A Review of Leadership Styles of Band Directors: Leadership Style Matters When It Comes to the Success of Marching Bands

Dr. Doris S. Hall

Mr. Derrick Yates

Alabama A&M University
Normal, Alabama

A Review of Leadership Styles of Band Directors: Leadership Style Matters When It Comes to the Success of Marching Bands

Abstract

Organizational leadership is functioning in an environment of unprecedented turbulence and change, and technology, education, business, and political sectors all must understand leadership theories, styles, and visioning. How leadership in organizations is conceptualized has important implications for theory, style, visioning, and research. Much of the leadership research has been influenced by the implicit assumption that effective leadership can be explained in terms of dyadic influence by a heroic leader. A leader who exemplifies influence, theories of change, the change system, how to manage the process, and one who gains the respect of other people is considered one who will contribute and strengthen the field of organizational leadership. Theories guide what people actually will do, styles guide new direction, change, re-focusing, and new energy.

In addition, when an organization needs a new direction or change, a re-focusing, or new energy, an appropriate leadership style should be chosen. The method used, ways of speaking, writing, building, living, or appearing is called style. Leadership style is a technique of presentation.

Introduction

Leadership involves a position of responsibility for setting the vision of an organization. Leadership puts into place a process whereby the vision can be achieved, and involves the responsibility for motivating and inspiring others in the pursuit of great goals (Billick & Peterson, 2001). In addition, leadership is in the process of influencing others to understand and deal with the theories of change and management, change in systems, how to manage the change process, and how to facilitate their learning organizations implementation, and adaptation to change (Robbins & Coulter, 2002).

Leadership in higher education involving music education and band programs must be prepared to act to address leadership strategies of the 21st century. Leadership theories of band directors, leadership styles of band directors, and visioning are cultured based, considering values, beliefs, customs, and ways of doing things. Moreover, leadership theories, styles and visioning require mission, patience, and courage especially when it involves music and band programs. This paper will address theories, styles of band directors, leadership reflecting marching bands and success of these bands, and visioning of leadership for the 21st century (Yukl, 2002).

Leadership Theories Related to Styles of Band Directors

A theory is an explanation based on thought, observation, and reasoning. It is the principles or methods of a science or art rather than its practice. According to Argyris and Schon (1996), there are two distinguished types of theories. Espoused theories are accounts individuals provide whenever they try to describe, explain, or predict their behavior. Theories-in-use guide what people actually do. A theory-in-use is an implicit program or set of rules that specifies how to behave. There are several leadership theories which enhance organizational development such as the great man theory, trait theory, behavioral theory, role theory, strategic contingencies theory, social exchange theory, contingency theory, cognitive resource theory, the Fiedler's least preferred co-worker theory, the leader-member exchange (LMX) theory, and lastly the path-goal of leadership theory (Fiedler, 1964).

Great Man Theory as it Relates to Directors of Bands

The Great Man Theory dealt with early research on leadership which was based on the study of people who were already great leaders. Many band directors are great leaders because of so many situations concerning people (students, parents, administration, faculty, and staff).

These people were often from aristocracy; however, band directors originate from all parts of the land. A few from lower classes had the opportunity to lead with this theory; however, band directors do not have a class status. In addition, the Great Man Theory contributed to the notion that leadership had something to do with breeding. The idea of the Great Man also strayed into the mythic domain, with notions that in times of need, a Great Man would arise, almost by magic. This was easy to verify, by pointing to people such as Eisenhower and Churchill, let alone those further back along the timeline, even to Jesus, Moses, Mohammed and the Buddah (McGuire, 1968).

Gender issues were not on the table when the 'Great Man' theory was proposed. Most leaders were male and the thought of a Great Woman was generally in areas other than leadership. Most researchers were also male, and concerns about androcentric bias were a long way from being realized. The assumption of the Great Man Theory is that leaders are born and not made. Great leaders will arise when there is a great need (McGuire, 1968). According to Lai Tsu,

> A leader is best when people barely know he exists; not so good when people obey and acclaim him; worse when they despise him; but of a good leader, who talks little, when his work is done, his aim fulfilled, they will say: We did it ourselves (Yukl, 2002).

Most Director of Bands exemplify the thoughts of Lai Tsu, especially through the preparation of producing half-time shows with marching bands for the performance during football season (Yukl, 2002).

Trait Theory as it Relates to Directors of Bands

The Trait Theory dealt with early research on leadership which was based on the psychological focus of the day, which was of people having inherited characteristics or traits. Attention was thus put on discovering these traits, often by studying successful leaders, but with

the underlying assumption that if other people could also be found with these traits, then they, too, could also become great leaders (Senge, 1990).

McCall and Lombardo (1983) researched both success and failure identified four primary traits by which leaders could succeed or "derail": (a) emotional stability and composure: calm, confident and predictable, particularly when under stress; (b). admitting error: owning up to mistakes, rather than putting energy into covering up; (c) good interpersonal skills: able to communicate and persuade others without resort to negative or coercive tactics; and, (d) intellectual breadth: able to understand a wide range of areas, rather than having a narrow (and narrow-minded) area of expertise.

