadership have led us to greater understanding of what motivates workers and what type of environment is more conducive to learning (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992). Harnessing that understanding may help conductors to achieve a greater musical product or increase singer satisfaction in their ensembles.

Leadership Studies

Recognizing the importance of leadership in organizational success, members of the business community have invested heavily in leadership studies. Many of these have been influenced by the learning theories proposed by Bandura (1985) and Turner (1985).

Relationships have also been discovered between an individual's self-concept and the role an

individual plays in a larger organization, making it important to hire leaders who engender high self-concept in their followers (Shamir, 1993). Since many of the issues in team situations revolve around the insecurities of the individuals, increasing the self-concept of team members has a positive effect on the group's achievement, and/or their collective efficacy (Walumbwa, Wang, Lawler, & Shi, 2004). The key to applying these ideas to choral leadership is determining how to train conductors to empower the members of the choir. Efforts such as these may result in higher achievement of artistic goals.

Similar to inspiring the self-concept of followers, researchers have also found a significant predictive relationship between transformational leadership and *emotional intelligence* (Mandell & Pherwani, 2003). Emotional intelligence suggests that similar to intelligence quotient, individuals fall on a continuum of ability to understand social cues and other individuals (Bar-On, 1997). The writings of Daniel Goleman (1995) on the topic have inspired a new interest in the emotional intelligence of leaders of the workplace and its effect on their success. Goleman predicted that emotional intelligence is the most important aspect of leadership, and that the best training in the world and an endless flow of great ideas would not alone produce a great leader (Goleman, 1995). One must assume that on some level, the same must be true for the leader of a musical ensemble.

When evaluating potential leader success, delineating between *transformational* versus *transactional* leadership styles can be helpful. Transactional leaders are task-oriented and less concerned with an overarching vision (Bass, 1990). Transformational leadership, by contrast, is the kind of leadership that causes overall change in the systems, culture, and commitment within an organization. It flows out of transactional leadership but is not limited to single tasks. Leaders who are relationship-focused, seek to understand follower motivation, facilitate less negative emotion, and make stressful tasks seem more manageable tend to

exhibit transformational leadership styles (Yukl, 1998). Transformative leadership also involves analyzing the environment and gaining cooperation and support from both within and outside the organization (Yukl, 1999). One specific trait of transformative leadership is charisma (Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993). Studies also found that the two strongest correlates to charismatic leadership were supportiveness and assuredness (e.g. supreme confidence in one's abilities), and that charismatic leadership involved several different communication styles which included assured, supportive, argumentative, precise, and verbally non-aggressive (DeVries et al, 2009). Determining how to assess a conductor's transformative versus transactional abilities could lead to more organizational strength and success in a musical organization.

Overall, the current study explored a measurement approach for identifying qualities of effective leaders of choral organizations. The design of the measurement approach was informed by best practices and research on leadership in conducting, music education, and business disciplines. The result was a research-based edge that improves the current and future experiences of those in choral ensembles and potentially other types of musical organizations.

Research Questions

- 1) What are the leadership characteristics of choral conductors?
- 2) What are the relationships among conductors' perceived leadership characteristics and music teacher effectiveness as indicated by perceptions of music teacher magnitude?
- 3) What are the relationships among conductors' perceived leadership characteristics and elements of communication style?

- 4) What is the relationship among conductors' perceived leadership skills and their ability to be clear in their conducting gestures?
- 5) What is the relationship between a conductor's perception of feedback style and student perceptions of the same?
- 6) What is the relationship between a conductor's perception about their feedback and their students' or colleagues' perception about their feedback.
- 7) What are the relationships between conductors' perceived leadership characteristics and magnitude and the singers' and colleagues' perceptions?
- 8) What are the relationships among conductors' perceived leadership characteristics and students' perceptions of elements of the conductors' communication style?
- 9) What are the relationships between conductors' perceived leadership characteristics and indicators of organizational success?
- 10) What are the relationships between conductors' perceived leadership characteristics and students' perceptions of indicators of organizational success?
- 11) What are the relationships between conductors' perceived leadership characteristics and colleagues' perceptions of indicators of organizational success?
- 12) What are the relationships between conductors' perceived organizational success and students' perceptions of indicators of organizational success?
- 13) What are the relationships between conductors' perceived leadership characteristics and colleagues' perceptions of indicators of organizational success?

Definitions

Transformational Leadership- Those who “engage the emotional involvement of their followers to build higher levels of identification, commitment and trust in the leader and his or her mission.” Transformational leaders express the importance and values associated with

desired outcomes in ways that are easily understood, while communicating higher levels of expectations for followers (Avolio & Bass, 1988; Conger & Kanungo, 1987). Also, transformational leaders “align followers' personal values and interests with the collective interests of the group/organization” (Bass, 1985).

Transactional Leadership- This is identified as a contractual or exchange process between leaders and followers. The transactional leader identifies specific followers' expectations and provides rewards in exchange for followers' performance (Bass, 1985; Daft, 1999). Although transactional leadership can be quite effective, it does not involve a leader's commitment toward followers' personal development nor does it involve a strong emotional attachment to the leader, based on higher levels of identification and trust (Podsakoff et al., 1991).

Directive Leadership - Directive behavior is a function of the way the leader delegates the tasks associated with the execution of a decision, once it is made. A nondirective or permissive leader holds followers responsible for results, but leaves them free to execute their tasks in any way they choose. A very directive leader, on the other hand, specifies how subordinates are to accomplish their assignments and then follows up closely on all phases of the actual execution as well as the end results (Muczyk, 1987).

Self- Concept- the idea or mental image one has of oneself and one's strengths, weaknesses, status, etc.; self-image (Merriam-Webster).

Charismatic Leadership- Charismatic leaders are individuals who are totally committed to their particular vision and course of action, who have unshakable faith in the rightness of their mission and their eventual success, and who have the ability to communicate this to their followers. Charismatic leaders may or may not be effective in achieving the

organization's goals, but their followers are blindly obedient and unquestioningly loyal (Fiedler, 1996).

Charismatic/Inspirational Leadership- Provides followers with a clear sense of purpose that is energizing; a role model for ethical conduct which builds identification with the leader and his/her articulated vision (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Individualized Consideration- Focuses on understanding the needs of each follower and works continuously to get them to develop to their full potential (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Active-Management by Exception- Focuses on monitoring task execution for any problems that might arise and correcting those problems to maintain current performance levels (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Passive- Avoidant- Tends to react only after problems have become serious to take corrective action and may avoid making any decisions at all (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Delimitations

The assessment was administered to 20 conductors in liberal arts colleges and state universities in the United States that have undergraduate programs in music performance and whose ensembles contain a mix of music majors and non-music majors. Major conservatories were not considered in the study, as the researchers assumed that the heterogeneity of singer in a liberal arts-focused college was a desirable trait in a sample. The conductors each possessed the minimum of a master's degree or equivalent in conducting and were employed in their current position for at least three years.

Surveyed choristers were at least 18 years of age and currently enrolled in a singing ensemble directed by the conductor. Their participation in the survey was completely voluntary and administered through a secure, online survey tool. Choristers were a mix of undergraduate music and non-music majors and choirs ranged from small to large. The

colleagues had worked with the conductor for at least one year. Neither colleague nor student assessment results were available to the conductor. All information was assigned a number to protect the subject's confidential information and was destroyed upon completion of the survey.

I recognize that the organization of the survey did not correlate results of conductor or student response with gender. Also, while cultural differences might skew results on certain items, items were weighted equally and the reliability and validity of the study were found to be high, leading the researcher to believe that the measures were acceptable as an initial assessment tool of conductor leadership potential. Finally, leadership can be a subjective topic, with success defined in part by context, but the researcher maintains that the findings of the present study represent an important exploratory step and have many implications for further research.

CHAPTER 2

Introduction

There is a significant amount of research on the traits of an effective conductor of a musical ensemble (Byo, 1990; Grechesky, 1985; Price, 2006; Price & Chang, 1995; VanWeelden, 2002). Unfortunately, there is very little information available when it comes to studies of leadership and how leadership skills can influence the success of a musical ensemble. In contrast, the world of business has invested heavily in the study of leadership and routinely uses this research to train, hire, and improve leaders. Some of these studies have focused on traits in the leader's personality that might lead to success (DeRue, Nahrgang, Wellman, & Hunphrey, 2011). Other studies have focused on behaviors, which researchers deemed to be more objective and measurable than traits (Hemphill & Coons, 1957; Stogdill, 1963). Still others have focused their inquiry on transformational versus transactional leadership (Bass, 1985; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Parallel research exists within music education literature, suggesting that certain personality traits such as enthusiasm have a positive effect on the effectiveness of the teacher (Collins, 1978; Yarbrough, 1975) or behaviors that exemplify good leadership in the classroom (Madsen, Standley & Cassidy, 1987; Yarbrough, 1999).

Creating a link between research on effective conducting, leadership studies, and best practices in music education could help improve the skills of professional conductors, enhance conductor-training programs, and strengthen the leadership of musical organizations in general. Research relevant to the current study will be discussed in the following order: (a) the definition of leadership used for the purposes of this study; (b) a discussion of the dynamics of musical ensembles; (c) a review of research on effectiveness in conducting from music education; and (d) an introduction of leadership theories that may be

applicable to conductors. Throughout these sections, I will also draw linkages among music education, leadership, and psychological studies.

A Working Definition of Leadership

There are a great number of diverse leadership theories that have arisen in the business field. Several of these theories have much to offer those interested in effective methods of assessment for future musical leaders. For example, there is the notion of leader as manager, which includes the following roles that are part of leadership: figurehead, leader, liaison, monitor, disseminator, spokesman, entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator, and negotiator (Mintzberg, 1973). Jago (1982, 315) defined leadership in the following way:

Leadership is both a process and a property. The process of leadership is the use of non-coercive influence to direct and coordinate the activities of the members of an organized group toward the accomplishment of group objectives. As a property, leadership is the set of qualities or characteristics attributed to those who are perceived to successfully employ such influence.

For many musical organizations, the leader, by nature of position, often has the role of directing musicians due to a natural hierarchical structure of an ensemble. This study seeks to develop a dynamic model focused more on process which will better define the properties of leadership within the field. In the ideal choir or orchestra, the conductor empowers the musicians to lead from within the ensemble, a situation wherein leaders become followers and followers become leaders (Hollander, 1961).

The Dynamics of a Musical Organization

One aspect of leadership in a musical ensemble relates to the relinquishment of an ensemble member's own self-concept in exchange for that of another, which in most cases is

the conductor's. This is consistent with the definition of an effective group posed by Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993). Here, members may forego their own interpretation to be part of 'the ensemble.' Ideally, this positively affects their self-concept, which in turn increases their commitment to the ensemble (Yukl, 1989). In theory, a natural self-perpetuating cycle begins to occur.

A second area of special consideration for leadership in music ensembles is hierarchy. Unless the organization is a chamber music ensemble (i.e., string quartet), most are arranged in a way that puts an artistic leader at the apex of the organizational structure. This leads to a more efficient model of management, but also has implicit group dynamics with which conductors should be familiar. Faulkner (1973) pointed out that the nature of orchestras, specifically, is ideal for comparing leadership styles. Because the canon of standard orchestral repertoire contains works which are often played numerous times and guest conductors are commonplace for most orchestras, it becomes easy to compare in a controlled environment. Faulkner's study analyzed the ways in which the performers, as "lower level participants in artistic organizations" (p. 148) perceived their interaction with conductors and formed deep impressions about organizational structures. Faulkner found one recurrent aspect of the relationship with a conductor that resulted in dissatisfaction with the conductor – ambiguity in gesture or explanation, essentially, made the player look incompetent. This is similar to the feelings subordinates have about leaders who are ambiguous in any situation.

Organizations such as the Orpheus Chamber Orchestra have attempted in recent years to create a structure that bypasses the need for a conductor. Their view of hierarchy is part of their initial vision and corporate culture, creating different expectations from the start (Khodyakov, 2007). This line of thinking addressed the intra-organizational cooperation

and coordination inherent in their management model. It highlighted the theory of trust-control, which maintains that trust and control are substitutes for one another (Bradach & Eccles, 1989; Sitkin & Roth, 1993). Trust-Control dynamics are applicable regardless of whether a musical organization has a conductor. Elements of trust and control exist in either situation for a musical ensemble, because trusting ones' colleagues or conductor is part of any ensemble dynamic. When trust is encouraged, it allows employees the freedom to be creative and help shape the organization's future (Edmondson, 2004; Rus, 2005). Trust in a conductor also follows the establishment of knowledge and integrity from the leader (Faulkner, 1975). The challenge for musical ensembles and their leaders is that a certain degree of both trust and control are necessary for success. The balance of the two may be a key to leadership success.

In conductor-led music ensembles, the presence of a single individual's vision for the music increases the efficiency of the ensemble and allows the selected nuance and subtlety in the music to come to fruition (Kammerman, 1983; Virkhaus, 1997). However, since control has been found to stifle creativity, foster dissatisfaction, and demotivate employees, a broader set of goals becomes necessary to maximize commitment within conductor-led ensembles (Adler & Borys, 1996). As Khodyakov found, a lack of control and trust are what lead to the detachment from the music that is sometimes inherent in a large ensemble.

Ensembles like Orpheus base their success on a different trust-control model. While it reduces efficiency of the organization, the positive effect is that the musicians' commitment to the organization as a whole rises because of the lack of hierarchy. This supports the idea that a vital aspect of leadership is related to the traits of the leader, not their position. In Orpheus, a lack of hierarchy does not mean that structure is absent, but instead that the lack of hierarchy may increase commitment in each of the stakeholders

because everyone has an opportunity to lead from time to time. The absence of hierarchy also suggests that good leadership involves empowering followers to exhibit the qualities of leadership regardless of position typically established by hierarchical situations. The time each member spends in the leadership role leads to empathy with the leader which manifests in more effective followers when hierarchy *does* exist. These traits of empathy and empowerment are consistent with the ideals of transformative leadership (Podsakoff et al, 1990). A study by Peterson et al. (2003) supports this, noting that the role of personality traits in top management teams (TMT) has an effect on organizational performance. In the musical setting, this undergirds the importance of roles in a choir such as rotating section leaders.

Another way to view shifts in hierarchical formation is to make a distinction between participative leadership and direction. Muczyk (1987) suggests that participative leadership is the involvement and empowerment of followers in significant, overarching decisions. The amount of direction a leader provides after decisions are made is independent of the participative aspects. Similarly, a good conductor can encourage participative leadership by engaging the choir in the overall vision for the organization at appropriate times both on and off the podium, but still be directive in rehearsal.

Muczyk (1987) noted that the importance of leadership is reflected in the amount of literature on the topic, citing trait theories, personal-behavioral theories, situational or contingency theories, and path-goal theory, to name a few. The number of these implies their importance to the field of business. Musical leadership is no different. The current study proposes to examine research in several areas relevant to conducting and then create an assessment approach, which utilizes the more salient aspects of the overall body of research.

