

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP ANALYSIS OF THE BAND DIRECTOR OF
A CHRISTIAN SCHOOL: A CASE STUDY

A Dissertation
Presented to
The Faculty of
Tennessee Temple University

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Submitted By
Ronald Edward Reed
November 2013

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP ANALYSIS OF THE BAND DIRECTOR OF
A CHRISTIAN SCHOOL: A CASE STUDY

By

Ronald Edward Reed

APPROVED:

COMMITTEE CHAIR: Andrew T. Alexson, Ed.D.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Laurie DiPadova-Stocks, Ph.D.

Larry Standridge, Ph.D.

DIRECTOR OF Ph.D. IN LEADERSHIP PROGRAM:

Howard Owens, Ph.D.

© 2013

Ronald Edward Reed

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the transformational leadership of the band director based on the perceptions of the school band members and teaching colleagues at the school. Quantitative data were collected from a Christian School in Louisiana. The band director completed two leadership self-assessments, the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (Kouzes & Pozner, 2007) and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Bass & Avolio, 2006). Ten teaching colleagues of the school also completed the LPI and MLQ. Eight band members completed the LPI observer form and the Reasons for Success Questionnaire, which included the Value of Music Program subscale. The survey findings confirmed consistency in the perception of band members' evaluation of the band director's leadership style. The band director rated his transformational leadership attributes as high, while band students and teaching colleagues rated the same attributes as moderately high. Overall, there was consistent information in the research results that showed that band students and teaching colleagues agreed that the band director is a transformational leader.

DEDICATION

Whoso findeth a wife findeth a good thing and obtaineth the favour of the Lord (Prov. 18:22, KJV). I would like to thank God for blessing me with my wife, Adrienne, who has been by my side for over twenty-eight years. Thank you for your unconditional love, your commitment to me and our children, and always hoping for and working towards a better future for our family. My highest honor in life has been that of sharing space and time with you and waking up each day to my best friend, my most intense supporter, and the absolute love of my life. God created you just for me, and for that, I am forever grateful. It is to you, my intelligent, articulate, beautiful, compassionate wife, Dr. Adrienne M. Reed, Pharm.D, that I dedicate this work, with all of the hope, enthusiasm, and expectation for future generations, who will consider the life that God has so richly blessed us with.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I must thank God for allowing me to enjoy such a wonderful life. My life began at birth, but “the abundant life” that I now enjoy began after I became a born again Christian. I would like to thank God for allowing me to strive for, and achieve academic goals that have risen far beyond my personal expectations, and for allowing me to walk in His marvelous light, even during the darkest days. I would like to thank my lovely wife, Adrienne, and our beautiful daughters, Jasmine and Ariyana, for their unwavering love, support, and encouragement during this endeavor. Their personal sacrifice and understanding provided me with inspiration and determination throughout this process. I would like to thank Will, who has gone on to be with the Lord, but will live in our hearts forever. To my mother, Mrs. Enola Reed, my father Leonard Reed, Jr. (late), and my siblings Leona, Clyde (late), Leonard III, David, Gina, and Garrett, my love and appreciation for you will never cease. I would like to say a special word of thanks to my friends, the Carter family of Colfax, Louisiana, most especially to Mrs. Judy Carter and her household.

I would like to thank Dr. Andrew Alexson for his wisdom, passion, and commitment, which he shares freely. I am intrigued by the fact that Dr. Alexson can thrive in the presence of the most notable scholars and theologians of our time, yet relate to people from any part of our society with the same level of concern and good intentions for their life’s journey. Dr. Laurie DiPadova-Stocks, you are and will always be one of my academic heroes. Thank you for teaching me the concepts, techniques, and theories of higher learning, and for sharing your world of knowledge with me from both an academic and practical perspective. Thank you for invoking my commitment to lifelong

learning – *fides et labor!* I am blessed to have experienced and embraced your spirit of excellence, which has inspired me to strive for higher heights and deeper depths of knowledge with the ultimate purpose of serving others. Thank you, Dr. Larry Standridge for sharing your academic expertise with me. As a child I was often reminded that no one can truly guide you to a destination unless they have travelled there before. Thank you for your guidance and your wisdom, which reminded me to regard this important journey as that part of my legacy that will never cease to exist and can be shared with future generations. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Mrs. Trudy Owens for always ensuring that the students in the Leadership doctoral program at Tennessee Temple University had everything that was needed to accomplish this challenging task. I can truly say that the students in the Leadership program appreciate your genuine concern and commitment to excellence.

IN MEMORANDUM

To my friend and brother, Billy Wayne Carter, I thank God for allowing me to call you friend. Your life was a testimony to countless people, and everyone who met you understood that God endowed you with many special gifts. Thank you for being the type of friend that “only God could send” and for treating me like a member of your family. I recognized you as a true friend as we served in the United States Army as young men. Over the years our friendship became a brotherhood, and the last time we spoke you were still encouraging me, praying for me and my family, and just being Billy. I never thought that I would be writing a memorial to you, and in my mind we were all going to celebrate this accomplishment together. I speak for family members, friends, and acquaintances when I say; we all miss you more than words can say. You made a profound mark on my life by helping me to become a better man, a better husband, and a better father. Most of all, you have helped me to become better servant of the one and only true and living God. I will never forget you or your family as long as I live.

Your Brother, Forever

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---------------------------------------|------|
| Abstract..... | iii |
| Dedication..... | v |
| Acknowledgements..... | vi |
| In Memorandum..... | viii |
| Table of Contents..... | ix |
| List of Tables..... | xii |
| Chapter I: Introduction..... | 1 |
| Problem Background..... | 1 |
| Problem Statement..... | 2 |
| Research Purpose..... | 3 |
| Research Questions..... | 4 |
| Research Methodology..... | 5 |
| Research Relevance..... | 6 |
| Summary..... | 7 |
| Chapter II: Review of Literature..... | 8 |
| Leadership..... | 8 |
| Transformational Leadership..... | 11 |
| Transactional Leadership..... | 17 |
| Emotional Intelligence | 20 |
| Authentic Leadership..... | 22 |
| Servant Leadership..... | 25 |
| Ethical Leadership..... | 26 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Leadership Power | 27 |
| Leadership Approaches..... | 28 |
| Trait Approach | 28 |
| Style Approach..... | 29 |
| Skills Approach | 29 |
| Situational Approach..... | 29 |
| Leadership Theories..... | 30 |
| Great Man Theory..... | 30 |
| Behavior Theory..... | 30 |
| Path-Goal Theory..... | 30 |
| Leader-Member Exchange Theory..... | 31 |
| Relevant Research | 31 |
| Leadership | 31 |
| Transformational Leadership | 32 |
| Servant Leadership..... | 33 |
| Authentic Leadership..... | 34 |
| Band Director Characteristics..... | 34 |
| Summary..... | 37 |
| Chapter III: Methodology..... | 38 |
| Research Design..... | 38 |
| Research Questions and Subquestions..... | 39 |
| Data Collection..... | 40 |
| Instruments..... | 40 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)..... | 40 |
| MLQ Reliability and Validity..... | 41 |
| Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)..... | 41 |
| LPI Reliability and Validity..... | 42 |
| Reasons for Success Questionnaire..... | 43 |
| Procedures..... | 43 |
| Data Analysis..... | 46 |
| Summary..... | 47 |
| Chapter IV: Results..... | 48 |
| Demographic Data..... | 49 |
| Assessment Data..... | 50 |
| Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)..... | 50 |
| Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)..... | 55 |
| Reason for Success Questionnaire..... | 65 |
| Summary..... | 66 |
| Chapter V: Discussion..... | 68 |
| MLQ Conclusions and Implications..... | 71 |
| Conclusions..... | 71 |
| Implications..... | 73 |
| LPI Conclusions and Implications..... | 75 |
| Conclusions..... | 75 |
| Implications..... | 76 |
| RSQ Conclusions and Implications Summary..... | 77 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Overall Conclusions and Implications..... | 78 |
| Limitations..... | 79 |
| Future Research Recommendations..... | 80 |
| Conclusion..... | 81 |
| REFERENCES..... | 83 |
| APPENDICES..... | 98 |
| A – MLQ Permission..... | 98 |
| B – LPI Permission..... | 99 |
| C – Reasons for Success Survey..... | 100 |
| D – Parental Consent Form..... | 102 |
| E – Demographic Raw Data..... | 103 |
| F – Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Raw Data..... | 104 |
| Teaching Colleagues..... | 104 |
| Band Director Self Evaluation..... | 106 |
| G – Leadership Practices Inventory..... | 108 |
| Band Member Panel/Director..... | 108 |
| Teaching Colleagues..... | 109 |
| Exemplary Leadership Subscales Raw Data Band Members..... | 110 |
| Exemplary Leadership Subscales Raw Data Staff/Director..... | 111 |
| H – Reasons for Success Questionnaire Raw Data..... | 112 |
| I – Models and Tools Checklist for Observations..... | 113 |
| J – National Music Standards..... | 115 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Instrument Administration Schedule..... | 45 |
| 2. Teaching colleague/Observer Demographic Summary..... | 49 |
| 3. Band Member Demographic Summary..... | 50 |
| 4. Total Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Summary Values..... | 51 |
| 5. Spearman's Ranked Correlation Analysis..... | 51 |
| 6. MLQ Factors of Transformational Leadership Subscale Summary..... | 52 |
| 7. MLQ Factors Correlation Analysis..... | 55 |
| 8. Total Leadership Practices Inventory Summary..... | 55 |
| 9. LPI Band Member and Director Values Correlation Analysis..... | 56 |
| 10. LPI Teaching colleague and Band Director Values Correlation Analysis..... | 57 |
| 11. LPI Band Member and Teaching colleague Values Correlation Analysis..... | 58 |
| 12. Practices of Exemplary Leadership Subscale Summary Values..... | 58 |
| 13. Model the Way Subscale Analysis..... | 59 |
| 14. Inspire a Shared Vision Subscale Analysis..... | 60 |
| 15. Challenge the Process Subscale Analysis..... | 62 |
| 16. Enable Others to Act Subscale Analysis..... | 63 |
| 17. Encourage the Heart Subscale Analysis..... | 64 |
| 18. Band Member Reasons for Success Questionnaire Summary..... | 65 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces a research strategy designed to assess the leadership style and level of leadership skill of a Louisiana Christian school band director based on the perceptions of the band director, band members, and teaching colleagues. The research background, problem statement, research purpose, research questions, research methodology, and research relevance are set forth in this chapter.

Leadership and music though seldom mentioned together were both by nature complex and had considerable capacity to influence people. Musical lyrics, instruments, and performances created countless interpretations, which made obvious the complexity of music and illustrated a similarity to the complex nature of leadership (Hall, 2008).

Problem Background

Leading a choir, band, or orchestra was not the same as heading a successful corporation. However, since a band director was a leader, the model of a transformational leader could be applied, offering insight into achieving excellence in a fine arts classroom/laboratory. A band director, as a transformational leader, could project a vision for students, for the music program, and for himself. Further, a director could elevate the level of a program by envisioning great success, exciting performance opportunities, and facilitating musical growth among band members (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1996).

According to Criss (2010) musical ensembles, such as a concert band, depended on the development of cohesion to achieve synergy and meaningful performances. No curricular discipline in a school was more focused on group effort than the musical

classroom. Burnsed and Jensen (1994) speculated that in order for band members to become effective within the organization, band directors must model strong leadership attributes. Band directors, who wanted a high level of cohesion, involved band members in goal-setting for the band. Comprehensive goal-setting involved all band members and potentially created a team vision that was owned by the entire band. If every member was empowered and all members embraced a common goal, there was potential for unity that could be reflected in the sound of an ensemble. When band members trusted each other and individually felt supported and respected, the performance level of the band was potentially enhanced (Iida, 1991). The skills required in leading a corporation, a church, or a school with excellence could be applied in a musical classroom to create excellence in musical growth and/or musical performance (Ballou, 2005).

Problem Statement

Little is known about musical leadership and band director leadership in relation to performance outcomes. The available research can be grouped into categories of leadership style and organizational success (Dunaway, 1987; Goodstein, 1987), investigations into the inherent nature of leadership behaviors (Palen & Palen, 1995; Roberson, 1985), and leadership development (Burnsed & Jensen, 1994; Palen & Palen, 1995; Rudatis, 1996). Dunaway (1987) noted that band directors of successful programs tended to rely on band students more than directors of average programs. Goodstein (1987), however, found no significant relationship between differing leadership styles and band director success, yet recommended further study of band director leadership behaviors.

Rudaitis (1996) noted the leadership qualities of band directors of a music organization and leadership development of band students. Leadership was, to a lesser degree, a potential concern of band members. Although band members strove for excellence, they were subordinates and could only advance to a high level of excellence under the direction of a skilled leader, whose goals for the band were mutually developed, well-defined, and masterfully executed (Iida, 1991).

This research addressed the leadership style and skills of a band director in a Louisiana Christian school. Leadership issues were of interest to school administrators and teaching colleagues because leadership of the high school faculty members had a potential for either a positive or negative effect in all areas of a school. Without an understanding of the leadership style of the school band director the assessment of influence in the band and contribution in other areas of a school program were limited.

Research Purpose

The purpose of this research was to gather and analyze band member, teaching colleagues, and band director perceptions of the band director's leadership style and level of leadership skills. To assess leadership skill, the overall ratings and subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory and overall ratings and subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire were analyzed and compared. The band director's leadership was also viewed through the lenses of band member responses to the Reasons for Success Questionnaire, which included the Values of the Music Program rating for band members.

Research Questions

The research question for this research was: How did band members and teaching colleagues assess the leadership skills of the school band director of a Christian school in Louisiana? Several subquestions were developed from the research question.

- RQ1. What was the overall leadership style of the band director?
- RQ2. How did the band director perceive his leadership?
- RQ3. How did band members perceive the band director's leadership?
- RQ4. How did teaching colleagues perceive the band director's leadership?
- RQ5. Was there a significant difference in perception of leadership between the band director, band members, and teaching colleagues?
- RQ6. In which areas of leadership could the band director focus in order to strengthen his leadership among band members?
- RQ7. What were band member, band director, and teaching colleague perceptions of the leadership of the band director, when assessed by each of the five subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory and each of the four subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire?
- RQ8. Were there areas of agreement among the findings of Reason for Success Questionnaire with Leadership Practices Inventory values and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire values?
- RQ9. Was there a relationship (correlation) in the measurement of leadership style between band member's Reason for Success Questionnaire values, band member's Leadership Practices Inventory values?

Research Methodology

A case study of one leader through quantitative data gathering was chosen to evaluate the leadership style of a band director. A case study was an in-depth study of one person. Case studies were different from other qualitative research approaches in that they were in-depth descriptions and analysis of a single unit or bounded system, such as an individual, program, event, group, intervention, or community (Smith, 1978).

A case study focused on holistic description and explanation; all factors were included. Special features of a qualitative case study could be characterized as (a) particularistic, the research focuses on the leadership style of a particular person; (b) descriptive, the end product of the case study is a rich description of the person under study; and (c) heuristic, the study illuminates the readers understanding of the person being studied (Merriman, 1998).

A case study did not have a unique approach to data collection or data analysis. Some techniques were used more than others but overall any and all data gathering methods were applied in case studies. Case studies collected research data through direct observation, interviews, documents, archival records, physical artifacts, and occasionally participant observation. The data collected for this research was data collected from instruments completed by the band director, band members, and teaching colleagues.

The band director did a self-assessment by completing two instruments, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, self-rater and the Leadership Practices Inventory, self. Two instruments were administered to band members; the Leadership Practices Inventory, observer, and the Reasons for Success Questionnaire which included the Value of Music Program. The Reason for Success Questionnaire was created by the

Florida Board of Music, and asked band-specific questions related to a band membership and band leadership. Also, two instruments, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, observer, and the Leadership Practices Inventory, observer, were administered to teaching colleagues.

The data collected from the band director, band members, and teaching colleagues were ordinal scale values, which dictated the application of nonparametric statistical procedures in the analysis. A Spearman's Rank Correlation Analysis was applied to determine if there was significant correlation among data sets. A Mann-Whitney U Test was applied to determine if there was significant difference between two data sets. A Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks was applied to determine if there was a significant difference between more than two data sets. If the Kruskal-Wallis procedure indicated a significant difference, a Tukey Multiple Comparison procedure was applied to locate the difference between groups.

Research Relevance

This research was important because it explored the innate connection between leadership skill and perceptions that affected the group, as a cohesive unit. The application of general leadership standards to a specific role in music provided information for leaders and specifically, for leaders in school music groups. The research sought to determine dimensions of leadership that contributed to a high quality school band program.

The school administration benefited from information about leadership perceptions of band members, teaching colleagues, and the band director. Teachers also

gained insights about leadership style, as perceived by the band director, band members, and teaching colleagues.

Summary

What were the perceptions of leadership skills of a Christian school band director in Louisiana among band members, the band director, and teaching colleagues? This research question was further developed by nine clusters of subquestions that were explored in this research. The purpose of the research was to analyze the perceptions of leadership skills through the lenses of band members, band director, and teaching colleagues. The research design was a case study focused on the leadership skills of one leader through quantitative data gathering. Four instruments were administered in the collection of data including the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire, the Leadership Practices Inventory, and the Reason for Success Questionnaire, which included the Value of Music Program.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, the researcher discussed areas of leadership, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, emotional intelligence, authentic leadership, servant leadership, ethical leadership, and leadership powers. Additionally, four leadership approaches and four leadership theories were defined and summarized in this chapter. Finally, relevant research and information related to effective band director characteristics was provided.

Leadership

Like a master pianist, a gifted leader knew which chords to strike hard and how to strike them, at certain times fortissimo, at others a subtle pianissimo. That was called touch. Master leaders learned that, but it took time. Engaging and aligning were crucial, if good judgments were to come (Tichy & Bennis, 2007). To compare the skills of a master leader to the skills of a master musician was to suggest that the development of leadership took time, practice, and repetition in order to master certain techniques. For instance, even talented musicians must go through beginner, intermediate, and advanced stages of musical preparation before mastering their instrument. Upon mastering a particular instrument, musicians must continue to practice to maintain skills, in order to advance to the next level (National Standards for Arts Education, 1994). Leadership, according to Keohane, was central to almost all collective social activity and may be defined as follows: "Leaders determine or clarify goals for a group of individuals and bring together the energies of members of that group to accomplish those goals" (Keohane, 2012, p. 23).

Leaders guiding a change must establish more relationships, connect with more sources of information, and get out and walk around more frequently. It was only by staying in touch with the world around them that leaders could expect to change the business-as-usual environment. People, who followed, must believe that a leader understood their needs and had their interests at heart. There was a consensus among researchers that leadership was jointly established by leaders and followers (Howell & Shamir, 2005).

Leadership was a dialogue, not a monologue. To enlist support, leaders must have intimate knowledge of people's dreams, hopes, aspirations, visions, and values. Getting extraordinary things done in organizations demanded a willingness to experiment and take risks with innovative ideas. Grand dreams did not become significant realities through the actions of a single person. Grand dreams required a team effort, solid trust, and strong relationships. Grand dreams also required deep competence, cool confidence, group collaboration, and individual accountability. To get extraordinary things done in organizations, leaders had to enable others to act (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

The difference between a leader with a powerful ego and an egomaniac was how the ego was channeled. The effective leader took his self-belief, his self-assurance, his self-confidence and pressed them into the service of an enterprise bigger than him. For the egomaniac, self was the enterprise (Buckingham, 2005). An effective leader might also be competitive, achievement oriented, and a good coach, but these were not the characteristics that made him a leader. He was a leader if, and only if, he was able to rally others to the better future he saw (Buckingham, 2005).