There have been many different studies of leadership traits and they agree only in the general saintly qualities needed to be a leader. For a long period, inherited traits were sidelined as learned and situational factors were considered to be far more realistic as reasons for people acquiring leadership positions. Paradoxically, the research into twins who were separated at birth along with new sciences such as Behavioral Genetics have shown that far more is inherited than was previously supposed. Perhaps one day they will find a 'leadership gene' (McGregor, 1960).

The assumptions of the Trail Theory was that people are born with inherited traits, some traits are particularly suited to leadership, and people who make good leaders have the right (or sufficient) combination of traits (Senge, 1990). There are band directors, who are better leaders than others comparatively, and this theory supports the idea of why some succeed and others do not (Senge, 1990).

Behavioral Theory as it Relates to Directors of Bands

The Behavioral Theory dealt with behavioral theories of leadership that do not seek inborn traits or capabilities. Rather, they look at what leaders actually do. If success can be

506

defined in terms of describable actions, then it should be relatively easy for other people to act in the same way. This is easier to teach and learn then to adopt the more ephemeral "traits" or "capabilities" (Bandura, 1989). Behavioral is a big leap from Trait Theory, in that it assumes that leadership capability can be learned, rather than being inherent. This opens the floodgates to leadership development, as opposed to simple psychometric assessment that sorts those with leadership potential from those who will never have the chance. A behavioral theory is relatively easy to develop, as you simply assess both leadership success and the actions of leaders. With a large enough study, you can then correlate statistically significant behaviors with success. You can also identify behaviors which contribute to failure, thus adding a second layer of understanding (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2000).

The assumptions of the Behavior Theory are that leaders can be made, rather than are born and successful leadership is based in definable, learnable behavior. For instance, through hazing in a marching band from student to student, a band director will learn how to lead from consequences and aftermaths of such behaviors from students. The band director is forced to be more responsible, firm, action oriented, and have an organized plan of action for such behaviors.

Role Theory as it Relates to Directors of Bands

We all have internal schemas about the role of leaders, based on what we read, discuss and so on. We subtly send these expectations to our leaders, acting as role senders, for example through the balance of decisions we take upon ourselves and the decisions we leave to the leader. Leaders are influenced by these signals, particularly if they are sensitive to the people around them, and will generally conform to these, playing the leadership role that is put upon them by others (Graen & Cashman, 2001). Within organizations, there is much formal and informal information about what the leader's role should be, including "leadership values", culture,

507

training sessions, modeling by senior managers, and so on. These and more (including contextual factors) act to shape expectations and behaviors around leadership (Higgins, 1989).

Role conflict can also occur when people have differing expectations of their leaders. It also happens when leaders have different ideas about what they should be doing vs. the expectations that are put upon them (Jecker & Landy, 2003). Role expectations of a leader can vary from very specific to a broad idea within which the leader can define their own style. When role expectations are low or mixed, then this may also lead to role conflict (Graen & Cashman, 2001).

The assumptions of the Role Theory were that people define roles for themselves and others based on social learning and reading. Also, people form expectations about the roles that they and others will play. In addition, people subtly encourage others to act within the role expectations they have for them, and people will act within the roles they adopt (Graen & Cashman, 2001).

Strategic Contingencies Theory as it Relates to Directors of Bands

Intraorganizational power depends on three factors: problem skills, actor centrality and uniqueness of skill. If you have the skills and expertise to resolve important problems, then you are going to be in demand. And by the law of supply and demand, that gives you the upper hand in negotiations. It also gives you power from the reciprocity created. If you work in a central part of the workflow of the organization, then what you do is very important. This gives you many opportunities to be noticed. It also means you are on the critical path, such that if your part of the company fails, the whole show stops. Again creating attention and giving you bargaining power (Fiedler, 1964).

Finally, if you are difficult to replace, then if you do make enemies up the hierarchy, then they cannot just move you out or sideways. For example, a production manager in an organization is in charge of a key manufacturing operation (centrality), and understands its complexities very well (uniqueness). From a long experience, when things go wrong, he is very good at fixing things, both mechanically and with the unions.

Using Strategic Contingencies Theory you build the philosophy to get a job on the critical path through the organization. Become expert in problem solving in it. Acquire and defend knowledge and skills that nobody else has, and, defending it, do not let any one person become indispensable (Fiedler, 1967).

Social Exchange Theory as it Relates to Directors of Bands

All relationships have give and take, although the balance of this exchange is not always equal. Social Exchange theory explains how we feel about a relationship with another person as depending on our perceptions of: (a) the balance between what we put into the relationship and what we get out of it; (b) the kind of relationship we deserve; and, (c) the chances of having a better relationship with someone else (Homans, 1961).

In deciding what is fair, we develop a comparison level against which we compare the give/take ratio. This level will vary between relationships, with some being more giving and others where we get more from the relationship. They will also vary greatly in what is given and received. Thus, for example, exchanges at home may be very different, both in balance and content. We also have a comparison level for the alternative relationships. With a high such comparison level, we might believe the world is full of lovely people just waiting to meet us. When this level is low, we may stay in a high-cost relationship simply because we believe we could not find any better elsewhere (Latane & Wolf, 1981).

