

The Routinization of Charisma:
Leader-Follower Relationships in the Suzuki Association of the Americas

by
Christina Rowan

An honors thesis submitted to the
Organizational Studies Program
University of Michigan

Winter 2013

Thesis supervisor: Michael Heaney

In 1978, one hundred Japanese students joined together with one hundred American students — all musically trained by the Suzuki method — for a tour of three “friendship concerts.” An emerging music education movement originating in Japan, the Suzuki method was based on the idea that all children can develop musical ability. After presenting numerous concerts in the United States with only Japanese students, it was Dr. Shinichi Suzuki’s dream to see an equal number of American and Japanese students perform together.¹ Made possible by the financial backing of David Smith, these students performed at the Kennedy Center, Carnegie Hall, and Atlanta Symphony Hall. While in Atlanta, Smith drew up a series of documents to establish a franchising system for the Suzuki method in the United States. Smith met in private with Dr. Suzuki, founder of the Suzuki method, saying, “We’d like to franchise the Suzuki method in the United States. Would you please sign this paper?”² Dr. Suzuki did not have any lawyers with him; no aids, no one. He was a very trusting man. Dr. Suzuki signed the paper.

At the time of this meeting, the Suzuki Association of the Americas (SAA), the organization dedicated to promoting and supporting the spread of Dr. Suzuki’s method in the Americas, was six years old. Soon after Dr. Suzuki’s meeting with Smith, William Starr and Sandy Reuning, two trusted members of the SAA, rode in a cab with Dr. Suzuki and his wife, Waltraud Suzuki. Dr. Suzuki pulled out the paper saying, “Mr. Smith just did this wonderful thing for me.” Starr and Reuning looked at the documents and panicked. “Dr. Suzuki, what did you do?” they asked. “You’re signing away your control of everything!” Fortunately, Dr. Suzuki signed on the wrong line. Instead of signing by his name, he signed by somebody else’s.

¹ Hermann, *Shinichi Suzuki*, 59.

² Throughout his biography on the Suzuki Association of the Americas’ website, Shinichi Suzuki is referred to as “Dr. Suzuki.” In order to be consistent with the SAA, I have chosen to address Suzuki as “Dr. Suzuki” throughout this thesis as well. Dr. Suzuki has received several honorary doctorates in music including from the New England Conservatory of Music and the Oberlin Conservatory of Music. “Shinichi Suzuki.” *Suzuki Association of the Americas*, accessed December 28, 2013, <http://suzukiassociation.org/teachers/twinkler/suzuki>.

Dr. Suzuki destroyed the paperwork and was warned by Reuning and Starr not to blindly trust other offers to control and expand the Suzuki method. The next summer, there was an international Suzuki conference in San Francisco. At that time, papers were drawn up to give the SAA exclusive rights to Dr. Suzuki's name and method in the United States, Canada, North America, and South America. Dr. Suzuki signed these papers as well — this time on the correct line.³

Everyone who knew Dr. Suzuki agreed he was an inspirational figure – a loving, caring, and trusting person. In the words of an SAA member, “Dr. Suzuki had an unfathomable wisdom and an enormous heart and there aren't words to say it better than that.”⁴ With this genuine disposition, Dr. Suzuki attracted a large number of followers dedicated to learning about and spreading his method of music education. Dr. Suzuki was a celebrity in the music world. His followers visited his hometown in Japan and took advantage of any and all opportunities to observe him teach. The extent of Dr. Suzuki's stardom was illustrated at an international Suzuki conference when a fan ran up an aisle to grab Dr. Suzuki's cigarette butt and ran off with it squealing, “I got it, I got it!”⁵ Dr. Suzuki was undoubtedly a charismatic figure.

How is it possible to take an inspiring leader with such innovative ideas and embody that in a formalized organization? Can an organization form around a leader so focused on philosophy and naive of business practices? Furthermore, what happens to this organization once the leader — the inspiration — is gone? A case study on the Suzuki movement serves to

³ Interview with SAA violin committee member 2, October 9, 2013. All interviews were conducted in confidentiality, and the names of interviewees are withheld by mutual agreement. Interviewees may be former or current members of the stated SAA committee.

⁴ Interview with SAA violin committee member 1, October 8, 2013.

⁵ Ibid.

address these questions. The International Suzuki Association (ISA) and five regional Suzuki associations successfully honored and promoted Dr. Suzuki's vision throughout his life. Fifteen years after Dr. Suzuki's death, these organizations continue to find success and ensure that the Suzuki method maintains a strong presence in the music education world. This thesis addresses how the SAA in particular dealt with the death and subsequent absence of Dr. Suzuki, the charismatic leader of the Suzuki method. I argue that various committees within the SAA handled the transition after Dr. Suzuki's death differently, and these differences can be explained by variations in charismatic leader-follower relationships.

The questions regarding charismatic leadership and the routinization of charisma are not unique to the SAA, but are common questions for all types of organizations. From religious movements to political parties to corporations, charismatic leadership is a prominent phenomenon in the organizational world.⁶ Over time, Max Weber and other scholars have developed several theories on charismatic leadership and the routinization of charisma, theories that have been applied to many organizations over the past fifty years. By applying these theories to the SAA, I provide a framework for the analysis of the organization's transition after Dr. Suzuki's death.

In this thesis, I first discuss the existing literature on charisma and the routinization of charisma from Weber and other scholars. I then give an overview of Dr. Suzuki's life and method of music education, as well as a brief history of the movement that formed around his work and the organizations created to promote his vision. Next, I detail the research design I use to assess the SAA's transition after Dr. Suzuki's death. I then present the findings of four case

⁶ Jesus, Adolf Hitler, and Kenneth Lay are examples of charismatic leaders in these three types of organizations, respectively. Piovenelli, "Jesus' Charismatic Authority," 395; Horn, "Writing Hitler's Biography," 96; Tourish and Vatcha, "Charismatic Leadership and Corporate Cultism," 455.

studies of different committees within the SAA followed by a comparative analysis of the results. Finally, I present potential implications of my findings to the SAA as well as charismatic organizations in general.

The Routinization of Charisma

Max Weber coined the term *charismatic authority* in his discussion of the three types of legitimate domination. As opposed to rational authority and traditional authority, charismatic authority is based on devotion to an individual that exhibits *charisma*, a personality quality considered to be extraordinary or superhuman.⁷ According to Weber, charismatic authority is derived from the recognition of the public, recognition that is freely given without duty or obligation. Contrary to popular usage, Weber reserves the use of *charisma* for those who seek to change an aspect of society, those who have a vision that things cannot go on as they are and something must be done.⁸ Through this personality trait alone, a charismatic leader is able to attract a following of people strongly committed to his or her vision.

Weber labels an organized group subject to charismatic authority a *charismatic community*.⁹ There is no hierarchy in this community, only the call of the leader. There are no formal rules, and each judgment is made on a case-by-case basis. In any given charismatic community, there is a *charismatic administrative staff*, chosen because of an unquestioned devotion to the charismatic leader.¹⁰ Technical training is not important as long as the

⁷ Weber, *Economy and Society*, 241.

⁸ Swedberg, *Idea of Economic Society*, 64.

⁹ Weber, *Economy and Society*, 243.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

charismatic administration shares the vision of the leader. With this informal organizational structure, Weber describes the charismatic authority as an anti-economic force, one that cares little for economic matters. According to Weber, a charismatic leader despises “traditional or rational everyday economizing, the attainment of a regular income by continuous economic activity devoted to this end.”¹¹ Because charisma is more than everyday life, the charismatic community is unstable.

Because of this instability, Weber argues that a charismatic authority structure must be radically changed — either traditionalized or rationalized — in order to become permanent. In Weber’s words, the charisma must be *routinized*.¹² The routinization of charisma is primarily driven by two forces: finding a successor to the charismatic leader and adjusting to the forces of everyday economic life.¹³ Weber lays out six solutions to finding a successor: (1) a search for a new charismatic leader, (2) designation by the original charismatic leader, (3) designation by the charismatic administration, (4) revelation by an oracle, (5) hereditary succession, and (6) transmitting charisma to the successor by ritual.¹⁴ In addition, Weber predicts that recruitment processes will become increasingly routinized and individual positions in the organization will be created with corresponding economic advantages for its members. Generally, Weber argues that the anti-economic character of the charismatic community must transition to become an everyday phenomenon.

Much scholarship has expanded on Weber’s idea of charismatic authority and scholars have sought to specifically define the traits of a charismatic leader. Despite many attempts, there

¹¹ Weber, *Economy and Society*, 244.

¹² *Ibid.*, 243.

¹³ Swedberg, *Idea of Economic Sociology*, 64.

¹⁴ Weber, *Economy and Society*, 246-49.

has yet to be a consensus on the personality characteristics that qualify a leader as charismatic and many researchers suggest that a single charismatic temperament does not exist.¹⁵ In the absence of a unified charismatic temperament, scholars have theorized about distinct types of charismatic leaders. Jane Howell argues that the key distinction in charismatic leaders lies in the leaders' motivations. From this, she suggests two types of charismatic leaders: personalized and socialized.¹⁶ Personalized leaders emphasize *personal identification* – an attachment to the leader himself – as the means for a strong following. Socialized leaders, on the other hand, rely on *value internalization* – follower agreement on the core values of the movement – as the primary mode of social influence.¹⁷ While the visions of personalized leaders are based on personal values, those of socialized leaders are influenced by the followers in the movement.¹⁸ Boas Shamir validates Howell's distinctions between personal identification and value internalization and develops her work further with the addition of the concept of *social identification* – the desire for a follower to become involved in the charismatic movement for social benefits such as the affirmation of social identities.¹⁹

By solely focusing on the role of the leader, however, the work of Howell and many others has been criticized as an over-simplified and narrow account of charismatic leadership. These critics argue that the concept of charismatic leadership can be better understood by the

¹⁵ e.g. Weierter, "Follow the Leader"; Bass, "Leadership and Performance"; Klein & House, "On Fire"; Shamir, House, and Arthur, "Motivational Effects."

¹⁶ Howell, "Two Faces of Charisma," 218-19.

¹⁷ Ibid., 219-20.

¹⁸ Ibid., 223.

¹⁹ Shamir, "The Charismatic Relationship," 95.

relationships between charismatic leaders and followers.²⁰ Stuart Weierter focuses on leader-follower relationships, suggesting that Howell's distinctions of socialized and personalized leaders can be reframed as relationships. Thus, Weierter introduces the personalized relationship, in which the follower passively accepts the charismatic leader's values without question, and the socialized relationship, in which the follower plays an active role in defining the values of the charismatic leader.²¹

In examining charismatic leadership, scholars also theorize about the future of a charismatic movement once the leader is gone. Harrison M. Trice and Janice M. Beyer generalize that the routinization of charisma is aided by: (1) development of an administration to enact the charismatic message; (2) transformation and transference of personal charisma via rites, ceremonials, and symbols; (3) incorporation of the charismatic message into tradition; (4) selection of a charismatic successor; and (5) continuity and cohesion of the charismatic mission.²² Each type of charismatic relationship, however, requires different mechanisms for routinization and, thus, results in different types of transitional periods once the charismatic leader is gone.²³ Because explanations that stress personal identification with the leader imply follower dependence on the leader, it is theorized that there will be a sense of crisis once the leader has left. Explanations that emphasize value internalization imply the need for the transference of charisma to another figure following the disappearance of the leader. Shamir adds a scenario, arguing that in cases of leader-follower relationships rooted in value

²⁰ e.g. Weierter, "Follow the Leader"; Bass, "Leadership and Performance"; Klein & House, "On Fire"; Shamir, House, and Arthur, "Motivational Effects."

²¹ Weierter, "Follow the Leader," 175.

²² Trice and Beyer, "Charisma and its Routinization," 144-54.

