

Chapter 4 – Leadership theory and Choral Conducting as Musical Leadership

4.1 Leadership Theory

In this chapter a review of the leadership literature will be presented alongside a review of choral conducting studies which have used leadership theory as a framework for research.

In this chapter, a focus on organisational leadership theory is maintained. This is in contrast to the aesthetic leadership theory discussed previously (see p.48) in relation to Jansson's research which used Ladkin's theory of "leading beautifully" (Ladkin, 2008, p.31) as a lens for analysis and discussion. Organisational leadership theory has been chosen as the focus of this review due to its prominence in the small body of choral conducting studies which utilise leadership theory.

4.2 Defining Leadership

'Leadership' is a contested term (Roe, 2017) with no single, universally accepted definition of the term existing. A 2006 study by Winston and Patterson collected over 1000 statements describing or defining leadership which, after analysis, resulted in the finding of 91 separate dimensions of leadership (Winston & Patterson, 2006). As noted in the *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*, "there are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept" (Bass, 1999, p.11). Defining leadership in succinct, simple terms is no easy task. Scholars have made attempts to define the concept in varying ways such as: the conception of a leader as a general source of influence (Northouse, 2018; Summerfield, 2014); the conception of a

leader as an agent of change in organisational processes (Katz & Kahn, 1966; Schein, 1992); the conception of a leader as a developer of followers (Winston & Patterson, 2006); the conception of a leader as a motivator (Buckingham, 2005, pp. 143-144); or simply the conception of a leader as someone who achieves followers (Silva, 2016).

Many other definitions exist, and a universally accepted definition of the term seems unlikely to be agreed upon (Grint, 2005). This has resulted in a multitude of leadership theories with a wide range of foci. Early leadership theorists focused on the traits of leaders, arguing that a 'Great Man' is born to lead and will inherently possess the traits required of a leader (Spector, 2014). Leadership scholarship has since moved on to focus variously on the skills, behaviour, situationally dependant approaches, transformational potential, and authenticity of leaders (Northouse, 2016).

4.3 Paradigms of Leadership

Due to the variety and abundance of conflicting theories present in the leadership literature, Keith Grint argues that it is more helpful to identify "areas of dispute" than themes of consensus. He identifies 4 areas of dispute to consider:

- Leadership as *person* – is it who leaders are that matters?
- Leadership as *results* – is it what leaders achieve that matters?
- Leadership as *process* – is it how things get done that matters?
- Leadership as *position* – is it where leaders operate from that matters? (Grint, 2005)

Similar areas of dispute have also been identified by other authors such as Gayle Avery who proposes four paradigms for leadership: Classical; Transactional; Visionary; Organic (Avery, 2004). These four paradigms succinctly summarise the multitude of theories of leadership in use by scholars and will therefore be used in the discussion of leadership in this thesis. The four paradigms are summarised as follows:

1. Classical Paradigm of Leadership

Classical leadership is defined as “dominance by a pre-eminent person or an ‘elite’ group of people” Avery, 2004, p29). The leader orders their followers to carry out instructions in order to move the group towards the achievement of a goal which the followers may or may not be aware of. Followers submit to the leader’s will either out of respect or fear of the leader. Theories falling within the Classical paradigm of leadership were most commonly used until the 1970s (Avery, 2004).

2. Transactional Paradigm of Leadership

Transactional leaders identify tasks to be completed and then influence followers to execute these tasks by using either incentivisation or the threat of punishment. In a Transactional Paradigm, leaders and followers engage in ‘transactions’, necessitating interaction and negotiation between the two parties. Transactional leadership theories were frequently used in academia during the 1970s until the mid-1980s (*Ibid.*).

3. Visionary Paradigm of Leadership

Visionary Leadership theories came to prominence around the mid-1980s. Leadership falling within the Visionary paradigm requires leaders to unite followers around a collective vision of the future and to inspire, motivate and support their team. This involves engaging the emotional involvement of followers in the task (*Ibid.*).

4. Organic Paradigm of Leadership

The final paradigm of leadership identified by Avery is Organic leadership. Theories fitting within this paradigm require leaders to emerge naturally from an organisation as opposed to being formally appointed or elected. Leadership is shared between those members of the group who can most appropriately contribute to the project as a result of their specialist knowledge or skills. Leadership may be shared between multiple leaders during the course of a project. Organic leadership theories have become academically more popular since the 2000s and continue to be developed (*Ibid.*).

Within these four paradigms, individual leadership theories therefore can be placed according to their focus. Although some theories straddle two or more paradigms, broadly speaking these four paradigms categorise leadership theories in a useful and manageable fashion. This is useful in enabling debate about the function and process of leadership, without restricting discussion to individual theoretical perspectives.

4.4 Choral Conducting and Leadership Theory

In this section I will discuss studies of conducting which use leadership theory as a framework. There are relatively few studies that explicitly use leadership theory as a framework for examining choral conducting, however those that are available will be discussed with reference to Avery's four paradigms of leadership.

4.4.1 Classical Leadership

There appear to be no studies that examine choral conducting explicitly using leadership theories sitting within the classical paradigm. Leadership theories in this group include "Great Man Theory", i.e. the theory that certain individuals possess God-given traits and talents that make them fit for leadership and followers should submit to the will of these leaders without seeking an explanation of the purpose of the group's activities. Great Man theory draws heavily on Thomas Carlyle's set of six public lectures, given in 1840 on the role of heroes in history (Spector, 2014). It is interesting however to note that the philosophy of this paradigm bears no small resemblance to the thinking behind the 'maestro writing' discussed in Chapter 2, in that this paradigm of leadership would expect singers to submit to the guidance of an esteemed maestro (Bowen, 2003).

4.4.2 Transactional Leadership

Theories falling within the Transactional Paradigm of leadership have been used by a small group of researchers to examine choral conducting. In particular, Situational Leadership Theory (*SLII® - A Situational Approach to Leadership*, 2020) has been used to examine the

conductor's role and actions in choral music (Allen, S. Gail, Apfelstadt, 1990; Allen, 1988; Apfelstadt, 1997; Davidson, 1995).

4.4.2.1 Situational Leadership Theory

Situational Leadership Theory was first developed in 1969 by Paul Hersey (an educator and researcher) & Ken Blanchard (a business author and consultant). The theory was then named the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership (Graeff, 1997). The model was then revised many times over the following decade, resulting in the development of various versions of the model being produced (Northouse, 2016). All versions of the models are broadly similar however subtle differences in the language used in labelling distinguish between versions.

Situational Leadership assumes that there is a task to be accomplished and a group of followers available. The leader must then consider the task and the followers to assess the “development level” (**D#**) or “readiness level” (**R#**) of the followers. This analysis will result in the followers being labelled as one of four types of group:

- **D1/R1** The followers are low in competence and low in willingness to complete the task.
- **D2/R2** The followers have some competence but low willingness to engage with the task.
- **D3/R3** The Followers are moderately competent and vary in their willingness to complete the task.

- **D4/R4** The followers are highly competent and highly motivated to complete the task.

The leader must then adapt their leadership style to match the assessment they have made of the followers, relating **D1/R1** (above) to **S1** (below), **D2/R2** to **S2**, and so on.

- **S1. Directing or “Telling”**

The leader acts in a high directive, low supportive manner. This might involve giving step-by-step instructions and focuses on achieving the task but not on developing followers.

- **S2. Coaching” or “Selling**

The leader acts in a high directive and high supportive manner. This might also involve giving most of the instructions but would also involve developing the abilities and confidence of the followers and encouraging them to take more responsibility for their actions.

- **S3. Supporting or Participating**

The leader acts in a low directive and high supportive manner, giving fewer direct instructions, handing over more responsibility to the followers. They will however continue to offer feedback and motivational comments.