Contingency Theory as it Relates to Directors of Bands

Contingency theories are a class of behavioral theory that contends that there is no one best way of leading and that a leadership style that is effective in some situations may not be successful in others. An effect of this is that leaders who are very effective at one place and time may become unsuccessful either when transplanted to another situation or when the factors around them change (Hickson, Hinigs, Lee, Schneck, & Pennings, 1971). This helps to explain how some leaders who seem for a while to have the 'Midas touch' suddenly appear to go off the boil and make very unsuccessful decisions.

Contingency theory is similar to situational theory in that there is an assumption of no simple one right way. The main difference is that situational theory tends to focus more on the behaviors that the leader should adopt, given situational factors (often about follower behavior), whereas contingency theory takes a broader view that includes contingent factors about leader capability and other variables within the situation (Higgins, 1989). The assumptions of the Contingency Theory is that the leader's ability to lead is contingent upon various situational factors, including the leader's preferred style, the capabilities and behaviors of followers and also various other situational factors.

Cognitive Resource Theory as it Relates to Directors of Bands

Cognitive Resource Theory predicts that: A leader's cognitive ability contributes to the performance of the team only when the leader's approach is directive. When leaders are better at planning and decision-making, in order for their plans and decisions to be implemented, they need to tell people what to do, rather than hope they agree with them (Moscovici, 1984). When they are not better than people in the team, then a non-directive approach is more appropriate, for

example where they facilitate an open discussion where the ideas of team can be aired and the best approach identified and implemented (Street, 1982).

Stress affects the relationship between intelligence and decision quality. When there is low stress, then intelligence is fully functional and makes an optimal contribution. However, during high stress, a natural intelligence not only makes no difference, but it may also have a negative effect. One reason for this may be that an intelligent person seeks rational solutions, which may not be available (and may be one of the causes of stress). In such situations, a leader who is inexperienced in 'gut feel' decisions is forced to rely on this unfamiliar approach. Another possibility is that the leader retreats within him/herself, to think hard about the problem, leaving the group to their own devices (Sawyer, 1981).

Experience is positively related to decision quality under high stress. When there is a high stress situation and intelligence is impaired, experience of the same or similar situations enables the leader to react in appropriate ways without having to think carefully about the situation. Experience of decision-making under stress also will contribute to a better decision than trying to muddle through with brain-power alone (Yukl, 2002).

For simple tasks, leader intelligence and experience is irrelevant. When subordinates are given tasks which do not need direction or support, then it does not matter how good the leader is at making decisions, because they are easy to make, even for subordinates, and hence do not need any further support. CRT arose out of dissatisfaction with Trait Theory. Fiedler also linked CRT with his Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) Theory, suggesting that high LPC scores are the main drivers of directive behavior (Fiedler, 1986).

A particularly significant aspect of CRT is the principle that intelligence is the main factor in low-stress situations, whilst experience counts for more during high-stress moments.

The assumptions of the Cognitive Resource Theory deals with intelligence and experience and other cognitive resources are factors in leadership success. Cognitive capabilities, although significant are not enough to predict leadership success. Stress impacts the ability to make decisions (Fiedler, 1986).

Fiedler's Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) Theory as it Relates to Directors of Bands

Fiedler identified the Least Preferred Co-Worker scoring for leaders by asking them first to think of a person with which they worked that they would like least to work with again, and then to score the person on a range of scales between positive factors (friendly, helpful, cheerful, etc.) and negative factors (unfriendly, unhelpful, gloomy, etc.). A high LPC leader generally scores the other person as positive and a low LPC leader scores them as negative (Fiedler, 1964).

High LPC leaders tend to have close and positive relationships and act in a supportive way, even prioritizing the relationship before the task. Low LPC leaders put the task first and will turn to relationships only when they are satisfied with how the work is going. Three factors are then identified about the leader, member and the task, as follows: (a) leader-Member Relations: The extent to which the leader has the support and loyalties of followers and relations with them are friendly and cooperative; (b) task structure: The extent to which tasks are standardized, documented and controlled; and, (c) leader's Position-power: The extent to which the leader has authority to assess follower performance and give reward or punishment (Fiedler, 1964).

The best LPC approach depends on a combination of three. Generally, a high LPC approach is best when leader-member relations are poor, except when the task is unstructured and the leader is weak, in which a low LPC style is better. This approach seeks to identify the underlying beliefs about people, in particular whether the leader sees others as positive (high

LPC) or negative (low LPC). The neat trick of the model is to take someone where it would be very easy to be negative about them. This is another approach that uses task- vs. people-focus as a major categorization of the leader's style (Fiedler, 1967). The assumptions of the leaders prioritize between task-focus and people-focus, and that relationships, power and task structure are the three key factors that drive effective styles.