²³ Weierter, "Follow the Leader," 187.

internalization and social identification, the charisma may transfer to a social role, group, or organization with the same values as the charismatic leader.²⁴

While theories focused on the relationships between the leader and followers are more thorough than those that solely revolve around the leader, these theories imply that within a given movement or organization, all followers have the same relationship with the charismatic leader. These scholars focus on categorizing charismatic movements as being based on either socialized or personalized leader-follower relationships. Likewise, when developing theories on the routinization of charisma after the loss of the charismatic leader, the organization or movement is analyzed as one entity.²⁵ Charismatic movements or organizations are not analyzed as having combinations of leader-follower relationships. These distinct categorizations make it possible to generate theories on the differences in the routinization of charisma for various charismatic organizations. Kurt Lewin, Ronald Lippitt, and Ralph K. White, for example, interpret the sense of crisis that followers face in the absence of their authoritarian leaders as the result of personalized leader-follower relationships, with the assumption that all followers exhibit this relationship with the charismatic leader.²⁶

In large movements and organizations with hundreds, thousands, or even millions of followers, however, it is unrealistic to assume that all followers will have the same relationship with the charismatic leader. Participation in the same charismatic movement or organization does not guarantee similar motivations for involvement. In any given charismatic movement, it is possible to see a combination of follower motivations including, but not limited to, personal

²⁴ Shamir, "The Charismatic Relationship," 97.

²⁵ e.g. Weierter, "Follow the Leader."

²⁶ Lewin, Lippitt, and White, "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior," 287-88.

identification, value internalization, and social identification. Larger organizations are likely to have several departments and branches with varying amounts of contact with the charismatic leader, creating the opportunity for the presence of more than one leader-follower relationship within the organization.

In this thesis, I argue that there is the potential for multiple leader-follower relationships in any given charismatic organization or movement. Therefore, instead of analyzing charismatic organizations as a whole, it may be more useful to separate the organization into smaller units of analysis.²⁷ Depending on which motivations outlined by Shamir are salient for followers of different departments (personal identification, value internalization, and/or social identification), different leader-follower relationships will exist.²⁸

Because a given charismatic organization may not necessarily exhibit only one type of leader-follower relationship, the aftermath of the loss of the charismatic leader may not be analyzed in terms of the organization as a whole, but must be examined on the departmental level. I argue that the departments in a charismatic organization that exhibit different leader-follower relationships may also experience different transitions after the absence of the charismatic leader. Specifically, as Shamir predicts an easier transition for organizations based on socialized leader-follower relationships than those based on personalized relationships, I argue that departments based on socialized relationships may experience easier success in the process of the routinization of charisma than those based on personalized relationships.²⁹

²⁷ “Departments” will hereafter be used to signify the smaller units of a charismatic organization. “Departments” may refer to departments, branches, committees, or other ways that an organization may be logically broken down.

²⁸ Shamir, “The Charismatic Relationship,” 94.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 97.

A Short History of the Suzuki Movement

Shinichi Suzuki is not a typical icon in the music education world. He was not a child prodigy; he did not study music education in school. Dr. Suzuki was born in 1898 in Nagoya, Japan. As the son of the founder of the largest violin factory in the world, the Suzuki Violin Factory, he was exposed to the violin throughout his childhood.³⁰ Dr. Suzuki went to Nagoya Commercial School and worked in his father's factory during the summers in preparation of taking over the violinmaking business.³¹ Despite his constant exposure, he considered the violin a toy, not a musical instrument, for the majority of his childhood. Dr. Suzuki did not develop an interest in music until age seventeen when he heard a recording of Mischa Elman performing Schubert's Ave Maria, a defining moment in his life. Elman's playing inspired Dr. Suzuki to see the violin differently, not as a toy, but as an instrument capable of producing beautiful sounds. The very next day, Dr. Suzuki brought a violin home from his father's factory and began to teach himself to play by imitating recordings of Elman.³² It was from these humble and unconventional beginnings that one of the most influential music pedagogues emerged.

Once Dr. Suzuki discovered his passion for music, his incredible journey to stardom began. In his autobiography, *Nurtured By Love*, Dr. Suzuki credits his father and the works of Tolstoy for instilling in him the value of meekness, which he claims to have opened his destiny.³³ Despite his self-proclaimed subpar performance ability, his passion and work ethic resulted in many opportunities. These opportunities began at age 21, when he was invited to go to Tokyo

³⁰ Suzuki, *Nurtured By Love*, 57.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 58.

³² *Ibid.*, 57.

³³ *Ibid.*, 72.

and take formal lessons in violin, music theory, and acoustics.³⁴ One year later, he moved to Germany to continue his violin studies.³⁵ Dr. Suzuki traveled for months to hear all violinists in the area in search of the perfect teacher, settling on Professor Karl Klinger of the Klinger Quartet.³⁶ During his time in Germany, Dr. Suzuki's connections led him to a close friendship with Dr. Albert Einstein.³⁷ After over eight years, Dr. Suzuki moved back to Tokyo and began teaching young children to play the violin.

Through these experiences, Dr. Suzuki developed his own philosophy of music education. In 1945, after working in a wood factory for the duration of World War II, he was invited to teach at the Matsumoto Music School. Dr. Suzuki accepted this position on the condition that he be allowed to teach using his own philosophy. It was here that the Talent Education Movement, led by Dr. Suzuki, began.³⁸ Dr. Suzuki based his philosophy on the idea that every child can develop musical ability if brought up in the right environment. Dr. Suzuki modeled his method after language acquisition, reasoning that if all children can learn to speak their native language, then all children can learn to play the violin with enough listening, repetition, and encouragement. Dr. Suzuki deeply believed that talent is not inherited, but is acquired through experience and practice. "Talent Education," better known as the "Suzuki method," is designed to appeal to all children, not solely those striving to become professional

³⁴ Suzuki, *Nurtured By Love*, 70-71.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 72.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 73.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 75.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 22.

musicians.³⁹ Inspired by the Nagoya Commercial School's motto "First character, then ability," Dr. Suzuki aimed to enrich people's lives and make them more understanding and sensitive human beings through the study of music.⁴⁰ In his words, "Music exists for the purpose of growing an admirable heart."⁴¹

After developing this guiding philosophy, the next step for the growth and spread of the Suzuki method was to create written materials to form a unified curriculum. The structure of the method books and the order in which concepts are presented was determined by Dr. Suzuki through his many years of teaching experience using his own research and pedagogical ideas.⁴² Even when the method books were written, however, Dr. Suzuki continued to invent and try new ideas. The spirit of experimentation and innovation was a vital part of his process. According to a member of the SAA violin committee, "He was often found saying 'Suzuki tomorrow is not going to be the same as Suzuki today. I'm always experimenting.'"⁴³ In this spirit, Dr. Suzuki acknowledged the need for the method books to be revised and insisted that such decisions be made by the ISA with international support. According to one violin committee member, "In the laws of the ISA, it says you cannot make any changes in the core materials unless that decision is made by the ISA instrument committee."⁴⁴

³⁹ "About the Suzuki Method." *Suzuki Association of the Americas*, accessed December 28, 2013, <http://suzukiassociation.org/teachers/twinkler>.

⁴⁰ Suzuki, *Nurtured By Love*, 65.

⁴¹ "Top 21 Shinichi Suzuki Quotes." *Music in Practice*, last modified September 13, 2011, <http://musicinpractice.com/2011/music>.

⁴² "Shinichi Suzuki." *Suzuki Association of the Americas*, accessed December 28, 2013, <http://suzukiassociation.org/teachers/twinkler/suzuki>.

⁴³ Interview with SAA violin committee member 2, October 9, 2013.

⁴⁴ Interview with SAA violin committee member 4, October 11, 2013.

In addition to his guiding philosophy on music education, Dr. Suzuki had a unique style of teaching, one that utilized humor, joy, and enthusiasm. One violin committee member recalled, “Sometimes Suzuki would give a very funny, bad example and everyone would laugh. And that was good because this meant there wasn’t any tension. He would follow the funny example with something correct, but there was always happiness in the lessons.”⁴⁵ While positivity and encouragement are key aspects of Dr. Suzuki’s philosophy, his specific style of teaching cannot be perfectly replicated, even by the teachers who spent years observing his teaching. Every teacher has a distinct personal teaching style. According to a member of the cello committee, “Dr. Suzuki was known to say that he was the only one who could truly teach the Suzuki method; everyone else teaches their own variation inspired by the Suzuki method.”⁴⁶

By the late 1950s, Dr. Suzuki’s method was gaining success and popularity. After becoming aware of the philosophy, John Kendall, a highly recognized string pedagogue in the United States, wrote several letters to Dr. Suzuki. In 1959, he was presented with a grant and invited to Japan to observe Dr. Suzuki and witness the Talent Education movement firsthand. Five years later, Kendall organized the first tour of the United States for Dr. Suzuki and ten of his Japanese students.⁴⁷ The students performed at many of the top music schools in the United States, including the Oberlin Conservatory, the Eastman School of Music, and the Juilliard School of Music, gaining recognition and support from world-renowned performers and music educators in the United States. These early supporters contacted Dr. Suzuki and made arrangements to observe and study with him in Japan. The second and third United States tours

⁴⁵ Interview with SAA violin committee member 3, October 10, 2013.

⁴⁶ SAA member, telephone conversation with author, August 27, 2013.

⁴⁷ “Suzuki Community Mourns the Loss of Leader and Mentor, John Kendall.” *Suzuki Association of the Americas*, last modified March 25, 2011. <http://suzukiassociation.org/news/suzuki-community-mourns-loss-leader-mentor-2>.

occurred in 1966 and 1967 respectively and international Suzuki conferences, workshops, and summer institutes were organized. Thus began the expansion of the Suzuki method into the United States.

In the early 1970s, John Kendall, William Starr, Louise Behrend, and Sandy Reuning, all key forces in establishing the Suzuki method in the United States, discussed establishing an association in the United States dedicated to promoting and spreading the Suzuki Method.⁴⁸ With the consent and support of Dr. Suzuki, the SAA was created in 1972.⁴⁹ In 1983, the ISA was founded.⁵⁰ The ISA serves as the headquarters of a coalition of five regional associations around the world. The regional associations include the SAA, overseeing North and South America; the European Suzuki Association (ESA), overseeing Europe, Africa, and the Middle East; the Asia Suzuki Association (ASA), overseeing Asia with the exception of Japan; the Pan Pacific Suzuki Association (PPSA), overseeing Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific Islands; and the Talent Education Research Institute (TERI), overseeing Japan. These associations have the exclusive rights to the use of Dr. Suzuki's name and the Suzuki method trademark.⁵¹ Together, these associations serve to promote the Suzuki method around the world by creating method books and training teachers in Dr. Suzuki's philosophy.

While Dr. Suzuki developed his philosophy and method based on the violin, the Suzuki method has been applied to several other instruments. Currently, there are thirteen instrument groups represented in the ISA: violin, viola, cello, bass, guitar, flute, recorder, piano, organ, harp,

⁴⁸ Interview with SAA violin committee member 2, October 9, 2013.

⁴⁹ "About." *Suzuki Association of the Americas*, accessed December 15, 2013. <http://suzukiassociation.org/about>.

⁵⁰ "About the ISA." *International Suzuki Association*, accessed December 15, 2013. <http://internationalsuzuki.org/about>.