Leadership flowed from many sources; sometimes springing from the joy of accomplishment, other times from a modest desire to serve others. Leadership took many forms, sometimes visible and heroic, other times quiet and unassuming. It had a different effect in different environments; a strategy that succeeded brilliantly in one organization could completely fail in another (Demi, 2008). Kouzes and Posner (2007) indicated that leadership succeeded, when the leader subscribed to the basic tenants. Those tenants included commitment to modeling the way by finding one's own voice, clarifying personal issues, and setting the example by aligning actions with shared values. The successful leader inspired a shared vision of the future by imagining the possibilities and enlisting others to share that common vision. Leaders accomplish this by appealing to shared interests (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

According to Lashway (1999) leadership came from the great thinkers, who believed "The Great Man." shaped all human history. He based his philosophy on a simple formula; "The great heart, the clear deep-seeing eye: there it lies" (p. 298). Leadership came from personal qualities that rose above the run-of-the-mill humanity (Lashway, 1999). Leadership involved providing solutions to common problems or offering ideas about how to accomplish collective purposes, and mobilizing the energies of others to follow these courses of action. Leaders brought together the energies of members of a group to achieve goals that were out of reach for individuals acting singly or randomly (Keohane, 2012).

The foundation of effective leadership was thinking through the organization's mission, defining it, and establishing it, clearly and visibly. The leader set the goals, set the priorities, and set and maintained the standards. He made compromises, of course;

effective leaders were painfully aware that they were not in control of the universe (Drucker, 2001). “The essence of leadership in any polity was the recognition of real need, the uncovering and exploiting of contradictions among values and between values and practice, the realigning of values. The leader’s fundamental act was to induce people to be aware or conscious of what they felt to feel their true needs so strongly, to define their values so meaningfully, that they could be moved to purposeful action” (MacGregor, 1978, p. 43). “Leadership is about creating a values-based umbrella large enough to accommodate the various interests of followers, but focused enough to direct their creating the conditions under which all followers can perform independently and effectively toward a single objective" (O’Toole, 1996, p. 11).

Transformational Leadership

Leithwood and Jantzi (1996) defined transformational leadership in terms of a process, by which higher levels of commitment to the organization and its goals were attained. Transformational leadership was the process of building commitment to organizational objectives and empowering followers to accomplish those objectives. Transformational leaders developed the members of the organization to their fullest potential. Wheatley (1999) defined transformational leadership, as a leader’s ability to focus those within the organization on the mission and challenges faced by the organization.

Yukl (1999) claimed a transformational leader articulated the vision in a clear and appealing manner, explained how to attain the vision, acted confidently and optimistically, expressed confidence in the followers, emphasized values with symbolic actions, led by example, and empowered followers to achieve the vision.

Transformational leadership elicited commitment rather than compliance and created a community in which each person had a sense that he or she was a stakeholder in the organization's mission. Transformational leadership was emotionally charged and empathetic (Martin, Crossland, & Johnson, 2001).

Transformational leadership was based on three assumptions: subordinates will band together around a person that inspired them, leaders with a vision and passion could accomplish amazing things, and the way to accomplish great things was to interject vehemence and encouragement. It was not really leading, if one did nothing, but it helped to define one's actions. The literature indicated that transactions, whether psychological or monetary, must take place between leader and follower to produce an observable "leadership process" and that the relationship between leader and constituent must be mutually beneficial (Northouse, 2010). Warden (2011) noted, "Where there is relationship and sharing of new information, transformational leadership is the method for new energy to do the work" (p. 4).

The five dimensions of transformational leadership were idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavioral), individual consideration, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation (Avolio, & Bass, 2004). Transformational leadership had three basic functions. First, transformational leaders sincerely served the needs of others, empowered them, and inspired followers to achieve great success. Secondly, transformational leaders led, set a vision, and instilled trust, confidence and pride in working with others. Finally, with the intellectual stimulation, transformational leaders shaped followers of the same caliber, as the leader (Castanheira & Costa, 2011). Transformational leadership was important, since it had significant influence on work

attitudes and behaviors of followers. It aided in the development of an emotional attachment between leaders and followers, which helped in shaping values, aspirations, and priorities of followers (Antonakis & House, 2002; Yukl, 1999).

Transformation required sacrifice, dedication, and creativity, none of which came without coercion (Kotter, 1996). Impacting people's lives and moving toward a strong vision was what the transformational leader endorsed totally. Maintaining the unswerving commitment to the vision and encouraging others was one of the key driving forces toward success. Music directors, especially, recognized that they were in the business of transforming people and their productivity (Ballou, 2005).

Although integrity, creativity, initiative, and personal convictions were admirable leadership qualities, it was still important to note that this was not the end-all to leadership. Leaders must view themselves as having the privilege to serve the organization by working to enhance the lives of others. The key thing about leading was not only that leaders envision a better future, but that they believed, in every fiber of their being, that they were the one to make this future come true. Transformational leaders focus on terminal values such as liberty, equality, and justice. These values mobilized and energized followers, created an agenda for action, and appealed to larger audiences (Burns, 2003).

The goal of transformational leadership, according to Covey (1990), was (a) to transform people and organizations in a literal sense; (b) to change them in mind and heart; (c) to enlarge vision, insight, and understanding; (d) to clarify purpose; (e) to make behavior congruent with beliefs, principles, or values; and (f) to bring about changes that were permanent, self-perpetuating, and momentum building.

Transformational leadership embodied the idea that all stakeholders were vital in the experience, which was believed to produce benefits for both the leader and the follower; leaders were transformed into change agents and followers were developed into leaders (Stewart, 2006; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1996; Bass, 1990). Transformational leadership models (a) conceptualized leadership, as an organizational entity rather than the task of a single individual, (b) promoted interpersonal relationships and (c) fostered communication (Hallinger, 2003). A transformational leader met the needs and wants of followers instead of driving them through the exercise of power and remained sensitive to their higher purposes (Bass, 1990).

Transformational leadership was a well-documented and validated leadership phenomenon studied in management and in organizational realms (Noland, 1999). The salient premise of transformational leadership theory was the leader's ability to motivate followers to accomplish more than what the followers planned to accomplish (Krishnan, 2005). This theory has been positively associated with a variety of organizational and personal outcomes such as organizational commitment, professional commitment, and job satisfaction (Bryman, 1992). Transformational leaders focused on transforming others by encouraging them to care for each other and work as a team, with the object of realizing common aspirations (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Transformational leadership was a leadership style that inculcated dynamic and positive change (Bennis & Nanus, 2003). Transformational leaders developed a closer relationship between followers based more on trust and commitment than contractual agreements and built self-confidence, self-efficiency, and self-esteem in followers, positively influenced followers' identification

with group/organization and vision, and boosted motivation and goal achievement (Jung & Avolio, 1999).

Berendt, Christofi, Kasibhatla, Malindretos, and Maruffi (2012) suggested that transformational leadership, as exhibited by the prophet Moses, could broadly and deeply contribute to an organization's success over the long term. Leadership issues tended to come under scrutiny during times of business scandal or ethical crises. Moses exhibited the qualities of humility, tenacity, integrity, strength, creativity, and innovation in succession planning, mission completion, organizational transformation, and future generational inspiration.

Dulewicz & Higgs (2005) described the transformational model as the dominant approach to studying leadership. Transformational leadership sought to motivate others by appealing to higher ideals and moral values, with the relevant leaders being expected to create a sense of trust, incorporating long-term vision, empowerment and coaching. The transformational leader was an effective agent of change, who thought beyond the conventional bounds of the immediate situation and identified opportunities for growth and increased effectiveness (Maurik, 2001). Without enough leaders, the vision, communication, and empowerment that were at the heart of transformation will simply not happen well enough or fast enough to satisfy needs and expectations (Kotter, 1996).

The concept of transformational leadership, a component of Bass and Avolio's full range leadership theory (Antonakis & House, 2002; Avolio, & Bass, 2004), was one of the most widely researched paradigms in the leadership field and had shown substantial validity for predicting a number of outcomes including leader performance

and effectiveness ratings in addition to follower satisfaction and motivation (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Sashkin & Sashkin, 2003).

Shin and Zhou (2003) found that transformational leadership positively related to follower creativity, followers' conservation, and intrinsic motivation. Transformational leadership boosted intrinsic motivation and provided intellectual stimulation; the followers were encouraged to challenge the status quo and the old ways of doing things. Kark and Shamir (2002) found transformational leadership to be a multifaceted, complex, and dynamic form of influence in which leaders could affect followers by highlighting different aspects of the followers' social self-concept and change their focus from one level to another.

Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater, and Spangler (2004) posited that by means of individualized consideration, a leader addressed issues of competence, meaningfulness and impact with each team member, and encouraged continued individual development. Transformational leaders acted as mentors to followers by encouraging learning, achievement, and individual development. They provided meaning, acted as role models, provided challenges, evoked emotions, and fostered a climate of trust. Kark and Shamir (2002) found that transformational leadership behavior, such as intellectual stimulation, increased the followers' feeling of self-worth because they transmitted the message that the leader believed in the followers' integrity and ability. Followers of transformational leaders, who were willing to focus on their relational self, would be motivated to enhance the well-being of the leader by being cooperative, loyal, and committed.

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership was most often explained as a cost-benefit exchange between leaders and their followers (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). The transaction or exchange involved something of value between what the leader possessed or controlled and what the follower wanted in return for his/her services (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992). Transactional leaders chose to motivate followers by inspiring a vision of what was to be accomplished, in an approach that was task oriented, and facilitated by the ability to solve problems, plan and organize, and ultimately obtain results (Northouse, 2010). Maurik (2001) observed that many approaches to leadership had a transactional quality, in ultimately representing a transaction between leader and follower, but that essentially transactional cultures were hierarchical and characterized by high levels of command and control.

In a more systematic approach to leadership, the transactional model was perceived as having three dimensions: management-by-exception, passive; management-by-exception, active; and, contingent reward. Management-by-exception, passive was employed by transactional leaders who only intervened when standards are not met or when the performance is not as per the expectations. Management-by-exception, active referred to the corrective actions the leader took, based on the transactions agreed upon between leader and follower. Contingent reward related to the level of beneficial transactions or exchanges with followers, whereby the leader stipulated the expectations and established the rewards for meeting the expectations (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2005).

Transactional leadership involved leaders clarifying goals and objectives, communicating to organize tasks and activities with the cooperation of members of the organization to ensure that wider organizational goals were met (Bass, 1974). The success of this type of leader-follower relationship depended on the acceptance of hierarchical differences and the ability to work through a mode of exchange.

Transactional leadership was based on the assumption that subordinates and systems work better under a clear chain of command. The implicit belief in the leader/follower relationship was that people were motivated by rewards and penalties (Kuhnert, 1994).

In his seminal work on leadership, James MacGregor Burns (1978) defined transactional leadership as the first form of interaction between leaders and followers. Transactional leadership occurred when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things. The relations of most leaders and followers were transactional; leaders approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contributions (Burns, 1978). It should be noted that Burn's conceptualization of transforming leadership was opposite of transactional leadership, and described when both people in the relationship (such as teacher-student) learn from each other and are transformed; the teacher and the student. Transforming leadership as described by Burns (1978) should not be confused with transformational leadership as defined by Bass (1998).

Despite numerous leadership studies highlighting the limitations of this approach, transactional leadership remained popular among leaders and managers. Along the spectrum leadership versus management, this approach was clearly closer to the management end (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 2001). Transactional Leadership was

referred to as the most common form of leadership in organizations and concerned managers, who get things done by making and fulfilling promises to employees (Bass, 1989, Avolio, Waldman, Yammarino, 1991, Burke, Stagl, Salas, Pierce, & Kendall, 2006). These leaders engaged in a dyadic transaction with their subordinates. The managers explained what was required of their employees and specified what compensation was ahead, if and when they fulfill the requirements or what discipline could be expected for poor performance (Bass, 1989). Leadership espoused behaviors, which were associated with transactions between leaders and followers. This was often associated with compliance in attaining a certain task or behavior (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasurbramaniam, 2003).

The distinction between transactional and transformational leadership was commonly emphasized in leadership studies. In spite of the fact that transformational theories were a popular topic in leadership literature, transactional leadership constituted a foundation for it and the two approaches were not necessarily in opposition to one another. (Northouse 2004; Tracey & Hinkin 1998). While transactional leaders motivated followers to comply with the leader's requests and organizational role through an exchange process, transformational leaders motivated followers by encouraging them to transcend their self-interests for the sake of the organization and shared goals. According to Bass and Avolio (1994), transactional leaders predetermined what their followers should do to realize their personal and organizational aims, while transformational leaders motivated and stimulated their followers to surpass their own self-interests and direct themselves to a higher level of motivation linked to the interests of the team, organization or larger community.

Emotional Intelligence

Although definitions of emotional intelligence varied widely, it could be thought of as "the set of abilities, verbal and non-verbal, that enabled a person to generate, recognize, express, understand, and evaluate their own and others' emotions in order to guide thinking and action that successfully cope with environmental demands and pressures" (Van Rooy & Viswesvaran, 2004, p. 72). Authors considered emotional intelligence as either a trait (Bar-On, 1997; Goleman, 1995; Petrides & Furnham, 2000; 2001) or ability (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Emotional intelligence was "the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth" (Caruso, Mayer, & Salovey, 2002, p. 56).

As a trait, emotional intelligence was considered to be an innate characteristic that enabled and promoted well-being. Trait emotional intelligence was described as a constellation of emotional self-perceptions at the lower levels of personality hierarchies (Petrides, Pita, & Kokkinaki, 2007). As ability, emotional intelligence was considered to be important for comprehending and regulating emotions and for understanding and integrating them into cognitions. Caruso, Mayer, and Salovey (2002) reported that the ability of a leader to identify emotions and feelings within themselves allowed them to accurately identify the emotions of peers and groups, to express emotions accurately, and to differentiate between honest and dishonest emotional expressions. Empathy, the ability to understand and experience another person's feelings or emotions, was an important component of emotional intelligence and facilitated a leader's social support and positive inter-personal relationships (George, 2000).

Barling, Slater, and Kelloway (2000) and Palmer, Walls, Burgess, and Stough (2001) suggested that higher levels of emotional intelligence predisposed a leader to apply transformational behaviors. Based on the concept of idealized influence from Bass (1990) and because leaders acted as role models for followers, the leaders' ability to understand and manage emotions and display self-control strongly affected the followers' trust and respect. Barling et al. (2000) and Palmer et al. (2001) proposed that leaders, who were competent at understanding emotions were more likely to have better perceptions of follower expectations, and thus more effective at using inspirational motivation (Gardner & Stough, 2002). An emotionally intelligent leader's ability to manage emotions and relationships resulted in greater individualized consideration, as they were able to understand and react to followers' needs (Barling et al., 2000; Gardner & Stough, 2002; Palmer et al., 2001).

Palmer et al. (2001) stated emotional intelligence rapidly became popular as a means for identifying potentially effective leaders and as a tool for nurturing effective leadership skills. Their findings indicated that emotional intelligence, which was assessed by a person's ability to monitor and manage emotions within self and in others, was an underlying competency of transformational leadership. Transformational leadership was defined as "that activity which stimulates purposeful activity in others by changing the way they look at the world around them and relate to one another.

Gardner and Stough (2002) found that the two underlying competencies of effective leadership were the ability to monitor emotions in ones' self and in others. Their research supported the existence of a strong relationship between transformational leadership and overall emotional intelligence. It was found that emotional intelligence

correlated highly with all components of transformational leadership, with the components of understanding of emotions and emotional management being the best predictors of this type of leadership style. Leaders, who considered themselves transformational, not transactional, reported that they could identify their own feelings and emotional states, express those feelings to others, utilize emotional knowledge when solving problems, understand the emotions of others in their workplace, manage positive and negative emotions in themselves and others, and effectively control their emotional states.

Authentic Leadership

According to Luthans & Avolio (2003), the development of authentic leadership came as a result of writings on transformational leadership, in which authors such as Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) suggested that there were pseudo versus authentic transformational leaders. Several scholars (Cooper, Scandura, & Schriesheim, 2005; Sparrowe, 2005) expressed concerns with Luthans and Avolio's initial definition of authentic leadership. The initial conceptual differences notwithstanding, there appeared to be general agreement in the literature on four factors that covered the components of authentic leadership: balanced processing, internalized moral perspective, relational transparency, and self-awareness (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, (2009).

Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, and May (2004) defined authentic leaders, as those individuals who were deeply aware of how they think and behave and were perceived by others as being aware of their own and others' values/moral perspective, knowledge, and strength; aware of the context in which they operated; and who were confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, and high on moral character. Although authentic leadership showed

some overlap with other contemporary perspectives, such as transformational, charismatic, servant, and spiritual leadership, the construct gained legitimacy in its own right, as researchers differentiated authentic leadership from related constructs by grounding it in theory and seeking support in empirical research. Transformational leaders, for example, like authentic leaders, were described, as being optimistic, hopeful, and developmentally oriented, and of high moral character (Bass, 1998). Authentic leaders were not necessarily transformational or charismatic; instead, they influenced follower awareness from a values/moral perspective and energized followers by creating meaning and positively constructing reality for themselves and followers (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

Luthans & Avolio (2003) introduced the concept of authentic leadership development into the literature with the goal of integrating work on (Luthans, 2002) positive organizational behavior with the life-span leadership development work of Avolio (1999). At the individual leader level, there is growing evidence that an authentic approach to leading is desirable and effective for advancing the human enterprise and achieving positive and enduring outcomes in organizations (George et al., 2007).

According to Yukl (2010) the actions of authentic leaders were strongly determined by their values and beliefs, not by a desire to be liked and admired or to retain their position. The core values for authentic leaders motivate them to do what is right and fair for followers, and to create a special type of relationship with them that includes high mutual trust, transparency, guidance toward worthy shared objectives, and emphasis on follower welfare and development.

Avolio et al. (2004) defined authentic leaders as those individuals who are deeply aware of how they think and behave and are perceived by others as being aware of their own and others' values/moral perspective, knowledge, and strength; aware of the context in which they operate; and who are confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, and high on moral character. Although authentic leadership showed some overlap with other contemporary perspectives such as transformational, charismatic, servant, and spiritual leadership; the construct is gaining legitimacy in its own right as researchers are beginning to differentiate authentic leadership from related constructs by grounding it in theory and seeking support in empirical research. Transformational leaders, for example, like authentic leaders, have been described as being optimistic, hopeful, developmentally oriented and of high moral character (Bass, 1998).

Authentic leadership, then, can incorporate transformational, charismatic, servant, spiritual, or other forms of positive leadership. However, authentic leaders were not necessarily transformational or charismatic; instead, they influence follower awareness from a values/moral perspective and energize followers by creating meaning and positively constructing reality for themselves and followers (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Although further work is needed to validate the construct of authentic leadership, Avolio et al. (2004) argued that the main distinguishing element that differentiates authentic leadership from related forms of leadership is that it is at the very core of what constitutes profoundly positive leadership in whatever form it exists. Avolio et al. (2004) argued that in authentic leadership; the focus on transparency, positivity, and high ethical standards is critical.

Servant Leadership

The basic premise of servant leadership was simple yet profound. Leaders should put the needs of followers before their own needs. What happened in the lives of followers should be the standard by which leaders were judged (Johnson, 2012). Robert Greenleaf sparked contemporary interest in leaders as servants. Greenleaf, who spent 40 years in research, development, and education at AT&T and 25 years as an organizational consultant, coined the term servant leader in the 1970s to describe a leadership model that put the concerns of followers first (Greenleaf, 1977).

Liden, Wayne, Zhao, and Henderson (2008) developed a comprehensive measure of servant leadership: behaving ethically, emotional healing, putting subordinates first, helping subordinates grow and succeed, empowering followers, creating value for the community, and conceptual skills. Transformational leaders put organizational needs first and encouraged employees to sacrifice their interests to meet the goals of the organization (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006); servant leaders put the follower's best interest as a top priority. Schaubroeck, Lam, and Peng (2011) found servant leadership at the team level influenced team performance; team performance increased by 10% beyond that explained by transformational leadership. Schaubroeck and his colleagues, using the Liden et al. (2008) servant leadership measure, demonstrated that servant leadership led to improved team performance because of a positive influence on affect-based trust, which provided psychological safety for team members. When employees felt psychologically safe, they were willing to take risks that included creativity, willingness to challenge the status quo, and perform well as reciprocation for fair treatment from the leader.

The servant leader, according to Russell and Stone (2002), took the position of servant to his or her fellow workers and aimed to fulfill the needs of others. Page and Wong (2000) defined servant leadership, as serving others by working toward their development and well-being in order to meet goals for the common good. Servant leaders trusted followers to act in the best interests of the organization and focused on followers rather than the organizational objectives (Stone, Russell & Patterson, 2004).