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory as it Relates to Directors of Bands

Leader-Member Exchange Theory, also called LMX or Vertical Dyad Linkage Theory, describes how leaders in groups maintain their position through a series of tacit exchange agreements with their members (Petri, 1991). In particular, leaders often have a special relationship with an inner circle of trusted lieutenants, assistants and advisors, to whom they give high levels of responsibility, decision influence, and access to resources. This in-group pays for their position. They work harder, are more committed to task objectives, and share more administrative duties. They are also expected to be fully committed and loyal to their leader. The out-group, on the other hand, is given low levels of choice or influence.

This also puts constraints upon the leader. They have to nurture the relationship with their inner circle whilst balancing giving them power with ensuring they do not have enough to strike out on their own. Successful members are thus similar in many ways to the leader (which perhaps explains why many senior teams are all white, male, middle-class and middle-aged). They work hard at building and sustaining trust and respect. To help this, they are empathetic, patient, reasonable, sensitive, and are good at seeing the viewpoint of other people (especially the leader). Aggression, sarcasm and an egocentric view are keys to the out-group wash-room (Petri, 1991).

The overall quality of the LMX relationship varies with several factors. Curiously, it is better when the challenge of the job is extremely high *or* extremely low. The size of the group, financial resource availability and the overall workload are also important. The principle works upwards as well. The leader also gains power by being a member of their manager's inner circle, which then can then share on downwards. People at the bottom of an organization with unusual power may get it from an unbroken chain of circles up to the hierarchy (Petri, 1991).

Path-Goal Theory of Leadership as it Relates to Directors of Bands

The Path-Goal Theory of Leadership was developed to describe the way that leaders encourage and support their followers in achieving the goals they have been set by making the path that they should take clear and easy. In particular, leaders: (a) clarify the path so subordinates know which way to go, (b) remove roadblocks that are stopping them going there, and (c) increasing the rewards along the route. Leaders can take a strong or limited approach in these. In clarifying the path, they may be directive or give vague hints. In removing roadblocks, they may scour the path or help the follower move the bigger blocks. In increasing rewards, they may give occasional encouragement or pave the way with gold (Evans, 1970).

This variation in approach will depend on the situation, including the follower's capability and motivation, as well as the difficulty of the job and other contextual factors. House and Mitchell (1974) describe four styles of leadership as listed below.

Supportive leadership. Considering the needs of the follower, showing concern for their welfare and creating a friendly working environment. This includes increasing the follower's self-esteem and making the job more interesting. This approach is best when the work is stressful, boring or hazardous (House & Mitchell, 1974).

Directive leadership. Telling followers what needs to be done and giving appropriate guidance along the way. This includes giving them schedules of specific work to be done at specific times. Rewards may also be increased as needed and role ambiguity decreased (by telling them what they should be doing). This may be used when the task is unstructured and complex and the follower is inexperienced. This increases the follower's sense of security and control and hence is appropriate to the situation (House & Mitchell, 1974).

Participative leadership. Consulting with followers and taking their ideas into account when making decisions and taking particular actions. This approach is best when the followers are expert and their advice is both needed and they expect to be able to give it (House & Mitchell, 1974).

Achievement-oriented leadership. Setting challenging goals, both in work and in self-improvement (and often together). High standards are demonstrated and expected. The leader shows faith in the capabilities of the follower to succeed. This approach is best when the task is complex (House & Mitchell, 1974).

Leaders who show the way and help followers along a path are effectively 'leading'. This approach assumes that there is one right way of achieving a goal and that the leader can see it and the follower cannot. This casts the leader as the knowing person and the follower as dependent. It also assumes that the follower is completely rational and that the appropriate methods can be deterministically selected depending on the situation (Evans, 1970).

Leadership Styles of Band Directors

When an organization needs a new direction or change, a re-focusing, or new energy, an appropriate leadership style should be chosen. The method used, ways of speaking, writing, building, living, or appearing is called style. Style is a technique of presentation. Among the

theories discussed earlier, there are several leadership styles which enhance organizational development such as, the charismatic leadership, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, participative leadership, Lewin's leadership style, Likert's leadership style, and situational leadership to assist with the process of success (Yukl, 2002).

Charismatic Leadership Style of Band Directors

The current theories of charismatic leadership were strongly influenced by the ideas of an early sociologist named Max Weber. Charisma is a Greek word that means "divinely inspired gift," such as the ability to perform miracles or predict future events. According to Weber, charisma occurs when there is a social crisis, the leader attracts followers who believe in the vision, they experience some successes that make the vision appear attainable, and the followers come to perceive the leader as extraordinary (Conger & Kanungo, 1998).

The Charismatic Leader gathers followers through personality and charm, rather than any form of external power or authority. It is interesting to watch a Charismatic Leader "working the room" as they move from person to person. They pay much attention to the person they are talking to at any one moment, making that person feel like they are, for that time, the most important person in the world. Charismatic Leaders pay a great deal of attention in scanning and reading their environment, and are good at picking up the moods and concerns of both individuals and larger audiences. They then will hone their actions and words to suit the situation (Yukl, 2002). Charismatic Leaders use a wide range of methods to manage their image and, if they are not naturally charismatic, may practice assiduously at developing their skills. They may engender trust through visible self-sacrifice and taking personal risks in the name of their beliefs. They will show great confidence in their followers. They are very persuasive and make very effective use of body language as well as verbal language (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Deliberate charisma is played out in a theatrical sense, where the leader is 'playing to the house' to create a desired effect. They also make effective use of storytelling, including the use of symbolism and metaphor. Many politicians use a charismatic style, as they need to gather a large number of followers. If you want to increase your charisma, studying videos of their speeches and the way they interact with others is a great source of learning. Religious leaders, too, may well use charisma, as do cult leaders (Conger & Kanungo, 1998).