⁵¹ Ibid.

voice, mandolin, and trumpet.⁵² Each of these instrument groups has developed, or is in the process of developing, its own method books and teacher-training process modeled after the violin instrument group. The various instrument groups have joined the ISA at different times since its founding, with the most recent instrument group, the trumpet, becoming officially recognized in 2011.⁵³

Unfortunately, Dr. Suzuki was not able to see the full extent of his method's success. In 1998, at the age of 99, Dr. Suzuki passed away.⁵⁴ The continuation of his legacy and philosophy was left to the ISA and regional associations, who were left without their leader, their inspiration. The death of Dr. Suzuki posed several questions for the existing organizations. How can the Suzuki method continue to grow and improve without Dr. Suzuki? Is it ethical for the associations to make changes to the method books without Dr. Suzuki's approval? How will the public react to the associations' efforts without Dr. Suzuki? Were different instrument groups affected differently by Dr. Suzuki's death? If so, why? This thesis addresses these complex questions.

Research Design and Hypotheses

In order to examine the effect of Dr. Suzuki's death on the organizations that promote his work, I focus on the differences in the processes of the various instrument committees. Each

⁵² "International Instrument Committees." *International Suzuki Association*, accessed December 20, 2013. http://internationalsuzuki.org/instrument_committees.

⁵³ "Suzuki Trumpet." *European Suzuki Association*, accessed December 26, 2013. <http://europeansuzuki.org/instruments.asp?instrument=16&suzuki=Trumpet>.

⁵⁴ "Shinichi Suzuki." *Suzuki Association of the Americas*, accessed December 28, 2013. <http://suzukiassociation.org/teachers/twinkler/suzuki>.

regional association has one committee for each of the thirteen instrument groups.⁵⁵ While each instrument committee is responsible for both overseeing the teacher-training process and developing the repertoire for the instrument, the committees have recently focused primarily on developing the repertoire. Although each regional association has a committee for each instrument, all final decisions must be approved by the respective ISA instrument committee, made up of representatives from each of the regions. Each instrument group has a unique history and structure, and Dr. Suzuki's death affected the processes of each instrument committee differently.

Although the Suzuki method is supported by a network of organizations, this study focuses on the instrument committees in the SAA. The SAA provides a valid focus of the study: a study broad enough to compare the effects of Dr. Suzuki's death on different instrument groups, but narrow enough to avoid confounding effects from cultural differences. As the original association created to support Dr. Suzuki's work, the SAA provides a comprehensive view on the transition from Dr. Suzuki's initial leadership to the current organizational structure.

In order to compare how different instrument groups dealt with the transition after Dr. Suzuki's death, I chose a representative sample of four instrument groups to study in-depth. Violin, cello, guitar, and bass were chosen as the instrument groups, based on the year the instrument group was recognized by the ISA. By choosing a sample that represents the original instrument group, instrument groups founded during Dr. Suzuki's life, and instrument groups founded close to or after Dr. Suzuki's death, the study allows for a comparison of committees, each with a unique relationship with Dr. Suzuki.

⁵⁵ Some of the recently developing instrument groups only have committees in one or two of the regional associations. For example, only the SAA and ESA have a committee for the mandolin.

In order to gain insight into the organizational processes and difficulties of these four SAA instrument committees, I conducted interviews with several past and current members. In total, I spoke with fourteen SAA members including four violin committee members, two cello committee members, five guitar committee members, and two bass committee members. The interviews aimed to gain an understanding of each committee's history and relationship with Dr. Suzuki. The open-ended questions served to discover the structure, decision-making processes, and difficulties of each committee before and after Dr. Suzuki's death within the context of each committee's unique history.⁵⁶

In analyzing the interviews, I assessed how the instrument groups were affected by Dr. Suzuki's death by examining three variables: the committee's internal difficulties during the revision process, external resistance to the revision process, and change in the organizational structure of the committee. These variables address concerns for organizations in the routinization process, which Weber claims is "not free of conflict."⁵⁷ First, the ideal and material interests of the followers may not align, which becomes evident when facing the problem of succession in the absence of the charismatic leader.⁵⁸ The variable of internal difficulties in the revision process addresses this concern. In addition, the transfer of authority to a successor may lead to resistance from the outside community, as the charisma of the original leader is not easily forgotten.⁵⁹ The variable of external resistance to the revision process addresses this danger. Finally, in the process of routinization, the organization may be restructured, either transferring

⁵⁶ The interview questions are included in Appendix A.

⁵⁷ Weber, *Economy and Society*, 252.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 246.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 252.

charisma to a successor, a social group, or the organizational structure itself.⁶⁰ The variable of change in the organizational structure of the committee addresses this possibility. Committees with higher levels of internal difficulties during the revision process, external resistance during the revision process, and change in organizational structure are assessed as experiencing a more difficult routinization process.

In order to identify the key causes for the differences in the routinization process, I considered three factors: the age of the instrument group, the amount of contact with Dr. Suzuki, and the organizational structure of the instrument group when creating the original method books. The age of the committee refers to how established the instrument group is, considering both the year in which each instrument group was recognized by the SAA and the year in which the instrument committee was formed. The amount of contact with Dr. Suzuki considers Dr. Suzuki's involvement in the committee itself as well as his contact with the members of the committee. The committee organizational structure addresses whether there was a clear leader of the committee at the time that the method books were originally created, or whether the repertoire was developed by consensus.

These three variables are interconnected and were chosen in order to identify the type of charismatic leader-follower relationship each instrument committee exhibits with Dr. Suzuki. In general, the more established the instrument committee is, the greater contact with Dr. Suzuki. More contact with Dr. Suzuki often results in a less collective decision-making process in the committee. Although interconnected, the amount of contact with the charismatic leader is arguably the most important variable as it directly implies the type of leader-follower relationship. Based on existing scholarship on charismatic leader-follower relationships and the

⁶⁰ Swedberg, *Idea of Economic Society*, 65.

routinization of charisma, I predict that being a more established instrument group, having significant contact with Dr. Suzuki, and having a clear leader when creating the original materials of the method are positively correlated with the internal difficulties within the instrument committee during the revision process, external resistance to revising the original repertoire, and amount of change in the organizational structure of the instrument committee.

Four Case Studies

In order to draw conclusions on the effects of Dr. Suzuki's death on different instrument committees, I discuss the data from the interviews of the four instrument groups individually, beginning with the violins. These evaluations are organized in terms of the three independent variables and the three dependent variables detailed above.

Violin

As the original instrument to use the Suzuki method, the violin is the oldest and most established instrument group in the SAA. In fact, the Suzuki method was being formed and developed for the violins well before the creation of the SAA. The process of constructing the method began when Dr. Suzuki was teaching in his own home in the 1930s and 1940s. Dr. Suzuki continued to develop his philosophy and refine his teaching methods during his time at the Matsumoto Music School, beginning in 1945. When the SAA was formed in 1972, the violin was immediately recognized as an instrument group, and served as the primary focus in the organization.

While the majority of the other instrument groups formed a committee at the time that the instrument group was officially recognized by the SAA, the violin is a unique case in this regard. Because the violin was Dr. Suzuki's own instrument, he was responsible for the direction of the instrument group. He was the clear leader in terms of developing material for the method books and training teachers in his personal philosophy, and there was simply no need or demand for a violin committee. In the words of one committee member, the committee "didn't exist. We just did what Dr. Suzuki said to do. He was the one and you did what he suggested."⁶¹

Because of Dr. Suzuki's clear leadership, the violin committee was not formed until 1996, two years before Dr. Suzuki's death, when it became clear that a formalized structure was necessary to continue to improve and grow the Suzuki violin method once Dr. Suzuki was not able to make these decisions. While the violin committee was not formed until relatively recently, the instrument group itself is the most established in the SAA due to its status as the first instrument group associated with the Suzuki method and the first instrument group to be recognized by the SAA.

The violin instrument group, as the original instrument of both Dr. Suzuki and the SAA, had significant contact with Dr. Suzuki. Dr. Suzuki was most knowledgeable about the violin, due to his background and experiences. He grew up around the largest violin factory in the world, the Suzuki Violin Factory, owned by his father. He studied the violin extensively with highly regarded teachers in Tokyo and Germany, and enjoyed teaching students out of his home in Nagoya. Through years of teaching, Dr. Suzuki created his teaching philosophy and the basis for how the philosophy could be practically applied to a violin education method. Throughout the years, Dr. Suzuki created an extraordinary amount of material as he progressed toward what

⁶¹ Interview with SAA violin committee member 2, October 9, 2013.

is now known as the Suzuki method. According to a violin committee member, “Suzuki made revisions [to his method] since the 1930s, and the current version was not alive until pretty much the 1970s. Suzuki published a huge amount of material through the 1950s, not just our [the SAA’s] books, but instructional books, books on intonation and bowing.”⁶²

In addition to Dr. Suzuki’s involvement in the violin instrument group in terms of developing the materials, Dr. Suzuki had significant contact with the violin teachers who sought to understand and use his method. Many of these violinists spent time in Japan observing Dr. Suzuki and participating in the teacher-training process.⁶³ Several developed close friendships with Dr. Suzuki. When the SAA violin committee was created, all members knew Dr. Suzuki personally, and most had participated in the two-year teacher-training process.

When the original method books were published for the violin, the SAA violin committee did not yet exist. Dr. Suzuki was the clear leader of the violin instrument group. While Dr. Suzuki delegated the responsibility of transcribing his material to trusted followers, everyone looked to Dr. Suzuki for the content of the books. The order of the repertoire of the books, the fingerings and bowings in each of the pieces, and the additional technical and preparatory exercises were all chosen by Dr. Suzuki in accordance with his teaching philosophy. In this way, the violin instrument group had an organizational structure of a clear leader with followers.

All members of the violin committee state the primary responsibility of the committee at this time is to complete the revision process of the violin books. The revision process has been a prominent project for the violin instrument group since the original books were published,

⁶² Interview with SAA violin committee member 4, October 11, 2013.

⁶³ Teacher-training is necessary in order to become a registered teacher of the Suzuki method. The process has evolved throughout the years. In the early years, the process was not standardized. Aspiring Suzuki teachers would spend roughly two years observing and studying with Dr. Suzuki, who would then “certify” teachers as Suzuki teachers. Currently, there are many teacher-trainers and a fixed process to be trained as a Suzuki teacher. SAA member, email message to author, September 20, 2013.

before Dr. Suzuki's death. Currently, the committee is in the process of finishing the revisions to *Book Seven* and is beginning work on *Book Eight*. The first through sixth books have already been revised, and the committee's most recent plan is to keep the original final two books, consisting of one complete Mozart violin concerto each.

For the SAA violin committee, the revision process occurs as follows: Each committee member goes through the given book and makes suggestions for changes. When possible, ideas for improvements are discussed in person at conferences and workshops; otherwise, communication occurs via email and conference calls. The information and decisions are compiled by SAA violin committee chair, Allen Lieb. The proposed revisions are discussed at ISA violin committee meetings, with Lieb as the representative of the SAA violin committee. Once the ISA violin committee approves the revisions to the book, the revised version is sent to the publisher.

The SAA revision process, as explained by one violin committee member, consists of three aspects: (1) deciding if the best versions of the pieces are being used in accordance with the original sources of the pieces, (2) looking at whether or not the books are addressing pedagogical needs, and (3) respecting Dr. Suzuki's work.⁶⁴ In accordance with these guidelines, a committee member reports that the committee has proposed revisions to articulations that are more historically accurate, in addition to proposing added scales, exercises, information about rhythm and note values, and definitions of musical terms that help to prepare certain techniques in the pieces in the books.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ Interview with SAA violin committee member 4, October 11, 2013.

⁶⁵ Interview with SAA violin committee member 2, October 9, 2013.

The process of revising a method book is quite time-consuming and challenging. When asked about the difficulty of the revision process, violin committee members agree that the process is quite demanding. One committee member states, “It’s difficult. You’re dealing with people, and anytime you deal with people who have definite ideas, it’s a challenge.”⁶⁶ The committee has also found difficulties in being completely volunteer-based, with members residing across North America. Despite these reported difficulties, the members of the violin committee state that the committee works together with little internal conflict. One member states, “I wouldn’t say the revision process is easy, but the committee works well together and has a real understanding of each other’s views.”⁶⁷ Additionally, committee members agree that over time, the revision process has become easier, due in part to the improvements of technology and communication. In effect, the violin committee has faced little internal conflict in the revision process after Dr. Suzuki’s death.