Research on Effective Conducting and Music Education

It would be difficult to argue that enthusiasm does not increase effectiveness as a teacher, but the challenge with determining its importance is how to measure it. Merriam-Webster suggests that enthusiasm comes from the Greek word *enthousiasmos* and means to be inspired (Merriam-Webster). When used in the context of a conductor, there is often a question of whether enthusiasm is teachable. Research suggests that it *can* be taught, and that its relationship to leadership aptitude can be identified (Collins, 1978). Along those lines, while enthusiasm may be obvious in a personality like Leonard Bernstein, it should not be mislabeled as a more stable personality trait such as extroversion. Other research has shown that intensity, or a deliberate focus and energy created in the use of the baton or conducting gesture, can be traded in importance for technically perfect gestures (Byo, 1990). In this instance, Madsen and Geringer (1989) suggest define intensity less in the gesture and more as a global attribute used to describe sustained control of the student-teacher interaction evidenced by efficient, accurate presentation and correction of the subject matter with enthusiasm and effective pacing. Madsen (1990) also suggested that teacher effectiveness is defined by the interaction of subject knowledge with delivery and sequencing method. Most importantly, several lines of research suggested that enthusiasm may suggest high intensity, but that it is not necessarily indicative of teaching success if the teacher has inadequate knowledge of the subject matter (Byo, 1990; Cassidy, 1990, 1993; Colwell, 1995; Duke & Madsen, 1991; Madsen, Standley, Byo & Cassidey, 1992; Madsen, Standley, & Cassidy, 1989). In one study, Madsen, Standley, & Cassidy (1989) surveyed 22 collegiate music education majors in their last week of student teaching. The subjects were rated by both expert evaluators and students using a 5-point Likert scale, and reliability between judges was shown to be .86. A significant correlation between effective teaching and intensity was

reported, showing a coefficient rating of .92. In addition, they found that intensity can be taught to teachers, suggesting that similar qualities might become a component of leadership training for future conductors. Other examples of ways in which intensity was taught in music education settings included pacing; short, simple instructions; good posture; and the need for making music as opposed to talking.

Different than enthusiasm, another attribute of effectiveness in music leadership is *magnitude*. Researchers synthesized eight different behaviors that made up 'magnitude.' These included body movement, pitch, voice volume, speed, activity, eye contact, gestures, and facial expressions (Yarbrough, 1975). Yarbrough (1975) investigated the effect of conductor magnitude on performance attentiveness and attitudes of students in mixed choruses. In this experiment, 207 individuals in four randomly selected mixed choruses (one university and three high schools) from Tallahassee, Florida were rehearsed under three conditions: with regular conductor, with high magnitude conductor, and with low magnitude conductor. Magnitude was defined a priori and its effect was measured in relation to independent judges' ratings of audiotaped musical performances, behavioral observations of student attentiveness, and students' self-reports of attitude. One experimental teacher, one observer, three media technicians, and audiovisual equipment surrounded the group during the experiment. One and one-half rehearsal periods were used for acclimation purposes. During this time regular rehearsals were continued within the experimental environment. The regular teacher was present only for the acclimation period and baseline rehearsal. At the beginning and end of each experimental rehearsal, each chorus sang an uninterrupted a cappella performance that was recorded for subsequent rating by judges. Following post-test performances for both baseline and experimental sessions, an attitude scale was administered.

Eye contact, closeness, volume and modulation of voice, gestures, and facial expressions were all defined as traits of a conductor with either high or low magnitude. The observers watched the conductor and recorded frequency of the behaviors and which were high or low magnitude. Three of the four conductors received their lowest ratings under the low magnitude condition. Another test revealed a significant difference in mean attitude ratings toward the experimental conductor between the high magnitude and low magnitude conditions. Students preferred the high magnitude conductor (mean attitude rating = 7.38) more than the low magnitude conductor (mean attitude rating = 6.76) as demonstrated by attitude scale ratings (10 = high; 1 = low). In Yarbrough's study, the percentage of off-task behavior under the low intensity condition was between 6% and 15% higher than under the high magnitude condition. In the categories "eye contact," "facial expression," and "voice volume," the high magnitude conductor appears to have been significantly different from the low magnitude conductor, showing eye contact 60.75 times in a given time period under the high magnitude conductor versus 3.5 times under the low magnitude conductor, with a baseline of 25.75. While magnitude may not play a significant role in the music's performance, it significantly affects ensemble member attitude. Yarbrough's work also suggests that the effect of magnitude may be less about frequency of behavior and more about the contrast in behavior. For instance, if a conductor is always high magnitude, do the participants eventually become numb to that intensity? Perhaps the most relevant finding to the current study is that the high magnitude conductor has the ability to show a greater *range* of behaviors that they can vary (body movement, eye contact, facial expression, gestures, physicality). In essence, it is not the height of the individual's most intense moment that matters, but the difference between their highs and lows that catches the ensemble's attention at just the right moment to create the desired effect.

Perception of physical characteristics of a conductor may also be related to choral teaching effectiveness in music education, just as eye contact has been shown to be a vital component of communication style in conducting studies (VanWeelden, 2002). In this study, VanWeelden surveyed 163 students from six universities who were reacting to six conductors of varying body types (ranging from thin to overweight). Each student viewed the six conductors on the master videorecording and then completed questionnaires relating to ensemble performance, visual appearance of the conductor, perceived confidence in the conductor, and conductor effectiveness. Students viewed videotapes of the six different conductors who had mock conducted to the same audio excerpt of a professional choir singing Samuel Barber's *The Coolin*. Conductors were given several attempts to suggest which version they themselves believed was their best example of effective conducting, which was then added to the master video that the students would watch. Participants rated the conductors' eye contact, facial expression, and posture. VanWeelden found that conductor body type did not significantly influence performance ratings. Generally, conductors were rated similarly across categories. For example, Conductor #6 received the highest score for ensemble performance, including eye contact, facial expression, posture, evaluator confidence, and overall effectiveness. This held true for all six conductors surveyed with a slight variation in evaluator confidence and overall effectiveness. This suggests that good conductors possess numerous traits that impress their followers, lending support to the idea that having a comprehensive set of positive leadership traits is a much better indicator of success than being good at one or another. By extension, this also implies that it is possible through training to hone one skill or another if the conductor could determine which traits need improvement.

In the present study, it was assumed that there are similarities between the processes of teaching, conducting, and organizational leadership. In a 1998 study, Yarbrough and Madsen partnered to evaluate the teaching that occurred in choral rehearsals, presenting seven excerpts of conductor's teaching to 89 university music majors with a focus on the conductor's teaching skills. These skills included efficiency, singer attentiveness, musicianship, performance quality, enthusiasm, intensity, pacing, personality, and effectiveness. The excerpt that was rated the highest also showed more on-task behavior, better eye contact, and the most positive comments. For the excerpt rated the lowest, most of the negative comments were about student pacing, attentiveness, and teaching effectiveness.

Bayless (1996) also posited that teaching and leadership are correlated. His study involved determining if discernible differences existed in leadership qualities between the teachers (leaders) of various public school ensembles. Bayless used the MLQ developed by Bass and Avolio (1990) which were used in the present study, drawing on the qualities of leadership defined to be charisma, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, management-by-exception, and laissez-faire (Bass & Avolio, 1990). While leadership styles differ between different sectors, some commonality between business, education, and military exist (Reavis, 1988). The premise of the current study was that the same characteristics can be generalized to conducting a musical ensemble as well. Reavis (1988) also noted that choral conductors in high schools who were considered highly successful used a great number of correctives in their leadership, suggesting that a transactional leadership style might be necessary for teachers. We hope to suggest in the present study that transactional leadership may be an effective subset of

transformational leadership, but that transformational leadership may not be a subset of transactional leadership.

An aspect of effective teaching and, by extension, effective musical leadership involves eye contact as it relates to keeping students on task. Yarbrough and Price (1981) found that the percentage of off-task behavior in the classrooms of six high school ensemble teachers was correlated with frequency of eye contact. For instance, percentage of off-task behavior was around 13-18% for the sample when the frequency of eye contact in the session was 95 instances or higher, compared with off-task behavior of 20-30% of the time when eye contact frequency was closer to 42-69 times in a session. In their research, the director with the least eye contact produced the most off-task behavior.

Good teachers provide adequate, timely feedback to their students. One review of studies of music teaching effectiveness suggested that a combination of positive and negative feedback may be the most effective for achieving results, provided the negative feedback is aimed at the music itself and not the individual (Duke, 1999). In this very comprehensive review of effective music education practices, the author compared twenty-five years worth of experimental and descriptive research on what contributes to effective music teaching. Among others, instructional variables covered in the review included allocation of time, teacher verbalizations, and gestures. One of the findings pertaining to feedback was that expert teachers gave more specific, positive feedback than did inexperienced teachers, who tended to give more general feedback (Goolsby, 1997). Expert teachers rapidly alternated between short, specific instructions and student action, resulting in higher quality student performance (Siebenaler, 1997). This is consistent with many musical organizations in which the conductor is perhaps not warm in personality, but is able to achieve high results because followers perceive negative feedback as focused on the music, not the individual themselves

(Duke, 1999). This distinction between types of feedback is an example of an instance when transactional leadership is ideal, which will be discussed in more detail later. If a leader can build the self-concept of followers, a moderate amount of negative feedback can be offered without negatively affecting the followers' identification with the organization as a whole.

Alan Gumm (1993) conducted a study on the development of a model for assessing choral music teaching. His study provides additional support for the current study. Gumm sought to study four issues related to choral music teaching including effective teaching behavior, teaching styles, and matching teaching to learning styles among groups of teachers. He accomplished this by attempting to determine measurable dimensions of music teaching style, identify the style of a group of directors, and develop a valid and reliable self-report instrument for assessing teaching style. The study included 475 subjects for a standardization phase and 210 for a validation phase. Samples consisted of choral directors from public and private high schools across the United States. Gumm's list of teaching behaviors came from previous studies and included such qualities as communication skills, interpersonal relations and group dynamics, and aesthetics and affect, which are similar to characteristics examined in many leadership studies (Avolio & Howell, 1992; Bass, Valenzi, Farrow, & Solomon, 1975; Bono & Judge, 2003). Gumm's goal of developing a comprehensive model of choral teaching style was accomplished to a moderate extent. It also suggested that while each conductor would vary certain aspects of their teaching style to a given situation, each had a general style of teaching that was essentially consistent throughout their work.

Structure of time and *organization* are important in most any leadership setting as well. The current study hypothesizes that much like leadership, rehearsal effectiveness can be increased or decreased based on the way the rehearsal is structured. In one study of high school music teaching, Price (1983) observed how much time was spent in performance and

non-performance. Performance was defined as time in which the students were playing as an ensemble or in small sections. Non-performance was defined as teacher instruction, teacher reinforcement, or anything not involving student performance. The experiment used three conditions. The first (Condition A) was “all-business”, very little teacher talking, neutral facial expression, and included the largest amount of ensemble performance time. The second (B) included verbalizations that were task-oriented only, neutral facial expression, and the ensemble performing half the time. Finally, (C) included verbalizations of reinforcement balanced between 80% academic approval and 20% non-approval. The ensemble performed for 50% of the time in this condition. It included facial expressions that mirrored the approval/disapproval given. Students were found to be least off-task in Condition A. Gains in musical performance were highest in Condition C with Condition A close behind. Performance gains were the smallest in Condition B. Their rating of the students’ affective state (how excited the subjects were about the material) showed Condition C as consistently higher on all five days of the experiment. Condition A was second highest with dramatic gains on days 4 and 5.

In light of this, one might conclude that the ways a musical leader balances transactional (Condition A in Price’s study) with transformational leadership matters. The implication for the effects of Condition C was that followers react not just to the instructions one provides as a leader, but also to the delivery of those instructions. Eye contact, comments of approval or disapproval, and facial expressions are important components of leadership. It follows that certain leadership styles or traits are likely to lead to more or less off-task behavior. If Price’s hypothesis about enjoyment is true, participants/followers’ enjoyment of the experience can be influenced by the leader.

Cordero, Farris, and DiTomaso (2004) reported a positive relationship between the ways in which supervisors interacted with subordinates and the job satisfaction of subordinates. Job satisfaction has also been linked with organizational commitment, which can reduce worker turnover (Kacmar, Carlson, & Brymer, 1999). Mathews and Kitsantis (2007) found that morale, group cohesion, and motivational climate also affect the ways in which conductor support is perceived by high school band students. In this study, 91 instrumentalists from three honor bands, representing 35 high school bands and conductors were recruited. Wind and percussion instrumentalists, 38 of whom were male and 53 female, completed questionnaires about their conductor. Four scales were administered, three of which were taken from a survey that assessed collective efficacy, group environment, and perceived motivational climate and the fourth, a Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ), assessed cohesiveness. Finally, an established evaluation tool for conductor support (CS) was used to assess student motivation for playing instruments. Original subscales for the assessment tools in Matthews and Kitsanis' study showed reliability coefficients between .73 and .90, with pilot testing results between .86 and .94. All other assessments adapted for the study showed equal or greater reliability coefficients, suggesting that adaptation of these methods for the musical setting was feasible. The researchers' hypotheses that group cohesion, collective efficacy, and task-orientation climate were accurate predictors of conductor support were confirmed. Task cohesion correlation was .39, social cohesion .45, and conductor support/perceived motivational climate was .31. The study supports the notion that a leader can influence the creation of a positive environment in which followers can flourish.

Leadership Theories and Their Application to Conducting

Not everyone believes that leadership studies have a direct application to organizational success, whether in the business or the arts sector. In a study of executive succession, Peterson, Smith, Martorana, and Owens (2003) suggested that leadership played a diminutive role in overall organizational performance (at most accounting for 10% of performance variability). Similarly, Lieberson and O'Connor (1972) found that when they analyzed different industries and the effect of leadership on profit margin, some industries found that up to 70% of variance in performance was not explained by leadership alone (for example, the soap-making industry). The shipbuilding industry, in contrast, only had its profit affected by leadership at the rate of 16%. Peterson et al. also cited several other studies (Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985; Pfeffer, 1977) that concluded that leadership did not have an effect on organizational performance, but suggested that organizational size might have contributed to the low correlation between leadership and performance in these cases.

While the results of Peterson et al. (2003) suggested a diminutive role of leadership on organizational success, researchers also found that top management teams (TMT) may have a significant influence on organizational performance (TMTs are the senior level management, the primary decision makers who set the tone for the rest of the workforce). The authors hypothesized that leader personality was linked to organizational performance, believing that leaders who had traits of agreeableness had teams that worked more cooperatively. They theorized further that in firms with a structure that allowed the CEO to hold a great deal of power and preference (much like the conductor of a musical organization) the impact of CEO personality is indirectly made through the group dynamics that individual creates.

Peterson, Smith, Martorana, and Owens (2003) also focused on the effect of personality variables on leadership as captured by the five-factor model of personality, which represents the current orthodoxy in personality assessment and was a simple, robust, and comprehensive way of understanding fundamental personality differences (Barrick & Mount, 1991; McCrae & Costa, 1996; Hogan, 2002). The hypotheses were: (1) CEO conscientiousness was related to TMTs that were concerned with legalism, centralization of power, and control over their environment; (2) emotionally unstable CEO's were risk-averse and intellectually rigid; (3) CEO agreeableness was related to TMT cohesion and decentralization; and (4) extroverted CEOs were related to TMT perceptions of leader dominance. CEO personality data was gathered from archival sources and independent readers used the California Adult Q-sort (CAQ) to describe the personality of each leader. TMT group dynamics were also measured from archival sources using the Organizational Group Dynamics Q-sort (GDQ). All sources had to include sufficient detail about group dynamics on CEO personality to permit hypothesis-blind q-sorters to perform a q-sort and all cases had to occur within the past 25 years. The results supported the researchers' hypotheses. CEO emotional stability was positively correlated to team cohesion, intellectual flexibility, and leader dominance. CEO agreeableness was positively correlated to team-level cohesion and decentralization of power. CEO extraversion was positively correlated to their group process measure of leader strength or dominance. Finally, CEO openness was positively correlated to team intellectual flexibility at .42 and risk-taking at .47. Regarding the connection between TMT and performance, TMTs characterized by intellectual flexibility, optimism, and cohesiveness (but not centralization of power) all experienced significantly greater income growth. It is important not to overgeneralize this study in application to a

musical ensemble, although a correlation between personality and organizational performance does become more plausible as a result of the study.