Charismatic Leaders, who are building a group, whether it is a political party, a cult or a business team, will often focus strongly on making the group very clear and distinct, separating it from other groups. They will then build the image of the group, in particular in the minds of their followers, as being far superior to all others. The Charismatic Leader will typically attach themselves firmly to the identity of the group, such that to join the group is to become one with the leader. In doing so, they create an unchallengeable position for themselves (Robbin & Coulter, 2002).

Conger & Kanungo (1998) describe five behavioral attributes of Charismatic Leaders that indicate a more transformational viewpoint: (a) vision and articulation; (b) sensitivity to the environment; (c) sensitivity to member needs; (d) personal risk taking; and, (e) performing unconventional behavior.

Musser (1987) notes that charismatic leaders seek to instill both commitment to ideological goals and also devotion to themselves. The extent to which either of these two goals is dominant depends on the underlying motivations and needs of the leader. The Charismatic Leader and the Transformational Leader can have many similarities, in that the Transformational Leader may well be charismatic. Their main difference is in their basic focus. Whereas the Transformational Leader has a basic focus of transforming the organization and, quite possibly,

their followers, the Charismatic Leader may not want to change anything. Despite their charm and apparent concern, the Charismatic Leader may well be somewhat more concerned with themselves than anyone else (Robbin & Coulter, 2002).

The values of the Charismatic Leader are highly significant. If they are well-intentioned towards others, they can elevate and transform an entire company. If they are selfish and Machiavellian, they can create cults and effectively rape the minds (and potentially the bodies) of the followers (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). Their self-belief is so high, they can easily believe that they are infallible, and hence lead their followers into an abyss, even when they have received adequate warning from others. The self-belief can also lead them into psychotic narcissism, where their self-absorption or need for admiration and worship can lead to their followers questioning their leadership. They may also be intolerant of challengers and their irreplaceability (intentional or otherwise) can mean that there are no successors when they leave (Billick & Peterson, 2001).

The assumptions of the Charismatic Leadership are charm and grace which is needed to create followers. Self-belief is a fundamental need of leaders, and people follow others that they personally admire.

Transformational Leadership Style of Band Directors

Working for a Transformational Leader can be a wonderful and uplifting experience. They put passion and energy into everything. They care about you and want you to succeed. Transformational Leadership starts with the development of a vision, a view of the future that will excite and convert potential followers. This vision may be developed by the leader, by the senior team or may emerge from a broad series of discussions (Yukl, 2002).

The next step, which in fact never stops, is to constantly sell the vision. This takes energy and commitment, as few people will immediately buy into a radical vision, and some will join the show much more slowly than others. The Transformational Leader thus takes every opportunity and will use whatever works to convince others to climb on board the bandwagon. In order to create followers, the Transformational Leader has to be very careful in creating trust, and their personal integrity is a critical part of the package that they are selling. In effect, they are selling themselves as well as the vision (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

In parallel with the selling activity is seeking the way forward. Some Transformational Leaders know the way, and simply want others to follow them. Others do not have a ready strategy, but will happily lead the exploration of possible routes to the Promised Land. The route forwards may not be obvious and may not be plotted in details, but with a clear vision, the direction will always be known. Thus finding the way forward can be an ongoing process of course correction and the Transformational Leader will accept that there will be failures and blind canyons along the way. As long as they feel progress is being made, they will be happy (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

The final stage is to remain up-front and central during the action. Transformational Leaders are always visible and will stand up to be counted rather than hide behind their troops. They show by their attitudes and actions how everyone else should behave. They also make continued efforts to motivate and rally their followers, constantly doing the rounds, listening, soothing and enthusing. It is their unswerving commitment as much as anything else that keeps people going, particularly through the darker times when some may question whether the vision can ever be achieved. If the people do not believe that they can succeed, then their efforts will

flag. The Transformational Leader seeks to infect and reinfect their followers with a high level of commitment to the vision (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

One of the methods the Transformational Leader uses to sustain motivation is in the use of ceremonies, rituals and other cultural symbolism. Small changes get big hurrahs, uplifting their significance as indicators of real progress. Overall, they balance their attention between action that creates progress and the mental state of their followers. Perhaps more than other approaches, they are people-oriented and believe that success comes first and last through deep and sustained commitment (Kouzes & Posner, 1996).

The Transformational Leader seeks overtly to transform the organization; there is also a tacit promise to followers that they also will be transformed in some way, perhaps to be more like this amazing leader. In some respects, then, the followers are the product of the transformation. Transformational Leaders are often charismatic, but are not as narcissistic as pure Charismatic Leaders, who succeed through believing in themselves rather than a believing in others (Kouzes & Posner, 1996).