While the SAA violin committee did not experience extraordinary internal challenges in the revision process, the committee faced extreme resistance from the outside public. As one committee member simply declares, “People just don’t like change.”⁶⁸ In addition to this generalization, the fact that the committee is attempting to make changes to the work done by an internationally celebrated, charismatic leader only serves to complicate the situation. Resistance is found in other Suzuki teachers as well as in members of the general public interested in the Suzuki method.

⁶⁶ Interview with SAA violin committee member 3, October 10, 2013.

⁶⁷ Interview with SAA violin committee member 4, October 11, 2013.

⁶⁸ Interview with SAA violin committee member 1, October 8, 2013.

Some Suzuki teachers object to being forced to change what they have been teaching for years in order to remain consistent with the revised Suzuki books. One committee member explains, “If you’ve taught certain bowings for 25 years and you’ve got them all memorized and all of a sudden somebody hits you with a revision where those are changed, it’s hard.”⁶⁹

Other Suzuki teachers and some of the general public are skeptical of the concept of making any changes to Dr. Suzuki’s work while retaining the Suzuki name. One committee member states, “Some people feel that the only way to honor Dr. Suzuki’s legacy is to not change anything that he did.”⁷⁰ The SAA violin committee addresses this concern by educating the public on the essence of Dr. Suzuki’s teaching, which embraced constant change and improvement. A committee member explains, “You get people that think ‘This [the original material] is the way Dr. Suzuki wanted it’ until they realize, or are made to realize, that he really wanted those changes.”⁷¹

The root of other teachers’ complaints is the misconception that Suzuki teachers must all teach exactly the same way. “There was ignorance in the early days that if someone didn’t do this fingering, that bowing, or this bow hold, they couldn’t call themselves Suzuki teachers.”⁷² In contrast, the members of the SAA violin committee “have always felt that teachers were free to make choices with students for fingering and bowings, especially in the upper volumes, and should treat the core material as a basis for one’s teaching.”⁷³

⁶⁹ Interview with SAA violin committee member 2, October 9, 2013.

⁷⁰ Interview with SAA violin committee member 1, October 8, 2013.

⁷¹ Interview with SAA violin committee member 2, October 9, 2013.

⁷² Interview with SAA violin committee member 1, October 8, 2013.

⁷³ Interview with SAA violin committee member 4, October 11, 2013.

The SAA violin committee also faced resistance from the other regional associations when changes to the repertoire were suggested. The SAA violin committee seriously discussed changing the repertoire in the books to include other styles of music such as romantic, virtuosic, or contemporary genres in addition to the baroque music emphasized in the traditional books. One committee member observes, “Students these days don’t mind working in the Suzuki books but they certainly want to know what the real world has.”⁷⁴ The other regional associations opposed such a major change to the method, and agreed to the compromise of including a list of supplementary pieces with each book.

Despite such criticism of the revision efforts, some committee members are optimistic, stating, “There’s a certain resistance to this, but it will dissipate over the years, I’m sure.”⁷⁵ Only time will tell if this prediction is accurate. For now, it is clear that because of Dr. Suzuki’s direct involvement with the creation of the original materials, the SAA violin committee is facing increased external opposition.

In terms of the organizational structure of the committee, the SAA violin committee witnessed significant change after Dr. Suzuki’s death. Before Dr. Suzuki’s death, there was no violin committee; all decisions were made by Dr. Suzuki, the charismatic leader. After Dr. Suzuki’s death, this structure was forced to adapt. One SAA violin committee member recalls, “We’d lost our leader. We’d lost our leader.”⁷⁶ Instead of another clear leader taking Dr. Suzuki’s role, the instrument group created a committee and adopted a decision-making process

⁷⁴ Interview with SAA violin committee member 3, October 10, 2013.

⁷⁵ Interview with SAA violin committee member 2, October 9, 2013.

⁷⁶ Interview with SAA violin committee member 1, October 8, 2013.

based on consensus. All interviewed committee members state that, at this time, the decision-making process is collective.⁷⁷

While they are in agreement about the current collective structure, some committee members identify Allen Lieb, the chair, as taking a leadership role. As one committee member explains, “Our chairman, Allen Lieb, is the most engaged in all the nitty gritty...he’s the one that has to put everything together.”⁷⁸ However, committee members view Lieb as a leader in terms of the logistics and processes of the violin committee, not in ideology and pedagogy like Dr. Suzuki. While the SAA respects Lieb as chair of the committee and ISA representative, he in no way replaces Dr. Suzuki in the instrument group.

While this study does not focus on comparisons between the SAA and other regional Suzuki associations, several violin committee members mentioned that in the TERI in Japan, Koji Toyoda is viewed as the heir to Dr. Suzuki, and the new leader of the Suzuki method.⁷⁹ While the SAA violin committee members respect and admire Toyoda as a violinist, they do not view his ideas as they viewed Dr. Suzuki’s, and prefer to make decisions as a collective committee.

As the case of the violin shows, the establishment of the instrument group, amount of contact with Dr. Suzuki, and organizational structure while creating the original materials greatly affected the instrument group’s transition after Dr. Suzuki’s death. Because Dr. Suzuki was so involved in creating the materials for the violin and did so without significant input from his

⁷⁷ Interview with SAA violin committee member 1, October 8, 2013; Interview with SAA violin committee member 2, October 9, 2013; Interview with SAA violin committee member 3, October 10, 2013; Interview with SAA violin committee member 4, October 11, 2013.

⁷⁸ Interview with SAA violin committee member 2, October 9, 2013.

⁷⁹ Toyoda was one of Dr. Suzuki’s first students and briefly lived with Dr. Suzuki before continuing his education and becoming the concertmaster of the Berlin Radio-Philharmonic Orchestra.

followers, the committee is facing resistance from the public in the revision process. Because the violin instrument group was clearly led by Dr. Suzuki, the instrument group saw a dramatic change in terms of its organizational structure and decision-making process after Dr. Suzuki's death. The current internal difficulties faced by the violin committee, however, do not appear to stem from Dr. Suzuki's death.

Cello

Like the violins, the cello instrument group is a well-established sector of the SAA. While the cello was not Dr. Suzuki's original instrument, the cello instrument group was also developing before the SAA became an official organization. The cello instrument group began developing simultaneously in the United States and Japan in the late 1960s and early 1970s. At this time, the cellists in the United States were completely unaware of the work being done by the Japanese cellists, and vice versa. After the Suzuki cellists in both countries were aware of each other, they met and collaborated to create a unified Suzuki cello method.

In Japan, the cello instrument group was headed by Yoshio Sato, an acquaintance of Dr. Suzuki. Sato, a former student of Pablo Casals, became aware of Dr. Suzuki's work in the mid-1950s and was inspired to apply the method to the cello.⁸⁰ Sato formed a cello committee in Japan and began creating the Suzuki-Sato method, a series of six cello method books based on the Suzuki philosophy. These materials were published in Japan through Zen-On Music Publishers Company and, years later, in America through the Summy Birchard Publishing

⁸⁰ Hermann, *Shinichi Suzuki*, 75. Pablo Casals is regarded as one of the greatest cellists of the twentieth century. In 1961, he was moved to tears by a performance of approximately 400 of Dr. Suzuki's students. Casals became a great advocate of Dr. Suzuki and his method. Suzuki, *Nurtured By Love*, 100-01.

Company.⁸¹ The Japanese cello committee worked in Matsumoto, Japan, where Dr. Suzuki resided.

In the United States, development of the Suzuki cello method began soon after Dr. Suzuki's first tour to the United States in 1964. American cellists, however, had difficulty obtaining existing materials from the Japanese, and instead began developing their own materials. Marilyn Kesler, one of the founding members of the SAA cello committee, was an example of one who used Dr. Suzuki's principles to create a version of the Suzuki cello method.⁸² Additionally, a group of cello teachers at the American Suzuki Institute in Stevens Point, Wisconsin decided to meet in the evenings to talk about producing additional books.⁸³ By the time the SAA was officially formed in 1972, several cellists had already been working together in an informal committee to establish the Suzuki cello repertoire. Because of this, the cello instrument group and committee were part of the SAA from the organization's origin, distinguishing itself as a highly established instrument group.

Although Dr. Suzuki did not play the cello, he was still highly involved with the cello instrument group. When the instrument group was developing in Japan, Dr. Suzuki was significantly involved in the committee's work.⁸⁴ According to a member of the SAA cello committee, "Dr. Suzuki chose who was going to be on the cello committee in Japan. He was

⁸¹ Carey, "Suzuki Cello Practices," 88. Zen-On Music Publishers Company holds the Japanese rights to publication of Suzuki materials. Summy Birchard Publishing Company holds the American rights to Suzuki materials.

⁸² Marilyn Kesler focused on the Suzuki pedagogy in her master's degree program at Southern Illinois University under John Kendall.

⁸³ Interview with SAA cello committee member 1, October 4, 2013. The American Suzuki Institute in Steven's Point, WI is the oldest of more than 70 Suzuki Institutes in North America each year. The institute was first held in 1971.

⁸⁴ The term "committee" is used loosely here. At this time, there was not a formal organization to promote the Suzuki method. This "committee" consisted of a group of Japanese cellists that met informally to apply the Suzuki method to the cello.

very involved with them there. The committee would meet where he taught in Matsumoto often.”⁸⁵

The committee that had formed in the United States had significantly less direct contact with Dr. Suzuki. When Kesler began producing her materials, she had no correspondence with Dr. Suzuki himself. She did, however, work closely with John Kendall, a close acquaintance of Dr. Suzuki who is credited with bringing the Suzuki method to the United States.⁸⁶ According to a committee member, Kendall advised Kesler, “Don’t try to publish any books with your materials because it will be minimized by just being your idea. The materials need to be sanctioned with Dr. Suzuki’s ideas and supported by him.”⁸⁷ At this time, however, Dr. Suzuki had no involvement with the committee in the United States.

Once the Japanese and American cello committees became aware of each other and realized the need to collaborate, the American committee experienced a slight increase in contact with Dr. Suzuki. According to a committee member, “Yvonne Tait from the SAA was asked to come to Japan with our materials and work with the Japanese teachers there.”⁸⁸ At this point, Dr. Suzuki was aware of the work of both committees, and the goal of the meeting was to agree on a unified Suzuki cello method. According to an interviewed committee member, “The reason the Japanese committee was open to change was because Dr. Suzuki was excited about what we were doing.”⁸⁹

⁸⁵ Interview with SAA cello committee member 2, December 13, 2013.

⁸⁶ John Kendall had experience publishing materials associated with Dr. Suzuki. His “Listen and Play Method” consisted of English-language versions of the first two Suzuki books. These books were replaced by the Summy Birchard Suzuki Violin School publications.

⁸⁷ Interview with SAA cello committee member 2, December 13, 2013.

⁸⁸ Ibid. Yvonne Tait was the first chair of the SAA cello committee.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

While a committee member explains, “Dr. Suzuki lived long enough to be influential in the approach that we use,” Dr. Suzuki was only marginally involved in the majority of the work of the SAA cello committee.⁹⁰ Dr. Suzuki’s role was to “put his stamp of approval on the repertoire” and “approve the recording artists for the CDs that go along with the books.”⁹¹ Even when a representative from the SAA was asked to go to Japan to meet with the Japanese committee, Dr. Suzuki was only present once during the week. Aside from approving the cello books and recordings, and providing an example of his philosophy and pedagogy through the violin method books, Dr. Suzuki was not involved in the SAA cello committee.