Another study that pertains to leadership was conducted based on the hypothesis that a leader's warmth inspires their followers' motivation on future tasks (Tjosvold, 1984). In the study, followers tended to find the "warm" leader helpful and were satisfied with their relationship to the leader, as compared to those in a "cold" leadership environment who experienced greater dissatisfaction. Tjosvold believed that leaders that provided both high structure and high employee consideration facilitated productivity and job satisfaction, suggesting that leaders should become more oriented toward production and toward people. Fifty-six male and female undergraduates were recruited from courses at Simon Fraser University to participate in this study. They were randomly assigned to four conditions, 14 in each condition. The proportion of males and females was approximately the same for all conditions. The independent variables were leaders' approach to work and warmth of interaction style. The directive approach was operationalized by having one of their colleagues assume the role of manager. This individual instructed the participants on how they should complete the task. In this case, being directive meant directly and clearly telling the participants what to do and how to do it, praising them for following, and criticizing their failure to do so when applicable. In a nondirective approach, the colleague in the manager's role identified the problem but avoided giving specific ideas about how they should work on the problem or what the solution should be.

This is a condition often observed with choral ensembles in which less skilled conductors do not offer enough specifics on how singers can improve. Warmth and coldness were communicated nonverbally through voice tone, facial expression, posture, and eye gaze. In the warm condition, the confederates spoke with a soft but clearly audible tone

of voice, smiled frequently, and retained a pleasant facial expression. When talking with or listening to the participants, they leaned toward them, and looked directly into the eyes of the participants as they talked with them. In the cold condition, the confederates spoke with a harsh, crisp voice and kept a serious, stiff expression on their face. They stayed a distance from and leaned away when talking to the participants and avoided looking directly into their eyes.

The results supported the hypotheses in most cases. The leader's interaction style as warm/cold and work approach of directive/nondirective and was expected to affect performance. Participants in the warm condition indicated that their manager was warmer than did participants in the cold environment. The participants in the directive work approach also reported that their leader instructed them in what they should do much more than with participants in the nondirective condition. Regarding the leader's perceived effectiveness and helpfulness, openness to the leader, attraction to the leader, and willingness to work again, the warm leader scored a better average than the cold leader in comparative styles (directive vs. nondirective) and was always rated higher than the cold leader. Correlational evidence collected in many kinds of organizational settings indicated that high structure and high consideration was related to productive, satisfied employees. This study provided experimental support for this general finding and suggested ways leaders could behave in order to be seen as concerned about both production and people. Warmth of the leader's interaction was found to have a powerful impact on subordinates and, when coupled with a directive work approach, was found to aid productivity on a subsequent task. The present study will examine whether a correlation exists between the conductor and chorister with regard to both effectiveness and perception of leadership.

Friedman, Fleischer, and Fletcher (1992) also examined leadership tasks and the abilities needed to accomplish them. This study identified three key leadership dimensions: project management, personnel supervision, and strategic planning. One hypothesis was that a leader's social judgment skills might help explain variance in their achievement. This is consistent with the findings of Davies and Stankov (1998), whose research showed that emotional intelligence demonstrates some important convergence with other types of abilities, particularly social and crystallized intelligence. Each of these studies points to the fact that social intelligence may indeed be a factor worthy of consideration when assessing leadership skills.

In a 1990 article on transformative leadership, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter examined the effects of leadership style on citizenship behavior, trust in and satisfaction with leadership, and transactional leader behavior. The study included obtaining six measures of transformational leadership. The researchers in this study posited that traditional leadership assessment has been focused on transactional behavior (Bass, 1985). In contrast, transformational leadership is focused on making followers more aware of the importance and values behind their tasks, activating higher-order needs, and inducing them to transcend self-interests for the sake of the organization (Bass, 1985; Yukl, 1989a, 1989b). Podsakoff et al's study also sought to understand how employee satisfaction was enhanced by transformational leadership. Application of this theory to choral organizations might lead to less turnover, higher recruitment rates, and larger audiences, based on the pride of the chorister in the organization.

Podsakoff et al. (1990) conducted their survey in a large Midwestern petrochemical company. In this study, the researchers theorized that there are six key behaviors associated with transformational leaders, including: identification of a vision, appropriate modeling,

fostering acceptance of group goals, high performance expectations, individualized support, and intellectual stimulation. The present study considers these same characteristics to be representative of transformational leadership as demonstrated by choral conductors. In Podsakoff (1990), trust was positively correlated with the core of transformational behaviors at .80 and individualized support for the leader at .32. The study also found satisfaction positively correlated at .70, suggesting that transformational leaders may produce more satisfied followers. The ramifications of this on a collegiate choral ensemble where a grade is involved may be minimal given that on some level, this is a contingent-reward situation; however, in the case of a community choir, satisfaction of the ensemble singers (followers) is crucial to retention.

One of the inevitable questions about transformational leadership is its practical effect, as many organizations have been successful with transactional leaders at the helm. The desire to become transformational does not negate the importance of transactional leadership – where one receives a reward in exchange for their efforts to follow the leader. In their assessment tool called the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), Avolio and Bass (2004) suggested that transformational leadership is *additive* to transactional leadership. In their study, the authors found that both transformational and transactional leadership were positively correlated, suggesting both leadership styles are related. However, the correlation between transformational leadership and the variables assessed was greater than that of transactional leadership. Also, the relatively corrective and passive style that characterizes transactional leadership was effective on a task management basis, but was unlikely to connect anyone to the organization's overall mission and vision. The notion that both styles of leadership are valid, but that transformational leadership is additive to transactional leadership is called augmentation. This augmentation effect of

transformational leadership was confirmed in numerous studies (Waldman & Bass, 1986; Waldman, Bass & Yammarino, 1990; Howell & Avolio, 1993). This finding corroborates Bass' earlier study, where he determined that extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness came from employees who had been led in settings with both types of leadership (Bass, 1985). This is also consistent with what the present researcher observed in musical ensembles where the hierarchy suggests transactional leadership is the primary day-to-day leadership style.

Howell and Avolio (1993) draw a connection between context, personality of the leader, and both transactional and transformational leadership qualities. Their first theory was that successful leadership depends on the context in which the leader is working. It makes sense that an organization that is ready for change and open to risk would accept transformational leadership qualities better than one steeped in tradition, in which case transactional leadership may be more effective. Again, both styles are necessary. Another construct examined in the study that is relevant to transformational leadership was locus of control. In short, if the leader had more actual or perceived control of their environment, they were more likely to be transformative than if they perceived a large number of things out of their control. Specifically, the study included 78 managers in the top four levels of a major financial institution in Canada. They ranged from 29-64 years old and were all white males. The organization was in a turbulent market with numerous upheavals expected to continue, making it ripe with transformational leadership opportunities. The MLQ was used in this study, measuring charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration were all positively correlated with each other. Finally, in the unmoderated model, the paths from locus of control to individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and charisma were positive

and significant. This indicates that internally oriented leaders are more transformational than externally oriented leaders, confirming the author's hypothesis.

While some of the business research is skeptical about the connection of leadership style with organizational success, the research overwhelmingly suggests that it does have a bearing on an organization and its employees, followers, or in this case, singers. Qualities such as warmth, emotional intelligence, and trust continue to benefit organizations whose leaders display these characteristics. Finally, the research suggests that in all types of organizations, transactional leadership has an important role and may be easier to tie to overall success than linking success with the personality attributes of a transformational leader. The same is true of choral organizations where the transactional leadership style is ultimately what demands the singers achieve the desired goal of the organization. The assumption underlying the present study is that accomplishing the transactional goals in a transformational way will have a lasting effect on the singer and audience experience.

CHAPTER 3

Sample

Generally, all subject background information was collected using an online, anonymous survey tool. Subjects received a study information sheet approved by the human subjects committee at Indiana University. All subject information was coded to preserve confidentiality of the conductor, colleague, and students who participated in the study. No compensation was provided to any participant.

Conductors ($N = 20$), colleagues of those conductors ($N = 19$), and students in their ensemble ($N = 437$; varying between 9 and 57 per ensemble) were the participants in this study. The conductors ranged in age from 31 to 60 or older, with 20% between 41 and 45, 15% between 46 and 50, 35% from 51-55, and 20% in the category of 60 or older. The subjects were recruited from liberal arts colleges, universities, and state colleges in the United States. The schools were chosen based on their liberal arts focus, which suggested there was reasonable similarity in the challenges and opportunities afforded the conductors. The participating conductors had all been in their current position at least three years, and all but one possessed a doctoral degree (or equivalent) in choral conducting. The conductor without a doctoral (or equivalent) degree possessed a master's degree in choral conducting. The conductor ratio was 25% female and 75% male with 90% of the conductors having worked in some collegiate environment for at least nine years. Of the conductors, 75% listed voice as their primary instrument, 20% listed piano, and one participant listed "other."

Students singing in the choral ensemble were undergraduates and participating choirs had no fewer than 9 and no more than 57 respondents. The total number of student respondents was 437, of which 49% were female and 51% were male. Age range of students was between 18 and 26, with 72% of those participating between the age of 18 and 21.

Distribution of participants between voice types was relatively consistent across the sample, with 27% of the sample in the bass section, 24% tenor, 25% mezzo/alto, and 24% soprano. 48% of the students participating had sung in the ensemble one year, 25% for two years, 13% for three years, and the remaining greater than three years. For 61% of the participating students, the class was not mandatory, while for 39% it was a requirement. Of those reporting, 67% were not music majors while 33% were majoring in music.

The colleagues participating in the survey were not asked for demographic information beyond the fact that they had worked with the conductor for at least one year. It was important to protect these participants' confidentiality.

Part I of the survey (Appendix A) was created based on prior research within the field of music education (Byo, 1990; Madsen, 1990; Price et al., 1983; VanWeelden, 2002; Yarbrough, 1975). It included 11 items on magnitude, 8 items on clarity and rehearsal structure of the conductor both in gesture and speech, and 15 items on communication style and techniques in listening skills, eye contact, and feedback. Participants' responses for the 32 items in Part I were recorded using a five-point Likert scale assessing the frequency of demonstrating various conducting/teaching skills and characteristics between '0 = Never' and '4 = Always.'

Part II (Appendix B) was an adaptation of Podsakoff et al.'s (1990) measure of transactional and transformative leadership styles for the context of choral conducting. In the Podsakoff measure, the wording was such that little or no changes were needed to adapt the measure to the context of musical leadership. Participants' responses to the 23 items in Part II utilized a similar scale, with ratings for items gauging perceptions of transactional and transformative leadership tendencies ranging from '0 = Disagree Always' to '7 = Agree

Always.’ Of the 23 items, 18 were related to first order transformational leader behavior and the remaining 5 were related to transactional leader behavior.

Both parts III and IV (Appendix C & D) are adaptations of the Avolio and Bass (2004) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), an assessment designed for the business community. The MLQ was considered to be appropriate for the study since the MLQ’s focus on transformational leadership, leadership styles, and effectiveness of leaders was deemed to be helpful in the context of musical ensemble leadership. The MLQ assessed four composite leadership scales that include Transformational, Transactional, Passive/Avoidant, and Outcomes of Leadership. The subscales that made up Transformational Leadership included Idealized Attributes and Behavior, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration. Transactional Leadership was made up of subscales including Contingent Reward and Management-By-Exception: Active. Passive/Avoidant was comprised of the subscales of Management-By-Exception: Passive and Laissez-Faire leadership. Outcomes of Leadership subscales were Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction with Leadership. Since Inspirational Motivation was of particular interest in the current study, that measure was considered separately for both the musical and non-musical assessments.

More specifically, Part III of the MLQ (Musical Leadership) was focused on perceptions of musical experiences with the conductor and featured 44 items, utilizing a Likert scale ranging from ‘0 = Never’ and ‘4 = Always’ for the items. This section was only distributed to the conductor and students for comparison, as colleagues would be unlikely to know the details of the conductor’s musical ability simply by watching a performance and not attending rehearsals. The general wording of each MLQ question was altered slightly in order to make it specific to the music industry and the respective surveys. For example, the

original question of “I get others to look at problems from many different angles” became “I get others to view the music in new ways” on the present survey. The instructions also clearly stated that questions all refer specifically to the conductor’s musical abilities.

Part IV featured adaptations of the same 44 items in Part III, this time focusing only on the non-musical experiences of the conductor, utilizing a Likert scale ranging from ‘0 = Never’ and ‘4 = Always’ for the items. These items were distributed to the conductor and colleagues only, since students would be less likely to observe the dynamics of the non-musical leadership qualities of the conductor such as organizational or administrative skills. The instructions stated that questions all refer specifically to the conductor’s non-musical abilities and were meant to distinguish the relationship between that which a conductor does musically and all of the other tasks associated with the position.

Part V involved 5 general questions about the perceptions of overall success of the organization as a result of the conductor’s leadership, with each item being rated on a Likert scale of ‘0= Not at all’ to ‘4 = Always’. These questions sought to define organizational success from five different but related angles.

Three parallel and related questionnaires were offered, one each to conductors, singers, and colleagues, in an effort to correlate perceptions of the conductor from three different perspectives. All items were designed so that the participant could speak about the conductor in the context that they most often experienced them (i.e., students were not asked about the conductor in the context of the dynamics of a university environment). Similarly, colleagues were not asked to comment on the conductor’s rehearsal techniques, since they were not likely to have experienced these.

Validity and Reliability of measures in the present study

Validity of the items used to create Part I is based on previous research. This includes 11 items on magnitude (as defined by Yarbrough), 6 items on clarity of the conductor, and 15 items on the communication style of the conductor. The magnitude scale was based on the mean of the 11 items. Reliability for the magnitude scale was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha and was determined to be .85 for the conductors. The median Cronbach's alpha across groups of students was .82. Table 1 shows descriptive statistics including mean, standard deviation, skew, and kurtosis for all items related to Research Question 1 (What are the leadership qualities of an effective conductor?). The primary source of variance in the MLQ was reported by its authors, who noted that these came from studies outside of the United States and showed context and contingencies as the most important variance. However, the fundamental idea of transformative leadership qualities was shown to transcend differences in culture, custom, or country. Moreover, relationships between transformational leadership and objectively measured performance were stronger and more positive than the transactional styles of leadership (Dum dum, Lowe, & Avolio, 2002; Gaspar, 1992; Fuller, Patterson, Hester, & Stringer, 1996; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996).

For Part II (Appendix B) based on Podsakoff et al., the goal was to examine the impact of transformational leader behaviors on organizational behavior, and the potential mediating role played by subordinates' trust and satisfaction in that process. Examination of the psychometric properties of the leadership scales designed to measure both transformational and transactional behaviors indicated good correspondence between the *a priori* assignment of items to the dimensions and the factor structure observed. There were also high internal consistency reliabilities for each of the dimensions (alphas ranging from

.78 to .92) and an adequate level of discriminant validity between the dimensions. However, when applied to the current study of conductors, the median coefficient for the Podsakoff transactional scale was .10, which was clearly not acceptable for the present study. Likewise, a great number of similarities were found in the transformational leadership measures and several of the subscales used by Podsakoff and the MLQ, but the MLQ seemed to align itself better with the focus of the present study.

Part III and IV (Appendix C & D) relied on validity findings pertaining to the MLQ in previous studies which suggest that transformational leadership generally generates greater follower effectiveness and satisfaction than does transactional leadership, although effective leaders certainly perform using the full range of styles (Avolio, 1999; Bass, 1985, 1998; Bass & Avolio, 1993). In Part III, the reliability of the 20 items in the transformational leadership scale for musical leadership by the conductor was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha and was determined to be .88 for the conductors. The median Cronbach's alpha across groups of students was .89. The 8 items which made up the transactional leadership scale in the musical leadership assessment of the conductor was found to be .68 using Cronbach's alpha, with the median student result of .74. The 8 items making up the Passive-Avoidant rating showed reliability of .69 for conductors with a median score for students of .81. In Part IV (Appendix D), the reliability of the 20 items in the transformational leadership scale for non-musical leadership by the conductor was also assessed using Cronbach's Alpha and determined to be .91 for the conductors and the colleagues' ratings of the conductor were .93. The 8 items of the transactional leadership scale for non-musical leadership assessment of the conductor (organizational skills, etc.) was found to be .86. The transactional leadership reliability for the colleagues was 0.70. The 8 items making up the Passive-Avoidant rating scale showed reliability of .86 for conductors and colleagues' perceptions of the conductor.