Ethical Leadership

Ethical leadership respected the rights and dignity of others. Leaders, who were ethical, demonstrated a level of integrity that was important for stimulating a sense of leader trustworthiness, which was important in order for followers to accept the vision of the leader. The character and integrity of the leader provided the basis for personal characteristics that directed a leader's ethical beliefs, values, and decisions. Ethical leaders assisted followers in gaining a sense of personal competence that allowed them to be self-sufficient by encouraging and empowering them (Trevino, Brown, & Hartman, 2003).

An increasingly common position, encountered in both scholarly and popular literature, was that the essence of effective leadership was ethical leadership. Ethical leadership was about leading an organization or people to accomplish its core purposes using ethical means (Rhode, 2006). Ethical leaders were strong, generous, full-hearted, trustworthy, resolute, and reliable. They were not without error or fault, but they did admit faults, when they became aware of the faults. They did not seek to dominate, except when the core principles of right action were in jeopardy. They encouraged others to come forward, when it was time for the other to lead. They sought to guide rather than

to direct. Their greatest achievements were accomplished, when people moved forward on their own (Berghofer, 2013).

According to Riggio (2013), some research, though not all research, suggested that women were more sensitive to ethical issues than men. Women were more likely to believe that corporate ethical codes made a positive difference. Women were more concerned about socially desirable/appropriate behavior and about being ethical. It was likely that women learned and developed sensitivity to ethical issues. The hope was that all leaders, men and women, could be more sensitive to and alert for possible ethical violations. Organizational codes of ethics could help; fostering an ethical organizational climate was important.

Leadership Power

Power was defined as "the ability of one party to change or control the behavior, attitudes, opinions, objectives, needs, and values of another party" (Rahim, 1989, p. 545). This definition implied that research on power was limited to the influence of one individual (leader) over another individual (follower). Several classifications of the powers of leaders have been set forth (Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980; Patchen, 1974; Shukla, 1982), but the bases of power taxonomy suggested by French and Raven (1959) still appeared to be fairly representative and popular in application (Frost & Stahelski, 1988; Rahim, 1989).

Social psychologists French and Raven (1959) identified five types of leadership power, which they grouped into positional power (three power sources) and personal power (two sources). Positional power included reward power, coercive power, and legitimate power. Reward power, as the name implies, rested on the ability of a leader to

give some sort of reward to subordinates. In 1965 Raven revised this model to include a sixth form by separating informational power base, as distinct from the expert power base (Forsythe, 2010).

Coercive power was the ability to force subordinates to comply with an order through the threat of punishment and typically led to short-term compliance, but in the long-run produced dysfunctional behavior. Legitimate power explained that there was a belief among subordinates that their leaders had the right to give orders based on his or her position. Personal power included expert power and referent power. Expert power explained that an individual that possessed a particularly high level of knowledge or a highly specialized skill set may be accorded authority based on the perception of subordinates. Referent power derived from subordinates' respect for leaders and their desire to identify with or emulate him or her (French & Raven, 1959).

Leadership Approaches

Trait Approach

The trait approach to leadership was one of the earliest theories of leadership. Implicit in this approach was an assumption that traits produced patterns of behavior that were consistent across situations. Leadership traits were considered to be enduring characteristics with which people were born and that remained relatively stable over time (Fleenor, 2006). The main assertion of the trait approach stated that persons could be categorized as born leaders or non-leaders. This approach provided characteristics of leader personality such as: intelligence, enthusiasm, honesty, dominance, and perseverance, and was well appreciated until the mid-1950s (Schriesheim & Neider, 1989).

Style Approach

This approach indicated that leadership was composed of two kinds of behaviors: task-oriented behaviors and relationship-oriented behaviors (McCaffery, 2004). Task-oriented behaviors facilitated goal accomplishment and helped group members achieve their objectives. Relationships-oriented behaviors helped subordinates feel comfortable with themselves, with each other, and with the situation in which they found themselves. The central purpose of the style approach was to explain how leaders combined the two kinds of behaviors to influence subordinates in efforts to reach a goal (Northouse, 2010).

Skills Approach

In the model proposed by Katz in the *Harvard Business Review*, entitled "Skills of an Effective Administrator" from 1955, three different abilities that a leader should possessed were technical skills, human skills, and conceptual skills. Katz argued that the skills were quite different from traits or qualities of leaders. The skills approach was a leader-centered perspective that emphasized the competencies of leaders. It was best represented in the early work of Katz (1955) on the three-skill approach and the more recent work of Mumford and his colleagues (Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs, & Fleishman, 2000), who initiated the development of a comprehensive skills model of leadership.

Situational Approach

Situational leadership was comprised of both a directive and a supportive dynamic. The situational approach has been refined and revised several times, since its inception and it has been used extensively in organizational leadership training and development (Northouse, 2010). This approach was developed by Hersey and Blanchard

(1969) based on Reddin's (1967) 3-D management style theory. The basic premise of the situational approach stated different situations demand different types of leadership.

Leadership Theories

Great Man Theory

Those who believed in the Great Man theory believed that people were born to leadership. Great men would include members of royalty, high-ranking military officers, and industry heads. Research suggested that some people have personality traits, behaviors, and knowledge that lended themselves to leadership (Yaverbaum & Sherman, 2008).

Behavior Theory

Behavior theory focused on what an effective leader did. Leadership was not considered something a person was born with, nor was a set of traits necessary. Effective leadership was considered to be dependent on the right behavior. The myth in this thinking was that outward behavior was enough to establish leadership. In the 1970s research found most of the behavior theory research to be invalid (Howell & Costley, 2001; Yaverbaum & Sherman, 2001).

Path-Goal Theory

The path-goal theory was originated by Evans (1970), advanced by House (1971), and refined by House and Mitchell (1974). This theory was based on the idea that different leadership styles complemented the characteristics of the followers and the demands of their tasks. The leadership behavior styles were classified into four categories: directive, supportive, achievement-oriented, and participative. The path-goal theory integrated key elements of behavioral theory, such as leader consideration and

initiating structure and expectancy theory, to qualify the contextual circumstances by which to examine effective leadership (Stoner & Freeman, 1992). The path-goal theory of leadership contended that leaders should clarify for their subordinates which path best led to the desired goal in question. Generally, this goal should be associated with certain payoffs consistent with the wants and/or needs of the subordinate (House, 1971; House and Mitchell, 1974; Stoner and Freeman, 1992).

Leader Member Exchange (LMX) Theory

The leader-member exchange (LMX) theory focused on the relationship between the leader and follower (Cogliser & Schriesheim, 2000). The central principle in LMX theory was that leaders developed different exchange relationships with their followers, whereby the quality of the relationship altered the impact on important leader and member outcomes (Gerstner & Day, 1997). Thus, leadership occurred, when leaders and followers were able to develop effective relationships that result in mutual and incremental influence (Uhl-Bien, 2006).

Relevant Research

Leadership

Rath and Conchie (2009) reported that Gallup scientists studied more than one million work teams, conducted more than 20,000 in-depth interviews with leaders, interviewed 10,000 followers, and drew on 50 years of Gallup Polls about the world's most admired leaders. Rath and Conchie drew three conclusions from the abundance of research. (a) Effective leaders always invested in strengths. (b) Effective leaders surrounded themselves with the right people and maximize their team. (c) Effective leaders understood followers' needs.

Riggio (2009) reviewed 100 years of research on effective leadership. He concluded that leadership was complex but could be developed by devoting time and energy to a personal program of skill acquisition. Riggio provided five summary statements: Leaders were both born and made; leadership training was a long-term and incremental process and most programs lead to positive change; all or at least most great leaders shared certain elements (the theory of transformational leadership represented the best elements of leadership). Leadership was not situation specific; transformational skills transferred to other settings; and, the foundation of effective leadership began at an early age.

Transformational Leadership

Wallace (2006) investigated the effect of teacher leadership on classroom effectiveness and student achievement. The research questioned student attitudes concerning the instructional environment, teachers leadership attributes, student learning and behavior, effectiveness of classroom instruction, and classroom management. The data strongly suggested that leadership behaviors play a major role in the reaction, learning, and behavior of students.

Amoroso (2002) investigated the relationship between principals' transformational leadership behaviors, teacher commitment, and teacher job satisfaction. The transformational leadership behaviors were found to have a significant impact on teacher commitment and teacher job satisfaction. An unexpected finding of the research was a negative relationship between the number of years a teacher had taught in the same school and their level of both commitment and job satisfaction.

Hoffman and Frost (2006) examined the impact of emotional, social, and cognitive intelligences on dimensions of transformational leadership. The findings indicated that multiple intelligences were a useful approach to predict transformational leadership. The findings provided a useful framework for practitioners interested in assessing precursors to transformational leadership with a focus on assessment centers, as a useful tool for predicting transformational leadership.

Servant Leadership

Farling, Stone, and Winston (1999) presented a concept of leadership based on the variables of vision, influence, credibility, trust, and service--characteristics of servant leadership frequently noted in the popular press. They concluded that servant leaders found the source of their values in a spiritual base. They argued that empowering followers allowed the servant leader to act on his or her embedded values.

Russell (2001) focused on understanding the values and attributes of servant leaders. His research hypothesized that servant leaders possessed different personal values than non-servant leaders, and the personal values were tied to the attributes of leadership. His research provided evidence of a relationship between values and leadership; however, the findings indicated the need for additional empirical studies to further examine and validate the link.

Peterson, Galvin, and Lang (2012) investigated servant leadership at the organizational level using a 16-item version of Liden et al. (2008) measure of servant leadership. Peterson et al. found that company performance, as measured by return on assets, was higher in companies led by CEOs, who engaged in servant leadership. CEOs, who had founded a company and those, who scored lower on narcissism, were

significantly more likely to engage in servant leadership. A negative relationship between servant leadership and leader narcissism agreed with Greenleaf's (1970) contention that leaders should help others before providing for themselves.

Authentic Leadership

Hassan and Ahmed (2011) examined how authentic leadership contributed to subordinate trust and how this trust predicted subordinate work engagement. The findings indicated that authentic leadership promoted subordinates trust in a leader and contributed to work engagement. Interpersonal trust predicted employee work engagement and mediated the relationship between this style of leadership and employee work engagement.

Band Director Characteristics

Iida (1991) concluded that the teacher was the most influential factor in successful band programs. In Iida's research, students and their band directors at five successful and five moderately successful schools participated in interviews and responded to an open-ended questionnaire. Rehearsals were videotaped. Findings of the research indicated that students perceived the teacher to be the leading cause for the success of a band and influential in the formation of the bond that band members formed. Iida listed the most common teacher characteristics contributing to successful band programs as follows: (a) a personality friendly toward students that included a sense of humor and a caring attitude (b) an ability to build and maintain a positive attitude among band members resulting from motivational and inspirational skills, (c) an ability to maintain a strong and fair sense of discipline, (d) having a strong musical background, and (e) having an organized system of teaching and having the confidence and knowledge to use the system.

Director's personality, teacher interaction style, and management skills in relation to the program were factors relevant to the success of band programs. Newman (1986) investigated the relationship of teacher interaction style, personality, and management skills (on-task behavior) to successful band programs. Successful band programs were identified as bands receiving a score of excellent or superior at the 1983 All-State Concert Band Festival. Results indicated teacher management style was a significant factor in the effectiveness of the band director. Additionally, band directors, who were highly enthusiastic, tended to be better managers.

Similar to previous studies, Dugle (1991) determined the most common factor in successful music programs was the band director. To create an assessment system for school band programs, (Dugle, 1991) investigated characteristics of successful band programs. Three successful bands were identified based on past performance at a concert band contest. Factors mentioned by all three programs were included on the final assessment checklist. To evaluate band programs, the researcher administered a checklist containing internal and external characteristics to parents, administrators, students, and staff. Participants were also interviewed. Various positive teacher traits including teacher teamwork, adequate funding, private lessons, the community arts environment, parental and administrative support were found to be integral parts of a successful program.

Setting goals was a fundamental success principle, especially for a transformational leader. Goals must be written down; unwritten goals were merely dreams. No one experiences the full potential of his or her abilities without setting specific, written, and timed goals. A principle factor that made goals work was the

principle of accountability. Sharing goals built group synergy, group advocacy, and accountability (Ballou, 2005).

Additionally, the success of a musical program was influenced by the teacher's interaction with community groups and businesses, the school administration, feeder schools, and the parents. Though most of the teachers had the characteristics listed, the highly successful band teachers possessed the characteristics to a higher degree than the moderately successful band teachers. In a similar study, Sawyer's (2002) participants ranked teacher effectiveness as the most important factor, while contest participation and ratings were the least.

Impacting people's lives and moving toward a strong vision was endorsed by a transformational leader. Maintaining the unswerving commitment to a vision and encouraging others was a key driving forces toward success. Music directors, especially, recognized that they were in the business of transforming people and their productivity (Ballou, 2005). Three characteristics were often associated with successful teachers: non-verbal communication, teacher self-efficacy, and servant leadership (Steele, 2010). Additionally, strong leadership skills were commonly identified as prominent traits of an effective teacher (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1996; Battisti, 1999). Battisti (1999) described music teacher leadership as consisting of: passion for music, enthusiasm for leading, vision, public relation skills, vitality, commitment, sense of responsibility, ability to motivate others, compassion, confidence, sense of community, communication skills, positive attitude, self-discipline, desire for excellence, fairness, respect, direction, political acumen, and ability to delegate.

Metzger (2011) researched leadership profiles of elementary music educators in an urban district in Connecticut. The population consisted of 30 music educators, who taught preschool through school. A sample of 17 teachers of elementary general and string music was selected; 10 music educators were women, one was a man. There were three women and four men among the string educators. Participants completed the Leadership Practices Inventory. The respondents by their action rated the leadership practices as Model the Way, Enable Others to Act, Challenge the Process, Inspire a Shared Vision, and Encourage the Heart. Behavioral statements were ranked as important including praising people, celebrating accomplishments, giving team support for contributions, setting a personal example, following through on commitment, being clear about personal leadership philosophy, developing cooperative relations, actively listening, and treating others with respect.

Summary

The review of literature began with general statements about the nature and role of leadership. A second section dealt with the nature and role of transformational leadership. The following sections provided information about transactional leadership, emotional intelligence, authentic leadership, servant leadership, ethical leadership, and leadership power, respectively.

Four leadership approaches, Trait, Style, Skill, and Situational were presented as well as four leadership theories, including the Great Man Theory, Behavior Theory, Path-Goal, and Leader Member Exchange. Relevant research in various areas was provided. Finally, research related to effective band director characteristics was reported.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This research was a case study designed to assess the leadership style of a band director in a Christian school in Louisiana. The self-assessment of the band director was compared with the assessment of band members and teaching colleagues. The overall purpose was to determine areas of leadership strength and leadership areas that could be strengthened.

Research Design

A case study of one leader through quantitative data gathering was used in this assessment research. Case studies emphasized detailed contextual analysis of a limited number of events or conditions and their relationships. Social scientists made wide use of this qualitative research method to examine contemporary real-life situations and provided the basis for the application of ideas and extension of methods (Yin, 1984). Case study research was organized around six steps including: (a) determine and define the research questions, (b) select the cases and determine data gathering and analysis techniques, (c) prepare to collect the data, (d) collect data in the field, (e) evaluate and analyze the data, and (f) prepare the report (Yin, 1984). Many tools were available for the collection of data in a case study including direct observations, interviews, protocols, tests, record examinations, and writing samples. This research employed observations and tests as the basic methods of data collection. Limited application was made of statistics in the analysis of data.

Research Question and Subquestions

The research question for this research was: What were the perceptions of the leadership style of the school band director of a Christian school in Louisiana? Several subquestions listed below were developed from the research question.

- RQ1. What was the overall leadership style of the band director?
- RQ2. How did the band director perceive his own leadership style?
- RQ3. How did band members perceive the band director's leadership style?
- RQ4. How did teaching colleagues perceive the band director's leadership style?
- RQ5. Was there a significant difference in perception of leadership style between the band director, band members, and teaching colleagues?
- RQ6. In which areas of leadership could the band director focus in order to strengthen his leadership among band members?
- RQ7. What were band member, band director, and teaching colleague perceptions of the leadership style of the band director, when measured by each of the five subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory and each of the four subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire?
- RQ8. Were there areas of agreement among the findings of Reason for Success Questionnaire with Leadership Practices Inventory values and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire values?
- RQ9. Was there a relationship (correlation) in the measurement of leadership style between band member's Reason for Success Questionnaire values, band member's Leadership Practices Inventory values?

Data Collection

Instruments

Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).

The Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Avolio and Bass (1997) captured the basic elements of transformational leadership. The 45-item instrument measured practices that aroused strong follower commitment influenced the perspective that followers had of problems, encourage and support vision, model appropriate behaviors, and enforce rules to avoid mistakes. Bruce Avolio was Ingersoll Professor, at the Michael G. Foster Business School and Director of the Center for Leadership at the University of Washington. Bernard M. Bass, a psychologist, published more than 400 journal articles, book chapters, and technical reports, and authored 21 books and edited 10 books. His Handbook of Leadership was a standard reference in the field.

The MLQ consisted of a number of statements about the leadership style of the individual being tested. The questionnaire used in this study contained 45 statements that identify and measure nine key aspects of leadership behaviors. Each statement corresponded to one of the nine components of transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire leadership factors. The transformational leadership style was divided into idealized charismatic behaviors and attributes. Factors representing transformational leadership included idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation. Transactional leadership style was represented by two factors called contingent rewards and management-by-exception. Management-by-exception was divided into Management-by-

exception-active (MBEA) and Management-by-exception-passive (MBEP). Five responses to the MLQ were presented on a 5-point Likert scale including: (0) Not at All, (1) Once in a While, (2) Sometimes, (3) Fairly Often, and (4) Frequently, if not Always. Respondents were instructed during the administration of the questionnaires to mark the most suitable answer.

MLQ Reliability and Validity.

The MLQ has been tested for reliability and content and concurrent validity (Bass and Avolio, 1989; Pruijn & Boucher, 1994; Yammarino & Bass, 1990). According to Bass and Avolio (1997), further reliability of the MLQ has been proven many times through test-retest, internal consistency methods and alternative methods.

Avolio, Bass and Jung (1995) confirmed the reliability of the MLQ by using a large number of respondents (N = 1394). According to Avolio and colleagues the MLQ scales exhibited high internal consistency and factor loadings; they reported reliabilities for total items and for each leadership factor scale that ranged from 0.74 to 0.94. Den Hartog, Van Muijen and Koopman (1997) investigated the internal consistency of the MLQ subscales. Their study group consisted of approximately 1200 employees from commercial businesses, health-care organizations, welfare institutions, and local governments. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the subscales of transformational leadership ranged from 0.72 to 0.93 and transactional leadership ranged from 0.58 to 0.78.

Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI).

The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) was a research instrument that contained 30 behavioral statements, six statements for each of the Five Practices of

Exemplary Leadership. Leaders completed the LPI Self, rating themselves on the frequency with which they believe they engaged in each of the 30 behaviors. Five to ten other people, usually selected by the leader, completed the LPI Observer, indicating the frequency with which they thought the leader engaged in each behavior.

There were six items for each of the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership; the five practices were Model the Way (items 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, and 26); Inspire a Shared Vision (items 1, 7, 12, 22, and 27); Challenge the Process (items 3, 8, 13, 18, 23, and 28); Enable Other to Act (items 4, 9, 14, 19, 24, and 29); and Encourage the Heart (items 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 30)

LPI Reliability and Validity.

The LPI was created by developing a set of statements describing each of the various leadership actions and behaviors. Each statement was originally cast on a five-point Likert scale, and reformulated in 1999 into a more robust and sensitive ten-point Likert-scale. A higher value represented more frequent application of a leadership behavior. Following were options for each of the statements: (1) Almost never do what is described in the statement; (2) Rarely; (3) Seldom; (4) Once in a while; (5) Occasionally; (6) Sometimes; (7) Fairly Often; (8) Usually; (9) Very Frequently; and, (10) Almost always do what is described in the statement. Statements were modified, discarded, or included following lengthy discussions and interactive feedback sessions with respondents, subject matter experts, and empirical analyses of behaviorally based statements.