Because the original materials were being developed simultaneously in the United States and Japan, the cello committee’s organizational structure when creating the original method books is complex. In both Japan and the United States, the development of the method was started by an individual. While Kesler took the lead in the United States, Sato was the main contributor in Japan. Both individuals quickly formed committees in their respective countries to continue work on the method books and publish the materials.

In the SAA cello committee, both interviewed committee members remember a decision-making process solely based on consensus. One member states, “I don’t remember taking votes. I remember coming to decisions where everybody was happy. I know the SAA always felt like the cello committee was an example of cooperative committee work that was successful.”⁹² The SAA cello committee was able to work collectively because of the amount of respect held for each committee member. One committee member elaborated on this point stating, “One of the

⁹⁰ Interview with SAA cello committee member 2, December 13, 2013.

⁹¹ Interview with SAA cello committee member 2, December 13, 2013; Interview with SAA cello committee member 1, October 4, 2013.

⁹² Interview with SAA cello committee member 2, December 13, 2013.

strengths of the committee is the quality of backgrounds of the members as far as our pedagogical studies. There's not one particular person that we look to."⁹³ In fact, over the years, many highly respected members of the cello committee rotated in and out of leadership positions. As an example, many individuals have served as the chair of the SAA cello committee beginning with Yvonne Tait, and followed by Marilyn Kesler, Tanya Carey, Barbara Wampner, and Gilda Barston.

In addition to the organizational structure of the SAA cello committee, interviewed committee members stress their connection to committees in the other regional associations, in particular, the TERI cello committee. While international collaboration is an aspect of all instrument groups as requested by Dr. Suzuki, the cello instrument group distinguishes itself from the other instrument groups in this study due to the extent of international collaboration, especially in the early stages of creating the original repertoire.

Similar to the SAA violin committee, the SAA cello committee's major responsibility is create and revise the method books. Currently, the cello committee is not active. According to a committee member, "The committee is not functioning much now because the majority of the work is done. We only get together when there is a problem."⁹⁴ At this time, the SAA cello committee has only two members; when the committee was working on creating and revising the material, there were usually four or five members of the committee.

In order to compare the cello committee to the other instrument group committees in this thesis, I focus on the committee's internal relations during the revision process. There are ten

⁹³ Interview with SAA cello committee member 1, October 4, 2013.

⁹⁴ Interview with SAA cello committee member 2, December 13, 2013.

cello method books, and all except *Book Nine* and *Book Ten* have been revised at least once.⁹⁵

Committee members clarified that revisions to the books did not involve changing the repertoire, but aimed to clarify articulations, bowings, and fingerings in the books.⁹⁶

Within the SAA cello committee, there was little internal conflict during the revision process. The interviewed committee members did not, however, imply that the process was easy. One member explained that the process was very time consuming, as “The process of revising and forming *Book Four* through *Book Eight* was about a twenty-year project.” The same committee member acknowledged, however, that the process has become easier over the years due to increased technology and communication.⁹⁷

Despite the inherent challenges of working in a committee, the cello committee members pride themselves on the collaborative nature of the committee. One member explains, “We seem to work in a very congenial way as colleagues. We don’t choose sides and fight; we work together. The SAA has recognized us as a model of the way the instrument committees should work.”⁹⁸ Another committee member attributes the success of the committee collaboration to the respect that exists between committee members stating, “Each of the members have their strengths. They are all wonderful teachers. They are real leaders.”⁹⁹

In terms of external difficulties, the cello committee faced significantly less resistance to the revision of the method than the violin committee. The lack of controversy can be partially

⁹⁵ *Book Nine* and *Book Ten* each solely consist of one standard cello concerto, the Haydn Cello Concerto in C Major and the Boccherini Cello Concerto in B-flat Major, respectively. The first, second, and third books have been revised twice.

⁹⁶ Interview with SAA cello committee member 1, October 4, 2013.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Interview with SAA cello committee member 2, December 13, 2013.

attributed to the committee's openness to suggestion and criticism in the revision process. One committee member explains, "If they didn't like something that was published, we usually had a way to talk about it. I didn't hear a lot of complaints."¹⁰⁰ Another committee member adds "I don't think there's much objection because of the quality of the teachers on the committee."¹⁰¹

The majority of the external difficulties mentioned by the interviewed members of the SAA cello committee involved relations with the other regional Suzuki associations. More than other instrument groups, the SAA cello committee worked closely with their counterparts in the TERI. Because Sato had already created a version of the cello method in Japan, the TERI cello committee was initially resistant to collaborating with the SAA cello committee and revising their original material. In addition, the TERI committee was skeptical of the quality of work of the SAA committee due to their dissatisfaction with the CD recordings of *Book One* through *Book Three*.¹⁰² While at first, this conflict was settled with the help of Dr. Suzuki, over the years, the SAA and TERI committees learned how to work together without Dr. Suzuki's mediation.

One committee member explained a system the SAA and TERI committees used to communicate:

We found a way to communicate with our Japanese colleagues to indicate where we felt particularly strongly about different ideas we had. We would indicate our strong preferences by just putting a heart by it and they picked up on that. From our knowledge of Japanese, we figured out that when they said 'in our opinion,'

¹⁰⁰ Interview with SAA cello committee member 1, October 4, 2013.

¹⁰¹ Interview with SAA cello committee member 2, December 13, 2013.

¹⁰² The original recordings were performed by Ron Leonard. He did not follow all of the articulations, bowings, and fingerings written in the books in exchange for a higher level of musicality in the recording. Because of this, these recordings were not accepted by the TERI committee. Interview with SAA cello committee member 2, December 13, 2013.

that didn't imply a suggestion but a strong preference. We've been able to communicate well in this way.¹⁰³

Another committee member credited specific members of the SAA cello committee with being particularly skilled in building this cross-cultural relationship, stating "Tanya Carey did a masterful job of communicating with the Japanese teachers and promoting the idea of a unified approach."¹⁰⁴ Aside from these concerns from other regional Suzuki associations, the SAA cello committee faced little external resistance to the revision process.

Despite having more contact with Dr. Suzuki than other more recently added instrument groups, there was little change in the organizational structure of the committee after Dr. Suzuki's death. During his life, Dr. Suzuki did not have significant involvement in the SAA cello committee.¹⁰⁵ Furthermore, there was no clear leader of the committee; no one committee member had more influence than another. The SAA committee was devoted to a collective process, even while Dr. Suzuki was alive. After Dr. Suzuki's death, interviewed committee members did not notice a difference in the cello committee's decision-making process. While one committee member admits, "It was a shock to the entire Suzuki community," there was no observation of a change in the structure or organization of the committee.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰³ Interview with SAA cello committee member 1, October 4, 2013.

¹⁰⁴ Interview with SAA cello committee member 2, December 13, 2013. Tanya Carey was the chair of the SAA cello committee after Marilyn Kesler.

¹⁰⁵ While Dr. Suzuki chose the members of the original TERI cello committee and approved the cello instrument group and repertoire, he was not involved in the actual decision-making processes of the TERI cello committee either.

¹⁰⁶ Interview with SAA cello committee member 2, December 13, 2013.

Guitar

The guitar instrument group is significantly less established than both the violin and cello instrument groups. Whereas the violin and cello instrument groups were already developing before the official formation of the SAA, the guitar instrument group was not formed until the mid-1980s. William Kossler and Frank Longay are credited with founding the guitar instrument group. According to a committee member, “Each took separate roles in order to promote the study of Suzuki guitar. Longay stayed in the United States and focused on the research and development of the method with his own students and Kossler went to Japan to study with Dr. Suzuki himself.”¹⁰⁷

Kossler initiated the process of developing the instrument group in 1985, when he traveled to Japan to study with Dr. Suzuki. Kossler stayed in contact with Longay during his time in Japan. After a year of classes and a graduation recital, Kossler returned to the United States and teamed up with Longay to begin work on the Suzuki guitar method. Shortly after, they met with Cesar Benevidas of Peru and formed the SAA guitar committee. This initial committee gained attention from international guitarists, including Elio Galvagno of Italy, Philippe Francaise of France, and Michael Koppe of Germany, and together, the six began work on the early drafts of the Suzuki guitar method books.

In 1986, fourteen years after the founding of the SAA, the SAA recognized the guitar as an official instrument group. Although the guitar is an officially recognized instrument group, according to one committee member, “Guitar hasn’t gained real acceptance because we didn’t

¹⁰⁷ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 5, October 9, 2013.

start in Japan. Guitar still is not in Japan.”¹⁰⁸ Because the guitar instrument group was formed more recently and lacks complete recognition from the regional associations, it is significantly less established than the violin and cello instrument groups.

In terms of the amount of contact with Dr. Suzuki, the guitar instrument group differs from both the violins and cellos. Because the guitar instrument group was founded in the United States, the committee had less contact with Dr. Suzuki than both the violins and the cellos. According to a member of the guitar committee, “Dr. Suzuki wasn’t really involved in what we were doing.”¹⁰⁹

In order to establish the instrument group in the SAA, however, the founders of the guitar committee, William Kossler and Frank Longay, had significant contact with Dr. Suzuki. As one member of the committee explains, “The deal with the SAA was that someone had to be a direct student of Dr. Suzuki. Kossler took on that role.”¹¹⁰ During his time in Japan, Kossler spent a great deal of time with Dr. Suzuki, as well as Toshio Takahashi, a close acquaintance of Dr. Suzuki.¹¹¹ Unlike the violin committee, in which most members observed or studied with Dr. Suzuki in Japan, Kossler is the only member of the guitar committee to study with Dr. Suzuki.

Other than Kossler’s contact, Dr. Suzuki was only involved in the guitar committee peripherally. By the time the committee formed, “Dr. Suzuki was still alive but kind of retired.”¹¹² According to a committee member, during the formative years of the guitar

¹⁰⁸ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 2, October 2, 2013.

¹⁰⁹ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 3, October 3, 2013.

¹¹⁰ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 5, October 9, 2013.

¹¹¹ Toshio Takahashi is responsible for creating the Suzuki flute instrument group and method books. Hermann, *Shinichi Suzuki*, 75.

¹¹² Interview with SAA guitar committee member 4, October 4, 2013.

committee, Dr. Suzuki's involvement consisted of being presented with guitar materials and videos, and witnessing guitar demonstrations at a conference.¹¹³ Aside from this early contact, the guitar committee did not communicate with Dr. Suzuki on a regular basis. A committee member states, Dr. Suzuki "needed to put his stamp of approval [on the guitar committee] and he certainly did that. Once people were in place, he was not that involved."¹¹⁴ Because Kossler was the only member of the guitar committee to have a relationship with Dr. Suzuki, the guitar instrument group ranks lower than both the violins and cellos in terms of the amount of contact with Dr. Suzuki.

Unlike the violin instrument group, whose method was based solely on Dr. Suzuki's ideas, the guitar method books were created completely by committee. From the beginning, the formation of the committee was not due to the effort of a single person but to two individuals: Longay and Kossler. From the creation of the first guitar method book, the committee has valued collaboration and consensus in the decision-making process.

Despite the commitment to consensus, nearly every interviewed member of the guitar committee mentioned the late Frank Longay as taking a clear leadership role in the committee. Committee members state: Longay had a "pivotal role in the process" of creating the committee; "When Longay was alive he took the leadership role"; Longay was "the motivating force behind getting everything together for the method and having it work."¹¹⁵ One committee member describes Longay's influence saying, "Longay's voice was a little stronger, but if you disagreed

¹¹³ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 5, October 9, 2013.

¹¹⁴ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 6, October 10, 2013.

¹¹⁵ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 1, October 1, 2013; Interview with SAA guitar committee member 4, October 4, 2013; Interview with SAA guitar committee member 3, October 3, 2013.

with him, you could certainly be heard.”¹¹⁶ Another member explains, “He carried tremendous weight in our committee because many of us looked up to him.”¹¹⁷ While the original guitar method books were created by committee, Frank Longay was a clear leader during this process.