- **S4. Delegating**

The leader acts in a low directive and low supportive manner. They delegate responsibility for the task to the followers, adopting a ‘hands-off’ approach to their role.

The Situational Leadership approach has received criticism due to being seen as “a reactive attempt to exploit the desire of managers and organizations to look for the ‘magic bullet’ that will solve their organizational woes” (Roe, 2017). Hersey and Blanchard revised their model multiple times over a short period of time, and in doing so, changed key terminology. Consequently, their work has been criticised as being too responsive to the demands of the market and less reliant on scientific data and, as such, less reliable. Criticism has also been levelled at the model in terms of its conceptual ambiguity (Graeff, 1997).

In spite of the criticism received by Hersey and Blanchard, Situational Leadership continues to enjoy commercial success, with over fourteen million leaders having received situational leadership training from The Centre for Leadership Studies (*The Centre For Leadership Studies*, 2019). It is also claimed by The Ken Blanchard Companies to be the most widely used leadership training programme in the world (*SLII® - A Situational Approach to Leadership*, 2020).

4.4.2.2 Situational Leadership Theory and Choral Conducting

Situational Leadership Theory was first linked to the study of choral conducting by Suzanne Gail Allen in her 1988 doctoral thesis, *Leadership styles of selected successful choral conductors in the United States*. Interestingly, this is the first scholarly use of *any* leadership theory in the study of choral conducting. In her thesis, Allen notes a

“serious lack of research in the area of leadership qualities of conductors” (Allen, 1988, p10) but at the same time that “[i]t seems implicit that the leadership style of conductors is [] important: therefore, not only do musical skills have to be superior,

but an ability to work effectively with people is also essential. If this premise is accepted as a logical assumption, success or failure as a leader may also be as important as musical skills” (*Ibid.*).

Allen’s study uses quantitative methods to explore the leadership style of US college-based choral conductors using Situational Leadership as a theoretical framework, finding that the majority of these practitioners use a high task/high relationship leadership style.

Whilst Allen’s use of leadership theory was an important step forward in the choral conducting field, her choice of participants limited her research to the study of *educators*, as opposed to conductors of other types of choirs. The conductors who participated in this study all led high school or college choirs which competed at National or Division level in American Choral Director’s Association conventions. It is therefore arguably unsurprising that, as competing conductors, the participants displayed high task focus, and as teachers of high school or college students they displayed high relationship focus. Also, Allen collected quantitative data in this study. As an initial exploration of leadership styles of choral conductors this is useful, however analysis of qualitative data alongside this may have provided further insight into the conductors’ motivations for their use of high task/high relationship approaches across varying contexts.

Related to this was Allen’s finding that the majority of the conductors studied displayed low levels of adaptability in their leadership style and therefore “a low ability to match an appropriate leadership style to situational changes” (Allen, 1988, p.94). This finding suggests

that these conductors were then not in fact successful Situational Leaders and instead used a more fixed leadership style regardless of their working situation. Allen suggests that, as opposed to moving between task and relationship orientated behaviours, the choral profession requires conductors to be both task and relationship orientated simultaneously. Whilst this may be true for the participant group studied, it is arguably less true for community choir leaders who may focus more on relationship building with singers or employed functional groups such as church choirs who may focus more on the tasks they are paid to perform. This argument was not explored in Allen's study and may warrant further research.

Allen's study has been built upon by other researchers such as Brenda Davidson who investigated the effects of gender and experience level of conductors on their leadership style, using SLT as one of the theoretical perspectives within the research (Davidson, 1995). Hilary Apfelstadt also built upon Allen's work, proposing that SLT should be utilised in the education of choral conductors (Allen, S. Gail, Apfelstadt, 1990; Apfelstadt, 1997). These authors argue that the majority of choral conductors tend to favour high task/high relationship styles. Allen & Apfelstadt's 1990 paper *Leadership Styles and the Choral Conductor* offers suggestions on what these task/relationship related behaviours might look like in practice, for example a high task-focused conductor may pay close attention to timekeeping and efficient use of rehearsal time, whereas a high relationship-focused conductor may emphasise morale-boosting activities during rehearsals. They also critique the lack of relationship-focused writing in the available conducting literature, pointing out that the training of conductors focuses heavily on task development however it is a simple

fact that without singers willing to engage in music making with the conductor, no music will be made (Allen, S. Gail, Apfelstadt, 1990). This conclusion bears resemblance to the comment made earlier in this thesis in Chapter 2 (see section 2.1.4) in relation to the focus on practical matters found in many how-to guides. Brenda Davidson's 1995 study also finds a high task/high relationship focus is used by the majority of her participating conductors. Further to this however she found that more experienced conductors tend to use a high task/relationship focus but that earlier in their careers, choral conductors tend to be low task/low relationship focused.

Allen and Apfelstadt (1990) end their paper with five "commandments" (Allen & Apfelstadt, 1990, p.30) of choral leadership, namely: Challenge the process (take risks, innovate); Inspire a shared vision; Enable others to act (Foster collaboration); Model the way; and Encourage the heart (Acknowledge individual contributions and wins) (Allen & Apfelstadt, 1990). These commandments are drawn from Kouzes and Posner's model of Transformational Leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 1987) and resonate strongly with later work in this area, particularly Armstrong & Armstrong (1996) and Davidson's (1995) use of Transformational Leadership theory in their research. These studies will be discussed more fully in the following section on Visionary Leadership.

4.4.3 Visionary Leadership

Visionary leadership is characterised by the leader uniting their followers around a shared vision and engaging the emotional investment of their followers by providing motivation,

support and/or inspiration (Avery, 2004). Relevant theories falling within this paradigm include Transformational Leadership and Servant Leadership.

4.4.3.1 Transformational Leadership and the Full Range Leadership Model

Although the term Transformational Leadership was first coined by J.V. Downton in 1973 in relation to “rebel political leader[s]” (Antonakis, 2012, p260), Northouse (2016) notes that it was James McGregor Burns who first began to develop a transformational approach to leadership in his 1978 book, *Leadership* (Burns, 1978, cited by Northouse, 2016). Burns proposed that leadership approaches could be considered either Transactional or Transformational. As previously described, transactional approaches are those in which the leader offers rewards or punishments for successful/unsuccessful completion of tasks. Transformational approaches by contrast require leaders to engage with the motives and needs of their followers in order to achieve maximum success (Northouse, 2016). The development of transformational approaches therefore marks a distinct paradigm shift in leadership scholarship in that these are concerned not only with the leader’s perspective and actions but also with the motivations and input of followers.

Since Burns’ original publication on this approach, various authors have developed this concept, producing models of transformational and charismatic leadership (*Ibid.*). Although charismatic leadership is its own distinct model of leadership (Yukl, 1993), the terms Transformational Leadership and Charismatic Leadership are often used by authors interchangeably (*Ibid.*). This is presumably due to the similarity in the

transformational/charismatic approaches and their shared origins in Burns' early work.