Part V referred to the five items on Organizational Success, but results were highly skewed and as a result, not very informative in the present study.

Procedure

The survey was created using SurveyMonkey, an anonymous, online survey tool designed to ensure the confidentiality of results and to make the process of responding easy for the participants. The researcher sent an email to conductors within the guidelines of the proposed sample to determine their interest in participation by sharing the basic premise of the study and its applicability to the field of conducting. Conductors who agreed to participate were then forwarded a student survey and a survey for a colleague whom they believed would consider participating in the survey based on their knowledge of the conductor. Once they agreed to participate, the conductor was sent an email with the information sheet for each specific survey and a specific link for the conductor survey, the student survey, and the colleague survey. For the student survey, the link asked for responses regarding their own perception of the conductor, the responses of which were sent to the researcher only. For the colleague survey, the link was provided to the conductor, who forwarded the link to the colleague. The researcher was not aware of the name of the colleague and the colleague response was returned anonymously to the researcher. Neither the conductor, students, nor colleagues were able to access the results of each other's surveys. All participants were only permitted to respond to the survey one time.

Timelines

The recruitment phase took approximately two months, and began in January 2012 until a sample of twenty conductors was achieved in late February 2012. Once a conductor, their students, and a colleague had been contacted and given the survey, all subjects were given two weeks to complete their responses. Email reminders were sent at one week from

the start date of the study, at three days remaining, and one day before the responses were due. Upon receipt, the responses were immediately coded to protect the anonymity of the respondents.

CHAPTER 4

What are the Leadership Characteristics of Choral Conductors?

Descriptive statistics for all variables and participant groups are presented in Table 1. Initial analysis suggests that the sample of conductors possessed transformative and transactional skills on both musical and non-musical tasks, as well as inspirational motivation. Using a 4-point Likert scale from 0-4, the mean score for clarity in baton technique was 3.15 ($SD=.59$) with distribution fairly predictable across the sample of conductors, with student opinion on the same question rating higher at 3.50 ($SD=.27$). Across the items on communication, the diversity of questions from conductors varied greatly, with the lowest mean response among conductors a 1.25 ($SD=.97$) and the highest a 3.50 ($SD=.61$). Student responses on the same set of items varied similarly, from 1.95 ($SD=.41$) to 3.70 ($SD=3.52$). On magnitude, conductors and students both rated the items high with composite means of 3.34 for conductors and 3.60 for the students. On transformative leadership ratings within the MLQ, conductor responses were virtually the same between musical and non-musical questions at a mean of 3.15 for musical tasks and 3.12 for non-musical tasks ($SD=.42$ and $SD=.50$, respectively). In all cases, when comparing musical and non-musical items between conductor response and either student or colleague response, ratings for transformative and inspirational motivation were both higher than the ratings for transactional leadership, but the latter was always at least 2.21 on a 0-4 Likert scale. Standard deviation tended to be small in all cases.

Table 1
Descriptive statistics for all variables and participant groups

| | Conductor | | Students | | Colleagues | |
|---|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| | Mean (SD) | Skew(Kurt) | Mean (SD) | Skew(Kurt) | Mean (SD) | Skew(Kurt) |
| Clarity - clear info in the tip of the baton | 3.15(.59) | .00(.18) | 3.50(.27) | -.98(.11) | NA | NA |
| Communication- In rehearsal, conductor listens effectively | 3.50(.61) | -.79(-.21) | 3.70(.18) | -.70(-.01) | NA | NA |
| Communication - In conversation, conductor listens effectively | 3.30(.66) | -.40(-.55) | 3.52(.24) | -.69(-.71) | NA | NA |
| Communication - Conductor receives info in ensemble via direct feedback | 2.95(.61) | .01(.19) | 3.35(.25) | -.57(-.72) | NA | NA |
| Communication - Conductor receives info in ensemble via eye contact | 2.95(.61) | .01(.19) | 2.97(.30) | -.17(-1.00) | NA | NA |
| Communication - Conductor expresses themselves generally through eye contact | 2.85(.67) | .18(-.55) | 2.83(.41) | -.46(.17) | NA | NA |
| Communication - In rehearsal, conductor gives positive feedback | 2.85(.81) | .30(-1.40) | 2.50(.32) | .16(-.17) | NA | NA |
| Communication - In rehearsal, conductor gives feedback as criticism until it is done to their liking. | 1.25(.97) | -.17(-1.31) | 1.95(.41) | .33(-.73) | NA | NA |
| Magnitude | 3.34(.45) | -.31(-1.03) | 3.60(.14) | -.44(-.48) | NA | NA |
| MLQ- Transformative leadership qualities in musical setting (ensemble) | 3.15(.42) | -.41(.30) | 3.22(.20) | .03(-.79) | NA | NA |
| MLQ- Transactional leadership qualities in musical setting (ensemble) | 2.28(.54) | -.21(-.02) | 2.63(.22) | .19(-1.18) | NA | NA |
| MLQ- Inspirational leadership qualities in musical setting (ensemble) | 3.30(.57) | -.50(-.79) | 3.45(.20) | -.92(.67) | NA | NA |
| MLQ- Passive-avoidant leadership qualities in musical setting (ensemble) | 1.16(.52) | .07(.34) | .95(.23) | .81(-.36) | NA | NA |
| NMMLQ- Transformative leadership qualities in non-musical setting (colleagues) | 3.12(.50) | -.60(.46) | NA | NA | 3.57(.45) | -1.19(.15) |
| NMMLQ- Transactional leadership qualities in non-musical setting (colleagues) | 2.21(.71) | -.42(-.76) | NA | NA | 2.67(.63) | -.03(-.74) |
| NMMLQ- Inspirational leadership qualities in non-musical setting (colleagues) | 3.18(.66) | -.44(-.59) | NA | NA | 3.59(.53) | -1.29(.93) |
| NMMLQ- Passive-avoidant leadership qualities in non-musical setting (colleagues) | 1.21(.63) | -.04(-1.10) | NA | NA | .91(.76) | 1.95(5.29) |
| Overall success- Conductor imparts technical knowledge to ensemble | 3.60(.50) | -.44(-2.02) | 3.54(.26) | -.53(.18) | 3.79(.42) | -1.55(.42) |
| Overall success- Conductor imparts musicological/theoretical knowledge to ensemble | 3.60(.50) | -.44(-2.02) | 3.49(.29) | -1.11(1.72) | 3.58(.77) | -2.35(6.48) |
| Overall success- Conductor has clear sense of the "sound" they want to achieve | 3.45(.51) | .22(-2.18) | 3.71(.17) | .02(-1.57) | 3.79(.42) | -1.55(.42) |
| Overall success- Conductor creates an atmosphere that is musically fulfilling for singers. | 3.45(.51) | .22(-2.18) | 3.71(.17) | -.49(.34) | 3.84(.38) | -2.04(2.41) |
| Overall success- Conductor creates an atmosphere that is personally rewarding for singers | 3.55(.51) | -.22(-2.18) | 3.69(.19) | -.69(.54) | 3.84(.38) | -2.04(2.41) |

SD = standard deviation; Skew = skewness; Kurt = kurtosis

The Relationship Between Leadership and Magnitude

The relationship between conductors' self-ratings on magnitude (Yarbrough, 1975) as compared with their score for transformational leadership on musical tasks showed high

correlation of .78 and are shown in Table 2. Magnitude as compared with transactional leadership on musical tasks was slightly less at .65, suggesting a moderately positive correlation between these two items. The study also analyzed one specific sub-scale from the MLQ entitled Inspirational Motivation, a measure that was included in the conductor's mean score on transformational leadership for musical tasks. On musical tasks, the correlation between inspirational motivation and magnitude was 0.77, exhibiting a greater correlation than between magnitude and transactional leadership. A slightly negative correlational relationship of -.24 occurred between magnitude and passive avoidant tendencies. While statistically insignificant, it may suggest parallels with the research of Avolio & Bass (2004). The relationship in the present study between magnitude and passive-avoidant leadership styles can be compared to the Avolio & Bass (2004), where researchers suggested an inverse correlation between transformative leadership and qualities such as passive avoidant leadership. On non-musical tasks, comparison of conductor score on magnitude and the same three MLQ measures (transformational, transactional, and inspirational motivation) exhibited correlations of .74, .56, and .56.

When comparing conductors' own ratings transformational leadership with their ratings on magnitude for both musical and non-musical areas and MLQ inspirational motivation, there were high correlations of .78, .77, and .74, respectively. Conductors who scored high on transformative leadership on musical issues most often also scored high on non-musical issues, with a correlation of .93.

Table 2
Relationship between magnitude, music-related MLQ and non-music related MLQ scores

| Measure | Musical Magnitude | Musical Transform | Musical Transact. | Musical Inspirational | Musical Pass-Av. | Non-mus. Transform. | Non-mus. Transact. | Non-mus. Inspirational | Non-mus. Pass. Av. |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Musical Magnitude | | .78*** | .65** | .77*** | -.24 | .74*** | .56* | .56* | -.31 |
| Musical Transform | | | .78*** | .92*** | -.09 | .93*** | .70*** | .80*** | -.19 |
| Musical Transact | | | | .86*** | -.06 | .75*** | .92*** | .67*** | -.05 |
| Musical Inspirational | | | | | .00 | .89*** | .79*** | .82*** | -.08 |
| Musical Passive Avoidant | | | | | | -.10 | -.12 | .08 | .75*** |
| Non-mus. Transformative | | | | | | | .70*** | .86*** | -.31 |
| Non-mus. Transactional | | | | | | | | .63** | -.06 |
| Non-mus. Inspirational | | | | | | | | | -.16 |
| Non-mus. Passive Avoidant | | | | | | | | | |

Note: N=20. Statistics for each pair of variables are based on all the cases with the valid data for that pair. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

The Relationship Between Communication & MLQ

The next connection we sought to make was between the conductor's perceptions of their communication skills and their MLQ ratings on the measures of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and inspirational motivation on both musical and non-musical tasks. (See Table 3) Within the items on communication, certain correlations were discovered. Within the conductor's own assessment of themselves, the correlation between the conductors' listening ability in rehearsal and their listening ability in conversation was .67. Their listening ability in rehearsal was also correlated with their ability to receive information from others by direct interaction with them at .50 and by eye contact at .45. Conductors whose listening skills shape the rehearsal are also correlated with their transformational leadership and inspiration motivation capacity at .65. Just as with magnitude, the correlation between listening in rehearsal and transactional skills was slightly lower at .50. An ability to receive information from others in rehearsal via direct feedback (vs. telling others, etc.) was correlated with all three leadership attributes from the MLQ at roughly .50.

Conductor's score on the MLQ for Inspirational Motivation correlated very strongly with their overall transformational leadership approach at .92. However, the conductors'

score for themselves on transactional leadership also showed a relatively high correlational value of .86. Finally, the correlation between transactional and transformational leadership on musical items was shown to be .78.

Table 3
Relationship between conductor communication and music-related MLQ scores

| Measure | Musical Set. Listen. | Non-mus. Set. Listen. | Receive Verbal Feedback | Receive Eye Contact | Express Eye Contact | Positive Feedback | Criticism | Mus. Transform | Mus. Transact | Mus. Inspir. | Mus. Pass. Avoid. |
|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Musical Setting Listening | | .66** | .50* | .22 | .45* | .27 | -.04 | .65** | .50* | .65** | .08 |
| Non-mus. Setting Listening | | | .31 | .17 | .47* | .29 | .04 | .48* | .29 | .52* | -.20 |
| Receive verbal feedback | | | | .42 | -.02 | .09 | -.29 | .56* | .51* | .50* | -.10 |
| Receive eye contact | | | | | .50* | -.02 | -.34 | .22 | .17 | .16 | -.02 |
| Express eye contact | | | | | | .34 | -.02 | .24 | .16 | .30 | .24 |
| Give positive feedback | | | | | | | -.08 | .34 | .29 | .50* | -.10 |
| Give criticism | | | | | | | | -.08 | .05 | .05 | .35 |
| Musical Transform | | | | | | | | | .73*** | .92*** | -.09 |
| Musical Transact | | | | | | | | | | .86 | -.06 |
| Musical Inspirational | | | | | | | | | | | .00 |
| Musical Passive Avoidant | | | | | | | | | | | |

Note: N=20. Statistics for each pair of variables are based on all the cases with the valid data for that pair. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

The Relationship Between Clarity in Baton Technique with Leadership

Clarity of the conductor's baton technique was moderately correlated with their self-dubbed musical transformational and transactional leadership qualities and inspirational motivation score, correlating between .52, .55, and .57 respectively. These are shown in

Table 4.

Table 4
Relationship between conductor clarity and music-related MLQ scores

| Measure | Musical Transform | Musical Transact. | Musical Inspirational | Musical Pass-Av. | Baton/hand Clarity |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Musical Transform | | .78*** | .92*** | -.09 | .52* |
| Musical Transact | | | .86*** | -.06 | .55* |
| Musical Inspirational | | | | .00 | .57** |
| Musical Passive Avoidant | | | | | .09 |
| Baton/hand Clarity | | | | | |

Note: N=20. Statistics for each pair of variables are based on all the cases with the valid data for that pair. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

Relationship between feedback perceptions of Students & Conductor

Two of the questions on conductor communication style dealt specifically with feedback, drawing on previous research about effective music education practices and the type of feedback students receive. In comparing conductor self-perception with student perception about the amount of positive feedback an ensemble received, a correlation of .44 existed, showing some similarity. The raw results are shown in Table 5 below.

Table 5
Relationship between conductor and student responses regarding conductor's feedback

| Measure | Conductor Pos. Feedback | Conductor Criticism | Student Pos. Feedback | Student Criticism |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <i>Conductor Gives Pos. Feedback</i> | | -08 | .44* | -.28 |
| <i>Conductor Gives Criticism</i> | | | -.01 | -.28 |
| <i>Student Perceives Pos. Feedback</i> | | | | -.39 |
| <i>Student Perceives Criticism</i> | | | | |

Note: N=20. Statistics for each pair of variables are based on all the cases with the valid data for that pair. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

Relationship between Perceptions of Leadership on Non-Musical Tasks Between Conductor and a Colleague

On non-musical tasks, the conductor's relationship between transformational and transactional items was correlated at .70, whereas the correlation between transformational leadership and inspirational motivation was high at .86. (See Table 6) The conductors' self-perception of their transactional score for non-musical tasks was correlated with inspirational motivation, though slightly less than their transformational score at .63. However, when a colleague's perception of transformational leadership is compared with the colleague's perception of transactional and inspirational motivation, a correlation of .53 and .96 were shown, respectively. If one then compares the non-musical tasks from conductors' perception with those of a colleague, no significant correlation was found.