Whereas the members of the violin and cello committees emphasize revising the repertoire as the committee’s primary responsibility, the members of the guitar committee declare a broader purpose. According to one committee member, “The committee has two functions: (1) promoting Suzuki guitar in the SAA regions and keeping it healthy, growing, and strong; and (2) establishing the method through the books.”¹¹⁸ Despite this two-fold purpose, in order to compare the guitar committee to the other instrument committees analyzed in this thesis, I focus only on the committee’s processes in terms of the method books revision process.

Unlike the violins and cellos, the guitar committee began the revision process relatively recently. For approximately a year, the committee has been working on revising *Book One* of the guitar method; until then, the committee was focused on creating the original nine method books. The current plan is to revise *Book One* through *Book Four*.

During the revision process, the SAA guitar committee is committed to consensus.¹¹⁹ One member states, “It was a committee-wide desire to have responsibilities equally distributed among the committee.”¹²⁰ In addition to an inclusive process amongst the committee members, the committee is dedicated to collecting opinions from guitarists around the world, including

¹¹⁶ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 4, October 4, 2013.

¹¹⁷ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 5, October 9, 2013.

¹¹⁸ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 1, October 1, 2013.

¹¹⁹ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 1, October 1, 2013; Interview with SAA guitar committee member 2, October 2, 2013; Interview with SAA guitar committee member 3, October 3, 2013; Interview with SAA guitar committee member 4, October 4, 2013; Interview with SAA guitar committee member 5, October 9, 2013; Interview with SAA guitar committee member 6, October 10, 2013.

¹²⁰ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 1, October 1, 2013.

those outside the Suzuki community. This open process ensures that all possible solutions are considered.

This openness, however, increases the difficulty of the revision process. One member explains, “It’s always difficult because people have a lot of different ideas.”¹²¹ Another committee member acknowledges “I would call it painfully but necessarily slow.”¹²² While openly admitting these internal difficulties, committee members are quick to clarify the spirit of the committee’s process. “I would not use the word conflict. It’s just the inevitable back and forth that happens when you are trying to come to some kind of an agreement.”¹²³ Despite these difficulties, the majority of the interviewed committee members agree that the process has become somewhat easier due to advances in technology and communication. Overall, the committee members expressed positivity about their work together, stating “We’re all putting in time from our commitment and love of what we do.”¹²⁴

While the guitar committee has faced internal difficulties similar to that of the violin and cello committees in the revision process, they have received little resistance from the outside community. Currently, the primary focus of the guitar committee’s revision process is the right-hand fingerings. One committee member admits that changing these original fingerings can be controversial, as “People become very personally attached to the fingerings that they teach,” but adds that for the most part, “People are open to new ideas.”¹²⁵ Another committee member agrees, saying, “People are happy to experiment and try new things.”¹²⁶

¹²¹ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 4, October 4, 2013.

¹²² Interview with SAA guitar committee member 2, October 2, 2013.

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 3, October 3, 2013.

¹²⁵ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 1, October 1, 2013.

Many committee members directly compare the guitarists to the violinists. One states, “The violinists have been through their own revisions and there have been some struggles there, but not in the guitar program.”¹²⁷ Another adds, “Since there are far fewer numbers of guitar teachers I think it’s easier [than the violin revision process.] It’s been pretty smooth.”¹²⁸ Yet another interviewed committee member attributes the difference between the violin and guitar committees to their respective relationships with Dr. Suzuki. A controversial situation “will probably be the most with the violins because that’s what Dr. Suzuki played and the attitude exists that you shouldn’t touch anything he did. I don’t think that impacts us so much.”¹²⁹ In general, the guitar committee has not faced the extreme external resistance that plagues the violin committee.

In terms of the organizational structure of the committee, guitarists did not see a change following Dr. Suzuki’s death. While not all interviewed committee members were active in the committee at the time of Dr. Suzuki’s death, the few who were do not remember any significant change in the decision-making process or structure of the committee. One states, “The only thing that’s changed is the number of teachers; there are more people involved now” while one simply declares “I don’t think it’s really made a change at all.”¹³⁰ Another admits a slight

¹²⁶ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 6, October 10, 2013.

¹²⁷ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 2, October 2, 2013.

¹²⁸ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 3, October 3, 2013.

¹²⁹ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 4, October 4, 2013.

¹³⁰ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 3, October 3, 2013; Interview with SAA guitar committee member 4, October 4, 2013.

change in attitude explaining, “We are more conscious that our decisions reflect on Dr. Suzuki’s legacy and want to be careful that we do things in the proper spirit.”¹³¹

While the committee dismisses the effects of Dr. Suzuki’s death, all interviewed members mention a change after Frank Longay’s death. One committee member states, “There’s definitely been a change in the decision-making process since Frank died. Frank was huge.”¹³² Another adds, “I think the biggest change in our committee was in 2010 when Frank suddenly passed away.”¹³³ Committee members emphasized the essential role Longay played in the guitar committee, serving as the committee chair and international committee representative while he was alive. In addition, Longay was the teacher trainer for many of the other members of the committee and had gained respect and admiration from the committee.

After Longay’s sudden death in 2010, the committee structure was forced to change. One committee member recalls, “It was an upheaval for a while. As the committee reformed itself, we talked a lot about consensus, and I really wanted us to make sure that everyone was heard and everyone’s viewpoint was considered.”¹³⁴ While the committee structure has always been based on decision-making by consensus, the committee members viewed Longay as an influential leader when he was alive. Without Longay’s presence, a committee member states, “The process became more open-ended and newer members of the committee were willing to speak up more than before.”¹³⁵ Interestingly, Longay’s death had a much greater effect on the committee’s organizational structure than Dr. Suzuki’s death.

¹³¹ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 5, October 9, 2013.

¹³² Interview with SAA guitar committee member 2, October 2, 2013.

¹³³ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 5, October 9, 2013.

¹³⁴ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 1, October 1, 2013.

¹³⁵ Interview with SAA guitar committee member 2, October 2, 2013.

Bass

The bass instrument group is the most recent instrument group to join the SAA out of the four instrument groups in this study. Unlike the violin, cello, and guitar instrument groups, there were several attempts to establish the bass instrument group before it was officially recognized by the SAA. After a few false starts, the development of the current bass instrument group began in the late 1980s, when Yvonne Tait, an active member of the SAA cello committee, approached Daniel Swaim about developing the Suzuki bass method. Swaim accepted the challenge and created the Arizona Double Bass Research Consort, a group of students that served as his research subjects.¹³⁶ From his research, Swaim wrote three method books, published in 1991, 1993, and 1993 respectively.

While developing the method books, Swaim was also completing the teacher-training process through the SAA, a necessary step in order to create the bass instrument group.¹³⁷ During this time, the bass instrument group was labelled an emerging instrument group by the SAA. Shortly after Swaim completed the first three method books and the teacher-training process, the bass instrument group was officially recognized as an instrument area within the SAA and the bass committee was formed. A bass committee member states, “The committee that had sustaining power was formed around 1994.”¹³⁸

Although officially recognized by the SAA, the bass instrument area is still labelled an emerging area in other parts of the world. According to a committee member, “The bass

¹³⁶ Swaim, “Development of Suzuki Bass,” 53.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ Interview with SAA bass committee member 1, December 4, 2013.

instrument area is not completely recognized by the ISA. Gilda Barston said we need to see the instrument area develop in other countries besides the United States before it is officially an instrument group in the ISA.”¹³⁹ Because the instrument area was created so recently, the bass is the least established of the four instrument areas in this study.

By the time the bass was recognized by the SAA as an official instrument group, Dr. Suzuki was 96 years old and had little role in the activities of the association. Because of this, the bass committee had no direct contact with Dr. Suzuki. One committee member states, “By the time the committee formed, he was pretty ailing. We never met with him or anything.”¹⁴⁰

Whereas at least one of the early leaders of the cello and guitar instrument groups went to observe and complete the teacher-training process with Dr. Suzuki in Japan in order to create the instrument group, this was not an option when the bass committee was developing. The first teacher trainer for the bass did not participate in the training process with Dr. Suzuki directly, but instead dealt solely with the SAA in order to earn this title. The first teacher trainer recalls, “I had to have videos of me playing, videos of me giving a lecture to parents, and a whole bunch of stuff. It was very extensive. It turned out to be about an hour and a half video that I had to send to them.”¹⁴¹ Another bass committee member took a different route to become a teacher trainer in the absence of a process involving Dr. Suzuki himself. “I began taking cello teacher-training to find out what the cellists were doing and planned to step over into bass from there.

¹³⁹ Interview with SAA bass committee member 2, December 10, 2013. Gilda Barston is the current CEO of the ISA.

¹⁴⁰ Interview with SAA bass committee member 1, December 4, 2013.

¹⁴¹ Interview with SAA bass committee member 2, December 10, 2013.

Afterwards I went through a provisional process that was laid out for the original members of the bass committee.”¹⁴²

While Dr. Suzuki did not have contact with any of the members of the bass committee, he did show support and interest in the group while he was still alive. One member of the committee recalls, “He did come to a session where we showed what we had developed in the books and I had my students play in it. He was sitting proudly in the back row with his wife and they looked at everything. He certainly had interest in what we were doing.”¹⁴³ In contrast with the violin, cello, and guitar instrument groups, however, not one member of the bass committee had direct contact with Dr. Suzuki. According to members of the committee, even Swaim, the founder of the bass instrument group and current chair of the bass committee, never had contact with Dr. Suzuki. “The closest he ever got to even talking to Dr. Suzuki was being on the same elevator with him and they nodded at each other.”¹⁴⁴ Throughout the relatively short history of the bass committee, there was very little contact with Dr. Suzuki.

Unlike the violin, cello, and guitar committees, the organizational structure of the bass committee changed throughout the process of creating the original method books. Swaim, the founder of the bass instrument group, was individually responsible for creating the first three method books. A member of the bass committee states, “The first three books of Suzuki bass were all written by Swaim completely. There was no committee at the time.”¹⁴⁵ This original organizational structure is similar to that of the violin instrument group — a structure with a clear leader in charge of developing the method.

¹⁴² Interview with SAA bass committee member 1, December 4, 2013.

¹⁴³ Interview with SAA bass committee member 2, December 10, 2013.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

At the time that these original three books were written, the bass instrument group was not yet officially recognized by the SAA. After Swaim's first three books were released, the SAA suggested forming a bass committee to continue work on the method. According to a committee member, the bass committee modeled the method books after the cello books.¹⁴⁶ Currently, the bass committee is continuing to create original materials with an organizational structure based on consensus, a change from the first three books, which were created by a clear leader.

Both bass committee members interviewed agree that the sole responsibility of the bass committee is to continue to develop the repertoire.¹⁴⁷ Unlike the other instrument groups in this thesis, the bass method books are not yet complete. Thus far, the committee has revised the first three books and developed materials through *Book Six*.¹⁴⁸ According to the committee members, they project the method to include nine, possibly ten books.¹⁴⁹ In order to compare the inner workings of the bass committee with that of the other instrument committees, I will assess the bass committee at the time that they were working on revisions to the first three books.

After the first three books were published, Swaim acknowledged the need to revise the books, saying, "I think maybe we need to start all over."¹⁵⁰ The committee did not start all over, but instead began to revise the books in response to two primary criticisms: (1) the books included too much information and technique all at once and (2) the technique of starting kids in

¹⁴⁶ Interview with SAA bass committee member 1, December 4, 2013.

¹⁴⁷ Interview with SAA bass committee member 1, December 4, 2013; Interview with SAA bass committee member 2, December 10, 2013.