Although there have been other scholars who have published versions of Transformational Leadership Theory (Kouzes & Posner, 2012), the most notable and well researched transformational approach was developed by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio, and sits within the Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM). The FRLM describes transformational, transactional, and non-leadership approaches (Avolio, 2011; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2016). The full range leadership model consists of 5 transformational factors, 3 transactional factors and 1 non-leadership factor. The transformational factors are:

- **Idealised Influence (II)**

Idealised influence involves acting as a role model for followers. Leaders display charisma, competence or other qualities which convince followers to look up to them and wish to emulate their behaviour. Leaders display high levels of ethical conduct and consistency, encouraging trust from followers. Followers may describe leaders displaying Idealised Influence as possessing extraordinary qualities and competencies (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

- **Inspirational Motivation (IM)**

Leaders inspire followers and motivate them to greater achievement using enthusiasm, positivity and by describing attractive future states/visions (*Ibid.*)

- **Intellectual Stimulation (IS)**

Leaders encourage input and creativity, asking followers to question routine processes or traditions and welcoming queries. Followers are never singled out for criticism, rather their input is encouraged (*Ibid.*)

- **Individual Consideration (IC)**

Leaders nurture followers, paying attention to individual needs and coaching and mentoring team members. Leaders get to know their followers personally and listen to people. Followers are delegated tasks appropriate to their capabilities but support is made available if necessary in completing these (*Ibid.*)

The four factors above describe transformational leadership. The FRLM combines these with transactional and absent leadership factors to describe a spectrum of leadership approaches which places Transformational Leadership approaches at the most effective end of the scale and absent leadership at the least effective point on the scale.

It is important to be clear about the incorporation of “Transactional Leadership” factors in the FRLM. Whilst Avery’s paradigms of leadership separate Transactional and Visionary leadership paradigms, Bass’ Full Range Leadership Model acknowledges the potential for the use of both types of leadership by leaders. The FRLM therefore incorporates both Transformational and Transactional factors. The Transactional factors in the model are: Contingent Reward; Management By Exception (Active); Management By Exception (Passive).


- **Contingent Reward** is the setting of tasks for followers, with the promise of rewards for successful completion of these tasks.
- **Management By Exception (Active)** is the monitoring of followers and providing correction when mistakes are made.
- **Management By Exception (Passive)** is the providing of correction only when mistakes are noticed which prevent required standards being met.

(Ibid.)

The final item in the FRLM, **Laissez-faire leadership**, is the neglect of leadership duties to the point of leadership being absent in a situation *(Ibid.)*.

Transformational Leadership theory therefore falls within Avery's Visionary paradigm of leadership, however the Full Range Leadership model may be used to examine both Transactional and Transformational leadership. The 9 factors of the Full Range Leadership Model with descriptions of each approach are shown in Figure 8 below:

Bass' Full range Leadership Model (FRLM)

Factor	Description	Leadership Type	
Idealised Influence (attributed)	The leader acts as a role model for followers. Charisma is attributed to the leader by followers.	Transformational Leadership	Most effective
Idealised Influence (behaviours)	The leader acts as a role model for followers. The leader behaves in a charismatic fashion.		
Inspirational Motivation	The leader motivates and inspires followers, often by communicating an attractive vision of the future.		
Intellectual Stimulation	The leader solicits followers' opinions and input into the organisation's strategy. They encourage creativity and problem solving in followers.		
Individual Consideration	The leader considers each follower's developmental needs and acts as a coach or mentor to aid the follower's advancement in these areas.		
Contingent Reward	The leader negotiates tasks to be completed with the follower and offers the follower a reward on completion of the task(s).	Transactional Leadership	
Management By Exception (Active)	The leader uses a 'hands off' approach, actively monitoring followers but only		


	stepping in to correct behaviours only when followers deviate from standards or norms.		
Management By Exception (Passive)	The leader uses a passive 'hands off' approach, only stepping in to correct followers when an error or problem arises.		
Laissez-Faire Leadership	The leader allows followers autonomy, offering no guidance or sanctions for their behaviours.	Non-Transactional (Absence of leadership)	Least effective

Figure 1 - Bass' Full Range Leadership Model (Based on Bass & Riggio, 2006)

Transformational Leadership has been widely researched, and indeed “continues to be one of the most actively researched leadership paradigms” (Siangchokyoo et al., 2020, p1). It has also been argued that other, newer theories of leadership such as Authentic Leadership are in fact based upon Transformational Leadership, so much so that they could be considered still to be a form of Transformational Leadership as opposed to distinct theories (Banks et al., 2016). There has equally been criticism of the theory. Criticisms include its potential for creating dependence on the leader, as opposed to empowering followers (Kark et al., 2003), a potential lack of conceptual clarity, particularly pertaining to overlapping criteria in the “Four Is” (Northouse, 2016), arguments relating to the division of transactions/transformational approaches (Yukl, 1999), and its potential for abuse by leaders with malicious intentions (Bass & Riggio, 2006). In spite of these and other criticisms, there is considerable support for Transformational Leadership as an effective

leadership style (Yukl, 1999) and that a transformational approach affords a broader view of leadership which can augment other leadership models (Northouse, 2016).

Choral Conductorship and Transformational Leadership/FRLM

In 1996, Armstrong & Armstrong published a paper simply titled *The Conductor As Transformational Leader* in which they argue that “Conductors (and that includes most music educators) can and should have a transforming impact on their students (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1996, p.22)”. This paper is not empirical, rather the authors use Transformational Leadership Theory as a framework for suggesting practical advice to conductors, drawn from their own experience. The six qualities advocated in this paper are: charisma/enthusiasm; a shared vision; producing through people; positive modelling; empowering others; and encouraging the heart. These qualities are shown to correspond to transformational factors from the FRLM in Figure 9, below.

Conductor Quality (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1996)	Corresponding Factor from the FRLM (Bass & Riggio, 2006)
Charisma/enthusiasm	Idealised Influence
A shared vision	Inspirational Motivation
Producing through people	Individual Consideration
Positive modelling	Idealised Influence
Empowering others	Intellectual Stimulation
Encouraging the heart	Inspirational Motivation

Figure 2 - Relationship between conducting qualities (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1996) and FRLM factors.

This paper refers to the potential for conducting to be an educational act, however the central thesis is that first and foremost conductors are leaders of people and that whilst this often involves development and coaching, conductors should also consider followers' needs in other terms such as motivation and individual support. This represents an important alternative perspective on choral conducting. As previously mentioned, much choral research takes an educational perspective on the role of a conductor as opposed to a leadership perspective. Armstrong & Armstrong's view of the conductor as a leader first whose role may involve the education of followers among other things, as opposed to as an educator, allows the full exploration of the conductor's role, without either limiting the scope of study to educational practices or mandating that a conductor *should* be an educator.

Armstrong & Armstrong's paper contrasts not only with previous choral research in terms of theoretical perspective, but also with previous choral leadership studies in terms of paradigm. Authors discussed previously, such as Allen and Apfelstadt, use theories lying within a Transactional paradigm (Avery, 2004). The focus of these types of leadership theories is on task completion and transactional leaders use 'carrot or stick' methods to ensure follower compliance. There is scope within this paradigm for the encouragement and support of individuals however the focus is not *necessarily* on the development of followers and there is no strict requirement for transactional leaders to use follower emotions to inspire group cohesion or achieve success. Armstrong & Armstrong's suggestion that conductors should behave transformationally, focusing on followers as opposed to focusing

solely on task completion, is an important paradigm shift in the study of choral conductors as leaders (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1996).

Transformational Leadership Theory has also been used as a framework for a small number of empirical studies of choral conducting. Brenda Davidson (1995) and Chris Ludwa (2012) both used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) in their doctoral theses to assess levels of Transformational Leadership in choral conductors. The MLQ is a quantitative instrument used to determine a leader's approach in relation to the FRLM. The MLQ can be administered to leaders alone, or to both leaders and their followers, in order to add another perspective to the assessment. Whilst Davidson administered the MLQ only to conductors, Ludwa included more participants in his study and collected responses to the MLQ from the conductors' choral singers and colleagues to add to his assessment of the conductors' leadership styles.