Table 6
Relationship of conductor and colleague responses of non-music related MLQ scores

| Measure | Con. Non-mus. Transform | Con. Non-mus. Transact | Con. Non-mus. Inspir. | Con. Non-mus. Pass. Av. | Col. Non-mus. Transform | Col. Non-mus. Transact | Col. Non-mus. Inspir. | Col. Non-mus. Pass. Av. |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Conductor Non-mus. Transform | | .70** | .86** | -.31 | .25 | .31 | .14 | .08 |
| Conductor Non-mus. Transact | | | .63** | -.06 | .29 | .33 | .23 | .15 |
| Conductor Non-mus. Inspirational | | | | -.16 | -.02 | .18 | -.14 | .17 |
| Conductor Non-mus. Passive Avoid. | | | | | .14 | .23 | .21 | .53* |
| Colleague Non-mus. Transform | | | | | | .53* | .96*** | .07 |
| Colleague Non-mus. Transact | | | | | | | .41 | .13 |
| Colleague Non-mus. Inspirational | | | | | | | | .11 |
| Colleague Non-mus. Passive Avoid. | | | | | | | | |

Note: N=20. Statistics for each pair of variables are based on all the cases with the valid data for that pair. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

Relationship Between Student and Conductor Magnitude & Leadership Ratings

In Table 7, a comparison of relationships between that which conductors perceive about themselves and that which others perceive show results that are quite different. In the case of magnitude, comparison of answers of the conductor sample with the same question asked of the students about the conductor showed little or no correlation at just .18. Whereas correlation between conductors' ratings of magnitude and transformational leadership was .78, the relationship between student perceptions between the same measures was .52. Conductor magnitude ratings compared with conductor transactional ratings correlated at .65, but student perceptions correlated at .53. While not quite as strongly connected in their minds, student responses clearly showed a relationship from their perspective. The student transactional ratings compared with transformational ratings correlated at .72, just slightly lower than the conductor's correlation of the same two items at .78. Students' transformational leadership ratings compared with inspirational motivation ratings were high at .78, showing the measure was worth considering. Student magnitude compared with student transformational, transactional and inspirational motivation ratings correlated at .52, .53, and .49, respectively. In comparing the student and conductor responses, an even greater void is seen, with all comparisons statistically insignificant and

correlating less than .32 in all cases. Chapter 5 will discuss the relationship between conductor and student ratings in depth.

Table 7
Relationship between student and conductor responses regarding magnitude and music-related MLQ scores

| Measure | Con. Mus. Magnitude | Con. Mus. Transform | Con. Mus. Transact | Con. Mus. Inspir. | Con. Mus. Pass-Av. | Stu. Mus. Magnitude | Stu. Mus. Transform | Stu. Mus. Transact | Stu. Mus. Inspir. | Stu. Mus. Pass. Av. |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Conductor Musical Magnitude | | .78*** | .65** | .77*** | -.24 | .18 | .18 | .03 | .32 | .07 |
| Conductor Musical Transform | | | .78*** | .91*** | -.09 | .10 | .02 | .11 | .17 | .28 |
| Conductor Musical Transact | | | | .86*** | -.06 | .02 | .01 | .13 | .17 | .32 |
| Conductor Musical Inspirational | | | | | .00 | .18 | .17 | .22 | .37 | .26 |
| Conductor Musical Passive Avoidant | | | | | | .03 | .16 | .06 | .32 | -.20 |
| Student Musical Magnitude | | | | | | | .52* | .53* | .49* | -.00 |
| Student Musical Transform | | | | | | | | .72*** | .78*** | -.03 |
| Student Musical Transact | | | | | | | | | .51* | .40 |
| Student Musical Inspirational | | | | | | | | | | -.07 |
| Student Musical Passive Avoidant | | | | | | | | | | |

Note: N=20. Statistics for each pair of variables are based on all the cases with the valid data for that pair. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

Relationship between Conductor & Student Perceptions of Leadership & Communication

Just as in surveying student and conductor ratings of magnitude and leadership, communication and leadership show a similar disconnect between student and conductor responses. Within the student responses, correlation of .56 existed between measures on listening skills in rehearsal and listening skills in conversation. Moderate correlation of .68 existed within student samples between a conductor's ability to receive direct feedback from students as compared with their eye contact. One might expect that conductor's leadership ratings would correlate with their ability to receive information from others. The results presented here show, however, no correlation or inverse correlation between most student perceptions of conductor communication and conductors' self-perceptions of transformational, transactional and inspiration motivation leadership. The results are below in Table 8 (NOTE: The table suggests student responses to the communication style of the conductor, so when a measure reads "Student- Gives criticism" it is the student's perception of the conductor giving criticism.)

Table 8
Relationship between conductor music-related MLQ scores and student communication responses

| Measure | Cond Mus. Transform | Cond Mus. Transact | Cond Mus. Inspir. | Cond Mus. Pass. Avoid. | Student Mus. Set. Listen. | Student Non-mus. Set. Listen. | Student Receive Verbal Feedback | Student Receive Eye Contact | Student Express Eye Contact | Student Positive Feedback | Student Gives Criticism |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Cond Musical Transform | .78*** | .92*** | -.09 | -.33 | .01 | -.18 | -.11 | .05 | .20 | .09 | |
| Cond Musical Transact | | .86*** | -.06 | -.31 | -.04 | -.21 | -.22 | -.07 | .18 | .11 | |
| Cond Musical Inspirational | | | .00 | -.29 | .12 | -.02 | .00 | .07 | .37 | -.06 | |
| Cond Musical Pass. Avoidant | | | | -.11 | .01 | .41 | .34 | .13 | .30 | -.17 | |
| Stu. Music Setting Listening | | | | | .56** | .31 | .45* | .36 | .39 | -.07 | |
| Stu. Non-mus. Set. Listening | | | | | | .49* | .59** | .65** | .56** | -.04 | |
| Stu. Receive verbal feedback | | | | | | | .68*** | .48* | .43 | -.33 | |
| Stu. Receive eye contact | | | | | | | | .63** | .65** | -.09 | |
| Stu. Express eye contact | | | | | | | | | .37 | .19 | |
| Stu. Give positive feedback | | | | | | | | | | -.39 | |
| Stu. Gives criticism | | | | | | | | | | | |

Note: N=20. Statistics for each pair of variables are based on all the cases with the valid data for that pair. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

Organizational Success from the View of Conductor, Student, Colleague

Items on the topic of organizational success included questions about the conductor's ability to impart technical, musical, and theoretical knowledge to an ensemble, their ability to share a clear concept of what they wanted to hear and how to create it, and whether an experience that was musically or personally fulfilling (See tables 9, 10, 11, and 12). Results showed that the means for conductor, student and colleague responses ranged only from 3.5 to 3.8 (on a Likert scale of 0-4). A student's perception of the conductor's overall success between ratings for ways in which the conductor imparted musical/theoretical knowledge to the choir were correlated with an experience that was musically fulfilling at .73. There was a similar correlation between the students' perception of the conductor having a clear idea of what sound they desired and a musically fulfilling experience (.72), just as there was for the colleagues, who believed similarly, correlated at .84. The lowest correlation within the student responses was correlation of .50, and referred to the relationship between the ways in which the conductor imparted technical knowledge and their ability to create a musically rewarding experience. When it came to what the colleagues reported in terms of overall success, the highest correlation was .84 between the conductor's

ability to impart technical knowledge with the colleagues' perception of what makes for a musically fulfilling experience. Results are shown in the respective tables below.

Table 9
Relationship between conductor music-related MLQ scores and conductor overall success responses

| Measure | Mus. Transform | Mus. Transact | Mus. Inspirational | Mus. Pass. Avoid. | Technical Knowledge | Musicological Knowledge | Sound | Fulfilling Experience | Personal Reward |
|--------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Musical Transform | | .78*** | .92*** | -.09 | -.17 | .35 | .40 | .21 | .12 |
| Musical Transact | | | .86*** | -.06 | -.24 | .21 | .36 | .24 | .26 |
| Musical Inspirational | | | | .00 | .21 | .26 | .46* | .28 | .26 |
| Musical Passive Avoidant | | | | | .05 | .13 | -.21 | .12 | -.19 |
| Technical Knowledge | | | | | | .58** | .33 | .33 | .08 |
| Musicological Knowledge | | | | | | | .12 | .53* | .29 |
| Sound | | | | | | | | -.01 | .21 |
| Fulfilling Experience | | | | | | | | | .62** |
| Personal Reward | | | | | | | | | |

Note: N=20. Statistics for each pair of variables are based on all the cases with the valid data for that pair. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

Table 10
Relationship between conductor music-related MLQ scores and student overall success responses

| Measure | Mus. Transform | Mus. Transact | Mus. Inspirational | Mus. Pass. Avoid. | Stu. Technical Knowledge | Stu. Musicological Knowledge | Stu. Sound | Stu. Fulfilling Experience | Stu. Personal Reward |
|------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Musical Transform | | .78*** | .92*** | -.09 | -.02 | .09 | .03 | .12 | -.14 |
| Musical Transact | | | .86*** | -.06 | -.02 | .04 | -.08 | -.08 | -.18 |
| Musical Inspirational | | | | .00 | .04 | .07 | .05 | .11 | -.00 |
| Musical Passive Avoidant | | | | | .01 | .13 | .07 | .16 | .20 |
| Stu. Technical Knowledge | | | | | | .75*** | .38 | .51* | .53* |
| Stu. Musicological Knowledge | | | | | | | .56** | .73*** | .45* |
| Stu. Sound | | | | | | | | .72*** | .64** |
| Stu. Fulfilling Experience | | | | | | | | | .70*** |

Note: N=20. Statistics for each pair of variables are based on all the cases with the valid data for that pair. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

Table 11
Relationship between conductor music-related MLQ scores and colleague overall success responses

| Measure | Cond Mus. Transform | Cond Mus. Transact | Cond Mus. Inspirational | Cond Mus. Pass. Avoid. | Col. OS Technical Knowledge | Col. OS Musicological Knowledge | Col. OS Sound | Col. OS Fulfilling Experience | Col. OS Personal Reward |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Cond Musical Transform | | .78*** | .92*** | -.09 | -.11 | -.18 | .03 | .05 | .28 |
| Cond Musical Transact | | | .86*** | -.06 | -.10 | -.11 | .03 | .01 | .16 |
| Cond Musical Inspirational | | | | .00 | .17 | -.18 | -.11 | .01 | .21 |
| Cond Musical Passive Avoidant | | | | | .10 | .22 | .06 | .00 | .12 |
| OS Col. Technical Knowledge | | | | | | .75*** | .69*** | .84*** | .49* |
| OS Col. Musicolog. Knowledge | | | | | | | .57** | .72*** | .14 |
| OS Col. Sound | | | | | | | | .84*** | .48* |
| OS Col. Fulfilling Experience | | | | | | | | | .60** |
| OS Col. Personal Reward | | | | | | | | | |

Note: N=20. Statistics for each pair of variables are based on all the cases with the valid data for that pair. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

Table 12
Relationship between overall success scores for conductor, student, and colleague

| Measure | Con. Tech. Know. | Con. Music. Know. | Con. Sound | Con. Ful. Exper. | Con. Personal Reward | Stu. Tech. Know. | Stu. Music. Know. | Stu. Sound | Stu. Ful. Exper. | Stu. Personal Reward | Col. Tech. Know. | Col. Music. Know. | Col. Sound | Col. Ful. Exper. | Col. Personal Reward |
|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Con. Technical Knowledge | | .58** | .33 | .33 | .08 | .55** | .33 | .52* | .40 | .50* | .08 | .09 | .34 | .22 | .22 |
| Con. Musicological Knowledge | | | .12 | .53* | .29 | .45* | .30 | .04 | .30 | .13 | .08 | .09 | .34 | .22 | .51* |
| Con. Sound | | | | -.01 | .21 | .32 | .09 | .24 | .07 | .30 | .18 | -.09 | -.08 | .08 | .08 |
| Con. Fulfilling Experience | | | | | .62** | .19 | .07 | -.04 | .22 | .17 | -.34 | -.23 | -.08 | -.22 | .08 |
| Con. Personal Reward | | | | | | .06 | .03 | -.07 | .00 | .04 | -.23 | -.11 | -.23 | -.12 | -.12 |
| Stu. Technical Knowledge | | | | | | | .75*** | .38 | .56* | .53* | .13 | .37 | .16 | .24 | .12 |
| Stu. Musicological Knowledge | | | | | | | | 0.56** | .73*** | .45* | .19 | .54* | .16 | .26 | .09 |
| Stu. Sound | | | | | | | | | .72*** | .64** | .24 | .27 | .24 | .40 | .18 |
| Stu. Fulfilling Experience | | | | | | | | | | .70*** | -.04 | .27 | -.04 | .10 | .09 |
| Stu. Personal Reward | | | | | | | | | | | .180 | .34 | .08 | .21 | -.06 |
| Col. Technical Knowledge | | | | | | | | | | | | .75*** | .68*** | .84*** | .45* |
| Col. Musicological Knowledge | | | | | | | | | | | | | .57** | .72*** | .14 |
| Col. Sound | | | | | | | | | | | | | | .84*** | .48* |
| Col. Fulfilling Experience | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | .60** |

Note: N=20. Statistics for each pair of variables are based on all the cases with the valid data for that pair. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

CHAPTER 5

The sample of conductors who participated in the study are all successful within the field of collegiate choral conducting, each leading a successful program at their respective universities and colleges which is comprised of a mix of music and non-music majors who participate for different reasons in the ensemble. They represent a microcosm of the leadership of the collegiate choral conducting industry as a whole. Within the field of choral conducting in general, the leadership concepts of the present study are applicable to virtually any type of music ensemble, including school based, community, professional, and church choirs. That said, it is also important to note that the sample was limited to liberal arts colleges and universities in the United States. While the findings and interpretations are framed within that context, we believe the concepts of leadership are in most cases fairly universal in nature. The interpretation of data that follows is discussed in a parallel order with the findings in Chapter 4, generally organized around the previously stated research questions.

Interpretation of Findings

This study was designed to draw on the researcher's personal experience as a singer and conductor in tandem with previous research between seemingly disparate fields in an effort to better inform present and future choral conductors of the dynamics of leadership. Prior to this study, minimal research on leadership attributes in ensemble leadership existed, other than anecdotally. While choral singers could easily name several conductors whose technique they liked and others whose technique they did not, a connection to leadership research was lacking. Using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Avolio and Bass (2004), one can begin to suggest that some choral leaders are transformational and that others, while transactionally effective, may not engender long-term commitment from

choristers. Regardless of the fact that most college choir singers leave the ensemble because they graduate, the goal should be to create in singers the kind of commitment that fuels a desire to sing with the ensemble long term (Walumbwa et al, 2004). This becomes particularly important with community or professional choirs, where low turnover rates and follower satisfaction musically, or otherwise, could mean a significant improvement in the overall artistic quality.

Using prior research upon which this study is based and the findings of the present study, I maintain that the qualities of leadership in a choral conductor are the following:

- 1) An ability to impart technical, theoretical, or musical knowledge in an ensemble in order to create the sound one desires.
- 2) An ability to use that defined as magnitude (Yarbough) to express oneself in a way that creates the sound one desires.
- 3) An ability to use bodily movement of various kinds (including the typical conducting gesture in the hands) to achieve the goals above.
- 4) An ability to express oneself as a leader in a way that inspires followers through a combination of transactional (extrinsic motivators) and transformational (intrinsic motivators) leadership skills.

Judging by the descriptive statistics (see Table 1), conductors generally rated themselves highly on clarity with the baton and even higher on their ability to listen effectively both on and off the podium. Here, they exhibited high scores for listening in rehearsal as well as listening in a conversation. On all other measures of communication, the conductors' mean was moderate. Conductor magnitude scores were also something that they considered to be one of their better attributes. Conductor ratings for transformational, transactional and inspirational motivation showed in most cases that the conductors'

transformational and inspirational motivation measures were slightly above 3 (out of 4) and their transactional rating hovered roughly one point lower on the 0-4 Likert scale. This suggested in most cases that the sample of conductors tended to use transactional leadership techniques as needed to accomplish musical goals, but that on average, their transformational and inspirational qualities were endorsed more highly than the transactional qualities. This was true for both musical and non-musical tasks and represents in many ways the ideal conductor. The conductor ratings for Passive-Avoidant leadership style were always below 1.5 (on a scale of 0-4), whether the question was asked of the conductor themselves or of a colleague about the conductor. This suggests it is difficult to be passive-avoidant as a leader and also be transformational, which is consistent with the findings of Avolio & Bass (2004).