¹⁴⁸ Interview with SAA bass committee member 2, December 10, 2013.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

fourth position was too extreme. The committee members were all in agreement on the importance of spreading out the material introduced in the first three books. One committee member states, “What was originally in volumes one to three is projected to be spread over one to seven.”¹⁵¹

Initially, however, there was internal disagreement on how to begin the method – whether to begin teaching in fourth position as the original three books did or to begin in first position as traditional school programs did. After much debate, the committee concluded that the method books could include both options. According to a committee member, once the committee overcame this obstacle, “It was possible for us to work together and we’ve been absolutely dedicated to keeping the peace since then.”¹⁵² While the bass committee had a fair share of internal difficulties in the beginning of the revision process, the disagreement was not centered on what Dr. Suzuki would have wanted and thus was not the result of the absence of the charismatic leader.

After agreeing on the beginning of the method books, the problems of the bass committee have been “more external than internal.”¹⁵³ The type of external resistance, however, has been quite different in nature than that of the violin committee. The bass committee witnessed no opposition to the revision process on the grounds that it was unethical to change the original method books. Because the original three bass books were written by Swaim, not the charismatic Dr. Suzuki, there was no argument that by revising the original books, Dr. Suzuki’s name would be dishonored and the method no longer the Suzuki method. In addition, because

¹⁵¹ Interview with SAA bass committee member 1, December 4, 2013.

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ Ibid.

Swaim was still alive and active in the revision of the original books, there was no movement to protect Swaim's original work. The struggles of the bass committee also differ from those of the violin committee in that they do not face conflict with the other regional associations. In describing the revision process, one committee member states, "Mostly everything has been done right here in this country," avoiding any international disputes.¹⁵⁴

Once again contrasting from the violin committee, the original bass method books received more external criticism than the revisions. According to a committee member, other bass teachers and public school music teachers thought the techniques used in the original books "were a bit too extreme."¹⁵⁵ Because of this, instead of causing controversy as revision to violin books did, the revision of the bass material "was totally embraced."¹⁵⁶

According to both interviewed members of the bass committee, the current major external difficulty is the publisher. "We have come up against a stone wall and the stone wall is the publisher."¹⁵⁷ After a recent personnel change in Alfred Music Publishing, the exclusive publisher of the Suzuki method outside Japan, "It's been a nightmare to try to get *Book Six* published."¹⁵⁸ While this is a major obstacle for the bass committee, the reason for the conflict with the publisher is economic in nature, and not based in objections of the revision of Suzuki bass material.

After Dr. Suzuki's death, the organizational structure of the bass committee did not change. As previously described, once the bass committee was formed in 1994, the creation and

¹⁵⁴ Interview with SAA bass committee member 2, December 10, 2013.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ Interview with SAA bass committee member 1, December 4, 2013.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ Interview with SAA bass committee member 2, December 10, 2013.

revision of the materials was done by consensus of the committee members. When asked if Dr. Suzuki's death resulted in a changed in the bass committee's decision-making process, the answer from both interviewed committee members was a confident "No."¹⁵⁹

Similar to the guitar committee, there is one member of the bass committee with stronger influence than the remaining committee members. This leader is Swaim, the founder of the bass instrument group and current chairman of the bass committee. While the Suzuki bass method is modeled after Dr. Suzuki's philosophy, because the committee members never directly observed Dr. Suzuki's teaching, Swaim has the most direct influence regarding the decisions of the committee. Because of such limited contact with Dr. Suzuki himself, the organizational structure of the committee remained the same after his death.

Comparative Analysis

By Weber's definition, Dr. Suzuki epitomizes a charismatic leader. Through his philosophy and work in music education, he attracted a following of people who willingly support him and his ideas. He was not content to become an exceptional violin teacher within the current music education framework, but sought to completely recreate the music education scene with his innovative philosophy and bold ideas. In fact, Dr. Suzuki refused to teach at the Matsumoto Music School unless he was allowed to teach using his method.¹⁶⁰ Dr. Suzuki was the clear leader of a movement.

¹⁵⁹ Interview with SAA bass committee member 1, December 4, 2013; Interview with SAA bass committee member 2, December 10, 2013.

¹⁶⁰ Suzuki, *Nurtured By Love*, 22.

In addition, Weber predicts someone such as Dr. Suzuki would not be interested in the economic aspect of his work. While undoubtedly passionate about his philosophy and teaching method, Dr. Suzuki did not seek to create an organization to promote his ideas. As illustrated in the introductory anecdote, Dr. Suzuki had little knowledge of the economic potential for the Suzuki method, almost signing away his own rights to the method.¹⁶¹ The creation of the SAA was the initiative of Dr. Suzuki's followers in the United States, an effort to facilitate the spread of the Suzuki method around the world. The organization allowed for the unification of the Suzuki method, including consistent repertoire in the method books and a fixed teacher-training process.

The case of the Suzuki movement differs from Weber's theory, however, in terms of the importance of a successor to the charismatic leader. Weber places great emphasis on the need to find a successor in the absence of the original charismatic leader in order for the charismatic organization to survive. As described in "The Routinization of Charisma" section of this thesis, Weber determines six approaches to finding a successor, each scenario resulting in a replacement charismatic leader.¹⁶² This expectation is not consistent with the progression of the Suzuki movement, as there was no clear replacement of Dr. Suzuki. Other scholars, however, acknowledge the possibility for successful routinization without a successor. Shamir, for example, argues that in certain cases, charisma may transfer to a social role, group, or organization with the same values as the charismatic leader.¹⁶³ This is a more appropriate assessment of the case of the Suzuki movement, as the SAA as an organization, along with the ISA and regional associations, took over the responsibility of representing Dr. Suzuki's ideology.

¹⁶¹ See the introductory anecdote, page 2-3.

¹⁶² See the discussion of the routinization of charisma, page 5-12.

¹⁶³ Shamir, "The Charismatic Relationship," 97.

As detailed by the four case studies, however, the SAA did not go through the process of routinization as a cohesive unit. Each of the four instrument groups faced different challenges following Dr. Suzuki's death. In order to synthesize the information presented in the four case studies, Table 1 organizes the data from the four instrument groups into the dependent and independent variables. The three dependent variables are used to assess the difficulty in the charisma routinization process while the three independent variables are used to assess the type of charismatic leader-follower relationship.

Table 1. Dependent and Independent Variables by Instrument Group

Dependent Variable	Violin	Cello	Guitar	Bass
Internal Difficulties During the Revision Process	Medium Difficulties	Medium Difficulties	Medium Difficulties	Medium Difficulties
External Resistance to Revision	Significant resistance	Little resistance	Little resistance	Little resistance
Change in Organizational Structure	Significant change	Little change	Little change	Little change
Independent Variable				
Establishment	Well-established	Well-established	Established	Less established
Contact with Dr. Suzuki	Significant contact	Contact	Contact	Little contact
Committee Organizational Structure when Creating Original Repertoire	Clear leader	Committee	Committee with leader	Committee with leader

From analysis of the dependent variables in Table 1, it is clear that the effects of Dr. Suzuki's death were experienced most strongly in the violin instrument group. While, surprisingly, all instrument groups faced similar challenges regarding internal difficulties during

the revision process, the violin instrument group alone faced significant external resistance to revision and a significant change in the committee organizational structure. In contrast, the cello, guitar, and bass instrument groups faced little resistance to revision and little change in the committee organizational structure. From this, we can conclude that the violin instrument group had a difficult transition after Dr. Suzuki's death while the cello, guitar, and bass instrument groups had a relatively easy transition.

As previously stated, I believe this discrepancy is primarily due to differences in charismatic leader-follower relationships between the four instrument groups. After analysis of the independent variables in Table 1, we can categorize the four instrument groups by leader-follower relationship. Because the violin instrument group was well-established, had significant contact with Dr. Suzuki, and had a clear leader throughout the process of creating original repertoire, it can be labelled as being based on personalized leader-follower relationships. The cello, guitar, and bass instrument groups were either less established, had less contact with Dr. Suzuki, created the original method books by consensus, or a combination of the three. Therefore, they can be labelled as being based on socialized leader-follower relationships.

Weierter describes a personalized relationship as one in which the followers do not contribute to or influence the charismatic message, but instead the leader's values become the collective values of the group. Different than a model of value congruence, in which the charismatic message aligns with the followers' pre-existing values, followers in a personalized relationship form their values from the charismatic message.¹⁶⁴ The violin instrument group exemplifies this type of relationship. In addition to supporting Dr. Suzuki's general philosophy on music education and talent acquisition, the violin instrument group observed all of Dr.

¹⁶⁴ Weierter, "Follow the Leader," 175.

Suzuki's specific ideas on violin pedagogy, technique, and repertoire. Violin committee members were aware that Dr. Suzuki was always changing and improving his method, but the Suzuki violin community continuously supported all Dr. Suzuki's new ideas.¹⁶⁵

When an aspect of Dr. Suzuki's philosophy did not immediately identify with a Suzuki violinist, the follower would not challenge the philosophy itself but his or her understanding of it. An interviewed committee member clearly illustrates this concept:

It took me three years to understand balance as he intended it to be understood. Because superficially you think 'Of course they're in balance, they're not falling over. What are you talking about?' But when he says it several thousand times in one week, you understand that it must be something deeper. I came home with festering questions that this is profound. I asked myself 'Why am I missing how profound this is?' That set me off looking at several pedagogues to see if they had anything that might shed light upon what he was saying. I did find it and I did understand it and I've been on a mission to have other people understand it too.¹⁶⁶

Members of the Suzuki violin community had similar unconditional support of Dr. Suzuki's ideas, forming the basis for a personalized leader-follower relationship.

In Weierter's words, the follower in a socialized relationship "plays an active role in determining the underlying values expressed by the charismatic leader."¹⁶⁷ As described in the case studies, Dr. Suzuki's followers in the cello, guitar, and bass committees actively contributed to creating the materials that would be published as the Suzuki method for those instruments. Dr. Suzuki was not afraid to delegate leadership roles to another individual or groups of individuals who had expertise in these instrument areas. In the case of the cellos, Dr. Suzuki placed his trust in both the TERI cello committee and the SAA cello committee, originally

¹⁶⁵ Interview with SAA violin committee member 1, October 8, 2013.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Weierter, "Follow the Leader," 175.

pioneered by Sato and Kesler respectively. The guitar committee was led by Longay and Kossler, while Swaim was responsible for creating the bass committee. By creating the materials to be used, the committees for these instrument groups added to what Dr. Suzuki advocated instead of simply following his methodology.

In addition, Howell states that socialized leaders rely on value internalization to attract and maintain a following.¹⁶⁸ This is consistent with Dr. Suzuki's relationship with the cello, guitar, and bass committees. The members of these three committees were drawn to the Suzuki movement because they identified with Dr. Suzuki's overall philosophy, and were motivated and allowed to contribute to the movement by adding instrument groups to be associated with Dr. Suzuki's method.

As predicted by Shamir, the type of leader-follower relationship in a charismatic organization directly affects the organization's ability to routinize in the absence of the charismatic leader. While organizations based on personalized relationships are expected to have a difficult transition, those based on socialized relationships are anticipated to have an easier routinization process.¹⁶⁹ Weierter elaborates on this idea, arguing, "The loss of the leader is not destructive in a socialized relationship because the follower is an active participant in the charismatic relationship."¹⁷⁰ While it is not fair to say that the committees with socialized relationships with Dr. Suzuki were unaffected by Dr. Suzuki's death, they exhibited signs of an easier transition process than the committee with personalized relationships with Dr. Suzuki.

¹⁶⁸ Howell, "Two Faces of Charisma," 213-36.

¹⁶⁹ Shamir, "The Charismatic Relationship," 97.

¹⁷⁰ Weierter, "Follow the Leader," 175.