One of the traps of Transformational Leadership is that passion and confidence can easily be mistaken for truth and reality. Whilst it is true that great things have been achieved through enthusiastic leadership, it is also true that many passionate people have led the charge right over the cliff and into a bottomless chasm. Just because someone believes they are right, it does not mean they are right. Paradoxically, the energy that gets people going can also cause them to give up. Transformational Leaders often have large amounts of enthusiasm which, if relentlessly applied, can wear out their followers. Transformational Leaders also tend to see the big picture, but not the details, where the devil often lurks. If they do not have people to take care of this level of information, then they are usually doomed to fail. Finally, Transformational Leaders, by

definition, seek to transform. When the organization does not need transforming and people are happy as they are, then such a leader will be frustrated. Like wartime leaders, however, given the right situation they come into their own and can be personally responsible for saving entire companies (Kouzes & Posner, 1996).

The assumption of the Transformational Leadership is one that people will follow a person who inspires them. A person with vision and passion can achieve great things, and the way to get things done is by injecting enthusiasm and energy.

Transactional Leadership Style of Band Directors

The transactional leader works through creating clear structures whereby it is clear what is required of their subordinates, and the rewards that they get for following orders. Punishments are not always mentioned, but they are also well-understood and formal systems of discipline are usually in place. The early stage of Transactional Leadership is in negotiating the contract whereby the subordinate is given a salary and other benefits, and the company (and by implication the subordinate's manager) gets authority over the subordinate. When the Transactional Leader allocates work to a subordinate, they are considered to be fully responsible for it, whether or not they have the resources or capability to carry it out. When things go wrong, then the subordinate is considered to be personally at fault, and is punished for their failure (just as they are rewarded for succeeding) (Kouzes & Posner, 1996).

The transactional leader often uses management by exception, working on the principle that if something is operating to defined (and hence expected) performance then it does not need attention. Exceptions to expectation require praise and reward for exceeding expectation, whilst some kind of corrective action is applied for performance below expectation. Whereas Transformational Leadership has more of a "selling" style, Transactional Leadership, once the

contract is in place, takes a "telling" style. Transactional leadership is based in contingency, in that reward or punishment is contingent upon performance. Despite much research that highlights its limitations, Transactional Leadership is still a popular approach with many managers. Indeed, in the Leadership vs. Management spectrum, it is very much towards the management end of the scale (Thompson & Strickland, 2001).

The main limitation is the assumption of "rational man", a person who is largely motivated by money and simple reward, and hence whose behavior is predictable. The underlying psychology is Behaviorism, including the Classical Conditioning of Pavlov and Skinner's Operant Conditioning. These theories are largely based on controlled laboratory experiments (often with animals) and ignore complex emotional factors and social values. In practice, there is sufficient truth in Behaviorism to sustain Transactional approaches. This is reinforced by the supply-and-demand situation of much employment, coupled with the effects of deeper needs, as in Maslow's Hierarchy. When the demand for a skill outstrips the supply, then Transactional Leadership often is insufficient, and other approaches are more effective (Thompson & Strickland, 2001).

The assumptions of Transactional Leadership are where people are motivated by reward and punishment. Social systems work best with a clear chain of command. When people have agreed to do a job, a part of the deal is that they cede all authority to their manager. The prime purpose of a subordinate is to do what their manager tells them to do.

Participative Leadership Style of Band Directors

A Participative Leader, rather than taking autocratic decisions, seeks to involve other people in the process, possibly including subordinates, peers, superiors and other stakeholders. Often, however, as it is within the managers' whim to give or deny control to his or her

subordinates, most participative activity is within the immediate team. The question of how much influence others are given thus may vary on the manager's preferences and beliefs, and a whole spectrum of participation is possible.

There are many varieties on this spectrum, including stages where the leader sells the idea to the team. Another variant is for the leader to describe the "what" of objectives or goals and let the team or individuals decide the "how" of the process by which the 'how' will be achieved (this is often called 'Management by Objectives'). The level of participation may also depend on the type of decision being made. Decisions on how to implement goals may be highly participative, whilst decisions during subordinate performance evaluations are more likely to be taken by the manager (Hesselbein, Goldsmith & Beckhard, 1996).

There are many potential benefits of participative leadership, as indicated in the assumptions, below. This approach is also known as consultation, empowerment, joint decision-making, democratic leadership, Management By Objective (MBO) and power-sharing. Participative Leadership can be a sham when managers ask for opinions and then ignore them. This is likely to lead to cynicism and feelings of betrayal (Hesselbein, Goldsmith & Beckhard, 1996).

The assumption of the Participative Leadership includes involvement in decision-making which improves the understanding of the issues involved by those who must carry out the decisions. People are more committed to actions where they have involved in the relevant decision-making. People are less competitive and more collaborative when they are working on joint goals. When people make decisions together, the social commitment to one another is greater and thus increases their commitment to the decision. Several people deciding together make better decisions than one person alone (Hesselbein, Goldsmith & Beckhard, 1996).