For the questions on organizational success, correlations were generally quite high regardless of whether given by conductors, students, and colleagues, but skewed toward overgeneralization, so analysis of these items was limited. Conductors showed a mean score on the five items between 3.45 and 3.60 on a 0-4 Likert scale. Student responses were clustered between 3.48 and 3.70 with the highest mean scores on the questions about how clear a concept the conductor had about the sound they were trying to create and their ability to provide a musically satisfying experience. Colleague responses ranged from a mean of 3.57 to 3.84 for the five items.

The Relationship Between Leadership and Magnitude

One of the goals of the study was to draw a tighter connection between what occurs in music education and what happens in the relationship between a conductor and an ensemble. Conductors are music educators at any level or discipline, whether conducting a professional choir or a 5th grade mixed choir. While a conductor of a professional choir will

presumably focus less on technique and more on musical interpretation, the process of educating singers on the leader's vision is consistent in any scenario. If this is true, then Gumm's 1993 study determining the effects of non-verbal motivation on choral ensembles and Yarbrough's 1975 study of magnitude are both important for studies of conducting effectiveness in general (Van Weelden, 2002). Further research on teaching style suggested that effective teaching matches the approach to the student learning style (Pautz, 1988; Zikmund, 1988). The present study sought to combine these strands of research and found a high correlation of .78 between conductor self-rating on magnitude and transformational leadership skills.

Yarbrough's (1975) research suggested that music education more effectively occurs under various conditions of magnitude, and the present study suggests that choral conductors of collegiate ensembles who seek to be transformational might consider what they perceive as their level of magnitude in musical leadership. To review, high magnitude refers to using a wide range of gestures, tones, and tempi in one's communication and is different than enthusiasm. Conductors should bear in mind that their perception of magnitude and transformational leadership does not necessarily equal that of their followers, but the strong correlation between the two suggests that success would be more likely if the conductor exhibited higher magnitude. In comparing magnitude with transactional leadership, the moderate correlation found here suggests that conductors who excel in certain aspects of the MLQ will likely also demonstrate magnitude in their conducting. The high correlation between inspirational motivation and magnitude in this study also suggests that leaders who are able to inspire their followers and display high magnitude may be able to achieve more with their ensembles. In comparing magnitude with passive-avoidant

leadership style in the MLQ, a small inverse correlation exists, suggesting the two do not often occur together.

Regarding differences between conductors' self-perception of their musical and non-musical leadership qualities, data from this study suggests that in leadership scenarios, musical and non-musical responses were similar. The present study also suggests that the need for transformational leadership on non-musical tasks (i.e. fundraising, board development, etc.) is still high. Anyone who has worked with a board understands that the conductor holds the keys to inspiring these stakeholders on the non-musical tasks that boards usually undertake. This does not negate the need for transactional skills, but is additive to it.

In general, the high correlation found between magnitude and transformative, transactional, and inspirational leadership suggests that in developing interview processes or training conductors, the ability to dynamically assess the variables both as a whole and independently is important. The present study suggests a high correlation between variables. Given this, if a conductor were given a similar assessment and a discrepancy was found between their magnitude and transformational leadership scores, then attempting to better understand why the two do not correlate could provide a more comprehensive picture of the individual.

Relationships Between Communication & MLQ

Questions on communication dealt with many of the same topics as the magnitude measure, where attributes such as eye contact were complemented in the communication items by listening skills, both on and off the podium, and feedback style (Duke, 1999). Perhaps the correlation of 0.48 and 0.52 for transformational and inspiration skills with

conductor's ability to listen in conversation indicates that transformational leaders excel at information intake from their followers in a variety of ways.

The connections between magnitude and non-musical items assessing transformative and transactional leadership from the MLQ are worth analysis. As Burns' (1978) political research showed, transactional leadership is often negatively associated with politics, in which rewards are exchanged for services. Inherent in any work situation, there are transactional relationships which are crucial to getting a job done and these should not mistakenly be viewed as negative attributes. The goal for successful leaders ought to be finding ways to effectively engage their choristers, students, and associates first on a transactional level, then build to a transformational level. This philosophy necessitates that in the choral ensemble, if the conductor is effective, there *should* be a correlation between the musical and non-musical experiences, both transactional and transformational. A high correlation for those attributes that are transformational along with reasonably high correlation for transactional attributes indicates both are occurring, with slight emphasis on the transformational. This suggests that the qualities of leadership in the MLQ, which were not necessarily designed for musicians, are indeed applicable to conductors, since it correlates strongly with magnitude, an attribute found in successful music teaching. One could also make the case that as before, this suggests high similarity between the ideals of leadership and effective music teaching.

The Relationship Between Clarity in Baton Technique with Leadership

A moderate relationship between conductor assessment of the clarity of their baton technique and their leadership qualities indicated that while conducting gesture is certainly a crucial part of standard communication with an ensemble, a clear conducting pattern does not say much about the conductors' leadership capacity (Byo, 1990). This finding can be

attested by anecdote and observation alike by most ensemble members, who will often overlook the quality of baton clarity if they are inspired by the individual's leadership. Since magnitude was shown to have a greater correlation with successful transformational leadership and inspiration, perhaps the sub-scales of magnitude such as tone of voice, eye contact, and body language should be equally explored by conductors and conductors-in-training.

Relationship between perceptions of leadership on Non-Musical Tasks between Conductor and a Colleague

When viewed on a more global scale, conductor correlation between the musical and the non-musical aspects of the MLQ were higher than 0.74. This suggests that one can assume that a conductor who rates high on musical leadership ability may rate high on non-musical leadership ability, according to their own assessment, but is unlikely to show the same correlation when considering choristers' assessment of the same conductor. One of the most significant findings of the present study is that conductors' leadership skills both on and off the podium are perceived differently by their followers and colleagues. In some cases, those around the conductor may perceive them to be stronger in one area than another. Providing ensemble members either a mechanism to provide honest feedback as to their experience or engaging them in the conductor's overall vision may enable stronger leadership by conductors of all types of ensembles.

Relationship Between Student and Conductor Magnitude & Leadership Ratings

As mentioned in Chapter 4, the perception of oneself is often vastly different from others' perception. This doesn't necessarily mean the conductor is not effective in their role. The fact that little correlation between student and conductor response was found may suggest that perhaps conductors need to explain more of the intent behind their decisions and help the followers to better understand the conductors' overall vision for the ensemble

and the goals that they have as a conductor, so that the followers are able to orient to that perspective, creating what would possibly be a greater correlation between conductor and singer responses about the conductor as a leader.

Because a strong correlation was shown within student responses between transformational and transactional ratings and inspirational motivation over .70, but the difference in ratings between student and conductor responses was weaker, vantage point is significant to perception of leadership. This is consistent with research outside the present study on the topic, which has shown significant contextual differences depending on the situation. In the present study, some of these contextual considerations might include the fact that liberal arts colleges were used, not conservatories. Others might include the gender of the conductors studied, differences between choral and orchestral musicians, or cultural differences for ensembles outside of the United States, although the items of focus in this study are also believed to be somewhat universal traits. In any case, if the intersection between perceptions of leadership by students and conductors could be discovered, then the effectiveness of the transformational leadership might rise for both the leader and the led.

Relationship Between Conductor & Student Perceptions of Leadership & Communication

In examination of the relationships between a conductor's leadership scores and student's perception of their communication skills, most correlations were zero or minimal, suggesting that simply because a conductor's scores on communication and their MLQ scores correlate, this is not necessarily true for students' perception of the same. A conductor may score highly on leadership skills but their ensemble may not see that they possess great listening skills. This was shown by a -.33 correlation between conductor transformational leadership score and the students' opinion of how well they listen in rehearsal. Interestingly, when it came to the students' perception of how well the conductor

listened in conversation (off the podium), there was virtually no correlation (.01). This suggests that as conductors, one should not assume a connection between leadership and listening. One might falsely assume the ability to be a transformational leader is something connected to an individual's ability to listen to one's followers (in the non-musical setting), but the present study suggests otherwise. Although not substantial, a small correlation existed between two of the student items and a conductor's passive avoidance rating. These included the relationship between conductor's score on passive-avoidant leadership and student questions on whether the conductor received feedback from singers directly (correlation coefficient was .41) and whether the conductor received information from singers via eye contact (a .34 correlation). This could be investigated in further studies.

Organizational Success from the View of Conductor, Student, Colleague

The measures of organizational success had limited use in the present study due to highly skewed responses, but some analysis of correlations might provide insight to future studies. Positive correlation of .58 between conductor perception of the technical and theoretical knowledge they impart to the ensemble suggests the importance of both in this context. Correlation of .53 between the conductor responses on overall success with regard to musical knowledge and how musically fulfilling they believe the singing experience is bears mention, especially since the correlation of technical knowledge with musical fulfillment was only correlated at .33. Perhaps for collegiate conductors, this suggests that their overall musical enjoyment is more affected by the musical or historical knowledge of the conductor than by the technical knowledge. This is consistent with what is known anecdotally about college singers, in particular voice majors, each of whom has a totally different view of the technical aspects of singing. Many collegiate choral conductors avoid discussing "how" to create the sound vocally and more on the "why" so as not to upset the

student or their voice teacher, which is consistent with the finding above. Out of the five items on overall success asked of conductors, the one which showed the greatest correlation with MLQ measures was focused on the conductor having a clear idea of the sound they wished to achieve. The correlations were modest at best (transformational leadership was .40, transactional was .36, and inspirational motivation was .46).

When comparing conductor data on overall success with student perception of organizational success, student views on technical knowledge were correlated with conductors' views on the same at a correlation of .55 suggesting a moderate connection. The highest correlation of student success responses within their own ratings was .75 for the relationship between their view of technical and theoretical knowledge of the conductor. Whereas conductors reported high correlation between a musically fulfilling experience and impartation of musical knowledge, student responses showed that technical knowledge correlation with overall musical enjoyment was .75. For students, there was a moderately strong correlation between the conductor having a sound they wanted to achieve with both musical and personal fulfillment, respectively at .72 and .64. Interestingly, when it came to the colleague's perception about success, the highest correlation within their own responses was .84, again showing that perhaps they perceive an important connection between technical knowledge and musical fulfillment. Similarly, a correlation of .84 was shown between the colleagues' perception of the conductor having a sound they wished to achieve with musical success. A correlation of .75 was shown within the colleague responses between technical knowledge and musical knowledge. Oddly, a negligible correlation occurred between colleague responses and student responses regarding musically fulfilling experiences, suggesting that conductor and colleague value different things. Likewise, virtually no relationship exists between conductor and student perception of what makes a

personally fulfilling experience. Of the measures of transformational leadership cited by Avolio and Bass (2004), those that consist of sharing one's vision for an organization and other non-technical aspects are categorized as Idealized Beliefs and Attributes and Inspirational Motivation, two of the components that make up the transformational leadership composite score. While the sample of conductors rated high (above 3) in most cases on transformational leadership aspects, the correlation between students and conductors is weak on items of organizational success.

This might suggest that colleagues' perception of a successful ensemble experience is different than the students. Student perception of musical/historical knowledge was more highly correlated with a positive musical experience, whereas colleague perception of the positive musical experience was correlated with technical knowledge.

Finally, student organizational success ratings were compared with conductor MLQ ratings. Correlations were either zero or slightly negative, suggesting once again that the conductor's perspective on leadership as viewed through the MLQ lens shows little correlation with the items on student perspective of organizational success.

Further Research

As mentioned, there are several contextual situations that could be researched more in depth in future studies, since the present study was focused on investigating what broad connections exist between leadership attributes and how self-perception differs from that of those around us. Some of these might include the ways in which leadership attributes are perceived differently according to gender, cultural differences, orchestral musicians versus choral singers, and professional versus volunteer musicians.

Since such a large part of being a conductor involves listening and reacting while providing a steady hand of leadership, a study that could closely define the relationship

between conductors' ability to listen in rehearsal and in conversation would be ideal. If the conductor were stronger in either interpersonal listening/reacting or on the podium, this connection might allow the conductor to apply their strengths from one to the other. This concept could be explored in isolation or as part of a larger study on emotional intelligence in musical leadership where the ability to better understand people could be used to create more transformational ensemble experiences.

The connection between music education, leadership, and conducting research as portrayed by the present study suggests that conductor training programs might consider adding leadership workshops to their curriculum, discussing aspects of magnitude and communication style, definitions of overall success, or perceptions of leadership. If conductors were better able to understand aspects of communication, magnitude, and leadership qualities in their musical and non-musical work, perhaps this focus on analyzing oneself as much as one analyzes the music would lead to stronger organizations. While the effect on the artistic quality of the performances might not be proven by developing better leadership skills, strengthening the infrastructure might certainly improve the long-term health of the organization, whether that be happier singers, a better connection to the university as a support base, improved recruitment or fundraising. When arts organizations and higher education funding are often on the chopping block, having skills in score analysis may no longer be enough.

Another interesting follow-up study would be an approach for assessing the relationship between organizational skills and leadership skills. Since none of the measures contained in the MLQ assess the quality of organizational skills, it is out of the realm of the present study, but it might be a worthwhile future study to determine how organization affects leadership in a musical ensemble. There is already a body of research on the topic of

how organization affects music education, and the application of this material to ensemble leadership would be worthwhile.

With regard to organizational success, given the disparity between student perception of technical knowledge and theoretical knowledge imparted by the conductor, comparing the differences in response between collegiate, professional, and community choristers might suggest where conductors should focus their efforts, as suggested by the singers in the ensemble, not just the conductor's own opinion. It might also be possible to administer the same questions to an orchestra with similar demographic information to see what the comparison is between choral leadership and orchestral leadership, again from the perspective of conductor and player. The low correlational numbers between student, colleague and conductor responses in the present study also suggests that the definition of organizational success in a choral ensemble is highly subjective. This is worth noting when considering factors that go into hiring or tenure candidacy, but perhaps assessing leadership attributes in combination with other indicators of organizational success would be good.

In summary, there exists a clear connection between music education, conducting, and the leadership studies. Regardless of the type of ensemble, conductors' display of magnitude, communication skills on and off the podium, and transactional, transformational, and inspirational leadership skills are related. Just as with any non-musical organization, the perceptions of those who are following the leader are unlikely the same as the perceptions of the leader themselves, which may be why things like magnitude and communication abilities matter so much. Finally, while organizational success is a subjective term, it can be more difficult to achieve without leadership skills. The transformational leader simply assumes that the steps needed to achieve the benchmarks will occur and then focuses his or her attention on the process it takes to get there. Transformational leadership is about transforming the

people in an organization by knowing what type of leadership style is needed and having enough perspective on each situation, individual, and oneself to enact that in the right moment.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CONDUCTORS

I am conducting a research project exploring the issues of leadership faced by choral conductors. The goal is to add credibility to our field by encouraging best practices in leadership. My hope is that this short questionnaire will yield information that will be helpful to all of us in the choral conducting field. The study consists of a 20-minute survey offered to twenty choral conductors in liberal arts colleges in the United States. This will be compared with an anonymous, volunteer questionnaire to be completed by the singers in the conductors' ensembles and colleagues. By conducting this study, we hope to learn more about the characteristics of effective choral leaders.

The information sheet attached will give you the details of the survey, which you will see is relatively quick, but designed to be objective and confidential. I hope you will consider participating in this worthwhile project. Together, we can improve singer experiences, conductor training, and the strength of the field.