Davidson's study used 3 separate questionnaires to assess conductors' leadership styles: the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire; the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description Self-Test; and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Davidson, 1995). The results are discussed primarily in terms of task/relationship focus, i.e. in a Transactional paradigm however after analysis of her data relating to Transformational Leadership Davidson does note a "... significant difference ($p < .05$) between the three transformational styles of leadership (Charismatic, Individualized Consideration, and Intellectual Stimulation) and the two transactional styles (Contingent Reward and Management by Exception)"

(Davidson, 1995, p.47). Davidson found that choral conductors participating in this study rated their leadership more Transformational than Transactional or Laissez Faire.

Whilst Davidson's thesis suggests that choral conductors report using Transformational Leadership in their practice, Ludwa's 2012 study suggests that self-reports from conductors may not be sufficient to determine the extent of the use of Transformational Leadership by conductors. Arguably Ludwa's most interesting finding is that "conductors' leadership skills both on and off the podium are perceived differently by their followers and colleagues" (Ludwa, 2012, p62). When conductors' self-ratings of transformational leadership were compared with those given to them by their students or colleagues, a small or negative correlation occurred. This may suggest that conductors believe they are using Transformational Leadership whilst their singers and colleagues disagree. Ludwa argues that whilst this may be a valid interpretation of the results, it may also be that perceptions of the conductors' leadership styles are influenced by their use of communication. He suggests that the correlation of the conductor, student and colleague scores could be improved by the use of more effective communication on the part of the conductors. He suggests that "[p]roviding 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" (Ludwa, 2012, p.62). In spite of this discrepancy in scores between conductor, singers and colleagues, ratings for Transformational Leadership were higher than those for Transactional Leadership, suggesting that whilst the various groups may disagree on the exact level of

Transformational Leadership used by conductors, this is still the most frequently used leadership style of conductors participating in this study.

4.4.3.2 Servant Leadership

The concept of Servant Leadership was first developed in the 1970s by Robert Greenleaf, based on his reading of Hermann Hesse's (1956) novel *The Journey to the East* in which a servant to a group of travellers emerges as the group's leader through attending to the needs of each member of the group to the point that they are unable to function without him (Northouse, 2016). Within Servant Leadership theory, the leader's focus is placed firmly on the fulfilment of their followers' needs. Since this time, relatively little empirical study has been undertaken on this theory (Gregory Stone et al., 2004; Northouse, 2016) although a few scholars have attempted to develop a model of Servant Leadership. A 2011 review of Servant Leadership identified four different models as being most influential, but no single theory was identified as definitive (Dierendonck, 2011). Whilst modern models of Servant Leadership vary, all are based on Greenleaf's original suggestion that:

“[Servant leadership] begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead...The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant—first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test . . . is: do those served grow as persons; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on

the least privileged in society; will they benefit, or, at least, will they not be further deprived?" (Greenleaf, 1970, cited by Northouse, 2016)

Choral Conductorship and Servant Leadership

Ramona Wis (2002, 2007, 2011, 2014) has pioneered the use of Servant Leadership theory to explore the role of a conductor. Unlike the other authors reviewed in this section, Wis does not limit the scope of her writing on conducting solely to choral ensembles and her work is included in this review due to the scarcity of authors publishing on the subject of choral conducting in relation to formal leadership theories, particularly within the Visionary paradigm.

Like other authors on the subject of Servant Leadership, Wis does not use a formal model of servant leadership, instead using Greenleaf's principles and relating these to specific aspects of the conductor's role. Wis defines leadership as "influence, service, and passion" (Wis, 2002, p23) and identifies Servant Leadership principles as:

- Service
- Vision
- Responsiveness
- Trust
- Persuasion
- Character (Wis, 2002, pp.21-23)

Again, Wis focuses on the conductor's role in education although, like Armstrong & Armstrong, her use of a leadership theory that focuses on the followers allows her to provide an insight into the conductor's role in a broader sense than an educational perspective would allow.

Servant Leadership is a theory that is still in development and therefore research using this theory to examine conducting is understandably scarce. Wis' work does however provide a promising starting point for further research in this area.

4.4.4 Organic Leadership

Similarly to Classical Leadership, the use of the Organic Leadership paradigm as a lens for examining choral conductorship is not common in (if not absent from) the literature. This may be due to the fact that conducting has traditionally been viewed as being enacted by a single person who influences the music making act. In contrast to this, Organic Leadership allows for the use of multiple leaders arising from the group's/project's needs at any given time. There are relatively few choirs operating without a designated conductor as compared to those that employ a single person to fulfil this role.

It is of course true that some ensembles can and do operate successfully within a leaderless model (Khodyakov, 2007; Page-Shipp et al., 2018). It is also true however that, on closer inspection, these conductorless ensembles employ control mechanisms which amount to delegating leadership to a single person as opposed to organic leadership. Based in New

York, the world's largest conductorless orchestra, The Orpheus Orchestra operates with "no hierarchical control, [however] Orpheus uses various control strategies. One of them is a system of seating position rotation on a piece-by-piece basis that provides everyone with an opportunity to lead the orchestra" (Khodyakov, 2007, p.10). This group is therefore not truly using Organic Leadership in that the role of leader is given to members on a rotational basis, not on the basis of the group needing the member's particular expertise at any given time. The process is democratic, but not organically generated.

The finding that leaderless groups delegate control to a de-facto leader has also been found by Page-Shipp et al. who found in their study on an 11-man, conductorless singing group that

"Leadership roles...are not well defined in this group, but singing members all defer to the musicality and technical insight of the Accompanist, who thus qualifies de facto as the undisputed, if informal, Musical Director as well as voice coach, repetiteur and major influence in repertoire selection" (Page-Shipp et al., 2018, p.338).

In this case leadership *has* been designated organically, however it is not the case that the group operates in a way that would allow for other leaders to take control of the group from the accompanist as this person has become the "undisputed" leader of the group.

Whilst it therefore is true that studies have identified that some ensembles do operate without an officially designated leader, research in this area is scarce. Additionally, the

literature that is available suggests that even within these ensembles, leadership is in fact delegated to a single person as opposed to organically moving within the organisation to those most suitable to fulfil a part of the leadership role at any given time. Finally, it has also been noted that whilst these ensembles avoid dictatorial leadership, a consequence of this is reduced efficiency (Ludwa, 2012). It is therefore unsurprising that very few scholars have employed the use of the organic paradigm in studying choral conductorship, in spite of the existence of choral groups operating within this paradigm.

4.5 Conclusions

Although much scholarly choral research views conductors as educators, there is a recent but significant precedent for studying choral conducting through a leadership lens.

The leadership literature can be divided into four paradigms: Classical; Transactional; Visionary; and Organic. Early theories of leadership which fall under the Classical paradigm such as “Great Man Theory” (Spector, 2014) are limited in scope and are seldom, if ever, used in examining choral conducting today. Theories falling under Transactional and Visionary paradigms are of more use as frameworks for examining choral conducting and Bass’ Full Range Leadership Model which incorporates both Transactional and Transformational factors (i.e. both the Transactional and Visionary paradigms) has been used successfully by researchers to examine choral leadership. Although recent leadership literature explores leadership from an Organic perspective, this paradigm removes the single locus of leadership from the situation and is therefore perhaps not as appropriate for

examining choral conductorship which is most widely recognized as being an act carried out by a single figure leading a choir.

Leadership-focused choral conducting research is an emerging field. The studies reviewed above focus on the leadership style of choral conductors and offer insight into aspects of the extra-musical functions of the conductor. They do not however integrate the findings of the leadership style studies with other aspects of the role in order to produce a holistic understanding of the conductor's function through a leadership lens. There is therefore a gap in the literature in the shape of a holistic model, developed using data from UK-based singers, which uses leadership theory as a framework for research. This thesis aims to develop such a model, adding to the choral conducting leadership literature.