Kurt Lewin and colleagues did leadership decision experiments in 1939 and identified three different styles of leadership, in particular around decision-making (Morgan, 1997).

Autocratic. In the autocratic style, the leader takes decisions without consulting with others. The decision is made without any form of consultation. In Lewin's experiments, he found that this caused the most level of discontent (Morgan, 1997). An autocratic style works when there is no need for input on the decision, where the decision would not change as a result of input, and where the motivation of people to carry out subsequent actions would not be affected whether they were or were not involved in the decision-making.

Democratic. In the democratic style, the leader involves the people in the decision-making, although the process for the final decision may vary from the leader having the final say to them facilitating consensus in the group. Democratic decision-making is usually appreciated by the people, especially if they have been used to autocratic decisions with which they disagreed. It can be problematic when there are a wide range of opinions and there is no clear way of reaching an equitable final decision (Morgan, 1997).

Laissez-Faire. The laissez-faire style is to minimize the leader's involvement in decision-making, and hence allowing people to make their own decisions, although they may still be responsible for the outcome. Laissez-faire works best when people are capable and motivated in making their own decisions, and where there is no requirement for a central coordination, for example in sharing resources across a range of different people and groups (Morgan 1997).

In Lewin, Lippit, and White's (1939) experiments, he discovered that the most effective style was Democratic. Excessive autocratic styles led to revolution, while under a Laissez-faire approach, people were not coherent in their work and did not put in the energy that they did

when being actively led. These experiments were actually done with groups of children, but were early in the modern era and were consequently highly influential (Northouse, 2004).

Likert's Leadership Styles of Band Directors

Rensis Likert identified four main styles of leadership, in particular around decision-making and the degree to which people are involved in the decision (Scott, Jaffe, & Tobe, 1993).

Exploitive authoritative. In this style, the leader has a low concern for people and uses such methods as threats and other fear-based methods to achieve conformance. Communication is almost entirely downwards and the psychologically distant concerns of people are ignored.

Benevolent authoritative. When the leader adds concern for people to an authoritative position, a "benevolent dictatorship" is formed. The leader now uses rewards to encourage appropriate performance and listens more to concerns lower down the organization, although what they hear is often rose-tinted, being limited to what their subordinates think that the boss wants to hear. Although there may be some delegation of decisions, almost all major decisions are still made centrally (Northouse, 2004).

Consultative. The upward flow of information here is still cautious and rose-tinted to some degree, although the leader is making genuine efforts to listen carefully to ideas. Nevertheless, major decisions are still largely centrally made.

Participative. At this level, the leader makes maximum use of participative methods, engaging people lower down the organization in decision-making. People across the organization are psychologically closer together and work well together at all levels. This is a classic 1960s through 1990s view in that it is still very largely top-down in nature, with the cautious addition collaborative elements towards the Utopian final state.

Situational Leadership Style of Band Directors

When a decision is needed, an effective leader does not just fall into a single preferred style, such as using transactional or transformational methods. In practice, as they say, things are not that simple (Morgan, 1997). Factors that affect situational decisions include motivation and capability of followers. This, in turn, is affected by factors within the particular situation. The relationship between followers and the leader may be another factor that affects leader behavior as much as it does follower behavior. The leaders' perception of the follower and the situation will affect what they do rather than the truth of the situation. The leader's perception of themselves and other factors such as stress and mood will also modify the leaders' behavior (Yukl, 2002).

Yukl (2002) seeks to combine other approaches and identifies six variables: (a) Subordinate effort: the motivation and actual effort expended; (b) subordinate ability and role clarity: followers knowing what to do and how to do it; (c) organization of the work: the structure of the work and utilization of resources; (d) cooperation and cohesiveness: of the group in working together; (e) resources and support: the availability of tools, materials, people, etc.; and, (f) external coordination: the need to collaborate with other groups.

Leaders here work on such factors as external relationships, acquisition of resources, managing demands on the group and managing the structures and culture of the group (Yukl, 2002). Tannenbaum and Schmidt (2001) identified three forces that led to the leader's action: the forces in the situation, the forces in then follower and also forces in the leader. This recognizes that the leader's style is highly variable, and even such distant events as a family argument can lead to the displacement activity of a more aggressive stance in an argument than usual. Maier (1963) noted that leaders not only consider the likelihood of a follower accepting a suggestion,

but also the overall importance of getting things done. Thus in critical situations, a leader is more likely to be directive in style simply because of the implications of failure. The assumption is that the best action of the leader depends on a range of situational factors.

Vision for the Band Program

A vision should be simple and idealistic, a picture of a desirable future, not a complex plan with quantitative objectives and detailed action steps. The vision should appeal to the values, hopes, and ideals of band members and other stakeholders whose support is needed (Bolman & Deal, 2003). The vision should emphasize distant ideological objectives rather than immediate tangible benefits. The vision should be challenging but realistic (Yukl, 2002). To be meaningful and credible, it should not be a wishful fantasy, but rather an attainable future grounded in the present reality. The vision should address basic assumptions, about what is important for the band program, how it should relate to the environment and how people should be treated (Yukl, 2002). The vision should be focused enough to guide decisions and actions, but general enough to allow initiative and creativity in the strategies for attaining goals and objectives of the band program (Nannus, 1992).