PART I

Please answer by circling the number that best represents your perceptions of yourself as a conductor. 0=Never, 1= Rarely, 2= Sometimes, 3= Often, 4 = Always.

MAGNITUDE

- 1) I look up at the ensemble while conducting a piece in rehearsal (not during an explanation). 0 1 2 3 4
- 2) I look at the ensemble during performance. 0 1 2 3 4
- 3) In rehearsal, while conducting, I make eye contact with ensemble members. 0 1 2 3 4
- 4) In performance, I make eye contact with ensemble members. 0 1 2 3 4
- 5) My facial expression changes in rehearsal according to the character of the music. 0 1 2 3 4
- 6) Not including the use of your hands, I consider how my body movement is reflective of the music. 0 1 2 3 4
- 7) Not including the use of my hands, I use my body to empower the ensemble (show gestures) 0 1 2 3 4
- 8) I use my hands/arms independently to show multiple musical elements (time, expression, dynamics) 0 1 2 3 4
- 9) In rehearsal, I vary the pitch of my speaking voice while explaining something. 0 1 2 3 4
- 10) In rehearsal, I vary the volume of my speaking voice while explaining something. 0 1 2 3 4
- 11) In rehearsal, I vary the speed of my speech while I am explaining something. 0 1 2 3 4

REHEARSAL STRUCTURE

- 12) I explain musical concepts in rehearsal. 0 1 2 3 4
- 13) Rehearsal is spent playing (vs. receiving instructions, verbal or otherwise). 0 1 2 3 4
- 14) I provide clear 'information' in the tip of my baton (or in a specific point in the hand if not baton) 0 1 2 3 4
- 15) Generally speaking, my conducting gestures are clear. 0 1 2 3 4
- 16) I organize each rehearsal. 0 1 2 3 4
- 17) I am efficient in rehearsal. 0 1 2 3 4
- 18) In a musical setting, I possess effective listening skills which shape the rehearsal. 0 1 2 3 4

19) In a non-musical setting (i.e. conversation), I possess effective listening skills. 0 1 2 3 4

COMMUNICATION

For 20-23: I receive most information from others in my ensemble via:

20) Direct verbal (they tell me) 0 1 2 3 4

21) Indirect verbal (I hear it from a trusted confidant) 0 1 2 3 4

22) Eye contact 0 1 2 3 4

23) 'Gut' feeling (I sense it) 0 1 2 3 4

For 24-28: I communicate best with others via:

24) Eye contact 0 1 2 3 4

25) Explaining myself verbally one on one 0 1 2 3 4

26) Explaining myself verbally to a group 0 1 2 3 4

27) Through others (intermediaries) 0 1 2 3 4

28) Through Email 0 1 2 3 4

For 29-32: In my rehearsals, I prefer to give feedback via:

29) Praise. 0 1 2 3 4

30) Praise balanced with constructive criticism. 0 1 2 3 4

31) Criticism 0 1 2 3 4

32) I don't think about it. 0 1 2 3 4

Part II

Please answer by circling the number that best represents your perceptions of experiences you have had. 0= Disagree Always, 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Disagree Somewhat, 4= Agree Somewhat, 5=Agree, 6 = Strongly Agree, 7=Agree Always.

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

33) I have a clear idea of where we are going. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

34) I paint an interesting picture of the future for the group. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

35) I am always seeking new opportunities for the organization. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

36) I inspire others with my plans for the future. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

37) I am able to get others committed to my vision. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

38) I lead by doing rather than by telling. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

39) I provide a good model for people to follow. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

40) I lead by example. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

41) I foster communication between different areas/sections of the organization. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

42) I encourage people to be team players. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 43) I get the group to work together toward one goal. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 44) I develop a team attitude and spirit among individuals. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 45) I show that I expect a lot from individuals. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 46) I insist on only the best performance. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 47) I will not settle for second best. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 48) I act without considering others' feelings. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 49) I show respect for individuals' feelings and opinions. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 50) I behave in a way thoughtful of others' needs. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 51) I treat others without considering their personal feelings. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP | | | | | | | | |
| 52) I give positive feedback when people perform well. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 53) I give special recognition when the work is good. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 54) I commend people for a better than average job. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 55) I personally compliment people when they do outstanding work. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 56) I frequently do not acknowledge good performance. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Part III – Your musical work (that is, specifically with your singers and focused on the music only)

Judge how frequently each statement fits you with regard to your musical work. The word “others” may mean your peers, students, colleagues, and/or all of these individuals.

Please answer by circling the number that best represents your perceptions of experiences you have had. 0=Not at all, 1=Once in a while, 2= Sometimes, 3= Often, 4 = Always.

MLQ

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 57) I provide ensemble members with assistance in exchange for their efforts. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 58) I re-examine critical assumptions about the music to question whether they are appropriate. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 59) I fail to interfere until musical errors become serious. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 60) I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 61) I avoid getting involved when important musical issues arise, letting the ensemble members solve | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 62) I talk about my most important values and beliefs. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 63) I am not as helpful as I could be in various moments where I am needed. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 64) I seek differing perspectives when approaching the music. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 65) I talk optimistically about the future. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 66) I instill pride in others for being associated with me. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 67) I discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 68) I wait for things to go wrong before taking action. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 69) I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 70) I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 71) I spend time teaching and coaching. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 72) I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 73) I show that I am a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 74) I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 75) I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 76) I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 77) I act in ways that build others' respect for me. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 78) I concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 79) I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 80) I keep track of all mistakes. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 81) I display a sense of power and confidence. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 82) I articulate a compelling vision of the future. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 83) I direct my attention toward failures to meet standards | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 84) I avoid making decisions. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 85) I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 86) I get others to look at problems from many different angles. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 87) I help others to develop their strengths. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 88) I suggest new ways of looking at the music. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 89) I delay responding to urgent questions. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 90) I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 91) I express satisfaction when others meet expectations. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 92) I express confidence that goals will be achieved. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 93) I am effective in meeting ensemble members' job-related needs. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 94) I use methods of leadership that are satisfying. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 95) I get others to do more than they expected to do. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 96) I am effective in representing others to higher authority. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 97) I work with others in a satisfactory way. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 98) I heighten others' desire to succeed. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 99) I am effective in meeting organizational requirements. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 100) I increase others' willingness to try harder. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 101) I lead a group that is effective. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Part IV – Your organizational work (that is, everything else BUT the music)

Judge how frequently each statement fits you with regard to your organizational work. The word “others” may mean your peers, students, colleagues, and/or all of these individuals.

Please answer by circling the number that best represents your perceptions of experiences you have had. 0=Not at all, 1=Once in a while, 2= Sometimes, 3= Often, 4 = Always.

MLQ

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 102) I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 103) I re-examine critical assumptions about the organization to question whether they are appropriate. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 104) I fail to interfere until mistakes become serious. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 105) I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 106) I avoid getting involved when important issues arise, letting others solve them. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 107) I talk about my most important values and beliefs. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 108) I am not as helpful as I could be in various moments where I am needed. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 109) I seek differing perspectives when approaching situations. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 110) I talk optimistically about the future. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 111) I instill pride in others for being associated with me. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 112) I discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 113) I wait for things to go wrong before taking action. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 114) I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 115) I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 116) I spend time teaching and coaching others in the organization. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 117) I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 118) I show that I am a firm believer in “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.” Some problems will fix themselves. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 119) I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 120) I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 121) I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 122) I act in ways that build others’ respect for me. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 123) I concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 124) I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 125) I keep track of all mistakes. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 126) I display a sense of power and confidence. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 127) I articulate a compelling vision of the future. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 128) I direct my attention toward failures to meet standards | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 129) I avoid making decisions. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 130) I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 131) I get others to look at problems from many different angles. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 132) I help others to develop their strengths. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 133) I suggest new ways of looking at problems. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 134) I delay responding to urgent questions. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 135) I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 136) I express satisfaction when others meet expectations. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 137) I express confidence that goals will be achieved. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 138) I am effective in meeting others' job-related needs. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 139) I use methods of leadership that are satisfying. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 140) I get others to do more than they expected to do. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 141) I am effective in representing others to higher authority. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 142) I work with others in a satisfactory way. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 143) I heighten others' desire to succeed. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 144) I am effective in meeting organizational requirements. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 145) I increase others' willingness to try harder. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 146) I lead a group that is effective. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Part V – Organizational Success

Judge how frequently each statement fits you with regard to your belief about the overall success of the choir under your leadership.

Please answer by circling the number that best represents your perceptions of experiences you have had. 0=Not at all, 1=Once in a while, 2= Sometimes, 3= Often, 4 = Always.

OS 1-5

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 147) I impart technical knowledge to the singers in my ensemble. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 148) I impart musicological/theoretical knowledge in my ensemble. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 149) I have a clear concept of a sound that I want to achieve and am successful in achieving it. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 150) I create an experience for my singers that is musically fulfilling. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 151) I create an experience that is personally rewarding. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SINGERS

I am conducting a research project exploring the issues of leadership faced by choral conductors. The goal is to add credibility to our field by encouraging best practices in leadership. My hope is that this short questionnaire will yield information that will be helpful to all of us in the choral conducting field. The study consists of a 20-minute survey offered to twenty choral conductors in liberal arts colleges in the United States. This will be compared with an anonymous, volunteer questionnaire to be completed by the singers in the conductors' ensembles and colleagues. We have sought you as an ensemble singer for a conductor that has agreed to participate in our survey. By conducting this study, we hope to learn more about the characteristics of effective choral leaders.

The information sheet attached will give you the details of the survey, which you will see is relatively quick, but designed to be objective and confidential. I hope you will consider participating in this worthwhile project. Together, we can improve singer experiences, conductor training, and the strength of the field.

PART I

Please answer by circling the number that best represents your perceptions of your conductor. 0=Never, 1= Rarely, 2= Sometimes, 3= Often, 4 = Always.

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) The conductor looks up at the ensemble while conducting a piece <u>in rehearsal</u> | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2) The conductor looks up at the ensemble <u>during performance</u> . | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3) In rehearsal, while conducting, the conductor makes eye contact with ensemble members. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4) In performance, the conductor makes eye contact with ensemble members. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5) The conductor's facial expression changes in <u>rehearsal</u> according to the character of the music. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6) Not including the use of their hands, the conductor's body movement is reflective of the music. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7) Not including the use of my hands, the conductor uses their body to empower the ensemble. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8) The conductor uses their hands/arms independently to show multiple musical elements. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9) In rehearsal, the conductor varies the pitch of their speaking voice while explaining something. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10) In rehearsal, the conductor varies the volume of their speaking voice while explaining something. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11) In rehearsal, the conductor often varies the speed of their speech while explaining something. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12) The conductor explains musical concepts in rehearsal. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13) Rehearsal is spent playing (vs. receiving instructions, verbal or otherwise). | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14) The conductor communicates clearly with the baton | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15) Generally speaking, the conductor's overall conducting gestures are clear. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16) The conductor organizes each rehearsal. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 17) The conductor is efficient in rehearsal. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 18) In a musical setting, the conductor possesses effective listening skills which shape the rehearsal. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 19) In a non-musical setting (i.e. conversation), the conductor possesses effective listening skills. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

For 20-23: When communicating with the conductor, I prefer to do so via:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20) Direct verbal (tell them what I think) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 21) Indirect verbal (tell a trusted confidant) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 22) Eye contact with the conductor | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 23) Body language | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| For 24-28: Generally, the conductor communicates best with others via: | | | | | |
| 24) Eye contact | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 25) Explaining themselves verbally one on one | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 26) Explaining themselves verbally to a group | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 27) Through others (intermediaries) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 28) Through Email | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| For 29-32: In their rehearsal, the conductor prefers to give feedback via: | | | | | |
| 29) Praise. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 30) Praise balanced with constructive criticism. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 31) Criticism | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 32) I don't think about it. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

PART II

Please answer by circling the number that best represents your perceptions of experiences you have had with this conductor. 0= Disagree Always, 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Disagree Somewhat, 4= Agree Somewhat, 5=Agree, 6 = Strongly Agree, 7=Agree Always.

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) The conductor has a clear idea of where they are going. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2) The conductor paints an interesting picture of the future for the group. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3) The conductor is always seeking new opportunities for the organization. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4) The conductor inspires others with their plans for the future. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5) The conductor is able to get others committed to their vision. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6) The conductor leads by doing rather than by telling. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7) The conductor provides a good model for people to follow. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8) The conductor leads by example. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9) The conductor fosters communication between different areas/sections of the organization. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10) The conductor encourages people to be team players. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11) The conductor gets the group to work together toward one goal. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12) The conductor develops a team attitude and spirit among individuals. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13) The conductor shows that they expect a lot from individuals. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14) The conductor insists on only the best performance. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15) The conductor will not settle for second best. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16) The conductor acts without considering others' feelings. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 17) The conductor shows respect for individuals' feelings and opinions. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 18) The conductor behaves in a way thoughtful of others' needs. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 19) The conductor treats others without considering their personal feelings. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 20) The conductor gives positive feedback when people perform well. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 21) The conductor gives special recognition when the work is good. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 22) The conductor commends people for a better than average job. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 23) The conductor personally compliments people when they do outstanding work. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 24) The conductor frequently does not acknowledge good performance. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Part III – The Conductor’s Musical Work (that is, specifically with you as a singer and focused on musical issues only)

Judge how frequently each statement fits your perception of the conductor of your ensemble with regard to your musical work. The word “others” may mean your peers, students, colleagues, and/or all of these individuals.

Please answer by circling the number that best represents the experiences you have had. 0=Not at all, 1=Once in a while, 2= Sometimes, 3= Often, 4 = Always.

The conductor I am rating...

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) Provides ensemble members with assistance in exchange for their efforts. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2) Re-examines critical assumptions about the music to question whether they are appropriate. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3) Fails to interfere until musical errors become serious. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4) Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5) Avoids getting involved when important musical issues arise, letting the ensemble members solve | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6) Talks about their most important values and beliefs. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7) Is not as helpful as they could be in various moments where they are needed. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8) Seeks differing perspectives when approaching the music. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9) Talks optimistically about the future. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10) Instills pride in others for being associated with them. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11) Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12) Waits for things to go wrong before taking action. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13) Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14) Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15) Spends time teaching and coaching. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16) Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17) Shows that they are a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 18) Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 19) Treats others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 20) Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before they take action. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 21) Acts in ways that build others' respect for them. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 22) Concentrates their full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 23) Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 24) Keeps track of all mistakes. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 25) Displays a sense of power and confidence. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 26) Articulates a compelling vision of the future. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 27) Directs their attention toward failures to meet standards | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 28) Avoids making decisions. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 29) Considers an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 30) Gets others to look at problems from many different angles. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 31) Helps others to develop their strengths. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 32) Suggests new ways of looking at the music. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 33) Delays responding to urgent questions. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 34) Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 35) Expresses satisfaction when others meet expectations. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 36) Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 37) Is effective in meeting ensemble members' job-related needs. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 38) Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 39) Gets others to do more than they expected to do. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 40) Is effective in representing others to higher authority. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 41) Works with others in a satisfactory way. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 42) Heightens others' desire to succeed. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 43) Is effective in meeting organizational requirements. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 44) Increases others' willingness to try harder. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 45) Leads a group that is effective. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Part IV – Organizational Success

Judge how frequently each statement fits with regard to your belief about the overall success of the choir under your conductor leadership.

Please answer by circling the number that best represents your perceptions of experiences you have had. 0=Not at all, 1=Once in a while, 2= Sometimes, 3= Often, 4 = Always.