Chapter 4 – Leadership theory and Choral Conducting as Musical Leadership

4.1 Leadership Theory

In this chapter a review of the leadership literature will be presented alongside a review of choral conducting studies which have used leadership theory as a framework for research.

In this chapter, a focus on organisational leadership theory is maintained. This is in contrast to the aesthetic leadership theory discussed previously (see p.48) in relation to Jansson's research which used Ladkin's theory of "leading beautifully" (Ladkin, 2008, p.31) as a lens for analysis and discussion. Organisational leadership theory has been chosen as the focus of this review due to its prominence in the small body of choral conducting studies which utilise leadership theory.

4.2 Defining Leadership

'Leadership' is a contested term (Roe, 2017) with no single, universally accepted definition of the term existing. A 2006 study by Winston and Patterson collected over 1000 statements describing or defining leadership which, after analysis, resulted in the finding of 91 separate dimensions of leadership (Winston & Patterson, 2006). As noted in the *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*, "there are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept" (Bass, 1999, p.11). Defining leadership in succinct, simple terms is no easy task. Scholars have made attempts to define the concept in varying ways such as: the conception of a leader as a general source of influence (Northouse, 2018; Summerfield, 2014); the conception of a

leader as an agent of change in organisational processes (Katz & Kahn, 1966; Schein, 1992); the conception of a leader as a developer of followers (Winston & Patterson, 2006); the conception of a leader as a motivator (Buckingham, 2005, pp. 143-144); or simply the conception of a leader as someone who achieves followers (Silva, 2016).

Many other definitions exist, and a universally accepted definition of the term seems unlikely to be agreed upon (Grint, 2005). This has resulted in a multitude of leadership theories with a wide range of foci. Early leadership theorists focused on the traits of leaders, arguing that a 'Great Man' is born to lead and will inherently possess the traits required of a leader (Spector, 2014). Leadership scholarship has since moved on to focus variously on the skills, behaviour, situationally dependant approaches, transformational potential, and authenticity of leaders (Northouse, 2016).

4.3 Paradigms of Leadership

Due to the variety and abundance of conflicting theories present in the leadership literature, Keith Grint argues that it is more helpful to identify "areas of dispute" than themes of consensus. He identifies 4 areas of dispute to consider:

- Leadership as *person* – is it who leaders are that matters?
- Leadership as *results* – is it what leaders achieve that matters?
- Leadership as *process* – is it how things get done that matters?
- Leadership as *position* – is it where leaders operate from that matters? (Grint, 2005)

Similar areas of dispute have also been identified by other authors such as Gayle Avery who proposes four paradigms for leadership: Classical; Transactional; Visionary; Organic (Avery, 2004). These four paradigms succinctly summarise the multitude of theories of leadership in use by scholars and will therefore be used in the discussion of leadership in this thesis. The four paradigms are summarised as follows:

5. Classical Paradigm of Leadership

Classical leadership is defined as “dominance by a pre-eminent person or an ‘elite’ group of people” Avery, 2004, p29). The leader orders their followers to carry out instructions in order to move the group towards the achievement of a goal which the followers may or may not be aware of. Followers submit to the leader’s will either out of respect or fear of the leader. Theories falling within the Classical paradigm of leadership were most commonly used until the 1970s (Avery, 2004).

6. Transactional Paradigm of Leadership

Transactional leaders identify tasks to be completed and then influence followers to execute these tasks by using either incentivisation or the threat of punishment. In a Transactional Paradigm, leaders and followers engage in ‘transactions’, necessitating interaction and negotiation between the two parties. Transactional leadership theories were frequently used in academia during the 1970s until the mid-1980s (*Ibid.*).

7. Visionary Paradigm of Leadership

Visionary Leadership theories came to prominence around the mid-1980s. Leadership falling within the Visionary paradigm requires leaders to unite followers around a collective vision of the future and to inspire, motivate and support their team. This involves engaging the emotional involvement of followers in the task (*Ibid.*).

8. Organic Paradigm of Leadership

The final paradigm of leadership identified by Avery is Organic leadership. Theories fitting within this paradigm require leaders to emerge naturally from an organisation as opposed to being formally appointed or elected. Leadership is shared between those members of the group who can most appropriately contribute to the project as a result of their specialist knowledge or skills. Leadership may be shared between multiple leaders during the course of a project. Organic leadership theories have become academically more popular since the 2000s and continue to be developed (*Ibid.*).

Within these four paradigms, individual leadership theories therefore can be placed according to their focus. Although some theories straddle two or more paradigms, broadly speaking these four paradigms categorise leadership theories in a useful and manageable fashion. This is useful in enabling debate about the function and process of leadership, without restricting discussion to individual theoretical perspectives.

4.4 Choral Conducting and Leadership Theory

In this section I will discuss studies of conducting which use leadership theory as a framework. There are relatively few studies that explicitly use leadership theory as a framework for examining choral conducting, however those that are available will be discussed with reference to Avery's four paradigms of leadership.

8.4.1 Classical Leadership

There appear to be no studies that examine choral conducting explicitly using leadership theories sitting within the classical paradigm. Leadership theories in this group include "Great Man Theory", i.e. the theory that certain individuals possess God-given traits and talents that make them fit for leadership and followers should submit to the will of these leaders without seeking an explanation of the purpose of the group's activities. Great Man theory draws heavily on Thomas Carlyle's set of six public lectures, given in 1840 on the role of heroes in history (Spector, 2014). It is interesting however to note that the philosophy of this paradigm bears no small resemblance to the thinking behind the 'maestro writing' discussed in Chapter 2, in that this paradigm of leadership would expect singers to submit to the guidance of an esteemed maestro (Bowen, 2003).

8.4.2 Transactional Leadership

Theories falling within the Transactional Paradigm of leadership have been used by a small group of researchers to examine choral conducting. In particular, Situational Leadership Theory (*SLII® - A Situational Approach to Leadership*, 2020) has been used to examine the

conductor's role and actions in choral music (Allen, S. Gail, Apfelstadt, 1990; Allen, 1988; Apfelstadt, 1997; Davidson, 1995).

4.4.2.1 Situational Leadership Theory

Situational Leadership Theory was first developed in 1969 by Paul Hersey (an educator and researcher) & Ken Blanchard (a business author and consultant). The theory was then named the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership (Graeff, 1997). The model was then revised many times over the following decade, resulting in the development of various versions of the model being produced (Northouse, 2016). All versions of the models are broadly similar however subtle differences in the language used in labelling distinguish between versions.

Situational Leadership assumes that there is a task to be accomplished and a group of followers available. The leader must then consider the task and the followers to assess the “development level” (**D#**) or “readiness level” (**R#**) of the followers. This analysis will result in the followers being labelled as one of four types of group:

- **D1/R1** The followers are low in competence and low in willingness to complete the task.
- **D2/R2** The followers have some competence but low willingness to engage with the task.
- **D3/R3** The Followers are moderately competent and vary in their willingness to complete the task.

- **D4/R4** The followers are highly competent and highly motivated to complete the task.

The leader must then adapt their leadership style to match the assessment they have made of the followers, relating **D1/R1** (above) to **S1** (below), **D2/R2** to **S2**, and so on.

- **S1. Directing or “Telling**

The leader acts in a high directive, low supportive manner. This might involve giving step-by-step instructions and focuses on achieving the task but not on developing followers.

- **S2. Coaching” or “Selling**

The leader acts in a high directive and high supportive manner. This might also involve giving most of the instructions but would also involve developing the abilities and confidence of the followers and encouraging them to take more responsibility for their actions.

- **S3. Supporting or Participating**

The leader acts in a low directive and high supportive manner, giving fewer direct instructions, handing over more responsibility to the followers. They will however continue to offer feedback and motivational comments.