Several studies established the internal reliability of the Leadership Practices Inventory. The Cronbach alpha was calculated between .80 and .92 in a study of

engineering managers and their constituents (Herold, Fields, & Hyatt, 1993), between .71 and .82 in a study of women in executive positions in banking and higher education (Ottinger, 1990), and between .82 and .84 for adults enrolled in a community leadership development program (Adams, 1999) .

Reason for Success Questionnaire.

The Reason for Success Questionnaire measured student opinions of the band director and the music program. The instrument was adopted from the Florida Music Education Association, a branch of the National Association for Music Education. The instrument was composed of 32 items, which queried the characteristics that contributed to success in a band program. Twelve additional items queried the value of the band program in the life of the school band members. A respondent was requested to rate each of the 44 items on a scale from (1) Not at All to (7) To a Very Great Extent.

Procedures

Upon approval from the dissertation committee Chair, the researcher made initial contact with the band director at the beginning of the 2012 – 2013 school session. During an informal meeting the band director the researcher expressed interest in observing the band program, and scheduling a formal meeting at a later date. In December of 2012, the researcher met with the band director and expressed interest in conducting formal research that would evaluate his leadership from a self-perspective, and from the perspective of band members and teaching colleagues.

The band director formerly served as an assistant band director for a year and was hired as the head band director the next year. He did not have reservations or concerns about his leadership being evaluated by his peers, or by band students. On the contrary,

because the new band director's leadership style was different than that of his predecessor, he was interested in a formal evaluation of his leadership with the expectation of utilizing the data as a training tool to quantify and enhance his personal leadership practices.

After the researcher made a formal request to conduct the research, the band director met with the lead teacher, who requested permission from the Principal of the school to participate in the research. Upon receiving permission from the Principal, the lead teacher contacted the band director, and told him that the research would be allowed. It was important that the lead teacher's role at the school was to oversee the proper usage of class time and to assist teachers in accomplishing the school's academic goals. The lead teacher did not exercise leadership authority over the band director or other teachers, but served as an intermediary between the teachers and the Principal. The band director reported directly to the Head Master of the school, as does the Principal and all other department leaders.

Upon receiving verbal confirmation from the band director that the research was authorized by the Principal of the school, and was supported by teaching colleagues and band members, permission letters were sent to the teaching colleagues and to the parents of the band members in order to describe the purpose of the research, the instruments that would be used, and to request legal consent for all parties to participate in the research.

On February 10, 2013 the researcher received written permission in the collection of data using the Mult-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), Self and Observer. On February 21, 2013, the researcher received written permission to collect data using the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), Self and Observer.

On February 27, 2013 consent forms were delivered to the Christian school, and given to the lead teacher to be disseminated to all teaching colleague participants, and to the band director to be given to band students to request permission from their parents to participate in the research. Of the 12 teaching colleagues, who were asked to participate in the research, 10 responded positively, and two declined to participate. Of the 11 band members who were asked to participate in the research, eight responded positively, and three were not allowed to participate because parental consent was not provided.

After copies of the approved consent forms were provided to the university overseeing the research, the researcher travelled to the school to administer the questionnaires. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire self-rater version and the Leadership Practices Inventory, Self were administered in written form to the band director of the Christian school of Louisiana on April 18, 2013. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, Observer and the Leadership Practices Inventory, Observer were administered in written form to teaching colleagues at the Christian school in Louisiana on March 18, 2013. The Leadership Practices Inventory, Observer and the Reasons for Success Questionnaire, which included the Value of the Music Program was

Table 1. Instrument Administration Schedule

| Instrument | Director | Band Members | Teaching Colleagues |
|--|----------|--------------|---------------------|
| Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, self-rater | 03/2013 | | |
| Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, rater | | | 03/2013 |
| Leadership Practices Inventory, self | 04/2013 | | |
| Leadership Practices Inventory, observer | | 03/2013 | 03/2013 |
| Reasons for Success Questionnaire, Band Member | | 03/2013 | |

administered to selected band members in written form on March 26, 2013 in order to gain their impression of the leadership style of the band director. In all instances, administration of questionnaires took between 15 – 30 minutes per respondent. (see Table 1)

Data Analysis

A Frequencies Analysis procedure was applied to analyze all descriptive data. Frequencies Analysis counted the occurrence of each data value for a variable and displays that information in a table. A total value and the seven factor values were calculated and reported for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, self-rater and rater. A Spearman Ranked Correlation procedure was applied to determine if there was a significant correlation between the self and the observer version of the questionnaire.

A total value for the Leadership Practices Inventory, self and observer and values for each of the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership was calculated and reported. A Spearman Ranked Correlation procedure was applied to determine if there was a significant correlation between the LPI, self and the LPI, observer. Kruskal-Wallis and Tukey Multiple Comparison procedures were applied to determine if there was significant difference in LPI subscale values between the band director, band members, and teaching colleagues. A total value for the Reasons for Success Questionnaire including a separate summary value for the Value of the Music Program was calculated and reported.

Summary

This chapter presented the data collection and data analysis procedures. Three research instruments were applied in the collection of data including the Multifactor Leadership Question, self and rater, the Leadership Practices Inventory, self and observer, and the Reasons for Success Questionnaire including a separate summary value for the Value of the Music Program. The data collected from the band director, band members, and teaching colleagues were ordinal scale values, which dictated the application of nonparametric statistical procedures in the analysis. A Spearman's Rank Correlation Analysis, Mann-Whitney U Test, Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks, or Tukey Multiple Comparison procedure was applied as described in the Research Methodology section of the introductory chapter.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The research question was: What were the perceptions of the leadership style of the school band director of a Christian school in Louisiana? Several subquestions were developed from the research question.

- RQ1. What was the overall leadership style of the band director?
- RQ2. How did the band director perceive his own leadership style?
- RQ3. How did band members perceive the band director's leadership style?
- RQ4. How did teaching colleagues perceive the band director's leadership style?
- RQ5. Was there a significant difference in perception of leadership style between the band director, band members, and teaching colleagues?
- RQ6. In which areas of leadership can the band director focus in order to strengthen his leadership among band members?
- RQ7. What were band member, band director, and teaching colleague perceptions of the leadership style of the band director, when measured by each of the five subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory and each of the four subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire?
- RQ8. Were there areas of agreement among the findings of Reason for Success Questionnaire with Leadership Practices Inventory values and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire values?
- RQ9. Was there a relationship (correlation) in the measurement of leadership style between band member's Reason for Success Questionnaire values, band member's Leadership Practices Inventory values?

Demographic Data

Ten teaching colleagues of a Christian school in Louisiana completed Leadership Practices Inventory and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, rater observer forms. Among the 10 teaching colleagues, four were men and six were women; nine were Caucasian and one was Hispanic. Four teaching colleagues were administrators and six were teachers. Two teaching colleagues were in the age range of 25-34, three were 35-44, four were 45-54, and one was 65-74. (see Table 2)

Table 2. Teaching colleague/Observer Demographic Summary

| Category | Data | | | |
|------------|----------------|-------|----------|-------|
| | Gender | Men | | Women |
| 4 | | 6 | | |
| Ethnicity | Caucasian | | Hispanic | |
| | 9 | | 1 | |
| Employment | Administration | | Teacher | |
| | 4 | | 6 | |
| Age Range | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 65-74 |
| | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 |

Eight band members completed the Leadership Practices Inventory, observer form, and the Reasons for Success Questionnaire. Six of the band members were boys and two were girls; one was a Freshman, two were Sophomores, two were Juniors, and three were Seniors. Three band members were African American, and five were Caucasian. (see Table 3)

Table 3. Band Member Demographic Summary

| Category | Data | | | |
|-------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|--------|
| | Gender | Boys | | Girls |
| 6 | | 2 | | |
| Ethnicity | African American | | Caucasian | |
| | 3 | | 5 | |
| Grade Level | Freshman | Sophomore | Junior | Senior |
| | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Age Range | 12-17 | | 18-24 | |
| | 6 | | 2 | |

Assessment Data

Four basic instruments were administered in the assessment of the musical leadership of the band director of a Christian school in Louisiana. The instruments included two versions of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, the self-rater version, which was completed by the band director and the rater version, which was completed by a panel of teaching colleagues. Two versions of the Leadership Practices Inventory were administered, the self-version was completed by the band director and the observer version was completed by two panels, a panel of band members and fellow teaching colleagues. Further input was gathered from band members through the administration of the Reasons for Success Questionnaire, which included a Value of Music Program subscale.

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

A summary of responses to the 45-item Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire from teaching colleagues was compared to responses from the band director. The mean

value for the teaching colleagues was 2.65, the standard deviation was 1.45; the mean value for the band director was 2.78, the standard deviation was 1.38. (see Table 4)

Table 4. Total Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Summary Values

| Value | Teaching Colleagues | Band Director |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Mean | 2.65 | 2.78 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.45 | 1.38 |

A Spearman Ranked Correlation analysis was applied to the teaching colleague mean values and the band director values to determine if there was significant correlation between the two data sets. When the data was ranked and the ranks were compared, the mean rank for teaching colleagues was 2.3027, the standard deviation was 1.5644. The mean rank for the band director was 2.3333, the standard deviation was 1.4464. The Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient was .6313. The t-value was 4.307662 with 28 degrees of freedom, and the p-value was <.001. Since the p-value was less than .05, there was evidence that the correlation was significantly different than zero. There was significant correlation

Table 5. Spearman's Ranked Correlation Analysis

| |
|---|
| Variables used: Teaching Colleagues (N) and Band Director (N) |
| Number of cases used: 30 |
| Mean (SD) Teaching Colleagues (N) = 2.3027 (1.5644) |
| Mean (SD) Band Director (N) = 2.3333 (1.4464) |
| Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient = 0.6313 |
| (Spearman's) t = 4.307662 with 28 d.f. p < 0.001 |
| 95% C.I. on Spearman's rho is (0.351, 0.808) |

between the two data sets. The teaching colleagues confirmed the band director's description of his leadership style. (see Table 5)

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire responses were further analyzed by examining the seven factors and items related to effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort. Two of the seven factors Idealized Influence and Management-by-Exception had dual expressions. The teaching colleague mean ratings were compared to the band directors self-rating in each of the factors and related items. (see Table 6)

Table 6. MLQ Factors of Transformational Leadership Subscale Summary

| Factor | Subscales | Teaching Colleague Total Rating | Teaching Colleague Mean | Band Director Total Rating | Band Director Mean |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Idealized Influence [Attributed] | Factor 1 | 12.50 | 3.13 | 12.00 | 3.00 |
| Idealized Influence [Behavior] | | 15.50 | 3.88 | 14.00 | 3.50 |
| Inspirational Motivation | Factor 2 | 15.00 | 3.75 | 13.00 | 3.25 |
| Intellectual Stimulation | Factor 3 | 12.28 | 3.07 | 12.00 | 3.00 |
| Individualized Consideration | Factor 4 | 11.60 | 2.90 | 15.00 | 3.75 |
| Contingent Reward | Factor 5 | 13.90 | 3.48 | 15.00 | 3.75 |
| Management-by-exception [Active] | Factor 6 | 5.70 | 1.43 | 5.00 | 1.25 |
| Management-by-exception [Passive] | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.00 | 0.75 |
| Laissez-faire Leadership | Factor 7 | 0.40 | 0.10 | 4.00 | 1.00 |
| Effectiveness | | 14.60 | 3.65 | 15.00 | 3.75 |
| Satisfaction | | 6.80 | 3.40 | 5.00 | 2.50 |
| Extra Effort | | 10.40 | 3.47 | 12.00 | 4.00 |

Factor 1, idealized influence indicated whether subordinates trusted, respected, showed dedication, and considered the leader a role model. Teaching colleagues rated the four items in Factor 1 at 3.13; the band director's rating of himself was 3.00.

Factor 2, inspirational motivation, measured the degree to which the band director provided a vision and made band members feel their work is significant. Teaching colleagues rated at 3.75, the band director 3.25.

Factor 3, intellectual stimulation, showed the degree to which band members were encouraged to be creative in looking at old problems in new ways, to create an environment that is tolerant of seemingly extreme positions, to nurture members to question their own values and beliefs and those of the school. Teaching colleagues rated the subscale at 3.07, the band director at 3.00.

Factor 4, individualized consideration, indicated the degree to which the band director showed interest in other's well-being, assigned projects individually, and paid attention to those who seem less involved in the group. Teaching colleagues rated the subscale at 2.90, the band director at 3.75.

Factor 5, contingent reward, showed the degree to which the band director told others what to do in order to be rewarded, emphasized what was expected from them and recognized their accomplishments. Teaching colleagues rated at 3.48, the band director at 3.75.

Factor 6, management-by-exception assessed whether the band director told others the job requirements, was content with standard performances, and was a believer in "if it is not broken, do not fix it." Teaching colleagues rated the subscale at 1.43; the band director at 1.25.

Factor 7, Laissez-faire, measured whether the band director required little of others, was content to let things ride, and let others do their own thing. Teaching colleagues rated the subscale at .10, the director at 1.00.

A total rating of 13-16 was considered a high rating in transformational leadership; a rating of 6-11 was considered moderate; and a rating of 0-5 was considered a low rating. In the band director's self-evaluation, he rated Factors 1B, 2, and 5 high; Factors 1A, 3, and 4 as moderate; and Factors 6 A and B as low. Teaching colleagues rated Factors 1B, 2, 4, and 5 high; Factors 1A and 3 as moderate; and Factors 6A and B low.

A Mann-Whitney U procedure was applied to determine, if there was significant difference in the overall MLQ Transformational Factors. The mean rank value for teaching colleagues and the band director was 8.5, the z-value was -.53, and the p-value was .958. There was no significant difference; the extremely high p-value indicated almost total agreement between teaching colleagues and the band director.

A Spearman's Ranked Correlation procedure was applied to the two data sets to determine if there was significant correlation between teaching colleague panel responses and band director responses. The teaching colleagues mean was 9.8900, the standard deviation was 5.3286. When the data was ranked and the ranks compared, the band director mean was 10.4167, the standard deviation was 4.6149. The Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient was .8065. Spearman's t-value was 6.398118 with 11 degrees of freedom and the p-value was <.001. Since the p-value was less than .05, there was evidence that the correlation was significantly different than zero. There was significant

correlation between the two data sets. The teaching colleagues confirmed the band director's description of his leadership style. (see Table 7)

Table 7. MLQ Factors Correlation Analysis

| |
|--|
| <p>Correlation Coefficients</p> <p>Variables used: Band Director (N) and Teaching Colleagues (N)</p> <p>Number of cases used: 30</p> <p>Mean (SD) Band Director (N) = 10.4167 (4.6149)</p> <p>Mean (SD) Teaching Colleagues (N) = 9.8900 (5.3286)</p> <p>Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient = 0.8065</p> <p>(Spearman's) $t = 6.398118$ with 11 d.f. $p < 0.001$</p> <p>95% C.I. on Spearman's rho is (0.597, 0.913)</p> |
|--|

Leadership Practices Inventory

The 30-item Leadership Practices Inventory, observer was administered to a panel of band members and to a panel of teaching colleagues. The Leadership Practices Inventory self was also administered to the band director. The mean value for the band members was 7.658; the standard deviation was 1.173. The mean value for the teaching colleagues was 9.574; the standard deviation was .191. The mean value for the band director was 8.63; the standard deviation was 1.41. (see Table 8)

Table 8. Total Leadership Practices Inventory Summary

| Value | Band Members | Teaching Colleagues | Band Director |
|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Mean | 7.658 | 9.574 | 8.63 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.173 | .191 | 1.41 |

A Spearman's Ranked Correlation procedure was applied to the band member and director data sets to determine if there was significant correlation between the band director values and band member panel mean values. The data was ranked and the mean rank for band members was 7.6617, the standard deviation was 1.1720. The mean rank for the band director was 8.6333, and the standard deviation was 1.0981. The Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient was .2581. The t-value was 1.413728 with 28 degrees of freedom, and the p-value was .168. Because the p-value was greater than .05 there was evidence that the coefficient was not significantly different from zero. There was no significant correlation between the band member mean values and the band director values. (see Table 9)

Table 9. LPI Band Member and Director Values Correlation Analysis

| Correlation Coefficients |
|--|
| Variables used: Band Members (N) and Band Director (N) Number of cases used: 30 |
| Mean (SD) Band Members (N) = 7.6617(1.1720) Mean (SD) Band Director (N) = 8.6333(1.0981) |
| Spearman's Correlation (nonparametric results) Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient = 0.2581 |
| (Spearman's) t = 1.413728 with 28 d.f. p = 0.168 |
| 95% C.I. on Spearman's rho is (-0.113, 0.566) |

A Spearman's Ranked Correlation procedure was applied to the teaching colleague and band director data sets to determine if there was significant correlation between the band director values and teaching colleague mean values. The data was ranked and the mean rank for the band director was 8.6333, the standard deviation was

1.0981. The mean rank for teaching colleagues was 9.5740, the standard deviation was .1909 and n was 30. The Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient was .0987. The t-value was .5247931 with 28 degrees of freedom, and the p-value was .604. Because the p-value was greater than .05 there was evidence that the coefficient was not significantly different from zero. There was no significant correlation between teaching colleague mean values and the band director values. (see Table 10)

Table 10. LPI Teaching colleague and Band Director Values Correlation Analysis

| Correlation Coefficients |
|--|
| Variables used: Teaching Colleagues (N) and Band Director (N) Number of cases used: 30 |
| Mean (SD) Teaching Colleagues (N) = 9.5740(.1909) Mean (SD) Band Director (N) = 8.6333(1.0981) |
| Spearman's Correlation (nonparametric results) Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient = 0.0987 |
| (Spearman's) t = 0.5247931 with 28 d.f. p = 0.604 |
| 95% C.I. on Spearman's rho is (-0.271, 0.443) |

A Spearman's Ranked Correlation procedure was applied to teaching colleague and band member data sets to determine if there was significant correlation between the band member values and the teaching colleague mean values. The data was ranked and the mean rank for the band members was 7.6617, the standard deviation was 1.1720. The mean rank for teaching colleagues was 9.5740, the standard deviation was .1909 and n was 30. The Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient was .4159. The t-value was 2.419833 with 28 degrees of freedom, and the p-value was .022. Because the p-value was less than .05 there was evidence that the coefficient was significantly different from

zero. There was a significant correlation between teaching colleague mean values and the band member values. (see Table 11)

Table 11. LPI Band Member and Teaching Colleague Values Correlation Analysis

| Correlation Coefficients | |
|--|--|
| Variables used: Band Members (N) and Teaching Colleagues (N) | |
| Number of cases used: 30 | |
| Mean (SD) Band Members (N) = 7.6617 (1.1720) | |
| Mean (SD) Teaching Colleagues (N) = 9.5740 (.1909) | |
| Spearman's Correlation (nonparametric results) | |
| Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient = 0.4159 | |
| (Spearman's) $t = 2.419833$ with 28 d.f. $p = 0.022$ | |
| 95% C.I. on Spearman's rho is (0.065, 0.675) | |

The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership subscale values are listed below. The band member and teaching colleague values are means of each of the panels. The band director is the ratings list on the Leadership Practices Inventory self. (see Table 12)

Table 12. Practices of Exemplary Leadership Subscale Summary Values

| Practice | Band Member Mean | Teaching Colleagues Mean | Band Director Rating |
|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Model the Way | 8.00 | 9.65 | 8.83 |
| Inspire a Shared Vision | 7.15 | 9.47 | 8.17 |
| Challenge the Process | 7.21 | 9.47 | 9.33 |
| Enable Others to Act | 8.02 | 9.58 | 8.67 |
| Encourage the Heart | 7.92 | 9.70 | 8.17 |