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) The conductor imparts technical knowledge to singers in the ensemble. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2) The conductor imparts musicological/theoretical knowledge in the ensemble. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3) The conductor has a clear concept of a sound that they want to achieve and are successful in achieving. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4) The conductor creates an experience for singers that is musically fulfilling. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5) The conductor creates an experience that is personally rewarding. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COLLEAGUES

I am conducting a research project exploring the issues of leadership faced by choral conductors. The goal is to add credibility to our field by encouraging best practices in leadership. My hope is that this short questionnaire will yield information that will be helpful to all of us in the choral conducting field. The study consists of a 20-minute survey offered to twenty choral conductors in liberal arts colleges in the United States. This will be compared with an anonymous, volunteer questionnaire to be completed by the singers in the conductors' ensembles and colleagues. We have sought you as a colleague that has agreed to participate in our survey with the hope that you can speak to the conductor's leadership capacity and ability to strengthen an ensemble over time. By conducting this study, we hope to learn more about the characteristics of effective choral leaders.

The information sheet attached will give you the details of the survey, which you will see is relatively quick, but designed to be objective and confidential. I hope you will consider participating in this worthwhile project. Together, we can improve singer experiences, conductor training, and the strength of the field.

PART I

Please answer by circling the number that best represents your perceptions of experiences you have had with this conductor, in whatever context you know them. 0= Disagree Always, 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Disagree Somewhat, 4= Agree Somewhat, 5=Agree, 6 = Strongly Agree, 7=Agree Always.

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) The conductor has a clear idea of where they are going. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2) The conductor paints an interesting picture of the future for the group. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3) The conductor is always seeking new opportunities for the organization. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4) The conductor inspires others with their plans for the future. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5) The conductor is able to get others committed to their vision. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6) The conductor leads by doing rather than by telling. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7) The conductor provides a good model for people to follow. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8) The conductor leads by example. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9) The conductor fosters communication between different areas/sections of the organization. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10) The conductor encourages people to be team players. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11) The conductor gets the group to work together toward one goal. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12) The conductor develops a team attitude and spirit among individuals. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13) The conductor shows that they expect a lot from individuals. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14) The conductor insists on only the best performance. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15) The conductor will not settle for second best. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16) The conductor acts without considering others' feelings. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 17) The conductor shows respect for individuals' feelings and opinions. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 18) The conductor behaves in a way thoughtful of others' needs. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19) The conductor treats others without considering their personal feelings. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 20) The conductor gives positive feedback when people perform well. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 21) The conductor gives special recognition when the work is good. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 22) The conductor commends people for a better than average job. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 23) The conductor personally compliments people when they do outstanding work. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 24) The conductor frequently does not acknowledge good performance. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Part II – The conductor’s organizational work (that is, everything BUT the music)

Judge how frequently you believe each statement fits the conductor with regard to their organizational work.

Please answer by circling the number that best represents your perceptions of experiences you have had. 0=Not at all, 1=Once in a while, 2= Sometimes, 3= Often, 4 = Always.

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) The conductor provides others with assistance in exchange for their efforts. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2) The conductor re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3) The conductor fails to interfere until problems become serious. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4) The conductor focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5) The conductor avoids getting involved when important issues arise. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6) The conductor talks about their most important values and beliefs. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7) The conductor is absent when needed. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8) The conductor seeks differing perspectives when solving problems. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9) The conductor talks optimistically about the future. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10) The conductor instills pride in others for being associated with them. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11) The conductor discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12) The conductor waits for things to go wrong before taking action. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13) The conductor talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14) The conductor specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15) The conductor spends time teaching and coaching. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16) The conductor makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 17) The conductor shows that they are a firm believer in “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.” | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 18) The conductor goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 19) The conductor treats others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 20) The conductor demonstrates that problems must become chronic before they take action. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 21) The conductor acts in ways that build others’ respect for them. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 22) The conductor concentrates their full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 23) The conductor considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 24) The conductor keeps track of all mistakes. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 25) The conductor displays a sense of power and confidence. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 26) The conductor articulates a compelling vision of the future. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 27) The conductor directs my attention toward failures to meet standards. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 28) The conductor avoids making decisions. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 29) The conductor considers an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 30) The conductor gets others to look at problems from many different angles. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 31) The conductor helps others to develop their strengths. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 32) The conductor suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 33) The conductor delays responding to urgent questions. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 34) The conductor emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 35) The conductor expresses satisfaction when others meet expectations. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 36) The conductor expresses confidence that goals will be achieved. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 37) The conductor is effective in meeting others' job-related needs. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 38) The conductor uses methods of leadership that are satisfying. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 39) The conductor gets others to do more than they expected to do. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 40) The conductor is effective in representing others to higher authority. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 41) The conductor works with others in a satisfactory way. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 42) The conductor heightens others' desire to succeed. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 43) The conductor is effective in meeting organizational requirements. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 44) The conductor increases others' willingness to try harder. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 45) The conductor leads a group that is effective. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Part IV – Organizational Success

Judge how frequently each statement fits with regard to your belief about the overall success of the choir under the conductor's leadership.

Please answer by circling the number that best represents your perceptions of experiences you have had. 0=Not at all, 1=Once in a while, 2= Sometimes, 3= Often, 4 = Always.

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) The conductor imparts technical knowledge to singers in the ensemble. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2) The conductor imparts musicological/theoretical knowledge in the ensemble. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3) The conductor has a clear concept of a sound that they want to achieve and are successful in achieving. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4) The conductor creates an experience for singers that is musically fulfilling. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5) The conductor creates an experience that is personally rewarding for the singers. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ashour, A.S. (1982). A framework for a cognitive behavioral theory of leader influence and effectiveness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 30, 407-430.
- Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M., & Jung, D.I. (1999). Reexamining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441-462.
- Avolio, B. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992). The impact of leader behavior and leader-follower personality match on satisfaction and unit performance. In K. E. Clark, M. B. Clark, & D. R. Campbell (Eds.), *Impact of leadership*. Greensboro, NC: The Center for Creative Leadership.
- Bandura, A. (1985). Model of causality in social learning theory. In M. J. Mahoney & A. Freeman (Eds.), *Cognition and psychotherapy* (pp. 81-99). Plenum Publishing Corporation.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *Development of the Bar-On EQ-i: A measurement of emotional and social intelligence*. Paper presented at the 105th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.
- Bass, B. M. (2008) *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*, 4th edition, New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990) From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, Winter, 19-31.

- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., Valenzi, E. R., Farrow, D. L., & Solomon, R. J. (1975). Management styles associated with organizational, task, personal, and interpersonal contingencies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*, 720–729.
- Bayless, R. (1996). The identification of leadership styles of large group music ensembles and their use of predictors of teacher effectiveness. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Kent State University.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T.A. (2003). Self-concordance at work: toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*, 554-571.
- Bradach, J., & Eccles, R. (1989). Price, Authority and Trust: From Ideal Types to Plural Forms. *American Review of Sociology, 15*, 97-118.
- Brown, M. C. (1982). Administrative succession and organizational performance: The succession effect. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 27*, 1–16.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York. Harper & Row.
- Byo, J. (1990) Recognition in intensity contrasts in the gestures of beginning conductors. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 38*, 157-163.
- Cassidy, J. W. (1990). Effect of intensity training on pre-service teachers' instructional accuracy and delivery effectiveness. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 38*, 164-174.
- Cassidy, J. W. (1993). A comparison between students' self-observation and instructor observation of teacher intensity behaviors. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 115*, 15-29.

- Colwell, C. M. (1995). Effect of teaching setting and self-evaluation on teacher intensity behaviors. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 43, 6-21.
- Collins, D. (1978). The effect of enthusiasm training on pre-service elementary teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 19(1), 53-57.
- Conger, J., & Kanungo, R. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4), 637-647.
- Cordero, R., Farris, G. F., & DiTomaso, N. (2004). Supervisors in R&D laboratories: Using technical, people, and administrative skills effectively. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 51(1), 19-30.
- Davies, M., & Stankov, L. (1998). Emotional Intelligence: In Search of an Elusive Construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75 (4), 989-1015.
- DeRue, D., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N., & Hunphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: an integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 7-52.
- DeVries, R., Bakker-Pieper, A., & Oostenveld, W. (2009). Leadership= Communication? The Relations of Leaders' Communication Styles, Knowledge Sharing and leadership outcomes. *Springerlink.com*, 4 October 2009, 369-380.
- Duke, R. D. (1999). Measures of instructional effectiveness in music research. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 143 (Winter) 1-48.
- Duke, R. A., & Madsen, C. K. (1991). Proactive versus reactive teaching: focusing observation on specific aspects of instruction. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 108, 1-14.
- Eden, D. (1990) *Pygmalion in Management*, Lexington, MA: Heath.

- Edmondson, A. C. (2004). Psychological Safety, Trust and Learning in Organizations: A Group Level Lens. In R. M. Kramer & K.S. Cook, (Eds), *Trust and distrust in organizations: Dilemmas and approaches* (239-72). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Faulker, R. (1973). Orchestra interaction: some features of communication and authority in an artistic organization. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 14 (2), 147-157.
- Friedman, L., Fleischman, E. A., & Fletcher, J. M. (1992). Cognitive and interpersonal abilities related to the primary activities of R&D Managers. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 9, 211-242.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York, Bantam Books.
- Goolsby, T. W. (1997). Verbal instruction in instrumental rehearsals: A comparison of three career levels and pre-service teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45, 21-40.
- Grechesky, R. N. (1987). *An analysis of nonverbal and verbal conducting behaviors and their relationship to expressive musical performance*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin- Madison.
- Gumm, A. (1993). The development of a model and assessment instrument of choral music teaching styles. *Journal of Research in Music Education* , 41 (3), 181-199.
- Hemphill, J. K. & Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of the leader behavior description questionnaire. *Leader Behavior: its description and Measurement*, 6-38, Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
- Hogan, R. (in press). An introduction to personality psychology for organizational researchers. In B. Schneider & B. Smith (Eds.), *Personality and organizations*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Hollander, E. P. (1961). Emergent Leadership and Social Influence. In Petrullo, L. and Bass, B. M. (Eds.), *Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: key predictors of consolidated business business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 891–902.
- Howell, J., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process. *Academy of Management Review*, 30 (1), 96-112.
- Jago, A. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in Theory and Research. *Management Science*, 28 (3), 315-336.
- Johnson, D. W. (1971). Effects of warmth of interaction, accuracy of understanding and the proposal of compromises on listener's behavior. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 18, 207-216.
- Julian, F. D. (1989). Nonverbal communication: Its application to conducting. *Journal of Band Research*, 24 (2), 49-54.
- Kacmar, M. K., Carlson, D. S., & Brymer, R. A. (1999). Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment: A comparison of two scales. *Education and Psychological Measurement*, 59 (6), 976-994.
- Kamerman, J. (1983). "Symphony Conductors as an Occupation." In Kamerman & R. Martorella (Eds.) *Performers and Performances: The Social Work of Artistic Performances*. Praeger Publishers.
- Kuhnert, K., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformative leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 12 (4), 648-657.

- Liebertson, S., & O'Connor, J. F. (1972). Leadership and organizational performance: A study of large corporations. *American Sociological Review*, 37, 117–130.
- Lyons, J. B., & Schneider, T. R. (2009). The effects of leadership style on stress outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 737-748.
- Madsen, C. K., Standley, J. M., Byo, J. L., & Cassidy, J. W. (1992). Assessment of effective teaching by instrumental music student teachers and experts. *Update: The Applications of Research in Music Education*, 10 (2), 20-24.
- Madsen, C. K. (1990). Teacher intensity in relationship to music education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 104, 38-46.
- Madsen, C. K., Standley, J. M., & Cassidy, J. W. (1989). Demonstration and recognition of high and low contrasts in teacher Intensity. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 37 (2), 85-92.
- Mandell, B., & Pherwani, S. (2003). Relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership style: a gender comparison. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17 (3), 387-404.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1996). Toward a new generation of personality theories: theoretical contexts for the five-factor model. In J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The five-factor model of personality* (pp. 51–87). New York: Guilford Press.
- Mehrabian, A. (1968). Communication without words. *Psychology Today*, 2, 53-55.
- Meindl, J., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 78–102.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The Nature of Managerial Work*. New York: Harper & Row.

- Muczyk, J., & Reimann, B. (1987). The Case for Directive Leadership. *The Academy of Management Executive (1987-1989)*, 1 (4), 301-311.
- Pautz, M. P. M. K. (1988). *An investigation of the effect of selected instructional strategies on the learning of complete songs as moderated by perceptual learning style*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin- Madison.
- Peterson, R., Smith, B., Martorana, P., & Owens, P. (2003). The impact of chief executive officer personality on top management team dynamics: One mechanism by which leadership affects organizational performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88 (5), 795-808.
- Pfeffer, J. (1977). The ambiguity of leadership. *Academy of Management Review*, 2, 104–112.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Todor W. D., & Skov, R. (1982). Effects of leader performance contingent and non-contingent reward and punishment behaviors on subordinate performance and satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25, 812-821.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leadership behaviors and their effect on followers: trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142.
- Reavis, C. A. (1988). *Extraordinary educators: Lessons in leadership*. Bloomington, Ind: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Rosner, J. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*. November - December.
- Rus, A. (2005). Trust and Performance: Institutional Interpersonal and Network Trust. In K. Bijlsma-Frankema and R. K. Woolthuis (Eds.) *Trust under Pressure* (80-105).
- Salancik, G., & Pfeffer, J. (1977). Constraints on administrator discretion: The limited influence of mayors on city budgets. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 12, 475–498.

- Shamir, B., House, R., & Arthur, M. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership. *Organization Science*, 4 (4), 577-594.
- Siebenaler, D. (1997) Analysis of student-teacher interactions in the piano lessons of children and adults. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45, 6-20.
- Sitkin, S., & Roth, N. (1993). The Limited Effectiveness of Explaining 'Remedies' for Trust/Distrust. *Science*, 4 (3), 367-92.
- Skadsem, J. (1997). Effect of conductor verbalization, dynamic markings, conductor gesture, and choir dynamic level on singers' dynamic responses. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45 (4), 509-520.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1963). *Manual for the Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire, Form XII*, Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
- Thomas, A. B. (1988). Does leadership make a difference to organizational performance? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33, 388-400.
- Turner, J. C. (1985). Social Categorization and the self-concept: A social cognitive theory of group behavior. In E.J. Lawler (Ed). *Advances in group processes: Theory and research*, 2, 77-121, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- VanWeelden, K. (2002). Relationships between Perceptions of Conducting Effectiveness and Ensemble Performance. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 50 (2), 165-176.
- Virkhaus, T. (1997). Myths and Magic: A Word from a Conductor. *Harmony*, 4, 86-89.
- Waldman, D. A., & Bass, B. M. (1986). *Adding to leader and follower transactions: The augmenting effect of transformational leadership* (Working Paper No. 86-109). Binghamton: State University of New York, School of Management.

- Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M., & Yammarino, F. J. (1990). Adding to contingent-reward behavior: The augmenting effect of charismatic leadership. *Group and Organizational Studies, 15*, 381–394.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Wang, P., Lawler, J., & Shi, J. (2004). The role of collective efficacy in the relations between transformational leadership and work outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77*, 515-530.
- Yarbrough, C. (1975). The effect of magnitude of conductor behavior on performance, attentiveness, and attitude of students in selected mixed choruses. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 23*, 134-146.
- Yarbrough, C., & Price, H. E. (1981). Prediction of performer attentiveness based on rehearsal activity and teacher behavior. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 29* (3), 209-217.
- Yarbrough, C., & Henley, D. (1999). The effect of observation focus on evaluations of choral rehearsal excerpts. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 47*, 308-319.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10* (2), 285-305.
- Yukl, G. A. (1989a). *Leadership in organizations* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Yukl, G. A. (1989b). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Yearly Review of Management, 15*, 251-289.
- Zikmund, A. B. (1989). *The effect of grade level, gender, and learning style on responses to conservation-type rhythmic and melodic patterns*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Nebraska—Lincoln.