- **S4. Delegating**

The leader acts in a low directive and low supportive manner. They delegate responsibility for the task to the followers, adopting a ‘hands-off’ approach to their role.

The Situational Leadership approach has received criticism due to being seen as “a reactive attempt to exploit the desire of managers and organizations to look for the ‘magic bullet’ that will solve their organizational woes” (Roe, 2017). Hersey and Blanchard revised their model multiple times over a short period of time, and in doing so, changed key terminology. Consequently, their work has been criticised as being too responsive to the demands of the market and less reliant on scientific data and, as such, less reliable. Criticism has also been levelled at the model in terms of its conceptual ambiguity (Graeff, 1997).

In spite of the criticism received by Hersey and Blanchard, Situational Leadership continues to enjoy commercial success, with over fourteen million leaders having received situational leadership training from The Centre for Leadership Studies (*The Centre For Leadership Studies*, 2019). It is also claimed by The Ken Blanchard Companies to be the most widely used leadership training programme in the world (*SLII® - A Situational Approach to Leadership*, 2020).

4.4.2.2 Situational Leadership Theory and Choral Conducting

Situational Leadership Theory was first linked to the study of choral conducting by Suzanne Gail Allen in her 1988 doctoral thesis, *Leadership styles of selected successful choral conductors in the United States*. Interestingly, this is the first scholarly use of *any* leadership theory in the study of choral conducting. In her thesis, Allen notes a

“serious lack of research in the area of leadership qualities of conductors” (Allen, 1988, p10) but at the same time that “[i]t seems implicit that the leadership style of conductors is [] important: therefore, not only do musical skills have to be superior,

but an ability to work effectively with people is also essential. If this premise is accepted as a logical assumption, success or failure as a leader may also be as important as musical skills” (*Ibid.*).

Allen’s study uses quantitative methods to explore the leadership style of US college-based choral conductors using Situational Leadership as a theoretical framework, finding that the majority of these practitioners use a high task/high relationship leadership style.

Whilst Allen’s use of leadership theory was an important step forward in the choral conducting field, her choice of participants limited her research to the study of *educators*, as opposed to conductors of other types of choirs. The conductors who participated in this study all led high school or college choirs which competed at National or Division level in American Choral Director’s Association conventions. It is therefore arguably unsurprising that, as competing conductors, the participants displayed high task focus, and as teachers of high school or college students they displayed high relationship focus. Also, Allen collected quantitative data in this study. As an initial exploration of leadership styles of choral conductors this is useful, however analysis of qualitative data alongside this may have provided further insight into the conductors’ motivations for their use of high task/high relationship approaches across varying contexts.

Related to this was Allen’s finding that the majority of the conductors studied displayed low levels of adaptability in their leadership style and therefore “a low ability to match an appropriate leadership style to situational changes” (Allen, 1988, p.94). This finding suggests

that these conductors were then not in fact successful Situational Leaders and instead used a more fixed leadership style regardless of their working situation. Allen suggests that, as opposed to moving between task and relationship orientated behaviours, the choral profession requires conductors to be both task and relationship orientated simultaneously. Whilst this may be true for the participant group studied, it is arguably less true for community choir leaders who may focus more on relationship building with singers or employed functional groups such as church choirs who may focus more on the tasks they are paid to perform. This argument was not explored in Allen's study and may warrant further research.

Allen's study has been built upon by other researchers such as Brenda Davidson who investigated the effects of gender and experience level of conductors on their leadership style, using SLT as one of the theoretical perspectives within the research (Davidson, 1995). Hilary Apfelstadt also built upon Allen's work, proposing that SLT should be utilised in the education of choral conductors (Allen, S. Gail, Apfelstadt, 1990; Apfelstadt, 1997). These authors argue that the majority of choral conductors tend to favour high task/high relationship styles. Allen & Apfelstadt's 1990 paper *Leadership Styles and the Choral Conductor* offers suggestions on what these task/relationship related behaviours might look like in practice, for example a high task-focused conductor may pay close attention to timekeeping and efficient use of rehearsal time, whereas a high relationship-focused conductor may emphasise morale-boosting activities during rehearsals. They also critique the lack of relationship-focused writing in the available conducting literature, pointing out that the training of conductors focuses heavily on task development however it is a simple

fact that without singers willing to engage in music making with the conductor, no music will be made (Allen, S. Gail, Apfelstadt, 1990). This conclusion bears resemblance to the comment made earlier in this thesis in Chapter 2 (see section 2.1.4) in relation to the focus on practical matters found in many how-to guides. Brenda Davidson's 1995 study also finds a high task/high relationship focus is used by the majority of her participating conductors. Further to this however she found that more experienced conductors tend to use a high task/relationship focus but that earlier in their careers, choral conductors tend to be low task/low relationship focused.

Allen and Apfelstadt (1990) end their paper with five "commandments" (Allen & Apfelstadt, 1990, p.30) of choral leadership, namely: Challenge the process (take risks, innovate); Inspire a shared vision; Enable others to act (Foster collaboration); Model the way; and Encourage the heart (Acknowledge individual contributions and wins) (Allen & Apfelstadt, 1990). These commandments are drawn from Kouzes and Posner's model of Transformational Leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 1987) and resonate strongly with later work in this area, particularly Armstrong & Armstrong (1996) and Davidson's (1995) use of Transformational Leadership theory in their research. These studies will be discussed more fully in the following section on Visionary Leadership.

8.4.3 Visionary Leadership

Visionary leadership is characterised by the leader uniting their followers around a shared vision and engaging the emotional investment of their followers by providing motivation,

support and/or inspiration (Avery, 2004). Relevant theories falling within this paradigm include Transformational Leadership and Servant Leadership.

4.4.3.1 Transformational Leadership and the Full Range Leadership Model

Although the term Transformational Leadership was first coined by J.V. Downton in 1973 in relation to “rebel political leader[s]” (Antonakis, 2012, p260), Northouse (2016) notes that it was James McGregor Burns who first began to develop a transformational approach to leadership in his 1978 book, *Leadership* (Burns, 1978, cited by Northouse, 2016). Burns proposed that leadership approaches could be considered either Transactional or Transformational. As previously described, transactional approaches are those in which the leader offers rewards or punishments for successful/unsuccessful completion of tasks. Transformational approaches by contrast require leaders to engage with the motives and needs of their followers in order to achieve maximum success (Northouse, 2016). The development of transformational approaches therefore marks a distinct paradigm shift in leadership scholarship in that these are concerned not only with the leader’s perspective and actions but also with the motivations and input of followers.

Since Burns’ original publication on this approach, various authors have developed this concept, producing models of transformational and charismatic leadership (*Ibid.*). Although charismatic leadership is its own distinct model of leadership (Yukl, 1993), the terms Transformational Leadership and Charismatic Leadership are often used by authors interchangeably (*Ibid.*). This is presumably due to the similarity in the

transformational/charismatic approaches and their shared origins in Burns' early work.