A Kruskal-Wallis procedure was applied to determine if there was significant difference in the Inspire a Shared Vision Subscale values. The rank sum for band members was 34, n was 6, and the mean rank was 5.67. The rank sum for teaching colleagues was 75, n was 6, and the mean rank was 12.5. Rank sum for the band director was 62, n was 6, and the mean rank was 10.33. The Kruskal-Wallis H was 5.19, the chi-square was 5.2 with 2 degrees of freedom, and the p-value was .076. Since the p-value was greater than .05 but less than 1.0, there was an observable though not significant difference between the band members and teaching colleague LPI Model the Way Subscale. (see Table 13)

Table 13. Model the Way Subscale Analysis

| | | |
|---|----|----|
| <p>Non-Parametric Independent Group Comparison Results of Non-Parametric analysis:</p> | | |
| <p>Group variable = GROUP Observation variable = OBS Kruskal-Wallis H = 5.19</p> | | |
| <p>P-value for H estimated by Chi-Square with 2 degrees of freedom. Chi-Square = 5.2 with 2 D.F. p = 0.076</p> | | |
| <p>Homogeneous Populations, groups ranked</p> | | |
| Gp | Gp | Gp |
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| ----- | | |
| <p>This is a graphical representation of the Tukey multiple comparisons test. At the 0.05 significance level, the means of any two groups underscored by the same line are not significantly different.</p> | | |

A Kruskal-Wallis procedure was applied to determine if there was significant difference in the Inspire a Shared Vision Subscale values. The rank sum for band members was 32, n was 6, and the mean rank was 5.33. The rank sum for teaching colleagues was 87, n was 6, and the mean rank was 14.5. Rank sum for the band director

was 52, n was 6, and the mean rank was 8.67. The Kruskal-Wallis H was 9.13, the chi-square was 9.1 with 2 degrees of freedom, and the p-value was .011. Since the p-value was less than .05, there was a significant difference among the band member, band director, and teaching colleagues. A Tukey Multiple Comparison was applied to locate the difference. The critical q-value was 2.394 and the calculated q-value between band members and teaching colleagues was 2.985. Since the calculated q-value was greater

Table 14. Inspire a Shared Vision Subscale Analysis

| Non-Parametric Independent Group Comparison Results of Non-Parametric analysis: | | | |
|--|------------|------------------|------------|
| Group variable = GROUP Observation variable = OBS | | | |
| Kruskal-Wallis H = 9.13 | | | |
| P-value for H estimated by Chi-Square with 2 degrees of freedom. | | | |
| Chi-Square = 9.1 with 2 D.F. p = 0.011 | | | |
| Rank sum group 1 = 32. | N = 6 | Mean Rank = 5.33 | |
| Rank sum group 2 = 52. | N = 6 | Mean Rank = 8.67 | |
| Rank sum group 3 = 87. | N = 6 | Mean Rank = 14.5 | |
| | | | Critical q |
| Tukey Multiple Comp. | Difference | q | (.05) |
| ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Rank(3)-Rank(1) = (SE used = 3.0711) | 9.1667 | 2.985 | 2.394 * |
| Rank(3)-Rank(2) = (SE used = 3.0711) | 5.8333 | 1.899 | 2.394 |
| Rank(2)-Rank(1) = (SE used = 3.0711) | 3.3333 | 1.085 | 2.394 |
| Homogeneous Populations, groups ranked | | | |
| | Gp Gp Gp | | |
| | 1 2 3 | | |
| | ----- | | |
| | ----- | | |

This is a graphical representation of the Tukey multiple comparisons test. At the 0.05 significance level, the means of any two groups underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

than the critical q -value, there was a significant difference in LPI Inspire a Shared Vision Subscale mean values between band members and teaching colleagues. No other significant differences were found. (see Table 14)

A Kruskal-Wallis procedure was applied to determine if there was significant difference in the Challenge the Process Subscale values. The rank sum for band members was 21, n was 6, and the mean rank was 3.5. The rank sum for teaching colleagues was 81, n was 6, and the mean rank was 13.5. Rank sum for the band director was 69, n was 6, and the mean rank was 11.5. The Kruskal-Wallis H was 11.95, the chi-square was 11.9 with 2 degrees of freedom, and the p -value was 0.003. Since the p -value was less than .05, there was a significant difference among the values of the band members, teaching colleagues and the band director. The Kruskal-Wallis procedure indicated a significant difference but did not locate the difference.

A Tukey Multiple Comparison was applied to locate the difference. There was a difference of 10.0 in the mean rank of the Challenge the Process subscale between the band members and the teaching colleagues. The calculated value was 3.266 and the critical value was 2.394. Since the calculated value was greater than the critical value, there was a significant difference in Challenge the Process subscale values between band members and teaching colleagues. There was a difference of 8.0 in the mean rank between the band director and the band members. The calculated value was 2.613 and the critical value was 2.394. Since the calculated value was greater than the critical value, there was significant difference in Challenge the Process subscale mean rank between band members and the band director. There appeared to be no significant

difference in the mean rank between the band director and teaching colleagues. (see Table 15)

Table 15. Challenge the Process Subscale Analysis

| Non-Parametric Independent Group Comparison | | | |
|--|------------|------------------|------------|
| Results of Non-Parametric analysis: | | | |
| Group variable = GROUP Observation variable = OBS | | | |
| Kruskal-Wallis H = 11.95 | | | |
| P-value for H estimated by Chi-Square with 2 degrees of freedom. | | | |
| Chi-Square = 11.9 with 2 D.F. p = 0.003 | | | |
| Rank sum BM = 21. | N = 6 | Mean Rank = 3.5 | |
| Rank sum SM = 81. | N = 6 | Mean Rank = 13.5 | |
| Rank sum BD = 69. | N = 6 | Mean Rank = 11.5 | |
| | | | Critical q |
| Tukey Multiple Comp. | Difference | Q | (.05) |
| ----- | | | |
| Rank(2)-Rank(1) = | 10.0 | 3.266 | 2.394 * |
| (SE used = 3.0615) | | | |
| Rank(2)-Rank(3) = | 2.0 | .653 | 2.394 |
| (SE used = 3.0615) | | | |
| Rank(3)-Rank(1) = | 8.0 | 2.613 | 2.394 * |
| (SE used = 3.0615) | | | |
| Homogeneous Populations, groups ranked | | | |
| Gp Gp Gp | | | |
| 1 3 2 | | | |
| ----- | | | |
| --- | | | |
| This is a graphical representation of the Tukey multiple comparisons test. At the 0.05 significance level, the means of any two groups underscored by the same line are not significantly different. | | | |

A Kruskal-Wallis procedure was applied to determine if there was a significant difference in the Enable Others to Act Subscale values. The rank sum for band members was 34, n was 6, and the mean rank was 5.67. The rank sum for teaching colleagues was 80, n was 6, and the mean rank was 13.33. Rank sum for the band director was 57, n was

6, and the mean rank was 9.5. The Kruskal-Wallis H was 6.32, the chi-square was 6.3 with 2 degrees of freedom, and the p-value was .043. Since the p-value was less than .05, there was a significant difference among the mean ranks of the band members, teaching colleagues and the band director. The Kruskal-Wallis procedure indicated a significant difference but did not locate the difference.

Table 16. Enable Others to Act Subscale Analysis

| Non-Parametric Independent Group Comparison | | | |
|--|------------|-------------------|------------|
| Results of Non-Parametric analysis: | | | |
| Group variable = GROUP Observation variable = OBS | | | |
| Kruskal-Wallis H = 6.32 | | | |
| P-value for H estimated by Chi-Square with 2 degrees of freedom. | | | |
| Chi-Square = 6.3 with 2 D.F. p = 0.043 | | | |
| Rank sum BM = 34. | N = 6 | Mean Rank = 5.67 | |
| Rank sum SM = 80. | N = 6 | Mean Rank = 13.33 | |
| Rank sum BD = 57. | N = 6 | Mean Rank = 9.5 | |
| | | | Critical q |
| Tukey Multiple Comp. | Difference | Q | (.05) |
| ----- | | | |
| Rank(2)-Rank(1) = | 7.6667 | 2.515 | 2.394 * |
| (SE used = 3.0486) | | | |
| Rank(2)-Rank(3) = | 3.8333 | 1.257 | 2.394 |
| (SE used = 3.0486) | | | |
| Rank(3)-Rank(1) = | 3.8333 | 1.257 | 2.394 |
| (SE used = 3.0486) | | | |
| Homogeneous Populations, groups ranked | | | |
| Gp Gp Gp | | | |
| 1 3 2 | | | |
| ----- | | | |
| ----- | | | |
| This is a graphical representation of the Tukey multiple comparisons test. At the 0.05 significance level, the means of any two groups underscored by the same line are not significantly different. | | | |

A Tukey Multiple Comparison was applied to locate the difference. There was a difference of 7.6667 in the mean rank of the Enable Others to Act subscale between the band members and the teaching colleagues. The calculated value was 2.515 and the critical value was 2.394. Since the calculated value was greater than the critical value, there was a significant difference in Enable Others to Act subscale values between band members and teaching colleagues. There appeared to be no significant difference in the mean rank between the band director and teaching colleagues and between the band director and band members. (see Table 16)

A Kruskal-Wallis procedure was applied to determine if there was a significant difference in the Encourage the Heart Subscale values. The rank sum for band

Table 17. Encourage the Heart Subscale Analysis

| | | |
|--|-------|-------------------|
| Non-Parametric Independent Group Comparison Results of Non-Parametric analysis: | | |
| Group variable = GROUP Observation variable = OBS Kruskal-Wallis H = 5.86 | | |
| P-value for H estimated by Chi-Square with 2 degrees of freedom. Chi-Square = 5.9 with 2 D.F. p = 0.054 | | |
| Rank sum BM = 39. | N = 6 | Mean Rank = 6.5 |
| Rank sum SM = 82. | N = 6 | Mean Rank = 13.67 |
| Rank sum BD = 50. | N = 6 | Mean Rank = 8.33 |
| Homogeneous Populations, groups ranked | | |
| Gp Gp Gp | | |
| 1 3 2 | | |
| ----- | | |
| This is a graphical representation of the Tukey multiple comparisons test. At the 0.05 significance level, the means of any two groups underscored by the same line are not significantly different. | | |

members was 39, n was 6, and the mean rank was 6.5. The rank sum for teaching colleagues was 82, n was 6, and the mean rank was 13.67. Rank sum for the band director was 50, n was 6, and the mean rank was 8.33. The Kruskal-Wallis H was 5.86, the chi-square was 5.9 with 2 degrees of freedom, and the p-value was .054. Since the p-value was greater than .05, there was an observable, though not significant, difference between the mean ranks of the band members and teaching colleagues. There appeared to be no significant difference in mean ranks between the band director and band members or band director and teaching colleagues. (see Table 17)

Reasons for Success Questionnaire

The Reasons for Success Questionnaire was 32 items through which band members evaluated the entire band program including four items that were a direct evaluation of the director. Twelve separate items, Value of the Music Program, gave band members an opportunity to express the value of the band program in their lives. Responses were on a scale of 1 to 7, 1 being low and 7 being high. The total mean value on the 32 items of the Reasons for Success Questionnaire for the band member panel was 4.634, the standard deviation was 1.1218. The total mean value on the 12 items of the Value of the Music Program for the band member panel was 5.667, the standard deviation was .76. The mean value of items 13, 17, 21, and 24 of the Reasons for

Table 18. Band Member Reasons for Success Questionnaire Summary

| Value | Total RSQ | Total VMP | RSQ Band Director Items |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------|
| Mean | 4.634 | 5.667 | 6.313 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.1218 | .76 | .462 |

Success Questionnaire that dealt directly with the band director was 6.313, the standard deviation was .462. (see Table 18)

Summary

This chapter provided an analysis of data that was collected about the leadership of the band director of a Christian school in Louisiana. In addition to data received from the band director, band members and teaching colleagues provided alternate perceptions of the band director's leadership. The following information was noted:

1. The band director is a transformational leader, as evidenced by the self-assessment and the perceptions of the band members and teaching colleagues . In most areas the band members confirmed the self-assessment of the band director. The director and teaching colleagues agree that Management-by-Exception as measured by the MLQ was a leadership area that could be strengthened.
2. In the areas, Inspire a Shared Vision and Challenge the Process, there was a significant difference between the responses of band members and teaching colleagues. In the LPI subscale, Enable Others to Act, there was a significant difference among the mean ranks of the band members, teaching colleagues, and the band director. Teaching colleagues rated the band director's leadership higher than either the band director or the band members. Band members rated the director lower than either the band director or the teaching colleagues.
3. In the LPI Model the Way subscale there was a difference, though not significant, in the category Model the Way. A Spearman's Ranked Correlation analysis of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, Leadership Practices Inventory, and

Reasons for Success Questionnaire findings confirmed correlation in the perception of the band director's leadership style.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This research was designed to assess the leadership style of the band director at a Christian school in Louisiana in order to determine whether there was a relationship between leadership style and the program perceptions of band members and teaching colleagues. The research question for this research was: What were the perceptions of the leadership style of the school band director of a Christian school in Louisiana? The initial questions for this research project came from nine questions that were developed to evaluate scope of the band director's leadership.

RQ1. What was the overall leadership style of the band director? The band director was a transformational leader, as evidenced by the self-assessment and the perceptions of the band members and teaching colleagues. In most areas the band members confirmed the self-assessment of the band director.

RQ2. How did the band director perceive his own leadership style? The band director perceived himself as a transformational leader, working to bring about positive change to the band program through the use of new methods and a major paradigm shift in organizational behavior. The band director was particularly focused on empowering band members to become a more cohesive musical group.

RQ3. How did band members perceive the band director's leadership style? Band members rated the director lower than either the band director or the teaching colleagues. Overall, the band members viewed the band director as a moderate-level transformational leader.

RQ4. How did teaching colleagues perceive the band director's leadership style?

Teaching colleagues rated the band director's leadership higher than either the band director or the band members. However, the overall correlation of MLQ Factors of Transformational Leadership values between teaching colleagues and the band director notwithstanding, there was a decided difference in perspective between teaching colleagues and the band director in Factor 4, individualized consideration. The director rated himself lower than the average rating of teaching colleagues. While both ratings were roughly the same, the band director did not attempt to inflate the quality of his leadership.

RQ5. Was there a significant difference in perception of leadership style between the band director, band members, and teaching colleagues? The LPI instrument did not discriminate the ratings as effectively as did the MLQ. There were significant differences in mean values between band members, teaching colleagues, and the band director; there was also an absence of correlation among the three values. The band director self-ratings were consistently higher than band members and lower than teaching colleagues.

RQ6. In which areas of leadership can the band director focus in order to strengthen his leadership among band members? A most significant issue in the seven factors is the discrepancy between the band director and teaching colleagues on Factor 4, individualized consideration. The band director's rating suggests a sense that individualized attention is being given. Teaching colleagues do not concur with that sense.

RQ7. What were band member, band director, and teaching colleague perceptions of the leadership style of the band director, when measured by each of the five subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory and each of the four subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire? There was an observable though not significant difference between the band members and teaching colleague LPI Model the Way Subscale. There was a significant difference in LPI Inspire a Shared Vision Subscale mean values between band members and teaching colleagues. There was a significant difference in Challenge the Process subscale values between band members and teaching colleagues. There was a significant difference in Enable Others to Act subscale values between band members and teaching colleagues. There appeared to be no significant difference in the mean rank between the band director and teaching colleagues and between the band director and band members. As it pertains to the Encourage the Heart Subscale, there was an observable, though not significant, difference between the mean ranks of the band members and teaching colleagues.

RQ8. Were there areas of agreement among the findings of Reason for Success Questionnaire with Leadership Practices Inventory values and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire values? A Spearman's Ranked Correlation analysis of the Reasons for Success Questionnaire, the Leadership Practices Inventory, and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire findings confirmed correlation in the perception of the band director's leadership style.

RQ9. Was there a relationship (correlation) in the measurement of leadership style between band member's Reason for Success Questionnaire values, and the band member's Leadership Practices Inventory values? A Spearman's Ranked Correlation

analysis of the Reasons for Success Questionnaire, and the Leadership Practices Inventory, findings confirmed a correlation in the perception of the band director's leadership style, but also revealed band member concerns that were commensurate with teaching colleague concerns as discussed per Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire results.

MLQ Conclusions and Implications

Several conclusions were drawn from a careful analysis of the band member and band director's responses to the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

Conclusions

1. There was significant correlation in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire values between teaching colleagues and the band director. When a Spearman's Ranked Correlation procedure was applied to the teaching colleague and band director data sets, the correlation coefficient was .6313 and the p-value was $<.001$. A p-value less than .05 in a correlation analysis indicates that the correlation coefficient is significantly different from zero. There was a significant correlation between the responses on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire between teaching colleagues and the band director.

2. There was no significant overall difference in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire values between teaching colleagues mean values and the band director's values. The teaching colleague mean value on the questionnaire with options from 0, not at all, to 4, frequently if not always, was 2.65 with a standard deviation of 1.45; the band director's mean value was 2.78 with a standard deviation of 1.38. When a Mann-Whitney procedure was applied to determine if there was significant difference in the values, the Mann-Whitney U' was 1,191, the z-value was 1.436, and the p-value was .151. A p-value

greater than .05 indicated no significant difference in the responses of the teaching colleagues and the band director on the 45-items of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

3. The self-evaluation of the band director was confirmed by the responses of teaching colleagues. A test for correlation, a test for significant difference, and a comparison of mean values all indicate significant correlation and no significant difference in the responses of the teaching colleagues and the band director on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

4. There was significant correlation in the overall MLQ Factors of Transformational Leadership between teaching colleagues and the band director. The correlation coefficient in MFQ subscales was .8065 and the p-value was $<.001$. A correlation p-value less than .05 indicates that the correlation coefficient is significantly greater than zero. In Factors 1, 2, 3, and 5, teaching colleagues and the band director rated the subscales between frequencies of fairly often and frequently, if not always, which was reasonably high ratings. Ratings of the teaching colleagues were in the proximity of the band director's rating, further confirming the band director's self-evaluation.

5. The overall correlation of MLQ Factors of Transformational Leadership values between teaching colleagues and the band director notwithstanding, there was a decided difference in perspective between teaching colleagues and the band director in Factor 4, individualized consideration. Teaching colleagues rated the four-item subscale at a mean of 2.90, the band director at 3.74. Teaching colleagues rated the band director significantly lower on a factor that directly affected band members, individual

consideration. Item 29 that suggested that band members had different needs, abilities, and aspirations received the lowest teaching colleague rating of the four items in the subscale and were largely responsible for the discrepancy in the subscale values.

Teaching colleagues rated the item with a mean of 1.10; the band director rated Item 29 at 4.0, a significant difference in perspective.

6. Management-by-exception, Factor 6, is rated much lower by teaching colleagues and the band director than is usually expected. Factor 6 was rated at a mean of 1.00 by teaching colleagues and rated 1.43 by the band director. Factor 6 addressed issues related to mistakes, irregularities, complaints, and failures. Failure to note deviation from standards and to ignore mistakes, complaints, and failures would indicate that minimal attention was given to program evaluation. A hallmark of organizations that excel is usually a high quality evaluation program.

7. The average mean rating by teaching colleagues for Factor 7 was .10 out of a possible 4.00; the rating of the band director was 1.00. The ratings of Factors 6 were definitely lower than was desired. What was measured was whether the band director required little of others, was content to let things ride, and let others do their own thing. Teaching colleagues rated the subscale at .10, the director at 1.00.

Implications

Several implications can be drawn from the MLQ Factors of Transformational Leadership. The unassuming nature of the band director is indicated in his rating of Factors 1, 2, 3, and 6. The director rated himself lower than the average rating of teaching colleagues. While both ratings were roughly the same, the band director did not attempt to inflate the quality of his leadership.

A most significant issue in the seven factors is the discrepancy between the band director and teaching colleagues on Factor 4, individualized consideration. The band director's rating suggests a sense that individualized attention is being given. Teaching colleagues do not concur with that sense. The band director may want to review his approach to leadership of the band in order to give special attention to individualization in working with band members. The band director could initiate individual conversations with band members to gain a better understanding the different needs, abilities, and aspirations of each band member. Attention could then be given to helping individuals in the band develop their strengths.