Specifically, the violin committee has faced significant external resistance to revision of the original method books whereas the cello, guitar, and bass committees have not. In the case of the violins, much of the outside community views making any changes to Dr. Suzuki's original work as disrespectful to his legacy and thus opposes the entire revision process.¹⁷¹ Despite Dr. Suzuki's spirit of constant improvement and innovation, and the committee members' expertise in violin pedagogy and commitment to upholding Suzuki's philosophy, the outside community does not trust the committee to make revisions to Dr. Suzuki's original work.

In the case of the cello committee, however, the outside community was open to and trusting of the committee members because the cello books were dissociated from Dr. Suzuki himself. The cello committee was responsible for creating the original method books, not Dr. Suzuki. Because of this, the outside community was not opposed to the revision of the materials, since it would not technically involve changing Dr. Suzuki's original work. While the cello method books were based on Suzuki's philosophy and associated with his name, because he was not directly involved in the creation of these materials as he was for the violin books, the outside community has been less resistant to change.

Similarly, the guitar and bass committees have not faced significant external resistance to the revision of the books, as the books were not originally created by Dr. Suzuki. While the outside guitar and bass communities do not agree with every decision the instrument committees make, the disagreements are due to differences in pedagogical ideas, not arguments that the revisions are disrespectful to Dr. Suzuki. Interestingly, although the materials for the cello, guitar, and bass instrument groups were not created by Dr. Suzuki himself, it was vital for the method books to be affiliated with the Suzuki movement in order to be marketable.

¹⁷¹ Interview with SAA violin committee member 1, October 8, 2013.

In addition, the violin instrument group differs from the cello, guitar, and bass instrument groups in the amount of change in the committee structure after Dr. Suzuki's death. While the cello, guitar, and bass instrument groups saw little change, the structure of the violin instrument group changed significantly. When Dr. Suzuki was alive, the cellos, guitars, and basses each had functioning committees that made the major decisions on repertoire. Because they had little contact with Dr. Suzuki at this time, Dr. Suzuki's death had little effect on each instrument group's structure; the committees continued to be responsible for major decisions without Dr. Suzuki. The violin instrument group, on the other hand, was solely led by Dr. Suzuki during his lifetime. It was not until immediately before his death that a violin committee formed and individuals other than Dr. Suzuki were given responsibility in making major decisions in regards to the method.

In his analysis of the routinization of charisma for organizations with a personalized leader-follower relationship, Weierter states, "Reinforcement of the message is most vital for the personalized relationship because the follower self is defined in terms of an external charismatic message."¹⁷² In fact, preserving and promoting Dr. Suzuki's general philosophy has been the focus of the violin committee through all of its work. As one member of the violin committee states:

It's fascinating what holds it all together is a core idea. We all have the same philosophical outlook on teaching and that's most important thing that keeps all the association and international association going. Other associations might be strictly process-oriented but we're not. We have an idea that holds us together and a common goal. The ideas are stronger than the people.¹⁷³

¹⁷² Weierter, "Follow the Leader," 187.

¹⁷³ Interview with SAA violin committee member 4, October 11, 2013.

Although a more challenging process for the violins, the instrument group has successfully dealt with the routinization of charisma by internalizing and committing to Dr. Suzuki's core values.

Because the SAA consisted of several instrument groups, each with a different relationship with the charismatic Dr. Suzuki, different leader-follower relationships are seen within the single organization. The violin instrument group established personalized relationships with Dr. Suzuki, while the cello, guitar, and bass instrument groups were based on socialized relationships with Dr. Suzuki. The differences in leader-follower relationships within divisions of the SAA account for the variance in the transitional difficulties after Dr. Suzuki's death. Thus, the violin instrument group's increased difficulty in the transition after Dr. Suzuki's death can be attributed to the type of relationship it exhibited with Dr. Suzuki. Likewise the relatively smooth routinization of charisma demonstrated by the cello, guitar, and bass instrument groups are explained by their relationships with the charismatic leader.

Implications

The findings on the routinization of charisma in four instrument committees after Dr. Suzuki's death have broader implications for the SAA. As expressed in the account of the creation of the Suzuki cello method, it is necessary for music educators interested in applying Dr. Suzuki's ideas to new instrument groups to officially collaborate with the SAA and be associated with Dr. Suzuki's name.¹⁷⁴ Materials that are based off of Dr. Suzuki's philosophy but published under a third party name will not receive the level of attention and support that comes with identification with Dr. Suzuki. It is because of this notion that instrument groups continue to be

¹⁷⁴ Interview with SAA bass committee member 2, December 10, 2013.

created and affiliated with the SAA. In fact, the SAA, in connection with the ISA and other regional associations, has continued to grow and increase its scope in the music education scene over the years, developing the trumpet instrument group only three years ago.

As demonstrated by this growth and success since Dr. Suzuki's death, the SAA was able to transfer Dr. Suzuki's charismatic leadership into the organization that promotes his vision. Although there was no clear successor to the charismatic Dr. Suzuki, the SAA itself successfully routinized Dr. Suzuki's charisma and continues to promote Dr. Suzuki's philosophy through the study of various musical instruments. While the violin instrument group continues to struggle with criticism from the outside community, leaders in the SAA are confident that, over time, the public will understand that the violin committee consciously strives to reflect Dr. Suzuki's spirit in its work. As evident with leaders that fully believe in Dr. Suzuki's guiding philosophy, the SAA itself has internalized Dr. Suzuki's core values, allowing it to continue to thrive without its founder and charismatic leader, Dr. Suzuki.

While the specific case of the SAA is somewhat unique, the findings on leader-follower relationships apply more broadly to charismatic organizations. While most organizations are not separated into instrument groups, many large organizations are broken down into smaller sectors, departments, or branches. As leader-follower relationships differed between various instrument groups in the SAA, other charismatic organizations can expect to see different leader-follower relationships among the various sectors, departments, or branches. Other organizations must also be prepared to analyze the routinization process on the departmental level rather than as a unified organization, as this thesis assesses the routinization process by SAA instrument group.

In addition, while the specific variables used to assess the SAA may not apply to most organizations, they may be made relevant to any charismatic organization with slight

adjustments. For example, “amount of contact with Dr. Suzuki” generally implies amount of contact with the charismatic leader while “external resistance to the revision process” more broadly refers to external resistance to changes to the charismatic leader’s work. In this way, the results of the SAA case study generalize to other charismatic organizations.

Because of this, other organizations can learn from the experience of the various instrument groups in the SAA following Dr. Suzuki’s death. More generally, organizations can gain knowledge on how leader-follower relationships affect the routinization of charisma. The results of this case study, along with earlier scholarship on charismatic leadership and the routinization of charisma, support the notion that different subsections of an organization may have different leader-follower relationships. In addition, personalized leader-follower relationships result in a more complicated transition process than socialized leader-follower relationships. Finally, it is possible for an organization to succeed without a successor to the charismatic leader with the transfer of the charisma to the charismatic organization.

These findings present encouraging information for charismatic organizations. With a charismatic movement based primarily on socialized relationships, emphasizing value congruence and value internalization, it is possible for the charismatic organization to thrive without the charismatic leader, as the SAA demonstrates.

Appendix A

Interview Questions:

1. At what point in your life were you first exposed to the Suzuki method?
2. How long have you been involved with the SAA and how/why did you become involved?
3. How long have you been a member of the [instrument] committee and how/why did you become involved?
4. Do you know approximately when the [instrument] became a part of the SAA?
5. Do you know approximately when the [instrument] committee formed?
6. Approximately how many people are on the [instrument] committee?
7. What are the major responsibilities of the [instrument] committee?
8. Describe the decision-making process for the [instrument] committee.
9. When Dr. Suzuki was alive, what was the extent of his involvement, if any, with the [instrument] committee?
10. Are you aware of a change in the [instrument] committee's decision-making process since Dr. Suzuki's death?
11. Does the [instrument] committee have a specific person to look to when questions arise or is it more of a collective process?
12. Has the [instrument] committee ever had a specific person to look to when questions arise or has it always been a collective process?
13. How many books have been published for the [instrument]?
14. How many times have the [instrument] books been revised, if any?
15. How does the [instrument] committee approach creating new method books or making changes to the original books?
16. Describe the difficulty of the process of creating a new book or revising an old book. Has it been relatively easy or difficult?

17. Has it gotten progressively easier or more difficult, if any, to create new books or revise old books?
18. Is it controversial when the [instrument] committee creates a new book or revises an old book? Why or why not?
19. Does the [instrument] committee keep meeting minutes? Could I get access to them?
20. Is there anyone else that worked with the [instrument] committee that you would recommend that I speak with?
21. Would you be willing to answer follow-up questions, if necessary?
22. Is there anything I have not asked about the [instrument] committee, Dr. Suzuki, or the SAA that you would like to share?

Bibliography

- Bass, Bernard M. *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: The Free Press, 1985.
- Carey, Tanya Lesinsky. "A Study of Suzuki Cello Practices as Used by Selected American Cello Teachers." DMA thesis, University of Iowa, 1979. <http://celloplayingiseasy.com/portal/Library/tabid/56/Default.aspx>
- Hermann, Evelyn. *Shinichi Suzuki: The Man and His Philosophy*. N.p.: Alfred Music Publishing, 1995.
- Horn, Eva. "Work on Charisma: Writing Hitler's Biography." *New German Critique* 38, no. 3 (2011): 95-114. doi: 10.1215/0094033X-1340066.
- Howell, Jane. "Two Faces of Charisma: Socialized and Personalized Leadership in Organizations." In *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness*, edited by Jay A. Conger and Rabindra N. Kanugo, 213-36. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1988.
- Klein, Katherine J., and Robert J. House. "On Fire: Charismatic Leadership and Levels of Analysis." *The Leadership Quarterly* 6, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 183-98. doi: 10.1016/1048-9843(95)90034-9
- Lewin, Kurt, Ronald Lippitt, and Ralph K. White. "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created Social Climates." *Journal of Social Psychology* 10, no. 2 (1939): 271-301.
- Pioveanelli, Pierluigi. "Jesus' Charismatic Authority: On the Historical Applicability of a Sociological Model." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 73, no. 2 (June 2005): 395-427. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/stable/4139803>.
- Shamir, Boas. "The Charismatic Relationship: Alternative Explanations and Predictions." *The Leadership Quarterly* 2, no. 2 (Summer 1991): 81-104. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(91)90024-V
- Shamir, Boas, Robert J. House, and Michael B. Arthur. "The Motivational Effects of Charismatic Leadership: A Self-Concept Based Theory." *Organization Science* 4, no. 4 (November 1993): 577-94. <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/stable/2635081>.
- Suzuki, Shinichi. *Nurtured By Love: The Classic Approach to Talent Education*. Translated by Waltraud Suzuki. N.p.: Alfred Music Publishing, 1983.
- Swaim, S. Daniel. "One Small Step at a Time: History of the Development of Suzuki Bass." *American Suzuki Journal* 41, no. 1 (December 2012): 53-55.

- Swedberg, Richard. *Max Weber and the Idea of Economic Sociology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998
- Tourish, Dennis, and Naheed Vatcha. "Charismatic Leadership and Corporate Cultism at Enron: The Elimination of Dissent, the Promotion of Conformity and Organizational Collapse." *Leadership* 1, no. 4 (November 2005): 455-480. doi: 10.1177/1742715005057671.
- Trice, Harrison M., and Janice M. Beyer. "Charisma and its Routinization in Two Social Movement Organizations." *Research in Organizational Behavior* 8, (1986): 113-64.
- Weber, Max. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. 3 vols. New York: Bedminster Press, 1968.
- Weierter, Stuart J. M. "Who Wants to Play 'Follow the Leader?' A Theory of Charismatic Relationships Based on Routinized Charisma and Follower Characteristics." *The Leadership Quarterly* 8, no. 2 (1997): 171-93. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(97)90015-1