Although there have been other scholars who have published versions of Transformational Leadership Theory (Kouzes & Posner, 2012), the most notable and well researched transformational approach was developed by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio, and sits within the Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM). The FRLM describes transformational, transactional, and non-leadership approaches (Avolio, 2011; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2016). The full range leadership model consists of 5 transformational factors, 3 transactional factors and 1 non-leadership factor. The transformational factors are:

- **Idealised Influence (II)**

Idealised influence involves acting as a role model for followers. Leaders display charisma, competence or other qualities which convince followers to look up to them and wish to emulate their behaviour. Leaders display high levels of ethical conduct and consistency, encouraging trust from followers. Followers may describe leaders displaying Idealised Influence as possessing extraordinary qualities and competencies (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

- **Inspirational Motivation (IM)**

Leaders inspire followers and motivate them to greater achievement using enthusiasm, positivity and by describing attractive future states/visions (*Ibid.*)

- **Intellectual Stimulation (IS)**

Leaders encourage input and creativity, asking followers to question routine processes or traditions and welcoming queries. Followers are never singled out for criticism, rather their input is encouraged (*Ibid.*)

- **Individual Consideration (IC)**

Leaders nurture followers, paying attention to individual needs and coaching and mentoring team members. Leaders get to know their followers personally and listen to people. Followers are delegated tasks appropriate to their capabilities but support is made available if necessary in completing these (*Ibid.*)

The four factors above describe transformational leadership. The FRLM combines these with transactional and absent leadership factors to describe a spectrum of leadership approaches which places Transformational Leadership approaches at the most effective end of the scale and absent leadership at the least effective point on the scale.

It is important to be clear about the incorporation of “Transactional Leadership” factors in the FRLM. Whilst Avery’s paradigms of leadership separate Transactional and Visionary leadership paradigms, Bass’ Full Range Leadership Model acknowledges the potential for the use of both types of leadership by leaders. The FRLM therefore incorporates both Transformational and Transactional factors. The Transactional factors in the model are: Contingent Reward; Management By Exception (Active); Management By Exception (Passive).


- **Contingent Reward** is the setting of tasks for followers, with the promise of rewards for successful completion of these tasks.
- **Management By Exception (Active)** is the monitoring of followers and providing correction when mistakes are made.
- **Management By Exception (Passive)** is the providing of correction only when mistakes are noticed which prevent required standards being met.

(Ibid.)

The final item in the FRLM, **Laissez-faire leadership**, is the neglect of leadership duties to the point of leadership being absent in a situation *(Ibid.)*.

Transformational Leadership theory therefore falls within Avery's Visionary paradigm of leadership, however the Full Range Leadership model may be used to examine both Transactional and Transformational leadership. The 9 factors of the Full Range Leadership Model with descriptions of each approach are shown in Figure 8 below:

Bass' Full range Leadership Model (FRLM)

Factor	Description	Leadership Type	
Idealised Influence (attributed)	The leader acts as a role model for followers. Charisma is attributed to the leader by followers.	Transformational Leadership	Most effective
Idealised Influence (behaviours)	The leader acts as a role model for followers. The leader behaves in a charismatic fashion.		
Inspirational Motivation	The leader motivates and inspires followers, often by communicating an attractive vision of the future.		
Intellectual Stimulation	The leader solicits followers' opinions and input into the organisation's strategy. They encourage creativity and problem solving in followers.		
Individual Consideration	The leader considers each follower's developmental needs and acts as a coach or mentor to aid the follower's advancement in these areas.		
Contingent Reward	The leader negotiates tasks to be completed with the follower and offers the follower a reward on completion of the task(s).	Transactional Leadership	
Management By Exception (Active)	The leader uses a 'hands off' approach, actively monitoring followers but only		


	stepping in to correct behaviours only when followers deviate from standards or norms.		
Management By Exception (Passive)	The leader uses a passive 'hands off' approach, only stepping in to correct followers when an error or problem arises.		
Laissez-Faire Leadership	The leader allows followers autonomy, offering no guidance or sanctions for their behaviours.	Non-Transactional (Absence of leadership)	Least effective

Figure 3 - Bass' Full Range Leadership Model (Based on Bass & Riggio, 2006)

Transformational Leadership has been widely researched, and indeed “continues to be one of the most actively researched leadership paradigms” (Siangchokyoo et al., 2020, p1). It has also been argued that other, newer theories of leadership such as Authentic Leadership are in fact based upon Transformational Leadership, so much so that they could be considered still to be a form of Transformational Leadership as opposed to distinct theories (Banks et al., 2016). There has equally been criticism of the theory. Criticisms include its potential for creating dependence on the leader, as opposed to empowering followers (Kark et al., 2003), a potential lack of conceptual clarity, particularly pertaining to overlapping criteria in the “Four Is” (Northouse, 2016), arguments relating to the division of transactions/transformational approaches (Yukl, 1999), and its potential for abuse by leaders with malicious intentions (Bass & Riggio, 2006). In spite of these and other criticisms, there is considerable support for Transformational Leadership as an effective

leadership style (Yukl, 1999) and that a transformational approach affords a broader view of leadership which can augment other leadership models (Northouse, 2016).

Choral Conductorship and Transformational Leadership/FRLM

In 1996, Armstrong & Armstrong published a paper simply titled *The Conductor As Transformational Leader* in which they argue that “Conductors (and that includes most music educators) can and should have a transforming impact on their students (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1996, p.22)”. This paper is not empirical, rather the authors use Transformational Leadership Theory as a framework for suggesting practical advice to conductors, drawn from their own experience. The six qualities advocated in this paper are: charisma/enthusiasm; a shared vision; producing through people; positive modelling; empowering others; and encouraging the heart. These qualities are shown to correspond to transformational factors from the FRLM in Figure 9, below.

Conductor Quality (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1996)	Corresponding Factor from the FRLM (Bass & Riggio, 2006)
Charisma/enthusiasm	Idealised Influence
A shared vision	Inspirational Motivation
Producing through people	Individual Consideration
Positive modelling	Idealised Influence
Empowering others	Intellectual Stimulation
Encouraging the heart	Inspirational Motivation

Figure 4 - Relationship between conducting qualities (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1996) and FRLM factors.

This paper refers to the potential for conducting to be an educational act, however the central thesis is that first and foremost conductors are leaders of people and that whilst this often involves development and coaching, conductors should also consider followers' needs in other terms such as motivation and individual support. This represents an important alternative perspective on choral conducting. As previously mentioned, much choral research takes an educational perspective on the role of a conductor as opposed to a leadership perspective. Armstrong & Armstrong's view of the conductor as a leader first whose role may involve the education of followers among other things, as opposed to as an educator, allows the full exploration of the conductor's role, without either limiting the scope of study to educational practices or mandating that a conductor *should* be an educator.

Armstrong & Armstrong's paper contrasts not only with previous choral research in terms of theoretical perspective, but also with previous choral leadership studies in terms of paradigm. Authors discussed previously, such as Allen and Apfelstadt, use theories lying within a Transactional paradigm (Avery, 2004). The focus of these types of leadership theories is on task completion and transactional leaders use 'carrot or stick' methods to ensure follower compliance. There is scope within this paradigm for the encouragement and support of individuals however the focus is not *necessarily* on the development of followers and there is no strict requirement for transactional leaders to use follower emotions to inspire group cohesion or achieve success. Armstrong & Armstrong's suggestion that conductors should behave transformationally, focusing on followers as opposed to focusing

solely on task completion, is an important paradigm shift in the study of choral conductors as leaders (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1996).

Transformational Leadership Theory has also been used as a framework for a small number of empirical studies of choral conducting. Brenda Davidson (1995) and Chris Ludwa (2012) both used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) in their doctoral theses to assess levels of Transformational Leadership in choral conductors. The MLQ is a quantitative instrument used to determine a leader's approach in relation to the FRLM. The MLQ can be administered to leaders alone, or to both leaders and their followers, in order to add another perspective to the assessment. Whilst Davidson administered the MLQ only to conductors, Ludwa included more participants in his study and collected responses to the MLQ from the conductors' choral singers and colleagues to add to his assessment of the conductors' leadership styles.