The band director and teaching colleagues indicate that little attention is given to Factor 6, management-by-exception. Giving attention to evaluation in order to determine weaknesses is a mark of a quality organization. Failure to assess irregularities, mistakes, and deviation from standards in band performance will result in a weaker program than most would have wanted. The band director rates himself as between not at all and once in a while in management-by-exception and teaching colleagues is less stringent in their evaluation but tend to confirm a weakness in this area of transformational leadership. While calling attention to irregularities, mistakes, and deviations may not be a pleasant task, the band director may want to take steps in the future to give attention to this area of leadership, as a way of strengthening his leadership of the band.

Factor 7, Items 5, 7, 28, and 33, deals with laissez-faire leadership. Two of the items are stated negatively and two are stated positively, which offsets the overall value. Item 5 indicating no involvement with a rating value of zero in avoiding involved, when important issues arise, would be desirable. In item 7 a frequently, if not always response

would have a value of 4. It seems that the items included in Factor 7 may lack clarity and the overall factor should thus be disregarded.

LPI Conclusions and Implications

Conclusions

1. There was a significant difference in the LPI values between band members, the band director, and teaching colleagues. This significant difference in LPI values provided an opportunity for the band director to explore this area of leadership, with the assurance that identifying areas of need may enhance his overall leadership skills. The overall mean value on the LPI for band members was 7.658 and the standard deviation was 1.173. The overall mean value on the LPI for teaching colleagues was 9.574 and the standard deviation was .191. The overall mean value on the LPI for the band director was 8.63 and the standard deviation was 1.41. A Kruskal-Wallis procedure was applied to determine if there was significant difference among the three data sets. The p-value was $<.001$ indicating a significant difference. A Tukey Multiple Comparison was applied to locate the difference. The critical value in the comparison of the three values was 2.394. The calculated value for the comparison of the band member and teaching colleague responses was 5.978, indicating a significant difference. The calculated value for the comparison of the band director and teaching colleagues was 2.833, indicating a significant difference. The calculated value of the comparison of the band members and the band director was 3.145, indicating a significant difference.

2. When Spearman's Ranked Correlation Analyses were applied to the three data sets, band member's mean LPI values, band director's LPI self-ratings, and teaching colleague's mean LPI values; there was a correlation in mean LPI values between the

band members and the teaching colleagues. There was no significant correlation between the band members mean LPI and the band director LPI values or between the mean teaching colleague LPI values and the band member LPI mean values.

3. There were significant differences in three of five LPI subscales between band members and teaching colleagues. The three subscales were Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, and Enable Others to Act. The band member means LPI Inspire a Shared Vision subscale was 5.33; the mean teaching colleague rating was 14.5. The band member LPI Challenge the Process subscale mean was 3.5; the teaching colleague subscale mean was 13.5. The band director LPI Challenge the Process subscale mean value was 11.5, significantly different from the band member subscale mean value of 3.5. The band member LPI Enable Others to Acts subscale mean value was 5.67; the teaching colleague subscale mean value was 13.33.

4. There was a significant difference in one LPI subscale, Challenge the Process, between band members and the band director. Challenge the Process subscale considered innovation and creativity in problem solving. Transformational leadership involves thinking outside the box in pushing the limits of program performance. The greatest discrepancy between band members and the band director was Item 18, which asked what can be learned, when things do not go as expected. Band members rated the item with a mean of 7.21; the band director rated the item at 9.33.

Implications

The LPI mean ratings of the teaching colleagues were consistently higher than the band director's ratings and significantly higher in three subscales than the ratings provided by band members. Some of the differences in ratings between the three values

could be attributed to professional courtesy between the band director and his colleagues. Teaching colleagues may have had limited opportunity to observe a new band director and in all instances gave the director the benefit of doubt. Lower band director subscale mean values spoke to the band director's reserved approach in his self-evaluation. The lower mean ratings by the students could in part be attributed to their immaturity and lack of leadership experience. Band member ratings could be more an emotional response than a carefully analysis of leadership skills.

Since there were a significant difference in LPI Challenge the Process mean values between band members and the band director and between teaching colleagues and the band director, the subscale merits additional attention. The band director may want to think seriously about new and innovative ways of addressing problems, about making concrete, measurable plans, and about risking the chance of failure. Thinking outside the box is what the LPI Challenge the Process is about.

RSQ Conclusions and Implications

The Reasons for Success Questionnaire was designed as a tool for band members in highly successful band programs to provide feedback on their perceptions of the program success. Four items inquired about band member perceptions of the band director. The inquiry includes issues about band director's personality, expectation level, student concern, and knowledge. The mean value from the band member panel for personality was 6.5, out of a possible 7.0; director expectations 4.750; concern for students 6.5; and knowledge 6.625.

The lower rating for band director expectations, Item 17 on Reasons for Success Questionnaire, would give added weight to the lower mean value suggested by band

members on Factor 6, management-by-exception in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. A significant implication of the overall assessment of the band director's leadership would be to encourage consideration of a more aggressive band and band member evaluation program. It may be true that the quality of a program will not rise above the quality of that program's evaluation. Calling attention to and insisting on the correction of irregularities, mistakes, and failures will provide the foundation for a higher quality program. Setting high standards for band members and the band and holding both to the high standards will bring good to band members, the band director, the band program, and the school.

Overall Conclusions and Implications

1. Overall, the teaching colleague MLQ evaluations confirmed the self-evaluation of the band director. The MLQ values indicated that the band director's transformational leadership was at a moderate level. In a number of areas teaching colleagues rated the director higher than the band director self-evaluation. The low level ratings in Factor 6 by teaching colleagues and the band director caused the overall transformational leadership rating to be lower than might have been expected. Factor 6 assessed whether teaching colleagues were told what is expected and whether the band performance met expected standards.

2. There was some difference in perspective in Factor 4, though the difference did not rise to the level of significant difference. Teaching colleagues rated some items in Factor 4 lower than the band director. Teaching colleagues did not rate individualized attention as high as the director.

3. The LPI instrument did not discriminate the ratings as effectively as did the MLQ. There were significant differences in mean values between band members, teaching colleagues, and the band director; there was also an absence of correlation among the three values. The band director self-ratings were consistently higher than band members and lower than teaching colleagues.

4. In four of five LPI Exemplary Practices of Leadership there was no significant difference in the ratings of the band members and the band director. There were significant differences in three of the subscales between band members and teaching colleagues. The three subscales were Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, and Enable Others to Act.

5. There was one LPI subscale, Challenge the Process, where band members rated the band director significantly lower than the band director self-evaluation. The subscale dealt with new and innovative ways of addressing problems, making concrete, measurable plans, and risking the chance of failure.

6. The most significant items in the RSQ were the four items that spoke directly to band member ratings of the personality, expectations, student concerns, and knowledge of the band director. Band member ratings on three of the four items were 6.5, 6.5, and 6.225, very high ratings. The fourth item dealt with expectations; the band member rating was 4.750, which tended to confirm the lower rating on the MLQ Factor 4.

Limitations

The band member research was limited to school band members of the Christian schools because this group of musicians encompassed all levels of performance proficiency from beginner to advanced musicianship. Additionally, individuals, who were

in lower grades (from grades 2-8), were not regularly allowed to perform with the school band. Because of their age range and limited participation in the musical education program, the younger students were not considered to have enough interaction with the band director to provide a fair and complete analysis of his leadership.

Future Research Recommendations

Although it was a well-documented fact that students, who have participated in music and arts curricula, received higher grades in other subjects, namely math, science, language arts and others, it was not known to what extent these students go on to become professionals and become leaders in other fields of endeavor. Moreover, studies were limited as to how music translated into other areas of academic and professional proficiency/excellence. For example, great public speakers understood and used certain speech patterns, such as dramatic pauses, soft-tone speaking, loud dramatic speaking, and poetic inferences in bringing forth a masterful speech. A musician could emulate these same things through the use of musical techniques such as rests (pauses), dynamics, crescendos, and diminuendos to create loud or soft sounds, and repetitive musical patterns to imitate poetic inferences. Little was known about the extent to which these musical skills were translated into academic or professional life. A foundational study that clarified these issues would be valuable because it could be the avenue through which a discovery could begin to clarify which music helped excellent students to become doctors, lawyers, theologians, and yes—the greatest leaders the world had ever known. Finally, a longitudinal case study in which the band director is evaluated again in five year increments would be in order, especially if the band director is transferred to another school and assumes new leadership responsibilities of a different band.

Conclusion

The primary goal of this research project was to evaluate the transformational leadership of the band director of a Christian school in Louisiana. Upon the considering the information listed in the Review of Literature and evaluating the data that was collected, a relationship correlation was established between the leadership of the band director and the attributes of transformational leadership. More specifically, the band director rated his transformational leadership attributes as moderately high, while band members and teaching colleagues rated the same attributes as moderate. There was consistent information in the research findings that showed that band and teaching colleagues agree that the band director was a transformational leader. In other words, the research findings confirmed consistency in the perception of band members' evaluation of the band director's leadership style. The research confirmed consistency in the perception of teaching colleagues' evaluation of the band director's leadership style.

There was a difference in the perception of the band director's leadership style between the band students and teaching colleagues based on the mean values recorded from the data collected with the Leadership Practices Inventory. The band members viewed the leadership practices of the band director from a day-to-day perspective, which involved close interaction and a more direct evaluation. Teaching colleagues observed the leadership practices of the band director from a more distant perspective, and as peers, but because they were not involved in the daily process, their assessment was generally based on how well they perceive the band as a unit. Some of the differences in ratings between the three values could be attributed to professional courtesy between the band director and his colleagues. Teaching colleagues may have had limited opportunity

to observe a new band director and in all instances gave the director the benefit of doubt. Lower band director subscale mean values spoke to the band director's reserved approach in his self-evaluation. The lower mean ratings by the band students could in part be attributed to their immaturity and lack of leadership experience. Band member ratings could be more an emotional response than a careful analysis of leadership skills.

This study was valuable because it added insight into musical leadership, which was an aspect of leadership that was rarely considered. According to Hall (2008) “Leadership and music are two topics that are rarely mentioned together; however, their universal, intriguing, and complex nature allows a unique framework for helping individuals learn leadership concepts” (p. 47). When discussing executive leadership of a corporation, church, community, politics, sports/coaching and other areas of leadership, most people agreed that the success of an organization was directly linked to the leader(s). In the field of music, the success of the musical organization was also directly linked to leadership. The leadership concepts that were applied in music have a direct application to leadership in other areas.

REFERENCES

- Amoroso, P. F. (2002). *The impact of principals' transformational leadership behaviors on teacher commitment and teacher job satisfaction*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Seton Hall University, New Jersey.
- Antonakis, J. & House, R. J., (2002). The full-range leadership theory: The way forward. In B. J. Avolio & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.). *Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead*. New York, NY: Elsevier.
- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine factor full-range leadership theory using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(3), 261-295.
- Armstrong, S., & Armstrong, S. (1996). The conductor as a transformational leader. *Music Educators Journals*, 82(6), 22-25.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire. Manual and sampler set* (3rd ed.). Redwood City, CA: Mindgarden.
- Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Walumbwa, F., & May, D. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 801-823.
- Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Avolio, B., & Gardner, W. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315-338.
- Avolio, B.J., Waldman, D.A., & Yammarino, F.J. (1991). Leading in the 1990's; The four I's of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 15(4), 8-16.

- Avolio, B., Walumbwa, F., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Management Department Faculty Publications*. Paper 37. Retrieved on 10-1-2013 from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/managementfacpub/37>.
- Barling, J., Slater, F., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 21(3), 157-161.
- Ballou, H. (2005). *Moving spirits, building lives: The church musician as transformational leader*. Blacksburg, VA: SynerVision International.
- Bar-on, T. (1997) The ambiguities of football, politics, culture and social transformation in Latin America. *Sociological Research Online*, 2(4).
- Bass, B. M. (1974). *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, research and Managerial Applications* (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1989). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*. 19-31.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994a). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformation leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1994b). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 17(3/4), March, 541-555.
- Bass B.M., & Steidlmeier P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly* 10:181–217
- Battisti, F. L. (1999). Grand masters series: Teaching music the leadership component. *Music Educators Journal*, 85(6), 38-40, 50.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (2003). *Leaders: Strategies for taking charge*. New York, NY: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Berendt, C. J., Christofi, A., Kasibhatla, K. M., Malindretos, J., & Maruffi, B. (2012). Transformational leadership: Lessons in management for today. *International Business Research*, 5(10).
- Berghofer, D. (2013). *Ethical leadership*. Retrieved on August 7, 2013 from <http://www.ethical leadership.com/EthicalLeadership.htm>.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.
- Buckingham, M., (2005). *The One Thing You Need to Know: About great managing, and leading and sustained individual success*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, Inc.
- Burke, C.S., Stagl, K.C., Salas, E., Pierce, L., & Kendall, D. (2006). Understanding team adaptation: A conceptual analysis and model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 1189-1207.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Burns, J. M. (2003). *Transforming leadership: A new pursuit of happiness*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.

- Burnsed, V. & Jensen, G. (1994). Teacher education in music: The development of leaders. *The Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning*, 5(3), 5-10.
- Caruso, D. R., Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (2002). Emotional intelligence and emotional leadership. In F. J. Pirozzolo (Ed.), *Multiple Intelligences and Leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Castanheira, P. & Costa, J. A. (2011). In search of transformational leadership: A (Meta) analysis focused on the Portuguese reality. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15 (2011), 2012–2015.
- Cogliser C.C., & Schriesheim C.A. (2000). Exploring work unit context and leader-member exchange: a multi-level perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 21:487–511.
- Cooper C.D., Scandura T.A., Schriesheim C.A. (2005). Looking forward but learning from our past: potential challenges to developing authentic leadership theory and authentic leaders. *Leadership Quarterly* 16:475–93
- Criss, E. (2010). Teamwork in the music room. *Music Educators Journal*, September 30-36.
- Covey, S. R. (1990). *Principle-centered leadership*. New York, NY: Fireside.
- Demi, K. (2008). Transformational leadership and collective efficacy: The moderating roles of collaborative culture and teachers' self-efficacy. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 33, 93-108.
- Dionne, S., Yammarino, F., Atwater, L., & Spangler, W. (2004). Transformational leadership and team performance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(2), 177-193.

- Drucker, P. F. (2001). *The Essential Drucker*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Dugle, J. R. (1991). *An assessment profile of quality secondary band programs in Illinois* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois, IL.
- Dulewicz, V., Higgs, M. (2005). Assessing leadership styles and organizational context. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 20, No. 2, p. 105-123.
- Dunaway, J. (1987). Characteristics of successful high school choral programs. *Choral Journal*, 28(2), 15-23.
- Evans, G. (1970). The effects of supervisory behavior on the path-goal relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 5, 277-298.
- Farling, M. L., Stone, A. G., & Winston, B. E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6, 49-72.
- Fleenor, J. W. (2006). Trait approach to leadership. *Encyclopedia of industrial and organizational psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Forsyth, D. R. (2010). *Group Dynamics* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Cengage.
- French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright and A. Zander. *Group dynamics*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Frost, D. E., & Stahelski, A. J. (1988). The systematic measurement of French and Raven's bases of social power in workgroups. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 18, 375-389.
- Gardner, L., & Stough, C. (2002). Examining the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence in senior level managers. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(2), 68-78.

- George, B., Sims, P., McLean, A. N., Mayer, D. (2007). Discovering your authentic leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(2): 129-138.
- George, J. M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, 53(8), 1027-1055.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader–member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 827–844.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.
- Goodstein, R. E. (1987). An investigation into leadership behaviors and descriptive characteristics of high school band directors in the United States. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 35, 13-25.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Hall, J. L. (2008). The sound of leadership: Transformational leadership in music. *Journal of Leadership Education*. Vol. 7, Issue 2 pp. 47 – 68.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33, 329-351.
- Hassan A., & Ahmed F. (2011) Authentic leadership: Trust and work engagement. *World Academy Of Science, Engineering & Technology*, (80), 750-756.
- Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal*, 23 (5), 26–34.
- Hoffman, B. J. & Frost, B. C. (2006). Multiple intelligences of transformational leaders: An empirical examination. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27(1), pp. 37-51.

- House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 321–338.
- House, R.J., & Mitchell, T.R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Contemporary Business*, 3, Fall, 81-98.
- Howell, J. P., & Costley, D. L. (2001). *Understanding behaviors for effective leadership*. Saddle River, N.J: Prentice-Hall.
- Howell J. M., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Relationships and their consequences. *Academic Management Review*, 30:96–112.
- Iida, G. Y. (1991). *Selected characteristics of successful school band programs* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Southern California, CA.
- Johnson, C. E. (2012). *Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership: Casting light or shadow*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Judge, T., & Piccolo, R. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 755-768.
- Jung, D. & Avolio, B. J. (1999). Effects of leadership style and followers' cultural orientation on performance in groups and individual task conditions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(2): 208-218.
- Kark, R., & Shamir, B. (2002, August). *The influence of transformational leadership on followers' relational versus collective self-concept*. Academy of Management Proceedings. Denver, Colorado.
- Katz, R. L. (1955). Skills of an effective administrator. *Harvard Business Review*, 33(1), 33–42.

- Keohane, N. O. (2012). *Thinking about leadership*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 440-452.
- Kotter, J. C., (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, P. Z., (2007). *The leadership challenge*, 4th edition. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Krishnan, R. (2005). Transformational leadership and outcomes: Role of relationship duration. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 26(6), 442-457.
- Kuhnert, K. W. (1994). *Transforming leadership: Developing people through delegation*. In B. M. Bass & B. J. Avolio (Eds.), *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership* (pp. 10-25). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 648-657.
- Lashway, L. (1999). *Measuring leadership: A guide to assessment for development of school executives*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Education Management.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1996). Towards an explanation of teachers' perceptions of transformational school leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(4), 312-538.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measures and multilevel assessment, *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 161-177.

- Luthans F., Avolio B.J. (2003). Authentic leadership: a positive developmental approach. In *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline*, ed. KS Cameron, JE Dutton, RE Quinn, pp. 241–58. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23: 695-706.
- MacGregor B. J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Rich, G. A. (2001). Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 29, 115–134.
- Martin, B., Crossland, B. & Johnson, J. (2001). *Is there a connection: Teacher empowerment, teacher's sense of responsibility and student success*. Paper presented at the Mid-South Educational Research Association Annual Meeting November, 2011, Little Rock, AK.
- Maurik, J.V. (2001). *Writers on Leadership*. London: Penguin Books.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Metzger, D. J. (2011). *Leadership profiles of elementary music educators in an urban Connecticut school district*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Bridgeport, CT.
- Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Harding, F. D., Jacobs, T. O., & Fleishman, E. A. (2000). Leadership skills for a changing world: Solving complex social problems. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(1), 11-35.

- Noland, R. (1999). *The heart of the artist: A character-building guide for you & your ministry team*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice*, (5th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- O'Toole, J. (1996) *Leading change: The argument for values-based leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Palen, L., Palen, J. (1997). Principles for principles: Shaping student section leaders. *American String Teacher*, 47(4), 31-35.
- Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., & Stough, C. (2001). Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(1), 5-10.
- Patchen, M. (1974). The locus and basis of influence on organizational decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 11, 195-221.
- Peterson, S., Galvin, B. M., & Lange, D. (2012). CEO servant leadership: Exploring executive characteristics and firm performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 65: 565-596.
- Petrides, K., & Furnham, A. (2000). On the dimensional structure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29, 313-320.
- Petrides, K., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: Psychometric investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, 425-448.
- Petrides, K., Pita, R., & Kokkinaki, F. (2007). The location of trait emotional intelligence in personality factor space. *British Journal of Psychology*, 98, 273-289.

- Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 327-340.
- Rahim, M. A. (1989). Relationships of leader power to compliance and satisfaction with supervision, Evidence from a national sample of managers. *Journal of Management*, 15, 545-557.
- Rath, T., & Conchie, B. (2009). *Strengths based leadership: Great leaders, teams, and why people follow*. Washington, D.C.: Gallup Press.
- Reddin, W. J. (1967). The 3-d management style theory. *Training and Development Journal* 1, 21 , 8-17.
- Rhode, D. L. (2006). *Moral leadership: The theory and practice of power, judgment and policy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Riggio, R.E. (2009). *What 100 years of research tells us about effective leadership: Cutting-edge leadership*. Retrieved on March 12, 2013 from <http://www.psychologytoday.com/>.
- Riggio, R. E. (2013). *Are women leaders more ethical than men?* Retrieved August 7, 2013 from <http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/cutting-edge-leadership/201305/are-women-leaders-more-ethical-men>.
- Rudaitis, C. (1996). Student leaders to leading teachers. *Teaching Music*, 3(4), 40-41.
- Russell, R. F. (2001). The role of values in servant leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 22 (2), 76-83.