Conclusion

The Directors of Bands leadership is functioning in an environment of unprecedented turbulence and change, technology, education, business, and political sectors all must understand leadership theories, styles, and visioning. How leadership in the band program is conceptualized has important implications for theory, style, visioning, and research (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Much of the leadership research has been influenced by the implicit assumption that effective leadership can be explained in terms of dyadic influence by a heroic leader. A leader who exemplifies influence, theories of change, the change system, how to manage the process, and

one who gains the respect of other people is considered one who will contribute and strengthen the band organizational leadership. Theories guide what people actually will do, styles guide new direction, change, re-focusing, and new energy. Lastly, visioning is addressing the basic assumptions, about what is important for the band program, how it relates to the environment, and how people should be treated, and a picture of a desirable future (Yukl, 2002). The leadership is responsible for setting the vision for the band program and where there is no vision the band will perish.

References

Argyris, G., & Schon, D.A. (1996). *Organizational learning II: Theory, method, and practice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bandura, A. (1989). *Principles of behavior modification*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Billick, B., & Peterson, J.A. (2001). *Competitive leadership: Twelve principles for success*. Chicago: Triumph Books.

Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership*. (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Chawla, S., & Renesch, J. (Ed.). (1995). *Learning organizations: Developing cultures for tomorrow in the workplace*. Portland, OR: Productivity Press.

Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (Ed.). (1998). *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Evans, M.G. (1970). The effect of supervisory behavior on the path-goal relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 5, 277-298.

Fiedler, F.E. (1986). The contribution of cognitive resources of leadership performance. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. New York: Academic Press.

Fiedler, F.E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psycholog*y. New York: Academic Press.

Fiedler, F.E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fishbein, & Ajzen. (2000). *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Graen, G., & Cashman, J.F. (2001). A role making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J.G. Hunt and L.L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership frontiers*, Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

Hesselbein, F., Godsmith, M., & Beckhard, R. (1996). *Leadership of the future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hickson, D.J., Hinigs, C.R., Lee, C. A., Schneck, R.S., & Pennings, J.M. (1971). A strategic contingencies theory of intra-organizational power. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 16*, 216-229.

Higgins, E.T. (1989). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review, 94*, 319-340.

Homans, G.C. (1961). *Social behavior*. New York: Harcourt Brace and World.

House, R.J., & Mitchell, T.R. (1974, Fall). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Contemporary Business,* 3, 81-98.

Jecker, J., & Landy, D. (2003). Likin a person as function of doing him a favor. *Human Relations, 22*, 371-378.

Kauzes, J.M., & Posner, B.A. (1996). *The leadership challenge.* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Latane, B., & Wolf, S. (1981). The social impact of majorities and minorities. *Psychological Review, 88*, 438-453.

Lewin, K., Lippit, R., & White, R.K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271-301

Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: Its management and value*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Maier, N.R.F. (1963). *Problem-solving discussions and conferences: Leadership methods and skills.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

McCall, M.W. Jr., & Lombardo, M.M. (1983). *Off the track: Why and how successful executives get derailed.* Greensboro, NC: Centre for Creative Leadership.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw Hill.

McGuire, W.J. (1968). Personality and attitude change: An information processing theory. In A.G. Greewald, T.C. Brock, and T.M. Ostrom (Eds.), *Psychological foundations of attitudes* (pp. 171-196). San Diego: Academic Press.

Moscovici, S. (1984). The phenomenon of social representations. In R.M. Farr and S. Moscovici (Eds.), *Social Representations*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organization.* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Musser, S.J. (1987). *The determination of positive and negative charismatic leadership*, Grantham: PA: Messiah College.

Nannus, B. (1992). *Visionary leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Northouse, P.G. (2004). *Leadership theory and practice*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
      Publication.

Petri, H. (1991). *Motivation: Theory, research and application* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA:
      Wadsworth.

Publication manual of the American Psychological Association. (5th ed.). (2001). Washington,
      DC: American Psychological Association.

Robbins, S.P., & Coulter, M. (2002). *Management* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-
      Hall, Inc.

Sawyer, A.G. (1981). Repetition, cognitive responses and persuasion. In R.E. Petty, T.M.
      Ostrom and T.C. Brock (Eds.), *Cognitive responses in persuasion* (pp. 237-261).
      Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Scott, C.D., Jaff, D.T., & Tobe, G.R. (1993). *Organizational vision, values and mission*.
      (Workbook). Boston: Thompson.

Senge, P.M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*.
      London: Random House.

Street, R.L., & Giles, H. (1982). Speech accommodation theory: A social cognitive approach to
      language and speech behavior. In M. Roloff and C.R. Berger (Eds.), *Social cognition and
      communication* (pp. 193-226). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Tannenbaum, A.S. and Schmitt, W.H. (1958, March-April). How to choose a leadership pattern.
      Harvard Business Review, 36, 95-101

Thompson, A.A., & Strickland, A.J. (2001). *Strategic management: Concepts and cases* (12th
      ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations*. (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.