Davidson's study used 3 separate questionnaires to assess conductors' leadership styles: the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire; the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description Self-Test; and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Davidson, 1995). The results are discussed primarily in terms of task/relationship focus, i.e. in a Transactional paradigm however after analysis of her data relating to Transformational Leadership Davidson does note a "... significant difference ($p < .05$) between the three transformational styles of leadership (Charismatic, Individualized Consideration, and Intellectual Stimulation) and the two transactional styles (Contingent Reward and Management by Exception)"

(Davidson, 1995, p.47). Davidson found that choral conductors participating in this study rated their leadership more Transformational than Transactional or Laissez Faire.

Whilst Davidson's thesis suggests that choral conductors report using Transformational Leadership in their practice, Ludwa's 2012 study suggests that self-reports from conductors may not be sufficient to determine the extent of the use of Transformational Leadership by conductors. Arguably Ludwa's most interesting finding is that "conductors' leadership skills both on and off the podium are perceived differently by their followers and colleagues" (Ludwa, 2012, p62). When conductors' self-ratings of transformational leadership were compared with those given to them by their students or colleagues, a small or negative correlation occurred. This may suggest that conductors believe they are using Transformational Leadership whilst their singers and colleagues disagree. Ludwa argues that whilst this may be a valid interpretation of the results, it may also be that perceptions of the conductors' leadership styles are influenced by their use of communication. He suggests that the correlation of the conductor, student and colleague scores could be improved by the use of more effective communication on the part of the conductors. He suggests that "[p]roviding 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" (Ludwa, 2012, p.62). In spite of this discrepancy in scores between conductor, singers and colleagues, ratings for Transformational Leadership were higher than those for Transactional Leadership, suggesting that whilst the various groups may disagree on the exact level of

Transformational Leadership used by conductors, this is still the most frequently used leadership style of conductors participating in this study.

4.4.3.2 Servant Leadership

The concept of Servant Leadership was first developed in the 1970s by Robert Greenleaf, based on his reading of Hermann Hesse's (1956) novel *The Journey to the East* in which a servant to a group of travellers emerges as the group's leader through attending to the needs of each member of the group to the point that they are unable to function without him (Northouse, 2016). Within Servant Leadership theory, the leader's focus is placed firmly on the fulfilment of their followers' needs. Since this time, relatively little empirical study has been undertaken on this theory (Gregory Stone et al., 2004; Northouse, 2016) although a few scholars have attempted to develop a model of Servant Leadership. A 2011 review of Servant Leadership identified four different models as being most influential, but no single theory was identified as definitive (Dierendonck, 2011). Whilst modern models of Servant Leadership vary, all are based on Greenleaf's original suggestion that:

“[Servant leadership] begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead...The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant—first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test . . . is: do those served grow as persons; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on

the least privileged in society; will they benefit, or, at least, will they not be further deprived?" (Greenleaf, 1970, cited by Northouse, 2016)

Choral Conductorship and Servant Leadership

Ramona Wis (2002, 2007, 2011, 2014) has pioneered the use of Servant Leadership theory to explore the role of a conductor. Unlike the other authors reviewed in this section, Wis does not limit the scope of her writing on conducting solely to choral ensembles and her work is included in this review due to the scarcity of authors publishing on the subject of choral conducting in relation to formal leadership theories, particularly within the Visionary paradigm.

Like other authors on the subject of Servant Leadership, Wis does not use a formal model of servant leadership, instead using Greenleaf's principles and relating these to specific aspects of the conductor's role. Wis defines leadership as "influence, service, and passion" (Wis, 2002, p23) and identifies Servant Leadership principles as:

- Service
- Vision
- Responsiveness
- Trust
- Persuasion
- Character (Wis, 2002, pp.21-23)

Again, Wis focuses on the conductor's role in education although, like Armstrong & Armstrong, her use of a leadership theory that focuses on the followers allows her to provide an insight into the conductor's role in a broader sense than an educational perspective would allow.

Servant Leadership is a theory that is still in development and therefore research using this theory to examine conducting is understandably scarce. Wis' work does however provide a promising starting point for further research in this area.

8.4.4 Organic Leadership

Similarly to Classical Leadership, the use of the Organic Leadership paradigm as a lens for examining choral conductorship is not common in (if not absent from) the literature. This may be due to the fact that conducting has traditionally been viewed as being enacted by a single person who influences the music making act. In contrast to this, Organic Leadership allows for the use of multiple leaders arising from the group's/project's needs at any given time. There are relatively few choirs operating without a designated conductor as compared to those that employ a single person to fulfil this role.

It is of course true that some ensembles can and do operate successfully within a leaderless model (Khodyakov, 2007; Page-Shipp et al., 2018). It is also true however that, on closer inspection, these conductorless ensembles employ control mechanisms which amount to delegating leadership to a single person as opposed to organic leadership. Based in New

York, the world's largest conductorless orchestra, The Orpheus Orchestra operates with "no hierarchical control, [however] Orpheus uses various control strategies. One of them is a system of seating position rotation on a piece-by-piece basis that provides everyone with an opportunity to lead the orchestra" (Khodyakov, 2007, p.10). This group is therefore not truly using Organic Leadership in that the role of leader is given to members on a rotational basis, not on the basis of the group needing the member's particular expertise at any given time. The process is democratic, but not organically generated.

The finding that leaderless groups delegate control to a de-facto leader has also been found by Page-Shipp et al. who found in their study on an 11-man, conductorless singing group that

"Leadership roles...are not well defined in this group, but singing members all defer to the musicality and technical insight of the Accompanist, who thus qualifies de facto as the undisputed, if informal, Musical Director as well as voice coach, repetiteur and major influence in repertoire selection" (Page-Shipp et al., 2018, p.338).

In this case leadership *has* been designated organically, however it is not the case that the group operates in a way that would allow for other leaders to take control of the group from the accompanist as this person has become the "undisputed" leader of the group.

Whilst it therefore is true that studies have identified that some ensembles do operate without an officially designated leader, research in this area is scarce. Additionally, the

literature that is available suggests that even within these ensembles, leadership is in fact delegated to a single person as opposed to organically moving within the organisation to those most suitable to fulfil a part of the leadership role at any given time. Finally, it has also been noted that whilst these ensembles avoid dictatorial leadership, a consequence of this is reduced efficiency (Ludwa, 2012). It is therefore unsurprising that very few scholars have employed the use of the organic paradigm in studying choral conductorship, in spite of the existence of choral groups operating within this paradigm.

4.5 Conclusions

Although much scholarly choral research views conductors as educators, there is a recent but significant precedent for studying choral conducting through a leadership lens.

The leadership literature can be divided into four paradigms: Classical; Transactional; Visionary; and Organic. Early theories of leadership which fall under the Classical paradigm such as “Great Man Theory” (Spector, 2014) are limited in scope and are seldom, if ever, used in examining choral conducting today. Theories falling under Transactional and Visionary paradigms are of more use as frameworks for examining choral conducting and Bass’ Full Range Leadership Model which incorporates both Transactional and Transformational factors (i.e. both the Transactional and Visionary paradigms) has been used successfully by researchers to examine choral leadership. Although recent leadership literature explores leadership from an Organic perspective, this paradigm removes the single locus of leadership from the situation and is therefore perhaps not as appropriate for

examining choral conductorship which is most widely recognized as being an act carried out by a single figure leading a choir.

Leadership-focused choral conducting research is an emerging field. The studies reviewed above focus on the leadership style of choral conductors and offer insight into aspects of the extra-musical functions of the conductor. They do not however integrate the findings of the leadership style studies with other aspects of the role in order to produce a holistic understanding of the conductor's function through a leadership lens. There is therefore a gap in the literature in the shape of a holistic model, developed using data from UK-based singers, which uses leadership theory as a framework for research. This thesis aims to develop such a model, adding to the choral conducting leadership literature.