- Russell, R. F., A. G. Stone. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(3/4): 145-158.
- Sashkin, M., Sashkin, M. G. (2003). *Leadership that matters. The critical factors for making a difference in people's lives and organizations' success*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Sawyer, J. R. (2002). *Factors that characterize successful inner city school band programs of the north central states of the United States as perceived by administrators, music supervisors and music educators*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Nebraska, NE.
- Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S. K., & Peng, A. C. (2011). Cognition-based and affect-based trust as mediators of leader behavior influences on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96: 863-871.
- Schriesheim, C.A., & Neider, L.L. (1989). Leadership theory and development: The coming new phase. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 10, 17-26.
- Shin, S. J., & Zhou, J. (2003). Transformational leadership, conservation, and creativity: Evidence from Korea. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(6), 703-714.
- Smith, L. M. (1978). An evolving logic of participation observation, educational ethnography and other case studies. In L. Shuman (Ed.). *Review of Research in Education*. Itasca, IL: Peacock.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 9, 185-211.

- Shukla, R. K. (1982). Influence of power bases in organizational decision making: A contingency model. *Decision Sciences*, 13, 450-470.
- Sparrowe R.T. (2005). Authentic leadership and the narrative self. *Leadership Quarterly* 16:419–39.
- Steele, N. A. (2010). *Three characteristics of effective teachers. Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 28(2), 71-78.
- Stewart, J. (2006). Transformational leadership: An evolving concept examined through the works of Burns. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 54, 1-29.
- Steyrer, J. (1998). Charisma and the archetypes of leadership. *Organization Studies* 19/5, Berlin, 807-828.
- Stone, A. G., R. F. Russell, & K. Patterson. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus.” *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(3/4): 349-361.
- Stoner, J. A. R., & Freeman, R. E. (1992). *Management* (5th ed.). New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.
- Tichy, N. M., Bennis, W. G. (2007). *Judgment: How winning leaders make great calls*. New York, NY: Penguin Group USA, Inc.
- Tracey, J. B., & Hinkin, T. R. (1998). Transformational leadership or effective managerial practices. *Group & Organization Management*, 23, 220-236.
- Trevino, L. K., Brown, M., & Hartman, L. P. (2003). A qualitative investigation of perceived executive ethical leadership: Perceptions from inside and outside the executive suite. *Human Relations*, 56(1), 5-37.

- Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17:654–76.
- Van Rooy, D., & Viswesvaran, C. (2004). Emotional intelligence: A meta-analytic investigation of predictive validity and nomological net. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65, 71-95.
- Wallace, J. M. (2006). *The relationship of leadership behaviors with follower performance: A study of alternative schools*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) Regent University, VA.
- Warden, G. (2011). *Nativity as leadership for transformation: Orienting the influence for change*. In J. D. Barbour & G. R. Hickman (Eds.), *Leadership for transformation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wheatley, M. J. (1999). *Leadership and the new science*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Yaverbaum, E., & Sherman, E. (2008). *The everything leadership book* (2nd ed.). Avon, MA: F & W Publications.
- Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations*, 7th ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weakness in transformational and charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10 (2): 285-305.
- Yukl, G., & Van Fleet, D. D. (1992). Theory and research on leadership in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 147–197). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PERMISSION TO USE THE MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

(MLQ)

For use by the researcher only.

Received from Mind Garden, Inc. on February 10, 2013.

To whom it may concern,

This letter is to grant permission for the above named person to use the following copyright material;

Instrument: *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*

Authors: *Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass*

Copyright: *1995 by Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass*

for his/her thesis research.

Five sample items from this instrument may be reproduced for inclusion in a proposal, thesis, or dissertation.

The entire instrument may not be included or reproduced at any time in any other published material.

Sincerely,
Robert Most
Mind Garden, Inc.
www.mindgarden.com

© 1995 Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass. All Rights Reserved.
Published by Mind Garden, Inc., www.mindgarden.com

APPENDIX B

PERMISSION TO USE THE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY (LPI)

February 21, 2013

Dear Researcher:

Thank you for your request to use the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) in your dissertation. We are willing to allow you to **reproduce** the instrument in written form, as outlined in your request, at no charge. If you prefer to use our electronic distribution of the LPI (vs. making copies of the print materials) you will need to separately contact Lisa Shannon (lshannon@wiley.com) directly for instructions and payment.

Permission to use either the written or electronic versions requires the following agreement:

- (1) That the LPI is used only for research purposes and is not sold or used in conjunction with any compensated management development activities;
- (2) That copyright of the LPI, or any derivation of the instrument, is retained by Kouzes Posner International, and that the following copyright statement is included on all copies of the instrument; "Copyright 8 2003 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved. Used with permission",
- (3) That one (1) electronic copy of your dissertation and one (1) copy of all papers, reports, articles, and the like which make use of the LPI data be sent promptly to our attention; and,
- (4) That you agree to allow us to include an abstract of your study and any other published papers utilizing the LPI on our various websites.

If the terms outlined above are acceptable, would you indicate so by signing one (1) copy of this letter and returning it to me either via email or by post to; 1548 Camino Monde San Jose, CA 95125.

Best wishes for every success with your research project.

Cordially,
Ellen Peterson
Permissions Editor
Epeterson4@gmail.com

APPENDIX C

REASONS FOR SUCCESS QUESTIONNAIRE

Student

Your band program has been identified as a high quality music program and has been selected to participate in a research study about successful music programs. Your answers will be anonymous and they will not be shared with your teacher. Read the directions carefully. Thank you for your participation!

To what extent do the following characteristics contribute to the success of your band program?

Please circle the corresponding number 1 - 7

Not at All - 1

To a Very Great Extent - 7

1. Guest artists/conductors
2. Student dedication to band
3. Quality feeder schools (middle schools)
4. After school rehearsals
5. Student enjoyment of band
6. Quality rehearsal space (band room)
7. Talented students
8. Student motivation
9. Challenging music
10. Parent support
11. Other band directors coming in to help
12. Students in band are friends
13. Band director's personality
14. Supportive administration/principal
15. Student leadership
16. A tradition of success
17. Band director's high expectations
18. Student teamwork
19. Successful fundraisers
20. Positive student attitudes
21. Band director's concern for students
22. Enjoyable/fun music
23. Student private lessons
24. Band director's knowledge
25. Student hard work
26. Hard working band staff
27. High quality music
28. Parent motivation
29. Adequate funding
30. Supportive faculty/staff
31. High quality instruments
32. High achieving students (academically)

Label your top three factors with 1 – 3 (1 being your top choice), that are most influential to the success of your band program:

- strong tradition
- student characteristics
- parental support
- adequate funding
- extra rehearsals
- outside help from guest artists/conductors
- music characteristics
- band director characteristics
- school support
- quality feeder schools
- quality facility/band room
- other: _____

To what extent do the following statements reflect the value of the music program in your life?

Please circle the corresponding number 1 - 7

Not at All - 1

To a Very Great Extent -7

1. It gives me an outlet for personal expression.
2. It has helped me develop confidence.
3. It has taught me life skills.
4. It has prompted valuable friendships.
5. It has given me a place to belong.
6. It is something I enjoy doing.
7. It has changed my life.
8. It gives me a reason to come to school.
9. It has taught me musical skills.
10. It gives me the opportunity to perform.
11. It has created in me a love of music.
12. It has given me musical experiences.

Additional Comments:

APPENDIX D

PARENTAL CONSENT FORM

Dear Parent,

I am a doctoral candidate under the direction of the Dean: College of Business and Leadership, and Director: Ph.D. in Leadership Program at Tennessee Temple University. I am conducting research to evaluate how leadership impacts the characteristics of band students as it relates to musical performance.

I will be surveying music students at a Christian school in Louisiana. Your child's participation will involve taking two short surveys during band class. Students will be asked about their band program in one survey, and asked questions related to leadership in the second survey. Both surveys are short and concise and will take a combined time of approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Your child's participation in this study is voluntary. If your child chooses not to participate or to withdraw from this study at any time, there will be no penalty and their grade will not be affected in any manner. The results of this survey may be published, but all information that is presented will be listed in an anonymous manner, and not associated with your child's individual identity.

You child may or may not receive a direct benefit from taking this survey, but this evaluation has the potential to provide valuable leadership information to the band director, teachers, and leaders of a Christian school in Louisiana that may clarify current and future strategies for the music program.

Sincerely,

Ph.D. Candidate, TTU

You may contact me at (XXX) XXX-XXXX or the Dean: College of Business and Leadership, and Director: Ph.D. in Leadership Program at Tennessee Temple University at (XXX) XXX-XXXX to answer questions, clarification, or concerns about this research or your rights.

I give consent for my child _____ to participate in the above study. I understand my child will be given two (2) brief surveys by the researcher. I understand that only the researcher will have access to these surveys and the surveys will be destroyed by December 31, 2013.

Parent's Name: _____

Parent's Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX E

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

| Observers(10) | Students (8) | Band Director (1) |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Male – 4 | Male – 6 | Male -1 |
| Female – 6 | Female – 2 | Female -N/A |
| Race | Race | Race |
| American Indian or Alaska Native - 0 | American Indian or Alaska Native - 0 | American Indian or Alaska Native - N/A |
| Asian – 0 | Asian – 0 | Asian - N/A |
| African-American or Black – 0 | African-American or Black - 3 | African-American or Black - 1 |
| Pacific Islander – 0 | Pacific Islander -0 | Pacific Islander -N/A |
| White or Caucasian - 10 | White or Caucasian - 5 | White or Caucasian - N/A |
| Ethnicity | Ethnicity | Ethnicity |
| Hispanic or Latino - 1 | Hispanic or Latino - 0 | Hispanic or Latino - N/A |
| Not-Hispanic or Latino - 9 | Not-Hispanic or Latino - 8 | Not-Hispanic or Latino - 1 |
| Employment | Classification/Grade Level | Education |
| Administration – 4 | Freshman -1 | Baccalaureate |
| Teacher – 6 | Sophomore -2 | Syracuse University |
| | Junior – 2 | Major - Philosophy |
| | Senior – 3 | Minor - Music |
| Age | Age | Age |
| Under 12 years old - 0 | Under 12 years old -0 | Under 12 years old - 0 |
| 12-17 years old - 0 | 12-17 years old -6 | 12-17 years old -0 |
| 18-24 years old – 0 | 18-24 years old -2 | 18-24 years old - 0 |
| 25-34 years old – 2 | 25-34 years old -0 | 25-34 years old -1 |
| 35-44 years old 3 | 35-44 years old -0 | 35-44 years old - 0 |
| 45-54 years old – 4 | 45-54 years old -0 | 45-54 years old - 0 |
| 55-64 years old – 0 | 55-64 years old -0 | 55-64 years old - 0 |
| 65-74 years old – 1 | 65-74 years old -0 | 65-74 years old - 0 |
| 75 years or older – 0 | 75 years or older -0 | 75 years or older - 0 |
| Observers(10) | Students (8) | Band Director (1) |
| Male – 4 | Male – 6 | Male -1 |
| Female – 6 | Female – 2 | Female -N/A |

APPENDIX F

MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

| Item # | Teaching Colleagues | | | | | | | | | | | Director Values |
|--------|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|------|-----------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Mean | |
| 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3.30 | 4.00 |
| 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2.78 | 2.00 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0.90 | 1.00 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| 6 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.80 | 2.00 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 8 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.20 | 3.00 |
| 9 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.80 | 3.00 |
| 10 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.80 | 1.00 |
| 11 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3.50 | 3.00 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| 13 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.80 | 4.00 |
| 14 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.80 | 4.00 |
| 15 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3.70 | 4.00 |
| 16 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3.70 | 4.00 |
| 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 2.00 |
| 18 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| 19 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3.60 | 3.00 |
| 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 21 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3.70 | 4.00 |
| 22 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2.50 | 1.00 |
| 23 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.90 | 4.00 |
| 24 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0.90 | 2.00 |
| 25 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| 26 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.80 | 2.00 |
| 27 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1.40 | 1.00 |
| 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.10 | 0.00 |
| 29 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 4.00 |
| 30 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| 31 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3.20 | 4.00 |
| 32 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.50 | 4.00 |
| 33 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.30 | 3.00 |
| 34 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.60 | 4.00 |
| 35 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3.40 | 4.00 |
| 36 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3.60 | 4.00 |
| 37 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3.70 | 3.00 |
| 38 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.80 | 3.00 |
| 39 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3.10 | 4.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 40 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.30 | 4.00 |
| 41 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.80 | 2.00 |
| 42 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.70 | 4.00 |
| 43 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.80 | 4.00 |
| 44 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.60 | 4.00 |
| 45 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.90 | 4.00 |
| Mean | 2.64 | 2.86 | 2.49 | 2.71 | 2.64 | 2.22 | 3.07 | 2.98 | 2.44 | 2.47 | 2.65 | 2.78 |
| Standard Deviation | | | | | | | | | | | 1.45 | 1.38 |

FACTOR SUBSCALES

MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

| Band Director Self-Evaluation | Item Ratings | | | | Sum | Mean | Factor |
|--|--------------|------|------|------|-------|------|--------|
| Idealized Influence [Attributed] (items 10, 18, 21, 25) | 1.00 | 3.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 12.00 | 3.00 | 1 |
| Idealized Influence [Behavior] (Items 6, 14, 23, 34) | 2.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 14.00 | 3.50 | 1 |
| Inspirational Motivation (items 9, 13, 26, 36) | 3.00 | 4.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 13.00 | 3.25 | 2 |
| Intellectual Stimulation (items 2, 8, 30, 32) | 2.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 4.00 | 12.00 | 3.00 | 3 |
| Individualized Consideration (items 15, 19, 29, 31) | 4.00 | 3.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 15.00 | 3.75 | 4 |
| Contingent Reward (items 1, 11, 16, 35) | 4.00 | 3.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 15.00 | 3.75 | 5 |
| Management-by-exception [Active] (items 4, 22, 24, 27) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 1.25 | 6 |
| Management-by-exception [Passive] (items 3, 12, 17, 20) | 0.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 3.00 | 0.75 | 6 |
| Laissez-faire Leadership (items 5, 7, 28, 33) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.00 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 7 |
| Effectiveness (Items 37, 40, 42, 45) | 3.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 15.00 | 3.75 | |
| Satisfaction (Items 38, 41) | 3.00 | 2.00 | | | 5.00 | 2.50 | |
| Extra Effort (39, 42, 44) | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | | 12.00 | 4.00 | |
| | | | Mean | | 10.42 | | |
| Band Director Observer Evaluation | | | | | | | |
| Idealized Influence [Attributed] (items 10, 18, 21, 25) | 3.80 | 3.00 | 3.70 | 2.00 | 12.50 | 3.13 | 1 |
| Idealized Influence [Behavior] (Items 6, 14, 23, 34) | 3.80 | 3.80 | 3.90 | 4.00 | 15.50 | 3.88 | 1 |
| Inspirational Motivation (items 9, 13, 26, 36) | 3.80 | 3.80 | 3.80 | 3.60 | 15.00 | 3.75 | 2 |
| Intellectual Stimulation (items 2, 8, 30, 32) | 2.78 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.50 | 12.28 | 3.07 | 3 |
| Individualized Consideration (items 15, 19, 29, 31) | 3.70 | 3.60 | 1.10 | 3.20 | 11.60 | 2.90 | 4 |
| Contingent Reward (items 1, 11, 16, 35) | 3.30 | 3.50 | 3.70 | 3.40 | 13.90 | 3.48 | 5 |
| Management-by-exception [Active] (items 4, 22, 24, 27) | 0.90 | 2.50 | 0.90 | 1.40 | 5.70 | 1.43 | 6 |
| Management-by-exception [Passive] (items 3, 12, 17, 20) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6 |
| Laissez-faire Leadership (items 5, 7, 28, 33) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.30 | 0.40 | 0.10 | 7 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|--|
| Effectiveness (Items 37, 40, 42, 45) | 3.70 | 3.30 | 3.70 | 3.90 | 14.60 | 3.65 | |
| Satisfaction (Items 38, 41) | 3.00 | 3.80 | | | 6.80 | 3.40 | |
| Extra Effort (39, 42, 44) | 3.10 | 3.70 | 3.60 | | 10.40 | 3.47 | |
| | | | Mean | | 9.89 | | |

| |
|-----------------|
| High = 13-16 |
| Moderate = 6-11 |
| Low = 0-5 |

APPENDIX G

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY RAW DATA

BAND MEMBER PANEL

| Item # | Band Member Panel | | | | | | | | | Band Director |
|--------|-------------------|------|-----|------|------|-----|-------|-----|------|---------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Mean | |
| 1 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 8.50 | 10.00 |
| 2 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 6.38 | 8.00 |
| 3 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 7.13 | 10.00 |
| 4 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 8.75 | 8.00 |
| 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9.88 | 9.00 |
| 6 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 9.25 | 10.00 |
| 7 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 7.13 | 7.00 |
| 8 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 6.38 | 9.00 |
| 9 | 8 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 7.38 | 8.00 |
| 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 7.88 | 8.00 |
| 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 9.25 | 8.00 |
| 12 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 8.00 | 7.00 |
| 13 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 7.88 | 10.00 |
| 14 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 9.38 | 10.00 |
| 15 | 10 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 7.88 | 7.00 |
| 16 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5.13 | 7.00 |
| 17 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 6.13 | 8.00 |
| 18 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 5.75 | 9.00 |
| 19 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 7.75 | 8.00 |
| 20 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 6.88 | 10.00 |
| 21 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 7.25 | 10.00 |
| 22 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 10 | 8 | 8.13 | 10.00 |
| 23 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 8.63 | 9.00 |
| 24 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 6.63 | 8.00 |
| 25 | 8 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 6.13 | 7.00 |
| 26 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 8.63 | 8.00 |
| 27 | 9 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 7.13 | 9.00 |
| 28 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 7.50 | 9.00 |
| 29 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 8.25 | 10.00 |
| 30 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 8.88 | 8.00 |
| 31 | 7.53 | 7.83 | 8.8 | 7.83 | 7.63 | 5.6 | 9.133 | 6.9 | 7.66 | 8.63 |

TEACHING COLLEAGUES PANEL

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY RAW DATA

| Item # | Teaching Colleague Panel | | | | | | | | | | Mean |
|--------|--------------------------|-----|-----|---|----|----|-------|-----|-------|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| 1 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | | 10 | 9.89 |
| 2 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | | 10 | 9.33 |
| 3 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9.40 |
| 4 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9.70 |
| 5 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.80 |
| 6 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 9.40 |
| 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9.20 |
| 8 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 9.20 |
| 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9.30 |
| 10 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.50 |
| 11 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.70 |
| 12 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.60 |
| 13 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.60 |
| 14 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.70 |
| 15 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9.70 |
| 16 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.50 |
| 17 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9.30 |
| 18 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.50 |
| 19 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 9.40 |
| 20 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9.60 |
| 21 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.70 |
| 22 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.60 |
| 23 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.60 |
| 24 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.70 |
| 25 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.90 |
| 26 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9.70 |
| 27 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9.80 |
| 28 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.50 |
| 29 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.70 |
| 30 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.70 |
| Mean | 8.667 | 9.6 | 9.2 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9.867 | 9.8 | 9.607 | 10 | 9.57 |
| | Standard Deviation | | | | | | | | | | 0.19 |

BAND MEMBER PANEL

EXEMPLARY LEADERSHIP SUBSCALES RAW DATA

| Item # | LPI Model the Way | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| 1 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 8.500 |
| 6 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 9.250 |
| 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 9.250 |
| 16 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5.125 |
| 21 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 7.250 |
| 26 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 8.625 |
| Mean | 8.33 | 7.67 | 9.00 | 8.83 | 8.00 | 6.50 | 8.67 | 7.00 | 8.00 |
| Item # | Inspire a Shared Vision | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 6.375 |
| 7 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 7.125 |
| 12 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 8.000 |
| 17 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 6.125 |
| 22 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 10 | 8 | 8.125 |
| 27 | 9 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 7.125 |
| Mean | 6.17 | 8.67 | 8.17 | 7.33 | 7.00 | 4.33 | 9.17 | 6.33 | 7.15 |
| Item # | Challenge the Process | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 7.125 |
| 8 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 6.375 |
| 13 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 7.875 |
| 18 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 5.750 |
| 23 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 8.625 |
| 28 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 7.500 |
| Mean | 6.17 | 8.50 | 9.00 | 7.00 | 6.67 | 4.67 | 9.33 | 6.33 | 7.21 |
| Item # | Enable Others to Act | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 8.750 |
| 9 | 8 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 7.375 |
| 14 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 9.375 |
| 19 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 7.750 |
| 24 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 6.625 |
| 29 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 8.250 |
| Mean | 7.83 | 8.17 | 8.83 | 7.83 | 8.33 | 6.83 | 9.00 | 7.33 | 8.02 |
| Item # | Enable Others to Act | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9.875 |
| 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 7.875 |
| 15 | 10 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 7.875 |
| 20 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 6.875 |
| 25 | 8 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 6.125 |
| 30 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 8.875 |
| Mean | 9.17 | 6.17 | 9.00 | 8.17 | 8.17 | 5.67 | 9.50 | 7.50 | 7.92 |

TEACHING COLLEAGUES/DIRECTOR
EXEMPLARY LEADERSHIP SUBSCALES RAW DATA

| Teaching Colleague Panel | | | | | | | | | | Director |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|----------|
| Item # | LPI Model the Way | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | | 10.00 |
| 6 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10.00 |
| 11 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8.00 |
| 16 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 7.00 |
| 21 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10.00 |
| 26 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 8.00 |
| Mean | 8.83 | 10.00 | 9.33 | 9.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 9.83 | 9.67 | 9.80 | 8.83 |
| Item # | Inspire a Shared Vision | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | | 8.00 |
| 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 7.00 |
| 12 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 7.00 |
| 17 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 8.00 |
| 22 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10.00 |
| 27 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9.00 |
| Mean | 8.50 | 8.83 | 9.33 | 9.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 9.83 | 9.67 | 9.60 | 8.17 |
| Item # | Challenge the Process | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10.00 |
| 8 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9.00 |
| 13 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10.00 |
| 18 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9.00 |
| 23 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.00 |
| 28 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.00 |
| Mean | 8.33 | 9.50 | 8.50 | 9.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 9.83 | 9.83 | 9.67 | 9.33 |
| Item # | Enable Others to Act | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 8.00 |
| 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 8.00 |
| 14 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10.00 |
| 19 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 8.00 |
| 24 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8.00 |
| 29 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10.00 |
| Mean | 8.67 | 9.67 | 9.50 | 9.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 9.83 | 10.00 | 9.17 | 8.67 |
| Item # | Encourage the Heart | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9.00 |
| 10 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8.00 |
| 15 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 7.00 |
| 20 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10.00 |
| 25 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 7.00 |
| 30 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8.00 |
| Mean | 9.00 | 10.00 | 9.33 | 9.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 9.83 | 9.83 | 8.17 |

APPENDIX H

REASONS FOR SUCCESS QUESTIONNAIRE RAW DATA

| Item # | Band Member Panel | | | | | | | | Mean |
|--------------------|-------------------|----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|------|-------|
| | #1 | #2 | #3 | #4 | #5 | #6 | #7 | #8 | |
| 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2.875 |
| 2 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5.250 |
| 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 6 | | 4 | 3 | 6 | 4.286 |
| 4 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 4.625 |
| 5 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 6.000 |
| 6 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4.625 |
| 7 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 4.625 |
| 8 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 5.125 |
| 9 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 5.000 |
| 10 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 5.000 |
| 11 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2.375 |
| 12 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 6.250 |
| 13* | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6.500 |
| 14 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3.875 |
| 15 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4.750 |
| 16 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.500 |
| 17* | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 5.625 |
| 18 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4.750 |
| 19 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2.250 |
| 20 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 4.625 |
| 21* | 7 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6.500 |
| 22 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6.000 |
| 23 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4.125 |
| 24* | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6.625 |
| 25 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5.625 |
| 26 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3.750 |
| 27 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4.875 |
| 28 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4.500 |
| 29 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2.375 |
| 30 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3.000 |
| 31 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3.125 |
| 32 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 4.875 |
| Mean | 5.7 | 4 | 4.6 | 5.4 | 3.6 | 3.73 | 4.64 | 5.33 | 4.634 |
| Standard Deviation | | | | | | | | | 1.218 |

*Items specifically related to band director

APPENDIX I

MODELS AND TOOLS CHECKLIST FOR OBSERVATIONS

Check List for Music Observations

This list is meant to be supplemental to district evaluation instruments, and is not meant to be all-inclusive. We have attempted to give specific items to be observed in most music classes.

Planning and Preparation Indicators
Assessment of a Christian School Band in Louisiana

- The teacher has lesson plans, and the plan indicates titles of music to be covered, specific musical sections to be addressed in class, and a method of assessment indicated.
- The objectives of the lesson are based on the standards and benchmarks outlined in the Curriculum Frameworks for the Arts.
- The plan of the lesson is followed and accomplishes most of what is planned.

Knowledge of Subject Matter Indicators

- Instrumental) The teacher can address fingerings (and bowings) without using reference materials most of the time.
- (Vocal) The teacher uses a regular system of sight-reading, such as scale numbers, letters, or solfege.
- The teacher uses a consistent method of counting rhythms, with effective syllables.
- The teacher can explain the meaning of musical terms.
- The teacher can address problems of tuning (matching pitches between players/singers).
- The teacher can explain methods of improving tone quality, breath control, and balance/blend within the group.

Classroom Management Indicators

- Effective procedures concerning use of instruments/music folders/equipment are visible.
- Students demonstrate knowledge and understanding of those procedures in getting instruments/music/equipment out (or putting away) and being seated, ready to play or sing.
- All students are engaged in the rehearsal, even when there are brief stops for corrections/re-evaluation for individuals or small groups.
- Organizational tasks of finding equipment, reeds, and music stands do not detract from the instructional activities.
- Vocal teachers are aware of proper climate in the room for good vocal health.

Techniques of Instruction Indicators

- Technical exercises for development are included in the lesson (i.e.: warm-ups, breathing, ear-training) and do not exceed an appropriate amount of time in the lesson.

√ Explanations of the teacher are clear and concise, so that as the group is stopped a correction or evaluation is given, and the rehearsal resumes.

√ The teacher is familiar with the musical score of the selection being taught, and his/her eyes are on the class the majority of the time.

√ If the same musical correction is needed more than once, the teacher varies the explanation using different words and concepts.

√ The teacher can identify musical mistakes easily and quickly, and give feedback/correction as necessary.

√ The teacher responds to the sounds of the ensemble and adjusts the instruction plan to address bad sounds, wrong notes, faulty tuning or balance immediately - working with both the “ensemble” as well as individuals.

√ The musical literature selected is appropriate for the level of skill of the players.

Student-Teacher Interaction Indicators

√ Students respond readily to teacher instructions. The ensemble starts and stops as indicated by the teacher without delays.

√ Students demonstrate good posture (sitting or standing up straight with good posture for breathing) and demonstrate proper hand positions on instruments.

Assessment Techniques Indicators

√ The teacher makes informal assessments of the students’ work, by asking for individual or small groups to perform small passages (2-8 measures).

x The teacher makes formal assessments of students’ work in sectional tests (quizzes), homework assignments, weekly exams, etc.

√ The teacher includes the performance as a portion of the grade when appropriate in performance based classes (band, chorus, and orchestra), using participation/performance at concerts as an indicator.

In General

√ The sound of the musical is pleasant, even though groups vary in maturity.

N/A The various groups/sections should be playing/singing together rhythmically most of the time

N/A Musical phrasing (inflection of musical line) should be addressed in conjunction with technical/mechanical aspects of instruction.

√ Class lessons are more than “run-throughs” of previously taught musical selections.

NOTE: This checklist was obtained from the Florida Music Educators Association (FMEA), a chapter of the National Association for Music Educators (NAfME). Access to any and all music program evaluation tools is available to current members of the NAfME.

NATIONAL STANDARDS IN MUSIC

Content Standard 1: Singing, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music

Grades K-4

- sing independently, on pitch and in rhythm, with appropriate timbre, diction, and posture, and maintain a steady tempo
- sing expressively, with appropriate dynamics, phrasing, and interpretation
- sing from memory a varied repertoire of songs representing genres and styles from diverse cultures
- sing ostinatos, partner songs, and rounds
- sing in groups, blending vocal timbres, matching dynamic levels, and responding to the cues of a conductor

Grades 5-8

- sing accurately and with good breath control throughout their singing ranges, alone and in small and large ensembles
- sing with expression and technical accuracy a repertoire of vocal literature with a level of difficulty of 2, on a scale of 1 to 6, including some songs performed from memory
- sing music representing diverse genres and cultures, with expression appropriate for the work being performed
- sing music written in two and three parts

Choral Performance - 5-8

- sing with expression and technical accuracy a varied repertoire of vocal literature with a level of difficulty of 3, on a scale of 1 to 6, including some songs from memory

Grades 9-12

Proficient

- sing with expression and technical accuracy a large and varied repertoire of vocal literature with a level of difficulty of 4, on a scale of 1 to 6, including some songs performed from memory
- sing music written in four parts, with and without accompaniment
- demonstrate well-developed ensemble skills

Advanced

- sing with expression and technical accuracy a large and varied repertoire of vocal literature with a level of difficulty of 5, on a scale of 1 to 6
- sing music written in more than four parts
- sing in small ensembles with one student on a part

Content Standard 2: Performing on instruments, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music

Grades K-4

- perform on pitch, in rhythm, with appropriate dynamics and timbre, and maintain a steady tempo
- perform easy rhythmic, melodic, and chordal patterns accurately and independently on rhythmic, melodic and harmonic classroom instruments
- perform expressively a varied repertoire of music representing diverse genres and styles
- echo short rhythms and melodic patterns
- perform in groups, blending instrumental timbres, matching dynamic levels, and responding to the cues of a conductor
- perform independent instrumental parts while other students sing or play contrasting parts

Grades 5-8

- perform on at least one instrument accurately and independently, alone and in small and large ensembles, with good posture, playing position, and good breath, bow or stick control
- perform with expression and technical accuracy on at least one string, wind, percussion, or classroom instrument a repertoire of instrumental literature with a level of difficulty of 2, on a scale of 1 to 6
- perform music representing diverse genres and cultures, with expression appropriate for the work being performed
- play by ear simple melodies on a melodic instrument and simple accompaniments on a harmonic instrument
- perform with expression and technical accuracy a varied repertoire of instrumental literature with a level of difficulty of 3, on a scale of 1 to 6, including some solos performed from memory

Grades 9-12

Proficient

- perform with expression and technical accuracy a large and varied repertoire of instrumental literature with a level of difficulty of 4, on a scale of 1 to 6
- perform an appropriate part in an ensemble, demonstrating well-developed ensemble skills
- perform in small ensembles with one student on a part

Advanced

- perform with expression and technical accuracy a large and varied repertoire of instrumental literature with a level of difficulty of 5, on a scale of 1 to 6

Content Standard 3: Improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments

Grades K-4

- improvise "answers" in the same style to given rhythmic and melodic phrases
- improvise simple rhythmic and melodic ostinato accompaniments
- improvise simple rhythmic variations and simple melodic embellishments on familiar melodies

- improvise short songs and instrumental pieces, using a variety of sound sources, including traditional sounds, nontraditional sounds available in the classroom, body sounds, and sounds produced by electronic means

Grades 5-8

- improvise simple harmonic accompaniments
- improvise melodic embellishments and simple rhythmic and melodic variations on given pentatonic melodies and melodies in major keys
- improvise short melodies, unaccompanied and over given rhythmic accompaniments, each in a consistent style, meter and tonality

Grades 9-12

Proficient

- improvise stylistically appropriate harmonizing parts
- improvise rhythmic and melodic variations on given pentatonic melodies and melodies in major and minor keys
- improvise original melodies over given chord progressions, each in a consistent style, meter, and tonality

Advanced

- improvise stylistically appropriate harmonizing parts in a variety of styles
- improvise original melodies in a variety of styles, over given chord progressions, each in a consistent style, meter, and tonality

Content Standard 4: Composing and arranging music within specified guidelines

Grades K-4

- create and arrange music to accompany readings or dramatizations
- create and arrange short songs and instrumental pieces within specified guidelines
- use a variety of sound sources when composing

Grades 5-8

- compose short pieces within specified guidelines, demonstrating how the elements of music are used to achieve unity and variety, tension and release, and balance
- arrange simple pieces for voices or instruments other than those for which the pieces were written
- use a variety of traditional and nontraditional sound sources and electronic media when composing and arranging

Grades 9-12

Proficient

- compose music in several distinct styles, demonstrating creativity in using the elements of music for expressive effect
- arrange pieces for voices or instruments other than those for which the pieces were written in ways that preserve or enhance the expressive effect of the music
- compose and arrange music for voices and various acoustic and electronic instruments, demonstrating knowledge of the ranges and traditional usages of the sound sources

Advanced

- compose music, demonstrating imagination and technical skill in applying the principals of composition

Content Standard 5: Reading and notating music

Grades K-4

- read whole, half, dotted half, quarter, and eighth notes and rests in 2/4, * and 4/4 meter signatures
- use a system (that is, syllables, numbers or letters) to read simple pitch notation in the treble clef in major keys
- identify symbols and traditional terms referring to dynamics, tempo, and articulation and interpret them correctly when performing
- use standard symbols to notate meter, rhythm, pitch and dynamics in simple patterns presented by the teacher

Grades 5-8

- read whole, half, quarter, eighth, sixteenth and dotted notes and rests in 2/4, *, 4/4, 6/8, 3/8 and alla breve meter signatures
- read at sight simple melodies in both the treble and bass clefs
- identify and define standard notation symbols for pitch, rhythm, dynamics, tempo, articulation, and expression
- use standard notation to record their musical ideas and the musical ideas of others
- (for choral/instrumental ensemble/class) sight-read accurately and expressively, music with a level of difficulty of 2, on a scale of 1 to 6

Grades 9-12

Proficient

- demonstrate the ability to read an instrumental or vocal score of up to four staves by describing how the elements of music are used
- (for choral/instrumental ensemble/class) sight-read accurately and expressively, music with a level of difficulty of 3, on a scale of 1 to 6

Advanced

- demonstrate the ability to read a full instrumental or vocal score by describing how the elements of music are used and explaining all transpositions and clefs
- interpret nonstandard notation symbols used by twentieth-century composers
- (for choral/instrumental ensemble/class) sight-read accurately and expressively, music with a level of difficulty of 4, on a scale of 1 to 6

Content Standard 6: Listening to, analyzing, and describing music

Grades K-4

- identify simple music forms when presented aurally
- demonstrate perceptual skills by moving, by answering questions about, and by describing aural examples of music of various styles representing diverse cultures

- use appropriate terminology in explaining music, music notation, music instruments and voices, and music performances
- identify the sounds of a variety of instruments, including many orchestra and band instruments, and instruments from various cultures, as well as children's voices and male and female adult voices
- respond through purposeful movement to selected prominent music characteristics or to specific music events while listening to music

Grades 5-8

- describe specific music events in a given aural example, using appropriate terminology
- analyze the uses of elements of music in aural examples representing diverse genres and cultures
- demonstrate knowledge of the basic principles of meter, rhythm, tonality, intervals, chords, and harmonic progressions in their analyses of music

Grades 9-12

Proficient

- analyze aural examples of a varied repertoire of music, representing diverse genres and cultures, by describing the uses of elements of music and expressive devices
- demonstrate extensive knowledge of the technical vocabulary of music
- identify and explain compositional devices and techniques used to provide unity and variety and tension and release in a musical work and give examples of other works that make similar uses of these devices and techniques

Advanced

- demonstrate the ability to perceive and remember music events by describing in detail significant events occurring in a given aural example
- compare ways in which musical materials are used in a given example relative to ways in which they are used in other works of the same genre or style
- analyze and describe uses of the elements of music in a given work that make it unique, interesting, and expressive

Content Standard 7: Evaluating music and music performances

Grades K-4

- devise criteria for evaluating performances and compositions
- explain, using appropriate music terminology, their personal preferences for specific musical works and styles

Grades 5-8

- develop criteria for evaluating the quality and effectiveness of music performances and compositions and apply the criteria in their own personal listening and performing
- evaluate the quality and effectiveness of their own and others' performances, compositions, arrangements, and improvisations by applying specific criteria appropriate for the style of the music and offer constructive suggestions for improvement

Grades 9-12

Proficient

- evolve specific criteria for making informed, critical evaluations of the quality and effectiveness of performances, compositions, arrangements, and improvisations and apply the criteria in their personal participation in music
- evaluate a performance, composition, arrangement, or improvisation by comparing it to similar or exemplary models

Advanced

- evaluate a given musical work in terms of its aesthetic qualities and explain the musical means it uses to evoke feelings and emotions

Content Standard 8: Understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts**Grades K-4**

- identify similarities and differences in the meanings of common terms used in the various arts
- identify ways in which the principles and subject matter of other disciplines taught in the school are interrelated with those of music

Grades 5-8

- compare in two or more arts how the characteristic materials of each art (that is, sound in music, visual stimuli in visual arts, movement in dance, human interrelationships in theater) can be used to transform similar events, scenes, emotions or ideas into works of art
- describe ways in which the principles and subject matter of other disciplines taught in school are interrelated with those of music

*Grades 9-12***Proficient**

- explain how elements, artistic processes (such as imagination or craftsmanship) and organizational principals (such as unity and variety or repetition and contrast) are used in similar and distinctive ways in the various arts and cite examples
- compare characteristics of two or more arts within a particular historical period or style and cite examples from various cultures
- explain ways in which the principles and subject matter of various disciplines outside the arts are interrelated with those of music

Advanced

- compare the uses of characteristic elements, artistic processes, and organizational principles among the arts in different historical periods and different cultures
- explain how the roles of creators, performers, and others involved in the production and presentation of the arts are similar to and different from one another in the various arts

Content Standard 9: Understanding music in relation to history and culture**Grades K-4**

- identify by genre or style aural examples of music from various historical periods and cultures
- describe in simple terms how elements of music are used in music examples from various cultures of the world
- identify various uses of music in their daily experiences and describe characteristics that make certain music suitable for each use
- identify and describe roles of musicians in various music settings and cultures
- demonstrate audience behavior appropriate for the context and style of music performed

Grades 5-8

- describe distinguishing characteristics of representative music genres and styles from a variety of cultures
- classify by genre and style (and, if applicable, by historical period, composer, and title) a varied body of exemplary (that is, high-quality and characteristic) musical works and explain the characteristics that cause each work to be considered exemplary
- compare, in several cultures of the world, functions music serves, roles of musicians, and conditions under which music is typically performed

Grades 9-12

Proficient

- classify by genre or style and by historical period or culture unfamiliar but representative aural examples of music and explain the reasoning behind their classifications
- identify sources of American music genres, trace the evolution of those genres, and cite well-known musicians associated with them
- identify various roles that musicians perform, cite representative individuals who have functioned in each role, and describe their activities and achievements

Advanced

- identify and explain the stylistic features of a given musical work that serve to define its aesthetic tradition and its historical or cultural context
- identify and describe music genres or styles that show the influence of two or more cultural traditions, identify the cultural source of each influence, and trace the historical conditions that produced the synthesis of influences

From *National Standards for Arts Education*. Copyright © 1994 by Music Educators National Conference (MENC). Used by permission. The complete National Arts Standards and additional materials relating to the Standards are available from MENC The National Association for Music Education, 1806 Robert Fulton Drive, Reston, VA 20191.